

## Analysis of Perfluorinated Chemicals and their Fluorinated Precursors in Sludge: Method Development and Initial Results

Hoon Yoo <sup>40</sup>, J. Jackson Ellington<sup>b</sup>, John W. Washington<sup>b</sup>, Thomas M. Jenkins <sup>10</sup>, F. Laurence Libelo<sup>4</sup> <sup>4</sup> National Research Council, <sup>10</sup> US EPA, National Exposure Research Laboratory, 960 College Station Rd, Athens, CA 30605 <sup>6</sup> Senior Environmental Employment Program, <sup>40</sup> USEPA, Office of Pollution Prevention & Toxics, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460

#### ABSTRACT

A rigorous method was developed to maximize the extraction efficacy for perfluorinated chemicals (PFCs), fluorotelomer alcohols (FTOHs), fluorotelomer acrylates (FTAc), perfluorosalifonamides (FtOSAs), and perfluorosalifonamidoethanols (FtOSEs) from wastewate-treatment sludge and quantitation using liquid-chromatography massspectrometry (ICMSMS) and gas-chromatography (ICCMS). Of five solvents tested for their PFC extraction effectiveness, 50:59-ACMMeOH(n/n) yielded the highest concentrations. Perferatment of sludge with NaOH and HCL, prior to extraction, recovered additional PFCs, but KOH and K252O8 digestion were less effective than no pretreatment. Volatile fluorochemicals in sludge were extracted with methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE). NaOHtrated sludge resulted in recovery of more FTOHs, specially 82 (FTOH. Presently we are investigating if this observation comes from the OH-facilitated hydrolysis of FTAc. With these efforts, we have been able to massure al teast ten volatile fluorochemicals from test sludge at the concentrations of sub-ng to tens ng/g, wet weight. The identification of a few suspected volatile fluorochemicals, for which no standards exist, was evaluated with a derivatization technique.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Chemicals of Conce	FTOHs		
PFCAs (Perfluoroalkyl carboxylates)	PFASs (Perfluoroalkyl sulfonates)	(Fluorotelomer alcohols) F(CF <sub>2</sub> ) <sub>n</sub> =(CH <sub>2</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> =OH	
0		(n = 6, 8, 10, 12, 14)	
F(CFa) - C - OH	U II	CH <sub>3</sub>	
	$F(CF_2)_n - S - OH$	F(CF,) C-OH	
n = 5 – 13 acid	n = 6, 7, 8 acid 0	(n = 7, 9, 11, 13)	

#### Selection of Appropriate Organic Extractant for PFCs

- 1) Five candidate solvents were tested for ~0.5g sludge; i) Acetonitrile (ACN), ii) Methanol (MeOH), iii) Isopropanol (IPA), iv) Tetrahydrofuran (THF), 50/50:ACN/MeOH (v/v)
- All sludge extracts were cleaned up with an ion-pairing method extraction
   Before a LC/MS/MS analysis, extract was filtered through a 0.22 µm nylon filter
- Testing of Sludge Pretreatment for PFCs
- Four pretreatments were evaluated for 0.5g sludge: i) 1M sodium hydroxide (NaOH), ii) 1M potassium hydroxide (KOH), iii) 1M hydrochloric acid (HCl), and iv) 0.2M potassium persulfate (K-S-O<sub>4</sub>)
- About 0.5g wet sludge was spiked with each 5ng of <sup>13</sup>C<sub>8</sub>-PFOA and 13C<sub>4</sub>-PFOS, and pretreated with 1mL of each chemical for 30 min in a hot-bath.
- Testing of Extract-Cleanup Methods for PFCs
  1) Three extract-cleanup techniques were compared: i) ion-pairing, ii) weak-anion
- inree extract-cleanup techniques were compared: i) ion-pairing, ii) weak-anioexchange (WAX) cartridge, iii) hydrophilic-lipophilic (HLB) cartridge

