

Article



Retention of Copper and Zinc from Traffic Area Runoff by Topsoil of Vegetated Infiltration Swales Amended with Recycled Demolition Waste

Sebastian Knoll ^{1,2}, Janna Moritz ¹, Philipp Stinshoff ¹ and Brigitte Helmreich ^{1,*}

- ¹ Chair of Urban Water Systems Engineering, Technical University of Munich, Am Coulombwall 3, 85748 Garching, Germany; s.knoll@tum.de (S.K.); janna.moritz@gmx.de (J.M.); philipp.stinshoff@tum.de (P.S.)
- ² Bodeninstitut Johannes Prügl, Moosburger Str. 5, 84072 Au in der Hallertau, Germany
- * Correspondence: b.helmreich@tum.de; Tel.: +49-89-28913719

Abstract: Infiltration swales are a prospective key component of water-sensitive urban planning. The utilization of appropriate soil amendments is intended to facilitate the retention of pollutants from the stormwater runoff of traffic areas. Little is known about the possibility of utilizing processed construction and demolition waste (CDW) as an amendment to improve pollutant retention. We conducted batch and field tests to investigate (i) the leaching of metals and other elements from soil substrates containing CDW and (ii) their retention potential for copper (Cu) and zinc (Zn) when charged with real traffic area runoff. To gain a comprehensive understanding of the chemical interactions, we (iii) employed sequential extractions using an optimized protocol from treated and untreated soil substrates. In batch tests, the potential of vanadium leaching from technosols amended with brick-dominated CDW was apparent. When charged with traffic area runoff, the retentions of Cu and Zn in the technosols were comparable to those of the control soil without CDW. However, the simulation of high rainfall intensities reduced Cu and Zn retention in the technosols and the control. The results from the subsequent sequential extraction of Cu and Zn imply shifts in the chemical binding in the technosols compared to the control.

Academic Editor: Maha Deeb

Received: 5 January 2025 Revised: 22 January 2025 Accepted: 24 January 2025 Published: 27 January 2025

Citation: Knoll, S.; Moritz, J.; Stinshoff, P.; Helmreich, B. Retention of Copper and Zinc from Traffic Area Runoff by Topsoil of Vegetated Infiltration Swales Amended with Recycled Demolition Waste. *Sustainability* 2025, *17*, 1048. https:// doi.org/10.3390/su17031048

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/license s/by/4.0/). **Keywords:** technosols; stormwater management; green infrastructure; waste management; engineered soils; groundwater protection; pollutant retention

1. Introduction

Traffic area runoff (TAR) constitutes a substantial source of pollution, transporting a diverse array of metals to the environment [1,2]. The metals copper (Cu) and zinc (Zn) from brake dust and tire wear, respectively, are expected to have the highest concentration in TAR [3,4]. By the sedimentation of particulate-bound metals and the precipitation or sorption of metal ions into the soil matrix, the implementation of roadside infiltration swales is an effective solution for contamination management and the state of the technology in Germany [5].

Recently, there has been growing interest in using construction and demolition waste (CDW), which consists mainly of concrete and bricks, as an innovative, cost-effective adsorbent [6]. Waste bricks were shown to effectively adsorb Cu from runoff [7]. Construction waste has been reported as a potential sink for heavy metals from urban runoff [8] and in bioretention filters [9]. CDW is one of the most significant waste streams in Europe, and its utilization could reduce CO₂ emissions and save landfill space [10,11].

In this context, the concept of technosols, or human-made soils created from the recycling of materials, such as CDW, has gained attention as a key approach to promoting sustainability within the framework of the circular economy [12]. In landscaping, the development of local material flows is key to a sustainable construction sector, and the local processing and use of CDW can contribute to this [13]. Repurposing CDW as a topsoil amendment in infiltration swales offers benefits, such as reducing the environmental burden of waste disposal and providing an efficient means of mitigating road runoff pollutants. However, the use of CDW is often hindered by issues related to acceptance and concerns about the release of potentially hazardous substances [14,15].

This three-year study investigates the potential of six CDW-derived technosols to remove Cu and Zn from genuine traffic runoff on a pilot scale for the first time compared to typical soil used in infiltration swales as a control. By examining the material compositiondependent leaching of substances based on batch tests and retention efficiency for Cu and Zn from real traffic area runoff under semi-real conditions, this research aims to evaluate their viability as an alternative to traditional filtration systems.

We hypothesize that topsoil from infiltration swales can be enriched with CDW without harming groundwater quality. In addition, we hypothesize that pollutant retention from traffic area runoff can be improved if the topsoil is enriched with CDW. We also hypothesize differences in the chemical binding of Cu and Zn in the technosols compared to the typical soils used for infiltration swales.

To test the hypotheses, we investigated three phases:

Phase 1: Batch tests of different technosols (soil mixtures based on CDW) and the evaluation of the potential groundwater hazard.

Phase 2: A field test of the technosols on the retention potential and efficiency of Cu and Zn when charged with real traffic area runoff.

Phase 3: Sequential extraction using reference material BCR 701 (BCR-SEP) of Cu and Zn from the technosols with the highest CDW ratios after treatment with TAR to understand the binding mechanisms of Cu and Zn ions.

The findings could contribute to developing sustainable solutions for urban pollution control, while simultaneously addressing waste management challenges and advancing the circular economy.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Technosols from CDW

For the investigations, different technosols were produced based on two recycling mixtures (RCM; RCM1 and RCM2) that derive from building demolition and processing its CDW. The RCMs are crushed aggregates with grain sizes of 0 to 16 mm. RCM1 is enriched with brick material. It contains 60% bricks and 40% concrete, plaster, and mortar. RCM2 is enriched with concrete, plaster, and mortar (70%) and contains 30% bricks (Figure 1). These RCMs have been blended with natural topsoil, subsoil, and compost to achieve comparable particle size distributions and organic matter contents (Table 1). A drum mixer (Doppstadt SM518, Velbert, Germany) was used for mixing the technosols. The resulting six technosols (*a*75, *a*50, *a*25, *b*75, *b*50, *b*25), containing different CDW ratios and compositions and one control soil (*ctl*) that did not contain CDW, were produced.



Figure 1. Schematic representation of the study design.

Table 1. Technosol characteristics (as partly published in Knoll, et al. [16]); GWC = green waste compost; TS = topsoil; SS = subsoil, k_f = hydraulic conductivity; n.a. = not analyzed.

Sample	CDW	Material Ratios [% v/v]			Grain Size Distribution [% <i>w/w</i>]			ibution	kf [m/s] ± SD	CaCO3 [% w/w]	pH Before Treatment with TAR	pH After Treat- ment with TAR	
		Bricks	Concrete + Mortar + Plaster	GWC	TS + SS	Clay	Silt	Sand	Gravel				
a75	RCM1: 75%	41	27	10	22	9.6	13.8	40.7	35.9	$1.8 \times 10^{-3} \pm 1.7 \times 10^{-4}$	45.3	7.5	8.0
a50	RCM1: 50%	28	18	10	44	9.5	12.0	43.2	35.3	1.0 × 10 ⁻³ ± 7.6 × 10 ⁻⁵	40.7	7.5	n.a.
a25	RCM1: 25%	14	9	10	67	9.1	12.2	43.4	35.2	1.1 × 10 ⁻³ ± 8.1 × 10 ⁻⁵	29.3	7.5	n.a.
b75	RCM2: 75%	20	48	10	22	8.9	12.4	42.1	36.6	2.2 × 10 ⁻⁴ ± 1.4 × 10 ⁻⁵	53.7	7.8	8.2
b50	RCM2: 50%	14	32	10	44	9.5	12.2	41.3	36.9	2.8 × 10 ⁻⁴ ± 1.6 × 10 ⁻⁵	46.7	7.8	n.a.
b25	RCM2: 25%	7	16	10	67	10.5	11.3	42.9	35.3	3.1 × 10 ⁻⁴ ± 1.7 × 10 ⁻⁵	34.6	7.7	n.a.
ctl	-	-	-	10	90	9.3	11.4	43.7	35.7	9.6 × 10 ⁻⁴ ± 5.6 × 10 ⁻⁵	22.3	7.8	7.6

2.2. Study Design

For the lysimeter tests, seven vessels (polyethylene, DN 776 mm, height = 500 mm) were buried 80 cm below ground in 2021 and each filled with one technosol or *ctl* (see Figure 1 and Figure A1 in Appendix A).

An extensive grass mix was then sown over the surface areas of all the lysimeters to establish the vegetation. Boundary rings were placed over the surfaces of the vessels (high-density polyethylene, DN 800). A plastic hose connected the outlets (1/2'') at the bottom of the vessels to manholes where the seepage was quantified and collected using tipping counters (100 mL, polycarbonate, REED-Sensor, max. flow rate = 5 L/min).

The assessment considered two thresholds: German threshold values for the seepage water (TV_1) and for the soil solution (TV_2), according to the German Federal Soil Protection and Contaminated Sites Ordinance (Bundesbodenschutz- und Altlasten-verordnung; BBodSchV) [17].

2.2.1. Phase 1–Leaching Behaviour

To assess the leaching of substances for the soil–groundwater pathway in advance, laboratory batch tests according to DIN 19529 with a liquid-to-solid ratio of 2 L/kg batch aqua test were conducted with RCM1, RCM2, the six technosols, and the *ctl* in triplicate [18]. Obtained eluates were analyzed for selected parameters, according to the threshold values TV_2 for soil solutions.

Besides total Cu and Zn concentrations in the eluate, the investigated parameter spectrum included the total concentrations of the elements Sb, As, Pb, B, Cd, Cr, Cr(VI), Co, Mo, Ni, Hg, Se, Tl, V, and Sn. Additionally, sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) were analyzed to evaluate the potential risk for groundwater contamination (list of methods, limits of quantification (LOQ), and threshold values (see Appendix A Table A1)).