## Selection of Appropriate Pretreatment for FTOHs

- Four pretreatments were evaluated for 1g sludge: i) 2.5mL of H2O, ii) 2.5mL of 8M Urea, iii) 2.5mL of Formic Acid, and iv) 2.5mL of NaOH (later neutralized)
   All treatments were sonicated in a hot bath for 30 min
- 5 mL of MTBE was added as an extractant for overnight extraction
- One milliliter extract was spiked with 1 ng of mass-labeled 10:2FTOH (an internal matrix standard)

#### LC/MS/MS Analysis

- 1) The Waters Acquity ultra-performance liquid chromatograph (UPLC) was operated using ACN and polished water eluent, both containing 0.075% (v/v) glacial acetic acid. Pumping at a constant total flow rate of 0.5 mL/min, we started runs with an eluent of 3566 (v/v) ACN/water, then linearly ramping to 9010 at 5 min, holding composition constant until 11 min and back to 6573.8 t111.min
- 2) Sludge extracts were analyzed on a Waters Quattro Premier XE tandem mass spectrometer interfaced with the UPLC. Twenty microilites of extract were withdrawn and introduced into a Waters BEH C18 guard followed by a Waters BEH C18 analytical column. The MS/MS was operated in FSI (+) and analytes were monitored using MRM mode. Detailed instrumental conditions are found in Ref. 1

#### **GC/MS** Analysis

1) Soil extracts were analyzed on an Agilent Technologies 6890 CC system equipped with a 5975M mass selective detector (MSD). The MSD was operated in the positive chemical ionization (PCI) mode with methane reagent gas. Compound separation and quantification were performed on a Restek Rtx-1701 capillary column (30m × 025mm ID). < 0.25µm (11m hickness) with a 10m deactivated Integra-CuardW gast o dum as the inlet. Sample volumes of 1 µL were injected. A selected-ion monitoring (SIM) program was constructed. Detailed instrumental conditions are found in Ref. 2

# RESULTS & DISCUSSION



Figure 1. Typical LC/MS/MS chromatogram of selected PFCs from sludge extract.

#### **Extraction Strength of Test Solvent for PFCs**

- Among the test extractants, 50:50/ACN:MeOH(v/v) and THF extracted the greatest concentrations of PFCs from test sludge (Fig. 2)
- Due to special handling requirement for THF and its strong ability to draw more non-target organic compounds, we selected a 50:50/ACN:MeOH as an extractant for PFCs
   Becoveries of fortified mass-labeled PFOA and PFOS before extraction were ranged
- from 91% to 99% and from 82% to 99%, respectively



Figure 2. Extractability of different organic solvents. Extractable PFC concentrations were normalized to those from ACN extraction. MPFOA and MPFOS were used as extraction internal standards.

#### Efficacy of Chemical Pretreatments on PFCs Analysis

- 1) Pretreatment with sonication in 1M NaOH before solvent extraction yielded the most PFCs from sludge, followed by 1M HCl (Table 1)
- Extracting efficacy of 1M KOH and 0.2M K<sub>2</sub>S<sub>2</sub>O<sub>8</sub> was comparable each other, and equal to an elemental extraction
- 3) % recoveries (m+4, (s.d.)) of a mass-labeled PFOA used as recovery internal standard for each pretrastment were; an elemental ACN/MeOH = 94 (6), NaOH = 92 (5), KOH = 65 (14), HCI = 101 (12), and K.S., S.Q. \* 51 (9). The % recoveries of a mass-labeled PFOS were elemental ACN/MeOH = 90 (12), NaOH = 86 (5), KOH = 93 (16), HCI = 106 (11), and K25408 = 102 (12).
- 4) Organic-rich Cowart soil was included as a reference matrix to evaluate overall extraction efficiency. The % recoveries of fortified PFCs into soil were 85% to 117%

 Table 1. Total extractable concentrations (n=4) of FFCs in test sludge with pretreatment (ng/g dw)