2.2.2. Phase 2-Retention of Cu and Zn from Traffic Area Runoff

After backfilling the lysimeters, the six technosols and the *ctl* were exposed to natural weather conditions to ensure stabilization until the Cu and Zn discharges had normalized to avoid biasing seepage concentrations when charging with TAR and measuring background concentrations. The quantities of seepage water up to the start of the TAR charging were recorded using tipping counters and reported as L/S in the results section. Mean background concentrations of Cu, Zn, V, and DOC are based on the values of 4 random samples per technosol between June 2023 and February 2024, which were taken using the tipping counters autosampler (sampling volume: 1% v/v of discharge) in intervals of approx. 2 months.

From April 2024 to August 2024, the lysimeter vessels were charged 12 times (6 per rainfall intensity) with TAR, collected at a highly trafficked road (approx. 24,000 vehicles/day; [19]). The TAR was transported to the study site, stored in containers, and pumped to the test plots using gear pumps. The flow rate was measured using flow meters. Two rainfall intensities were applied, according to measured data from the German Weather Service (KOSTRA data): RI_1: 121 L/(s·ha), volume per charging = 139 L and RI_2: 221 L/(s·ha), volume per charging = 127 L. The charging volume and flow rate of TAR were calculated, according to the German guideline DWA-A 138-1, assuming a ratio of 15 m² of asphalt surface (mean runoff coefficient = 0.9) to 1 m² of active infiltration area in a swale. The influent and total seepage of the lysimeters were sampled and analyzed for Cu and Zn concentrations after aqua regia (AR) digestion and compared to the threshold values TV_1 for seepage water.

2.2.3. Phase 3-Sequential Extraction of Cu and Zn from Soil

Soil samples from *a*75, *b*75, and *ctl* were taken in triplicate from the infiltration areas and, as a control, from the non-infiltration areas at depths of 0–25 mm. From these soil samples, Cu and Zn concentrations were further analyzed following the three-step optimized sequential extraction protocol (BCR-SEP) using BCR 701 (Community Bureau of Reference, European Commission) reference material, according to Rauret et al. [20]. All the used utensils were made of borosilicate glass, polypropylene, or polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE). The extractions were carried out in 80 mL centrifuge tubes (Herolab, Wiesloch, Germany), which were cleaned with 4 mol/L HNO₃ before use and then rinsed with ultrapure water [21]. From each sample, 1 ± 0.01 g was weighed into the centrifuge

tubes three times. Additionally, as a reference, BCR-701 sediment (European Commission, Joint Research Center, Belgium) was added to each batch for quality control. The individual steps of the procedure, including the different fractions and chemical solutions, are briefly described in Appendix A Table A2. The calculated total Cu and Zn contents are the sum of fractions S1 to S4.

Due to difficulties with separation during centrifugation, the speed was increased from 3000 g to 4000 g. To compare the total concentrations from S1 to S4, an AR digestion was performed directly in each batch with 3.0 ± 0.1 g per technosol plus a BCR-701 reference. The Zn and Cu concentrations in the extracts were determined using inductively coupled plasma optical-emission spectrometry (ICP-OES).

In addition, all the technosols' dry weight and loss on ignition (LOI) were determined. For this purpose, 1.0 ± 0.01 g of each technosol in triplicate and one BCR-701 reference per batch was weighed and dried overnight at 105 ± 2 °C in an oven until a constant weight was achieved. These values were used as correction factors, and all the analytical results in this work refer to the dry mass of the samples. To determine the LOI, the samples were heated in a muffle furnace at 550 °C for 2.5 h.

2.3. Data Processing

Mann–Whitney U-tests were applied to detect significant differences between the influent and effluent concentrations of the TAR charging experiment, as well as between the technosol effluents and effluent of the control, respectively. Statistical analysis was conducted using Python's scipy package v1.7.3 [22]. The data were processed with Python's pandas [23], and the plots were created with Python's matplotlib [24] and seaborn [25].

3. Results

3.1. Leaching Potential

The concentrations, pH values, and EC of the leached substance in the batch tests are summarized in Table 2.

Most metal concentrations, also those for Cu and Zn, in the eluate of all the CDW mixtures, the six technosols, and the control were low and under the threshold values of TV_2.

Exceptions were V and Cr(VI). Here, the threshold values for TV_2 were exceeded. The highest V concentrations in the eluate were found for the CDW mixtures between 66.7 μ g/L (RCM2) and 167 μ g/L (RCM1), slightly lower concentrations for the six technosols (up to 43.3 μ g/L for *a*75). Also, the V concentrations of 5 μ g/L in *ctl* were higher than the threshold values of 4 μ g/L in TV_1. The Cr(VI) concentrations were highest in the CDW mixtures with 25.0 μ g/L (RCM 1) and 38.7 μ g/L (RCM 2). In comparison, the threshold value TV_2 was 8 μ g/L. The technosols and the *ctl* did not exceed the threshold value for Cr(VI).

Sulfate concentrations in the eluate of the two CDW mixtures RCM1 and RCM2 were the highest. However, in all the technosols, sulfate concentrations were lower, ranging from 9.6 mg/L (*b*25) to 52.3 mg/L (*a*75). Fluoride concentrations in the eluate of all the tested technosols, RCM1 and RCM2, and *ctl* were low and did not exceed the threshold values of TV_2, which was 1.5 mg/L. Additionally, chloride concentrations were also low. DOC concentrations in the technosols and *ctl* were low and ranged from 5.7 to 7.3 mg/L.

Table 2. Substance concentrations in the eluate of the technosols *a*75, *a*50, *a*25, *b*75, *b*50, and *b*25, the control (*ctl*), and the two CDW mixtures RCM1 and RCM2 based on batch tests at L/S ratio = 2. Concentrations are mean values of the triplicate ± standard deviation; TV_2: German threshold values for soil solution (TV_2), according to BBodSchV [17]; n.a. = not analyzed, <LOQ = below limit of quantification.

				Soil	CDW m	ixtures	TV_2			
	a75	a50	a25	b75	b50	b25	ctl	RCM1	RCM2	
pH [-]	8.7 ± 0.1	8.8 ± 0.0	8.7 ± 0.0	8.8 ± 0.1	8.7 ± 0.1	8.7 ± 0.0	8.5 ± 0.0	10.5 ± 0.5	10.3 ± 0.3	none
EC [µS/cm]	278 ± 17.6	215 ± 9.5	205 ± 5.4	269 ± 39.3	217 ± 19.1	206 ± 4.0	212 ± 2.9	552 ± 28.1	503 ± 65.3	none
Fluoride [mg/L]	0.6 ± 0.2	0.5 ± 0.0	0.5 ± 0.0	0.4 ± 0.0	0.5 ± 0.0	0.5 ± 0.0	0.5 ± 0.0	0.6 ± 0.0	0.6 ± 0.1	none
Chloride [mg/L]	1.6 ± 0.9	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>2.0 ± 0.8</td><td>2.2 ± 0.9</td><td><loq< td=""><td>3.7 ± 1.9</td><td>1.4 ± 0.6</td><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>2.0 ± 0.8</td><td>2.2 ± 0.9</td><td><loq< td=""><td>3.7 ± 1.9</td><td>1.4 ± 0.6</td><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>2.0 ± 0.8</td><td>2.2 ± 0.9</td><td><loq< td=""><td>3.7 ± 1.9</td><td>1.4 ± 0.6</td><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<>	2.0 ± 0.8	2.2 ± 0.9	<loq< td=""><td>3.7 ± 1.9</td><td>1.4 ± 0.6</td><td>none</td></loq<>	3.7 ± 1.9	1.4 ± 0.6	none
$SO_4[mg/L]$	52.3 ± 6.0	26.7 ± 2.4	11.2 ± 1.4	44.0 ± 10.4	19.0 ± 0.8	9.6 ± 1.4	1.4 ± 0.5	167 ± 41.9	170 ± 8.2	none
Sb [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td>4.2 ± 1.2</td><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	3.3 ± 1.2	4.2 ± 1.2	3.3 ± 1.2	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	3.3 ± 1.2	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<>	10
As [µg/L]	8.3 ± 0.5	7.0 ± 0.8	<loq< td=""><td>4.8 ± 1.6</td><td>5.7 ± 0.9</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	4.8 ± 1.6	5.7 ± 0.9	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>25</td></loq<>	25
Pb [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td>8.0 ± 2.2</td><td>4.3 ± 2.6</td><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td>4.3 ± 2.6</td><td>5.8 ± 2.7</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>85</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	8.0 ± 2.2	4.3 ± 2.6	3.3 ± 1.2	4.3 ± 2.6	5.8 ± 2.7	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>85</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>85</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>85</td></loq<>	85
Β [µg/L]	150 ± 8.2	96.7 ± 17.0	70.0 ± 0.0	100 ± 8.2	103 ± 26.2	73.3 ± 4.7	<loq< td=""><td>193 ± 17.0</td><td>143 ± 60.2</td><td>1000</td></loq<>	193 ± 17.0	143 ± 60.2	1000
Cd [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>7.5</td></loq<>	7.5
Cr [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td>4.3 ± 2.6</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>23.3 ± 2.5</td><td>37.3 ± 10.8</td><td>50</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	4.3 ± 2.6	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>23.3 ± 2.5</td><td>37.3 ± 10.8</td><td>50</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>23.3 ± 2.5</td><td>37.3 ± 10.8</td><td>50</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>23.3 ± 2.5</td><td>37.3 ± 10.8</td><td>50</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>23.3 ± 2.5</td><td>37.3 ± 10.8</td><td>50</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>23.3 ± 2.5</td><td>37.3 ± 10.8</td><td>50</td></loq<>	23.3 ± 2.5	37.3 ± 10.8	50
Cr(VI) [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25.0 ± 2.9</td><td>38.7 ± 10.9</td><td>8</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25.0 ± 2.9</td><td>38.7 ± 10.9</td><td>8</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25.0 ± 2.9</td><td>38.7 ± 10.9</td><td>8</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25.0 ± 2.9</td><td>38.7 ± 10.9</td><td>8</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25.0 ± 2.9</td><td>38.7 ± 10.9</td><td>8</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>25.0 ± 2.9</td><td>38.7 ± 10.9</td><td>8</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>25.0 ± 2.9</td><td>38.7 ± 10.9</td><td>8</td></loq<>	25.0 ± 2.9	38.7 ± 10.9	8
Co [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>125</td></loq<>	125
Cu [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>80</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	3.3 ± 1.2	3.3 ± 1.2	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>80</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>3.3 ± 1.2</td><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>80</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	3.3 ± 1.2	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>80</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>80</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>80</td></loq<>	80
Mo [µg/L]	8.0 ± 0.8	5.3 ± 0.5	6.0 ± 0.0	6.3 ± 0.5	5.3 ± 0.5	4.8 ± 1.6	4.5 ± 1.5	9.8 ± 5.3	2.5 ± 0.0	70
Ni [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>60</td></loq<>	60
Hg [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>1</td></loq<>	1
Se [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>10</td></loq<>	10
Tl [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<>	none
V [µg/L]	43.3 ± 4.7	33.3 ± 4.7	16.7 ± 4.7	26.7 ± 4.7	23.3 ± 4.7	20.0 ± 0.0	5.0 ± 0.0	166.7 ± 47.1	66.7 ± 9.4	70
Zn [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>600</td></loq<>	600
Sn [µg/L]	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>none</td></loq<>	none
DOC [mg/L]	5.7 ± 0.5	6.3 ± 0.5	6.7 ± 0.5	5.7 ± 0.5	5.7 ± 0.5	7.3 ± 1.2	6.0 ± 0.8	n.a.	n.a.	none

3.2. Retention and Water Quality

Figure 2 shows the retention performance for Cu and Zn from the traffic area runoff by the different technosols compared to *ctl* (cf. Table A4). The Mann–Whitney U statistics and *p*-values are shown in Table A3.



Figure 2. Cu, Zn, DOC, and EC; grey boxes = RI_1, white boxes = RI_2; red solid line = TV_1, yellow areas = limits of quantification; black asterisks indicate the level of significance of differences between technosol effluents and the effluent of the control derived from Mann–Whitney U-tests (*: *p*-value < 0.05; **: *p*-value < 0.01).

Mean influent concentrations of Cu were 73.4 µg/L at RI_1 and 84.7 µg/L at RI_2. While the Cu concentrations in the influent of the lysimeters were still above the threshold values of TV_1 (50 µg/L), in the leachate of all the experiments (RI_1 and RI_2), the values are consistently below 20 µg/L. However, we also analyzed the seepage water between June 2023 and February 2024 for mean background concentrations, the background values (5 to 6.5 µg/L) were lower compared to the leachate concentrations (up to 19.4 µg/L for *a50*) after treatment with traffic area runoff. Based on Mann–Whitney U-tests with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, the effluents of *a50*, *a25*, and *b50* at RI_1 showed significantly higher Cu concentrations than the control (p = 0.019, 0.005, and 0.005, respectively). At RI_2, the effluents of the technosols showed no significant differences in Cu concentrations compared to the control.

Similar observations can be made for zinc but with differences between RI_1 and RI_2 (Figure 2). The mean influent concentrations of Zn were 247 µg/L at RI_1 and 68.1 µg/L at RI_2, which were both below the threshold value TV_1 of 600 µg/L. The mean effluent concentrations of Zn of all the technosols and the control were much lower, ranging from 9.4 µg/L (*a*25) to 16.2 µg/L (*a*50) at RI_1 and 15.7 µg/L (*a*50) to 38.5 µg/L (*a*25) at RI_2. RI_2 concentrations were higher compared to RI_1 and higher than the background values. Based on Mann–Whitney U-tests with a significance level of α = 0.05, effluent concentrations of Zn of all the technosols including the control were significantly lower than in the influent (cf. Table A3) both at RI_1 and RI_2. The Zn discharges showed no

significant differences compared to the control at RI_1. At RI_2, *a*25 showed marginally higher Zn concentrations in the effluent compared to the control (p = 0.041).

The mean influent concentrations of DOC were 7.4 mg/L at RI_1 and 10.4 mg/L at RI_2. The mean effluent concentrations of DOC were in the range of 9.4 (*a*25) to 15.4 mg/L (*a*75) at RI_1 and 13.6 (*a*25) to 21.6 mg/L (*a*75) at RI_2. DOC was significantly higher in the effluents of all the technosols and the control compared to influent concentrations at RI_1 and RI_2. Compared to the control, effluent DOC was significantly higher in *a*75 and *a*50 at RI_1. At RI_2, effluent DOC was significantly higher in *a*75 and significantly lower in *a*25 compared to the control.

The pH values were comparably stable and were between 7.5 and 7.9 for all the tests and technosols and the *ctl*.

The mean influent EC was 2588 μ S/cm at RI_1 and 352 μ S/cm at RI_2. The mean effluent EC ranged from 2270 μ S/cm (*b*75) to 2896 μ S/cm (*a*25) at RI_1 and from 643 μ S/cm (*a*25) to 703 μ S/cm (*b*25) (*ctl* 576.5 ± 257.4) at RI_2. At RI_1, the EC of effluents of all the technosols, including the control, were not significantly different from the influent EC. At RI_2, the EC of effluents of all the technosols, including the control, was, on the other hand, significantly higher than the influent EC. Compared to the control, no technosol effluent showed significant differences in EC at RI_1 and RI_2.

We evaluated the retention performance of the technosols for Cu and Zn for the tests depending on the rainfall intensities (Figure 3) based on the total loads (cf. Table A5). At RI_1, the mean retention efficiencies for Cu ranged from 78.3% (*a*25) to 94.8% (*a*75) (*ctl*: 90.2%) and from 50.3% (*a*75) to 80.6% (*ctl* 78.7%) at RI_2. At RI_1, the mean retention efficiencies for Zn ranged from 93.7% (*a*25) to 98.0% (*b*25) (*ctl*: 93.2%) and from 48.2% (*a*25) to 83.3% (*b*50) (*ctl* 75.5%) at RI_2. The overall mean retention efficiencies of Cu were highest in *b*25 (85.6%) and lowest in *a*75 with 72.5% (*ctl* 73.9%). The overall mean retention efficiencies of Zn were highest in *b*50 with 90.3% and lowest in *a*25 with 71.0% (*ctl* 84.3%).

RI_1 and RI_2 showed no significant differences in the Cu retention of technosols compared to the control soil. At RI_1, there were no significant differences in the Zn retention of technosols compared to the control. At RI_2, only *a*25 showed significantly lower Zn retention efficiency than the control (p = 0.03). The total retention efficiencies of technosols showed no significant differences compared to the control. However, across all the soils, the retention efficiencies for Cu and Zn were significantly reduced at higher rainfall intensities (p = 0.003 and p < 0.001, respectively).



Figure 3. Retention efficiencies of Cu and Zn based on influent and effluent loads for RI_1, RI_2, and total (=both rain intensities).

3.3. Sequential Extraction of Cu and Zn

After treatment with TAR, Cu and Zn accumulation was measured in the technosols a75 and b75 and the control (Figure 4).



Figure 4. Total contents of Cu and Zn in the technosols *a75*, *b75*, and *ctl* before treatment and the technosols after treatment with TAR (*a75_treat*, *b75_treat*, and *ctl_treat*), based on the sums of S1–4 derived from the sequential extraction procedure.

Based on the sequential extraction, the residual Cu fraction was the dominant component in all the samples and always accounted for more than 60% of the total content (Figure 5). In the untreated substrates, the residual Cu content is higher in *ctl* compared to *a*75 and *b*75. The following order was determined in the treated soils: *ctl_treat* > *b*75_*treat* > *a*75_*treat*. The second largest Cu fraction in all the substrates was the oxidizable, accounting for approximately 30% in the untreated soils, 22.3% in *ctl_treat* and 35.9% in *a*75_*treat*. Again, in the untreated substrates, the Cu contents were higher in *ctl* compared to *a*75 and *b*75. A similar pattern was seen in the treated substrates: *ctl*_treat > *a*75_*treat* > *b*75_*treat*.

The reducible and acid-exchangeable Cu fractions were <1 mg/kg in all the samples, and each represented less than 2% of the total contents. An exception was *a*75, where 0.87 mg/kg was measured for the acid-exchangeable Cu fraction, corresponding to 5.45%.

Considering the relative frequencies of mobilizable Cu (sum of S1–S3), *a*75_treat and *b*75_treat showed the increased mobile phases of Cu compared to *ctl_treat*.

In summary, the proportion of the residual Cu fraction increased after treatment, while the mobile Cu phases (S1–S3) decreased, except for *a*75_treat. The mobile Cu phase increased slightly, shifting from reducible to oxidizable fractions.

Of all the treated soils, *ctl_treat* had the highest total Zn content, followed by *a*75_*treat* and *b*75_*treat*. However, the content of Zn in the untreated substrates was also higher in *ctl* than in *a*75 and *b*75. In the untreated soils, the fractionation obtained from BCR-SEP for *a*75 and *b*75 was residual >> reducible >> acid-exchangeable > oxidizable, while for *ctl*, the order was residual >> reducible > oxidizable > acid-exchangeable. In the treated substrates, the fractionation in *ctl_treat* was identical to *ctl*, while in *a*75_*treat* and *b*75_*treat*, it was residual >> reducible > acid-exchangeable.

The residual Zn fraction was dominant in all the samples. The reducible Zn fraction was the second largest in all the samples. The highest reducible Zn fraction was found in substrate *a*75, followed by *ctl* and *b*75. The treated samples showed the following order: *a*75_*treat* > *b*75_*treat* > *ctl*_*treat*. The substrates *a*75 and *b*75 differ from *ctl* in terms of Zn fractionation. In the control soil, the oxidizable Zn fraction ranked third in the untreated and treated. In *a*75 and *b*75, the acid-exchangeable Zn fraction was the third largest.

The lowest Zn contents of *ctl* were found in the acid-exchangeable fraction, both treated and untreated. For *a*75 and *b*75, the oxidizable Zn fraction was the smallest, both with and without treatment. In summary, the residual fraction increases after TAR treatment, while the mobile phase decreases, except in *a*75_*treat*. There, the proportion of the mobile Zn phase remains nearly unchanged, with a shift in the reducible fraction towards the acid-exchangeable fraction.



Figure 5. Fractions of mobilizable (acid-extractable, reducible, and oxidizable) and residual phases before and after treatment with TAR based on the sequential extraction procedure.

To assess shifts in the chemical bindings of Cu and Zn after treatment with TAR, the treated substrates' mean Cu and Zn contents were subtracted from those of the untreated soils (Table 3). The most pronounced shifts in Cu contents were found for *a75*, where oxidizable Cu was nearly as high as residual Cu, showing a decrease in reducible Cu, on the other hand. *b75* also showed a relative increase in oxidizable Cu, albeit less pronounced.

In *ctl*, most Cu accumulation occurred in the residual phase. Analogously, the most pronounced shifts in Zn were found in *a*75, where a significant accumulation of Zn was found in the acid-exchangeable phase, and only half of the Zn accumulation was found in the residual phase. In *b*75, most of the Zn accumulation occurred in the residual phase. In *ctl*, all the highly mobile phases stayed the same or decreased, and only the residual phase increased.

Metal	Substrate	S1 Acid-Exchangea- ble	S2 Reducible	S3 Oxidizable	S4 Residue	Sum S1–S4
	a75	1.1	-11.8	52.2	58.6	100
Cu	b75	1.2	-1.7	17.2	83.3	100
	ctl	0.8	-0.1	3.9	95.5	100
	a75	26.5	13.3	8.0	52.2	100
Zn	b75	7.0	17.7	4.9	70.3	100
	ctl	0.2	-0.1	-6.2	106.1	100

Table 3. Cu and Zn shifts in the substrates; calculated as mean percentage of Cu and Zn of treated soils minus mean percentage in untreated substrates [%].

4. Discussion

4.1. Risk of Substance Release

Except for Cr(VI) and V, the leaching of substances obtained from batch tests at L/S 2 was largely unremarkable compared to the German threshold values for soil solution TV_2. Concentrations of Cr(VI) in both RCM1 and RCM2 exceeded the threshold value substantially. However, Cr(VI) concentrations were below the threshold value in the six technosols, which will be normally applied in practice. The concentration of V in RCM1 exceeded the threshold value TV_2 and was substantially higher than in RCM2. Hence, while V concentrations were lowest in the control, in the technosols, we see a dose-response of V with an increasing ratio of RCM1, which, in contrast, is vaguer for RCM2. Crushed bricks release substantially more sulfate, Cr, and V than crushed concrete [26]. Vanadium release from CDW that contains bricks can be three times higher than in CDW based solely on concrete [15]. Our data confirm that an increased proportion of bricks in the CDW increases the release of some elements, like Cr and V [15,26-28]. While in German legislation, an L/S-dependent decay behavior is assumed to evaluate recycled building materials for Cr discharges, there is no generalizable decay behavior for V [29]. While the high pH of mixed CDW is related more to its concrete than its brick phase [26], in our study, the pH of both CDW mixtures derived from the batch tests was high (>10, cf. Table 2). Over time, the increased specific surface area and increased air and water supply during storage facilitate the carbonation of crushed CDW [15], resulting in a pH between 8 and 9 [30-33], while partly carbonated CDW is suggested to have a pH 10.5 to 11.9 [31,34]. This indicates that the CDW mixtures were not yet carbonated, as they were sampled. Carbonation is associated with the increased leaching of anionic compounds when the aging of concrete leads to the release of sulfate and its substituting ions, chromate, and vanadate [15,35]. Consequently, in our study, the sulfate leaching from the mixed CDW, the technosols, and the control correlated strongly with the leaching of Cr(VI) (r² = 0.81) and V ($r^2 = 0.71$). Furthermore, V release in soils is supposed to correlate to higher pH [36]. Therefore, we attribute the reduced release of V from the soil to a reduction in the pH value by adding soils with a neutral pH and to a reduced release of sulfate in the technosol mixtures. For EC, we observed a dose-dependent response, increasing with higher ratios of both RCM 1 and RCM 2.

4.2. Retention and Binding

The traffic area runoff TAR concentrations of Cu and Zn used as influent in this study were comparable with concentrations reported for urban roads with AADT > 15,000 vehicles [1]. The Zn/Cu ratio at RI_1 was 3.4, which concurs with the literature [1]. However, Zn concentrations and, thus, the Zn/Cu ratio of TAR used for RI_2 (0.8) were lower than expected. We attribute this to the different sampling periods. The TAR for RI_1 was sampled in late winter/early spring; whereas, the TAR for RI_2 was sampled during the summer months. In winter, metal loadings in traffic area runoff are expected to be higher, which is often caused by the application of de-icing salts and increased corrosion rates [1,37,38].

Metals and other elements from TAR were found to bind to soil particles by precipitation or adsorption, forming strong bonds that are difficult to change under typical environmental conditions [1,39]. Copper occurs in topsoils in oxic conditions, mostly in oxidation state II, and is not very exchangeable at pH > 5; its solution concentration is mainly determined by adsorption and desorption, depending on pH and soluble, organic or inorganic complexing agents [40]. We assume that, due to the high carbonate content of the soils analyzed, Cu is present in the form of carbonate and organometallic complexes [40]. In addition, we assume that the microbial degradation of the substrate compost releases soluble organic complexing agents and promotes the mobilization of adsorbed Cu [40]. On the other hand, the content of exchangeable Zn is very low at pH > 6.5, as Zn^{2+} , $Zn(OH)^+$, and $ZnCO_3$ are mainly present here, of which $Zn(OH)^+$ in particular increases proportionally with increasing pH and is specifically adsorbed and fixed by oxides [40]. Furthermore, metals and other elements transported by the TAR to roadside soils are bound to particles, which in turn, are largely retained by physical mechanisms, particularly in the upper soil layers [2,41]. Therefore, metal mobilities were determined in roadside soils, depending on the pH and organic matter [42-44].

Accordingly, Zn retention in our study was higher than Cu retention, comparable to findings reported from the US [45]. Our study found no correlations between Cu and Zn discharge in the effluents and its pH, EC, or DOC. Although DOC concentrations in the effluents were higher than in the influents (presumably due to the addition of compost), we suggest that due to the high charging rates applied in our study, retention times in the soil were not long enough to promote the complexation of Cu and organic matter. In addition, we can rule out unfavorable redox conditions due to the high oxygen content in the effluents. As the Cu and Zn retentions measured for RI_2 were significantly lower than RI_1, we consider it rather likely that the mechanical filtering effect of the coarse-grained soils with high water permeability was no longer present at the high charging rate. Hence, we assume that the retention of particulate-bound Cu and Zn was impaired. This assumption is supported by the fact that there was no backwater in the plots during the irrigations, even at a high charging rate. Nevertheless, the Cu and Zn retentions of the studied technosols were not significantly lower than that of the control. The effluent concentrations of Cu and Zn of all the analyzed technosols and the control were below the threshold of the German BBodSchV.

After the treatment with TAR, the direct AR pseudo-total analysis was generally unable to extract the same metal content as the sum of the BCR-SEP fractions (S1–4). However, we found accumulations compared to the non-treated soils for Cu and Zn. The relatively lower concentrations in the pseudo-total can also be reflected in the pseudo-accuracy of the reference material BCR-701, with the residual fraction slightly overestimated and the direct AR pseudo-total rather underestimated (cf. Table A6). The large difference cannot be fully explained. Possible reasons could be that the samples were not ground before direct digestion, leading to the incomplete extraction of metal concentrations, and that the AR digestion technique is more accurate for analyzing the residue than the raw material [21]. Davidson et al. [46] and Rommel, Stinshoff and Helmreich [21] reported comparable deviations of summarized SEP fractions and pseudo-total digestion from the sequential extractions of soil and filter media, respectively. Also, for these reasons, the recoveries are sometimes very poor (cf. Table A6). They are in the 109–234% range, which means that the sum of the fractions of metal concentrations is sometimes more than twice as high as the pseudo-total. Ideally, the values should be between 80 and 120% [47].

For Cu and Zn, the residual fraction increases slightly after treatment (approx. 2– 11%), except in *a*75_*treat*, where a small increase in the mobile phase was observed. The residual fraction is >53% in all the substrates. Due to the pseudo-accuracy calculated for this fraction, we attribute discrepancies to overestimating the residual fraction. Sutherland et al. [48] reported lower residual fractions of Cu (35%) and Zn (21%) in road-deposited sediments (RDS). In contrast, Pérez, López-Mesas and Valiente [39] found residual fractions of up to 80% for Cu in RDS (Table A7). Rommel, Stinshoff and Helmreich [21] have found comparably high residual fractions in carbonate sand used to treat TAR from the same origin we used in this study. Zn and Cu are found predominantly in particulate form in traffic area runoff TAR, making the upper soil layer critically important. In this layer, metals and other elements are primarily retained mechanically by sedimentation and filtration, while chemical processes, such as adsorption and binding to organic matter, also contribute significantly to their immobilization [1,2]. Rommel, Stinshoff and Helmreich [21] sampled the TAR used in this study at the same sampling site as in this study and found concentrations of total Cu and Zn approx. seven times higher than dissolved Cu and Zn.

For Cu, the oxidizable fraction is the second largest (approx. 22 to 36%), while for Zn, it is negligible (about 5 to 11%). In *a*75, treatment with TAR caused a shift in Cu from the reducible fraction (from 5.5 to 0.45%) to the oxidizable fraction (from 29.2 to 35.9%). Bacon and Davidson [49] point out that Cu expected in the oxidizable can also be released in the reducible phase, making interpretation difficult. Similar contents in the oxidizable fraction (approximately 26%), which also correlate with organic carbon, were observed by Sutherland et al. [50] and Kartal et al. [51] in studies of RDS in Honolulu, Hawaii, and Kayseri, Turkey (cf. Table A6).

*a*75_*treat* also shows a shift in Zn, with a decrease in the reducible fraction (from 25.8 to 20.4%) and an increase in the acid-exchangeable fraction (from 10.3 to 17.3%). The latter, the most mobile and potentially harmful fraction, is strongly influenced by pH. Metals become more mobile the more acidic the soil. This behavior is opposite to the pH in the substrates, especially for *a*75_*treat* and *a*75_*treat*. Bacon and Davidson [49] also found that a phase shift can occur during the extraction of Zn, which can distort the results. The findings of this study differ from other studies, where higher fractions of acid-exchangeable Zn were reported, ranging from 25 to 38% [39,48,50,51].

A comparison of only the mobile fraction (S1-S3) shows a similar pattern in fractionation for Zn in the substrates *a75_treat* and *b75_treat* as in other studies [48,50,51]. However, the proportions of the individual fractions vary considerably, with overall higher Cu and Zn contents, especially in the acid-exchangeable fraction reported in these comparative studies.

No comparable pattern emerges for Cu. However, the authors of [39] reported a similar sequence of fractions, with the residue even accounting for about 80%. In contrast, Kartal, Aydın and Tokalıoğlu [51] and Sutherland, Tack and Ziegler [48] reported the following order for Cu: acid-exchangeable < oxidizable < reducible. In contrast to *b75_treat* and *ctl_treat*, *a75_treat* showed an increase in Cu in both the mobile and residual phase.

*b*75, which contains higher proportions of concrete, mortar, and plaster, shows more favorable distribution ratios than *a*75. This finding is in concordance with Pallewatta, Weerasooriyagedara, Bordoloi, Sarmah and Vithanage [6], who have found better

retention in concrete-based waste than in masonry-based waste. Barrett, Katz and Taylor [3] point out that Portland cement concrete in roadside soils fosters metal retention, mainly by controlling pH and precipitation. Furthermore, we hypothesize that, in *a75*, where higher iron contents due to a higher brick ratio are to be expected, the presence of humic-coated Fe-oxide colloids also combined with higher Ca contents inherent in the CDW promotes the transport of Cu [52]. On the other hand, high Cu retention [7,8] and Zn retention [53] were found for brick or brick-dominated aggregates.

However, despite overall comparable Cu and Zn retentions when charged with TAR, both CDW-amended technosols showed unfavorable binding properties compared to the control. This is due to relative increases in mobile Cu and Zn phases, which could be released by various environmental influences (e.g., changes in pH, de-icing salt input, enrichment of organic matter).

Future studies should address the role of aging (e.g., the degree of carbonation) on the retention of heavy metals and other elements from runoff in CDW technosols.

5. Conclusions

Technosols amended with brick-dominated CDW showed the dose-dependent increased leaching potential of V, which correlates with sulfate emissions. Therefore, V and sulfate content should always be analyzed, and high contents should be avoided when bricks are used to amend the topsoils of infiltration swales to not harm groundwater quality. However, CDW-amended technosols can be used in infiltration swales regarding the retention of metals and other elements from traffic area runoff. They had comparable Cu and Zn retentions as the control soil with the same particle size distribution. Considering the chemical binding of Cu and Zn, the amendment of concrete-dominated CDW is favorable to brick-dominated CDW. Still, both showed an increase in mobile Cu and Zn phases compared to the control, implying increased potential for desorption and remobilization. From a sustainability perspective, the use of recycled construction and demolition waste from local production in infiltration swales could be a sustainable solution for reducing transport related CO₂ emissions and resource consumption. However, the prerequisite for this is the best possible separation of waste, for example, to avoid the influence of other, non-mineral components, such as plastic in the CDW.

Author Contributions: S.K.: conceptualization; data curation; formal analysis; funding acquisition; investigation; methodology; project administration; resources; software; supervision; validation; visualization; writing—original draft. J.M.: investigation; writing—review and editing. P.S.: writing—review and editing. B.H.: supervision; writing—review and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the City of Munich, Municipal Department and contributes to the EU URBACT project URGE (circular building cities). Parts of this work were additionally funded by The German Research Foundation (DFG) funds from the Research Training Group Urban Green Infrastructure—Training Next Generation of Professionals for Integrated Urban Planning Research (GRK 2679/1).

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author due to legal restrictions from the funding partner.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank Myriam Reif, Wolfgang Schröder, Carolin Heim, and Maximilian Damberger from the Technical University of Munich for their technical and analytical support. The authors thank the City of Munich's Municipal Department for funding this study. **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the study's design, in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

- AR Aqua regia
- BCR Community Bureau of Reference, European Commission
- CDW Construction and demolition waste
- RCM Recycling mixture (in this study: crushed aggregates of mixed CDW)
- RDS Road-deposited sediments
- SEP Sequential extraction procedure
- TAR Traffic area runoff
- TV_1 Threshold values for seepage water, according to BBodSchV
- TV_2 Threshold values for soil solution, according to BBodSchV

Appendix A

Table A1. List of methods, limits of quantification (LOQ), and threshold values, according to BBodSchV.

	Substance	Method	LOQ	Unit	BBodSo	chV [17]
					TV_1	TV_2
		Batch tests				
pН		DIN 38404-5: 2009-07 [54]				
EC		DIN EN 27888: 1993-11 [55]	10	µS/cm		
Sb	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	5	10
As	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	10	25
Pb	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	10	85
В	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	50	µg/L	1000	1000
Cd	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	0.5	µg/L	3	7.5
Cr	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	50	50
Cr(VI)	AR	DIN ISO 15923-1: 2014-07 [57]	5	µg/L	8	8
Co	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	10	125
Cu	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	50	80
Мо	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	35	70
Ni	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	20	60
Hg	AR	DIN EN ISO 12846: 2012-08 [58]	0.2	µg/L	1	1
Se	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	5	µg/L	10	10
Tl	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	0.5	µg/L		
V	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	2	µg/L	4	70
Zn	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	50	µg/L	600	600
Sn	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]	20	µg/L		
DOC	Filtration 0.45 µm	DIN 1484 [59]	1	mg/L		
Cl		DIN ISO 15923-1: 2014-07 [57]	2	mg/L		
SO_4		DIN ISO 15923-1: 2014-07 [57]	2	mg/L		
F		DIN 38405-4: 1985-07 [54]	0.2	mg/L	1,5	
		Retention tests				
pН		on-site				
EC		on-site		μS/cm		
O2		on-site		mg/L		
Cu	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]		μg/L	50	
Zn	AR	DIN EN ISO 17294-2: 2017-01 [56]		µg/L	600	

Step	Fraction	Solution	Process Description
			Addition of the solution to the samples in centrifuge tubes;
			Overnight extraction $(16 \pm 2 h)$ in an end-over-end shaker at 30 ± 10
			rpm and 21 ± 2 °C;
	A gid ov	40 mJ acotic acid (0.11	Centrifugation at 4000× g for 20 min to separate the extract from
S1	Acia-ex-	40 mL acetic actd (0.11	the technosol;
	tractable	mor/L)	Pipetting off the supernatant, filtering with 0.45 µm, and stabilizing
			with 50 µL of 65% HNO ₃ ;
			Washing the residue with 20 mL of ultrapure water, shaking for 15 min,
			centrifuging for 20 min, pipetting off, and discarding the supernatant.
	Reducible	40 mL hydroxylammonium	Addition of the solution from a 1 L mixture (containing 25 mL of 2
S2		chloride (0.5 mol/L)	mol/L HNO3) to the residue;
		chioride (0.5 mol/L)	Continuation of the procedure as described in S1.
			Addition of 10 mL H_2O_2 to the residue, covering the tubes, and reaction
			at 21 \pm 2 °C for 1 h with occasional manual shaking;
		2 × 10 mL hydrogen perox-	Placement of the tubes in a water bath (85 \pm 5 °C), reduction in the vol-
53	Ovidizabla	ide (8.8 mol/L);	ume to <3 mL (occasional manual shaking);
55	Oxidizable	50 mL ammonium acetate (1	Addition of 10 mL H ₂ O ₂ (tubes in the water bath) and reaction until the
		mol/L)	volume is reduced to 1 mL (occasional manual shaking);
			Addition of 50 mL NH4OAc (pH 2) and continuation of the procedure
			as described in S1.
S4	Residue	HNO3:HCl = 3:1	Digestion of the residue with AR.

Table A2. Four steps of the optimized BCR-SEP with corresponding fractions and solutions [20].

Table A3. Mann–Whitney U statistics and *p*-values for Cu and Zn concentrations in the effluent of the technosols compared to the control.

Element	Rain Intensity	Technosol	U Statistic	<i>p</i> -Value
		a75	21	0.732
		a50	33	0.019
	121 I ((a ba))	a25	36	0.005
	121 L/(S·na)	b75	28	0.142
		b50	36	0.005
Cu		b25	30	0.073
Cu		a75	18	1.000
		a50	8	0.132
	221 I ((a b a))	a25	12	0.394
	221 L/(S·na)	b75	11	0.310
		b50	15	0.699
		b25	11.5	0.336
		a75	19	0.935
		a50	13	0.452
	121 I ((a ba))	a25	26.5	0.196
	121 L/(S·IIa)	b75	16.5	0.870
		b50	14.5	0.618
7		b25	12	0.357
ZII		a75	21.5	0.630
		a50	6.5	0.078
	221 L /(c.b.a)	a25	31	0.041
	221 L/(S·11a)	b75	19	0.937
		b50	28	0.132
		b25	14	0.589

Table A4. Mean background concentrations and mean influent and effluent concentrations from
TAR treatment; L/S = liquid to solid ratio at the beginning of TAR treatment; inf = inflow; n.a. = not
analyzed.

Mean Background Concentra-				Concentration	Concentrations Rain Intensity RI_2							
tions $(n = 4)$					(n = 6)							
I/S	Cu	Zn	DOC	Cu [ug/]] 7 n [ug/]]	DOC	nН	EC [uS/cm]	Cu [ug/I]	7n [ug/I]	DOC	лH	FC [uS/cm]
L/5	′ [μg/L]	[µg/L]	[mg/L]	Cu [µg/L] Zn [µg/L]	[mg/L]	PII	Le [µ0/em]	Cu [µg/1]	ΖΠ [μg/L]	[mg/L]	PII	Le [µ0/em]
inf n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	$73.4 \pm 61.5\ 247 \pm 169$	7.4 ± 3.9	7.8 ± 0.1	2588 ± 2128	84.7 ± 34.6	68.1 ± 20.5	10.4 ± 0.9	7.8 ± 0.1	351 ± 218
a750.51	6.5 ± 2.6	6.5 ± 2.6	35 ± 14	7.0 ± 5.1 17.5 ± 13.8	15.4 ± 6.7	7.7 ± 0.1	2648 ± 1060	17.1 ± 2.4	19.6 ± 3.6	21.6 ± 1.5	7.8 ± 0.1	683 ± 286
a500.57	7.0 ± 3.5	5 ± 0	31 ± 13	$12.7 \pm 4.4 \ 14.6 \pm 14.3$	16.2 ± 7.1	7.9 ± 0.3	2471 ± 948	12.7 ± 4.3	15.7 ± 1.5	200.6 ± 3.1	7.8 ± 0.1	697 ± 3389
a250.55	6.5 ± 2.6	5 ± 0	38 ± 18	$15.3 \pm 4.7\ 24.8 \pm 18.8$	9.4 ± 3.9	7.5 ± 0.1	2896 ± 1520	15.4 ± 3.1	38.5 ± 24.3	13.6 ± 1.1	7.9 ± 0.0	643 ± 268
b750.47	5 ± 0	5 ± 0	23 ± 10	9.5 ± 5.5 11.6 ± 9.1	11.6 ± 5.3	7.7 ± 0.1	2270 ± 516	15.1 ± 2.9	21.8 ± 7.4	16.5 ± 0.8	7.8 ± 0.0	698 ± 277
b500.57	5 ± 0	5 ± 0	20 ± 7	$19.4 \pm 12.9 \hspace{0.2cm} 9.7 \pm 9.5$	11.0 ± 5.1	7.9 ± 0.3	2590 ± 901	16.9 ± 3.8	27.3 ± 6.7	16.1 ± 0.8	7.8 ± 0.1	688 ± 330
b250.82	5 ± 0	5 ± 0	20 ± 9	$14.5 \pm 9.3 8.3 \pm 4.8$	10.1 ± 4.6	7.8 ± 0.1	2643 ± 829	15.7 ± 1.8	18.6 ± 6.2	15.5 ± 1.9	7.7 ± 0.1	703 ± 323
ctl 0.84	5 ± 0	7.0 ± 3.5	14 ± 5	5.0 ± 2.8 14.1 ± 15.1	11.6 ± 5.4	7.9 ± 0.2	2099 ± 453	17.4 ± 2.9	20.2 ± 6.6	16.9 ± 1.9	7.7 ± 0.0	576 ± 257

Table A5. Total loads [mg] and load based retention [%] of Cu and Zn per substrate and rain intensity RI.

			Cu			Zn	
		Influent Load	Effluent Load	Retention	Influent Load	Effluent Load	Retention
	RI_1	101	2.8	94.8 ± 3.3	158	7.4	95.5 ± 1.7
a75	RI_2	27.4	7.5	50.3 ± 27.4	27.2	8.4	66.3 ± 14.6
	Total	128	10.3	72.5 ± 0.4	185	15.8	80.9 ± 18.0
	RI_1	110	6.1	88.0 ± 8.4	225	5.6	96.2 ± 4.4
a50	RI_2	46.0	6.0	71.5 ± 20.6	40.2	7.3	73.9 ± 15.7
	Total	156	12.0	79.8 ± 0.3	265	12.9	85.0 ± 16.0
	RI_1	146	6.0	78.3 ± 29.3	191	12.7	93.7 ± 2.0
a25	RI_2	131	6.2	69.6 ± 37.1	40.4	14.6	48.2 ± 32.9
	Total	276	12.2	73.9 ± 0.6	232	27.3	71.0 ± 32.6
	RI_1	80.9	4.0	86.8 ± 15.6	172	5.3	96.8 ± 2.0
b75	RI_2	31.5	5.9	66.1 ± 19.7	39.4	8.5	76.9 ± 12.6
	Total	112	9.9	76.5 ± 0.3	211	13.8	86.9 ± 13.4
	RI_1	111	8.5	83.5 ± 13.8	2134	4.5	97.2 ± 2.9
b50	RI_2	54.5	6.7	77.9 ± 18.7	77.8	10.6	83.3 ± 8.4
	Total	166	15.2	80.7 ± 0.2	292	15.1	90.3 ± 9.3
	RI_1	130	5.1	90.5 ± 13.1	320	2.7	98.0 ± 1.8
b25	RI_2	56.4	5.5	80.6 ± 19.2	89.1	6.7	82.2 ± 15.7
	Total	187	10.5	85.6 ± 0.2	410	9.4	90.1 ± 13.7
	RI_1	75.7	2.1	90.2 ± 8.5	150	7.3	93.2 ± 5.3
ctl	RI_2	105	7.3	78.7 ± 22.8	48.9	9.1	75.5 ± 13.0
	Total	181	9.4	73.9 ± 17.6	199	16.3	84.3 ± 13.3

Table A6. Cu and Zn content in S1 to S4 and their sum of the non-irrigated substrates <i>a75</i> , <i>b75</i> , and
<i>ctl</i> and with TAR irrigated <i>a</i> 75_ <i>treat</i> , <i>b</i> 75_ <i>treat</i> , and <i>ctl_treat</i> , reported as mean values ± standard
deviation; additionally, pseudo-total content and the recovery as a difference between sum $S1-S4$
and pseudo-total.

	Commite	S	1	S2		S3	;	S 4		Sum	Pseudo-	Decement	
	Sample	Acid-Exch	angeable	Reduc	ible	Oxidiz	able	Resid	ue	S1–S4 ^a	Total ^b	Kecovery	
		[mg/kg]	[%]	[mg/kg]	[%]	[mg/kg]	[%]	[mg/kg]	[%]	[mg/kg]	[mg/kg]	[%]	
	o75	0.13	0.82	0.87	5.45	4.66	29.2	10.3	64.5	16.1	0 70	102	
	a75	± 0.06	± 0.3	± 0.48	± 2.9	± 0.26	± 0.9	± 0.42	± 3.8	± 0.69	0.20	193	
	h75	0.1	0.68	0.28	1.91	4.33	29.6	9.94	67.9	14.7	7 57	104	
	075	± 0.0	± 0.1	± 0.03	± 0.6	± 1.28	± 3.4	±1.59	± 2.7	± 2.04	7.37	174	
	ctl	0.1	0.37	0.28	1.04	8.41	31.2	18.2	67.4	27.1	14.6	185	
Cu	cu	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.03	± 0.2	± 0.83	± 1.1	± 2.63	± 1.3	± 2.76	14.0	105	
Cu	a75 troat	0.2	0.89	0.1	0.45	8.05	35.9	14.1	62.8	22.5	17	100	
	a/J_ffeat	± 0.0	± 0.1	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.34	± 1.5	± 1.57	± 1.6	± 1.61	17	152	
	b75_treat	0.22	90	0.11	0.45	6.04	24.6	18.2	74.1	24.6	10.5	224	
		± 0.0	± 0.1	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.67	± 4.0	± 2.1	± 4.0	± 2.2	10.5	204	
	ctl_treat	0.2	0.5	0.27	0.67	8.93	22.3	30.7	76.6	40.1	18	222	
		± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.02	± 0.0	± 0.49	± 0.7	± 2.81	± 0.7	± 2.91	10	225	
	275	7.65	10.3	19.1	25.8	7.21	9.7	40.3	54.2	74.3	61.0	120	
	a75	± 1.16	± 1.0	± 0.88	±1.6	± 0.76	± 1.3	± 4.43	± 3.1	± 1.23	01.9	120	
	h75	5.73	9.49	11.4	18.9	5.37	8.89	37.9	62.8	60.4	196	122	
	075	± 0.50	± 2.0	± 3.08	± 1.5	± 1.79	± 1.2	± 8.7	± 2.2	± 4.33	47.0	122	
	ctl	6.66	6.2	14.3	13.3	11.2	10.5	75.3	70.1	107	79.6	135	
7n	cu	± 0.18	± 0.3	± 1.3	± 0.5	± 0.39	± 0.8	± 5.54	± 0.7	± 12.4	79.0	155	
211	a75 treat	22.4	17.3	26.5	20.4	11.6	8.98	69.2	53.3	131	108	120	
	a/5_ticat	±1.16	± 0.8	± 0.62	±1.0	± 0.07	± 0.2	± 4.09	± 1.8	± 7.18	100	120	
	h75 treat	10.4	8.17	23.3	18.3	8.68	6.8	85.3	66.8	128	60.1	213	
	b/5_ticat	±1.27	±1.9	± 2.20	± 2.8	± 2.59	± 1.2	±15.9	± 3.5	± 4.32	00.1	213	
	ctl treat	6.75	4.36	14.2	9.2	8.32	5.38	125	81.1	155	69.4	222	
	ctl_treat	± 0.16	± 0.3	± 0.41	± 0.8	± 0.15	± 0.4	±11.4	± 1.5	± 8.90	07.4	220	

 $^{\rm a}$ Sum of means of S1–S4, $^{\rm b}$ values from single determination.

Table A7. Comparison of the sequentially extracted fractions of Cu and Zn in this study with data from the literature; RDS = road-deposited sediment or similar.

		S1	S 2	S 3	S4	Total	
	Type	Acid-Exchangeable	Reducible	Oxidizable	Residual	I Utal	
		[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[mg/kg]	
		Cu					
a75	Technosol	0.8 ± 0.3	5.4 ± 2.3	29.2 ± 0.7	64.6 ± 3.1	15.9 ± 0.4	
a75_treat	Technosol	0.9 ± 0.1	0.5 ± 0.0	35.9 ± 1.2	62.7 ± 1.3	22.5 ± 1.6	
b75	Technosol	0.7 ± 0.1	2.0 ± 0.5	29.1 ± 2.8	68.2 ± 2.2	14.6 ± 2.3	
b75_treat	Technosol	0.9 ± 0.0	0.5 ± 0.0	24.7 ± 3.2	73.9 ± 3.3	24.6 ± 1.4	
ctl	Soil	0.4 ± 0.0	1.0 ± 0.2	31.3 ± 0.9	67.3 ± 1.0	27.0 ± 2.8	
<i>ctl</i> _treat	Soil	0.5 ± 0.0	0.7 ± 0.0	22.3 ± 0.5	76.5 ± 0.6	40.1 ± 2.8	
[48]	RDS	7.0 ± 1.4	37.2 ± 2.6	20.5 ± 2.2	35.3 ± 3.1	409.0	
[51]	RDS	6.0	43.6	25.5	24.9	84.2	
[39]	RDS	1.9	8.2	10.3	79.6	670.0	
[50]	RDS	4.9 ± 1.2	23.6 ± 3.1	26.2 ± 3.2	45.4 ± 3.9	163.0	
[60]	RDS	7.3	44.6	26.8	21.3	207.0	
[21]	Carbonate sand	2.6 ± 0.1	1.6 ± 0.2	16.7 ± 0.4	79.1 ± 6.6	137 ± 8	

		Zn				
a75	Technosol	10.3 ± 0.9	25.8 ± 1.3	9.7 ± 1.0	54.2 ± 2.6	74.3 ± 4.2
a75_treat	Technosol	17.3 ± 0.7	20.4 ± 0.8	9.0 ± 0.2	53.3 ± 1.4	129.7 ± 3.3
<i>b</i> 75	Technosol	9.8 ± 1.6	18.7 ± 1.2	8.7 ± 1.0	62.8 ± 1.8	60.4 ± 11.1
b75_treat	Technosol	8.3 ± 1.5	18.5 ± 2.3	6.7 ± 1.0	66.5 ± 2.8	128 ± 15.0
ctl	Soil	6.2 ± 0.2	13.3 ± 0.4	10.5 ± 0.6	70.0 ± 0.6	107.5 ± 5.6
<i>ctl</i> _treat	Soil	4.4 ± 0.3	9.2 ± 0.7	5.4 ± 0.4	81.0 ± 1.2	155 ± 9.2
[48]	RDS	27.2 ± 2.5	42.1 ± 2.0	9.5 ± 0.6	21.2 ± 1.6	671
[51]	RDS	25.1	55.1	9.6	10.2	443
[39]	RDS	28.8	28.9	14.1	28.3	640
[50]	RDS	32.7 ± 2.2	36.6 ± 1.5	8.3 ± 1.3	22.4 ± 2.1	471
[60]	RDS	26.7	42.5	13.2	17.6	344
[61]	RDS	33.2	29.7	20.9	16.2	113.0
[21]	Carbonate sand	14.4 ± 0.1	10.4 ± 0.7	6.7 ± 0.9	68.5 ± 4.6	813 ± 37



Figure A1. (**a**) Mixing of technosols; (**b**) installation of technosols; (**c**) technosol surface with boundary ring; (**d**) collection and quantification of seepage.

References

- 1. Huber, M.; Welker, A.; Helmreich, B. Critical review of heavy metal pollution of traffic area runoff: Occurrence, influencing factors, and partitioning. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2016**, *541*, 895–919. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.09.033.
- Werkenthin, M.; Kluge, B.; Wessolek, G. Metals in European roadside soils and soil solution A review. *Environ. Pollut.* 2014, 189, 98–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2014.02.025.
- Barrett, M.; Katz, L.; Taylor, S. Removal of Dissolved Heavy Metals in Highway Runoff. Transp. Res. Rec. 2014, 2436, 131–138. https://doi.org/10.3141/2436-13.
- 4. Gavrić, S.; Leonhardt, G.; Österlund, H.; Marsalek, J.; Viklander, M. Metal enrichment of soils in three urban drainage grass swales used for seasonal snow storage. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *760*, 144136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144136.
- 5. DWA. Arbeitsblatt DWA-A 138-1—Anlagen zur Versickerung von Niederschlagswasser—Teil 1: Planung, Bau, Betrieb; DWA: Hennef, Germany, 2024.
- 6. Pallewatta, S.; Weerasooriyagedara, M.; Bordoloi, S.; Sarmah, A.K.; Vithanage, M. Reprocessed construction and demolition waste as an adsorbent: An appraisal. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2023**, *882*, 163340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.163340.
- 7. Zhang, X.; Guo, S.; Liu, J.; Zhang, Z.; Song, K.; Tan, C.; Li, H. A Study on the Removal of Copper (II) from Aqueous Solution Using Lime Sand Bricks. *Appl. Sci.* **2019**, *9*, 670.

- Wang, J.; Zhang, P.; Yang, L.; Huang, T. Adsorption characteristics of construction waste for heavy metals from urban stormwater runoff. *Chin. J. Chem. Eng.* 2015, 23, 1542–1550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjche.2015.06.009.
- Jiang, C.; Peng, X.; Dang, Z.; Li, J.; Dong, W.; Yang, X.; Zhang, Y.; Bai, X.; Yang, Q. Temporal Process and Leaching Characteristics for Runoff Pollutants in Typical Solid Waste Improved Bioretention Filters. *Water Air Soil Pollut.* 2023, 234, 458. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-023-06434-1.
- Caro, D.; Lodato, C.; Damgaard, A.; Cristóbal, J.; Foster, G.; Flachenecker, F.; Tonini, D. Environmental and socio-economic effects of construction and demolition waste recycling in the European Union. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2024, 908, 168295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.168295.
- 11. Soto-Paz, J.; Arroyo, O.; Torres-Guevara, L.E.; Parra-Orobio, B.A.; Casallas-Ojeda, M. The circular economy in the construction and demolition waste management: A comparative analysis in emerging and developed countries. *J. Build. Eng.* **2023**, *78*, 107724. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2023.107724.
- Deeb, M.; Groffman, P.M.; Blouin, M.; Egendorf, S.P.; Vergnes, A.; Vasenev, V.; Cao, D.L.; Walsh, D.; Morin, T.; Séré, G. Using constructed soils for green infrastructure – Challenges and limitations. SOIL 2020, 6, 413–434. https://doi.org/10.5194/soil-6-413-2020.
- Minixhofer, P.; Scharf, B.; Hafner, S.; Weiss, O.; Henöckl, C.; Greiner, M.; Room, T.; Stangl, R. Towards the Circular Soil Concept: Optimization of Engineered Soils for Green Infrastructure Application. *Sustainability* 2022, 14, 905. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14020905.
- 14. Chen, Y.; Zhou, Y. The contents and release behavior of heavy metals in construction and demolition waste used in freeway construction. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2020**, *27*, 1078–1086. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-07067-w.
- 15. Butera, S.; Christensen, T.H.; Astrup, T.F. Composition and leaching of construction and demolition waste: Inorganic elements and organic compounds. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2014**, *276*, 302–311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2014.05.033.
- Knoll, S.; Mindermann, S.; Porter, L.; Pauleit, S.; Duthweiler, S.; Prügl, J.; Helmreich, B. The potential of processed mineral construction and demolition waste to increase the water capacity of urban tree substrates—A pilot scale study in Munich. *Sustain. Cities Soc.* 2024, *113*, 105661. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2024.105661.
- 17. German Federal Office of Justice. *BBodSchV Bundes-Bodenschutz-und Altlastenverordnung*; German Federal Office of Justice: Bonn, Germany, 2021.
- DIN 19529; Leaching of Solid Materials—Batch Test for the Examination of the Leaching Behaviour of Inorganic and Organic Substances at a Liquid to Solid Ratio of 2 l/kg. DIN: Berlin, Germany, 2015.
- 19. Rommel, S.H.; Helmreich, B. Influence of Temperature and De-Icing Salt on the Sedimentation of Particulate Matter in Traffic Area Runoff. *Water* **2018**, *10*, 1738.
- 20. Rauret, G.; López-Sánchez, J.; Lück, D.; Yli-Halla, M.; Muntau, H.; Quevauviller, P. *The Certification of the Extractable Contents* (*Mass Fractions*) of Cd, Cr, Cu, Ni, Pb and Zn in Freshwater Sediment Following a Sequential Extraction Procedure: BCR-701; Publications Office: Luxembourg, 2001.
- 21. Rommel, S.H.; Stinshoff, P.; Helmreich, B. Sequential extraction of heavy metals from sorptive filter media and sediments trapped in stormwater quality improvement devices for road runoff. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *782*, 146875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146875.
- Virtanen, P.; Gommers, R.; Oliphant, T.E.; Haberland, M.; Reddy, T.; Cournapeau, D.; Burovski, E.; Peterson, P.; Weckesser, W.; Bright, J.; et al. SciPy 1.0: Fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nat. Methods* 2020, *17*, 261–272. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2.
- 23. McKinney, W.; others. Data structures for statistical computing in python. In Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference 2010, Austin, TX, USA, 28 June–3 July 2010; Volume 445, pp. 51–56.
- 24. Hunter, J.D. Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. Comput. Sci. Eng. 2007, 9, 90–95. https://doi.org/10.1109/MCSE.2007.55.
- 25. Waskom, M.L. seaborn: Statistical data visualization. J. Open Source Softw. 2021, 6, 3021. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03021.
- 26. Vollpracht, A.; Weiler, L. Recycling of Slightly Contaminated Demolition Waste Part 1: Inorganic Constituents. In Proceedings of the 3rd RILEM Spring Convention and Conference (RSCC 2020), Guimarães, Portugal, 9–14 March 2020; pp. 87–101.
- Galvín, A.P.; Ayuso, J.; Agrela, F.; Barbudo, A.; Jiménez, J.R. Analysis of leaching procedures for environmental risk assessment of recycled aggregate use in unpaved roads. *Constr. Build. Mater.* 2013, 40, 1207–1214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2011.12.091.
- Alonso-Santurde, R.; Coz, A.; Quijorna, N.; Viguri, J.R.; Andrés, A. Valorization of Foundry Sand in Clay Bricks at Industrial Scale. J. Ind. Ecol. 2010, 14, 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-9290.2010.00233.x.

- Susset, B.; Maier, U.; Finkel, M.; Grathwohl, P. Weiterentwicklung von Kriterien zur Beurteilung des Schadlosen und Ordnungsgemäßen Einsatzes Mineralischer Ersatzbaustoffe und Prüfung Alternativer Wertevorschläge; Umweltbundesamt: Dessau-Roßlau, Germany, 2018.
- Bary, B.; Sellier, A. Coupled moisture—Carbon dioxide–calcium transfer model for carbonation of concrete. *Cem. Concr. Res.* 2004, 34, 1859–1872. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2004.01.025.
- Garrabrants, A.C.; Sanchez, F.; Kosson, D.S. Changes in constituent equilibrium leaching and pore water characteristics of a Portland cement mortar as a result of carbonation. *Waste Manag.* 2004, 24, 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0956-053X(03)00135-1.
- 32. Van Gerven, T.; Cornelis, G.; Vandoren, E.; Vandecasteele, C.; Garrabrants, A.C.; Sanchez, F.; Kosson, D.S. Effects of progressive carbonation on heavy metal leaching from cement-bound waste. *AIChE J.* **2006**, *52*, 826–837. https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.10662.
- Van Gerven, T.; Van Baelen, D.; Dutré, V.; Vandecasteele, C. Influence of carbonation and carbonation methods on leaching of metals from mortars. *Cem. Concr. Res.* 2004, 34, 149–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0008-8846(03)00255-2.
- Engelsen, C.J.; van der Sloot, H.A.; Wibetoe, G.; Petkovic, G.; Stoltenberg-Hansson, E.; Lund, W. Release of major elements from recycled concrete aggregates and geochemical modelling. *Cem. Concr. Res.* 2009, 39, 446–459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2009.02.001.
- 35. Müllauer, W.; Beddoe, R.E.; Heinz, D. Effect of carbonation, chloride and external sulphates on the leaching behaviour of major and trace elements from concrete. *Cem. Concr. Compos.* **2012**, *34*, 618–626. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2012.02.002.
- Reijonen, I.; Metzler, M.; Hartikainen, H. Impact of soil pH and organic matter on the chemical bioavailability of vanadium species: The underlying basis for risk assessment. *Environ. Pollut.* 2016, 210, 371–379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2015.12.046.
- 37. Helmreich, B.; Hilliges, R.; Schriewer, A.; Horn, H. Runoff pollutants of a highly trafficked urban road—Correlation analysis and seasonal influences. *Chemosphere* **2010**, *80*, 991–997. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2010.05.037.
- Hilliges, R.; Endres, M.; Tiffert, A.; Brenner, E.; Marks, T. Characterization of road runoff with regard to seasonal variations, particle size distribution and the correlation of fine particles and pollutants. *Water Sci. Technol.* 2016, 75, 1169–1176. https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2016.576.
- Pérez, G.; López-Mesas, M.; Valiente, M. Assessment of Heavy Metals Remobilization by Fractionation: Comparison of Leaching Tests Applied to Roadside Sediments. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2008, 42, 2309–2315. https://doi.org/10.1021/es0712975.
- 40. Amelung, W.; Blume, H.-P.; Fleige, H.; Horn, R.; Kandeler, E.; Kögel-Knabner, I.; Kretzschmar, R.; Stahr, K.; Wilke, B.-M. *Scheffer/Schachtschabel—Lehrbuch der Bodenkunde*, 17th ed.; Springer Nature: Berlin, Germany, 2018; p. 767.
- 41. Boivin, P.; Saadé, M.; Pfeiffer, H.R.; Hammecker, C.; Degoumois, Y. Depuration of Highway Runoff Water into Grass-Covered Embankments. *Environ. Technol.* **2008**, *29*, 709–720. https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330801986972.
- 42. Kocher, B.; Wessolek, G.; Stoffregen, H. Water and heavy metal transport in roadside soils. Pedosphere 2005, 15, 746–753.
- 43. Kluge, B.; Wessolek, G. Heavy metal pattern and solute concentration in soils along the oldest highway of the world—The AVUS Autobahn. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* **2012**, *184*, 6469–6481. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-011-2433-8.
- Turer, D.G.; Maynard, B.J. Heavy metal contamination in highway soils. Comparison of Corpus Christi, Texas and Cincinnati, Ohio shows organic matter is key to mobility. *Clean Technol. Environ. Policy* 2003, *4*, 235–245. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-002-0159-6.
- 45. Hatt, B.E.; Fletcher, T.D.; Deletic, A. Hydrologic and pollutant removal performance of stormwater biofiltration systems at the field scale. *J. Hydrol.* **2009**, *365*, 310–321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.12.001.
- 46. Davidson, C.M.; Duncan, A.L.; Littlejohn, D.; Ure, A.M.; Garden, L.M. A critical evaluation of the three-stage BCR sequential extraction procedure to assess the potential mobility and toxicity of heavy metals in industrially-contaminated land. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 1998, 363, 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-2670(98)00057-9.
- 47. Long, Y.-Y.; Hu, L.-F.; Fang, C.-R.; Wu, Y.-Y.; Shen, D.-S. An evaluation of the modified BCR sequential extraction procedure to assess the potential mobility of copper and zinc in MSW. *Microchem. J.* **2009**, *91*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2008.05.006.
- Sutherland, R.A.; Tack, F.M.G.; Ziegler, A.D. Road-deposited sediments in an urban environment: A first look at sequentially extracted element loads in grain size fractions. J. Hazard. Mater. 2012, 225–226, 54–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2012.04.066.
- 49. Bacon, J.R.; Davidson, C.M. Is there a future for sequential chemical extraction? *Analyst* 2008, 133, 25–46. https://doi.org/10.1039/B711896A.
- Sutherland, R.A.; Tack, F.M.G.; Tolosa, C.A.; Verloo, M.G. Operationally Defined Metal Fractions in Road Deposited Sediment, Honolulu, Hawaii. J. Environ. Qual. 2000, 29, 1431–1439. https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2000.00472425002900050009x.

- 51. Kartal, Ş.; Aydın, Z.; Tokalıoğlu, Ş. Fractionation of metals in street sediment samples by using the BCR sequential extraction procedure and multivariate statistical elucidation of the data. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2006**, *132*, 80–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2005.11.091.
- Kretzschmar, R.; Sticher, H. Transport of humic-coated iron oxide colloids in a sandy soil: Influence of Ca²⁺ and trace metals. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1997**, *31*, 3497–3504. https://doi.org/10.1021/es970244s.
- Arabyarmohammadi, H.; Salarirad, M.M.; Behnamfard, A. Characterization and utilization of clay-based construction and demolition wastes as adsorbents for zinc (II) removal from aqueous solutions: An equilibrium and kinetic study. *Environ. Prog. Sustain. Energy* 2014, 33, 777–789. https://doi.org/10.1002/ep.11833.
- 54. 54. DIN. DIN 38405-4: 1985-07 German standard methods for the examination of water, waste water and sludge; anions (group D); determination of fluoride (D 4); Berlin, 1985.
- 55. 55. DIN. DIN EN 27888:1993-11 Water quality; determination of electrical conductivity (ISO 7888:1985); German version EN 27888:1993; Berlin, 1993.
- 56. DIN. DIN EN ISO 17294-2:2017-01 Water quality Application of inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) - Part 2: Determination of selected elements including uranium isotopes (ISO 17294-2:2016); German version EN ISO 17294-2:2016; Berlin, 2017.
- 57. DIN. DIN ISO 15923-1:2014-07 Water quality Determination of selected parameters by discrete analysis systems Part
 1: Ammonium, nitrate, nitrite, chloride, orthophosphate, sulfate and silicate with photometric detection (ISO 15923-1:2013);
 Berlin, 2014.
- 58. 58. DIN. DIN EN ISO 12846:2012-08 Water quality Determination of mercury Method using atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS) with and without enrichment (ISO 12846:2012); German version EN ISO 12846:2012; Berlin, 2012.
- 59. 59. DIN. DIN EN 1484:2019-04 Water analysis Guidelines for the determination of total organic carbon (TOC) and dissolved organic carbon (DOC); German version EN 1484:1997; Berlin, 2019.
- 60. Zhang, M.; Wang, H. Concentrations and chemical forms of potentially toxic metals in road-deposited sediments from different zones of Hangzhou, China. *J. Environ. Sci.* **2009**, *21*, 625–631. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1001-0742(08)62317-7.
- 61. Tokalıoğlu, Ş.; Kartal, Ş. Multivariate analysis of the data and speciation of heavy metals in street dust samples from the Organized Industrial District in Kayseri (Turkey). *Atmos. Environ.* **2006**, *40*, 2797–2805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.01.019.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.