 Pretreatment
 PEHA
 PEDA
 <t

## Testing of Extract-Cleanup Method for PFCs

established using current efforts (Fig. 3)

- 1. All cleanup methods without sludge extracts showed 85-97% (Ion pairing), 82-104% (HLB), and 85-98% (WAX) of recoveries (1ng PFCs spike in 100 mL  $\rm H_2O)$
- In general, a HLB cleanup approach retained and yielded PFCs in sludge extracts (Table 2); also peak separation were better with HLB cleanup (chromatograms not shown)
   The final analytical method for PFCs analysis from sludge or biosolid samples were

 Table 2. Recoverable PFC concentrations (n=4) in test sludge extract (ng/g ww)

 Method
 PFHA
 PFDA
 Pf

PRETREATMENT/ EXTRACTION STEP 0.5 give VISUage Internal STDs Spike <sup>(2)</sup> C-PFC) 0.5 mL of 1M NaOH Pretreatment (1/2hr Sonication with heat) • Overnight Incubation & Neutralization • 10 mL 5050/ACN.McOH (#2)	CLEANUP STEP Sample Dilution (2m L ottact + 0% nl H2O) Acidification (9H 4) Mixture Sonication (30 min) + HLB Cartridge Extraction + Eulee with SnL MeOH Dyness under Vacuum Reconstitution (Jeannically diluted)
+ 10 mL 50:50/ACN:MeOH (*2)	Dryness under Vacuum Reconstitution (Isotopically diluted)
Moderate Shaking (1hr) ↓ Extract Collection (-20 mL)	v 0.22 um Nylon Filter ↓ LCMSMS Injection
Figure 3. An extraction strategy for determinin	g PFCs from treated sludge

#### Isotopic Dilution Method for Quantifying PFCs with LC/MS/MS

- The compound-specific mass-labeled PFC (<sup>13</sup>C-PFC) was used as a matrix internal standard for quantitation purpose in the current study. For example, <sup>10</sup>C<sub>4</sub>-PFOA was used for PFOA quantitation, <sup>13</sup>C<sub>3</sub>-PFOA for PFNA and so on.
- Adequacy of isotopically-diluted calibration against solvent-based calibration on PFC quantitation was explored using standard-addition method. Four fortifications (x0, x0.5, x1.0, and x2.0) were prepared triplicates to define 'true' concentrations
- Quantitation results using compound-matched <sup>13</sup>C-PFC (internal calibration) were more accurate (see slopes in Fig. 4 below) than using solvent-based calibration (external CBT)
- While <sup>10</sup>-CPFC appear to improve accuracy relative to an external calibration, quantitation is not dependably accurate if not with its native PFC or <sup>13</sup>C-PFC having closest retention time (Ref 3)



Figure 4. Plots of standard additions in diluted-sludge extract (dashed line) or solvent (straight line) for PFOA and PFDA. CBT represents calibration.

#### Selected Extraction Method for FTOHs in Sludge using GC/MS

- Among extraction conditions tested for FTOHs in sludge, the pretreatment sonicated in 1M NaOH in sonication and subsequent overnight extraction with MTBE was determined to be the best in terms of FTOHs extractability (Fig. 5)
- All target peaks were identified using 1) retention time of sample extract vs. genuine calibration standard, 2) derivatization technique (Fig. 6), and 3) qualifier ions





Figure 5. Comparison of extracting condition for FTOHs in test sludge. Asterisk symbolizes significant yields of NaOH method against other methods, except Urea method for 10:2FTOH



Figure 6. FTOH peak confirmation using a TMSI-derivatization (shifted forward in time)

#### **Concentrations of FTOHs in Sludge/Biosolid Samples**

- 1. Total ten semi-volatile fluorochemicals were identified and quantified (Table 3)
- 2. 8:2 FTOH and 10:2 FTOH were the predominant FTOHs in studied sludge/biosolids
- Me-FOSA and Et-FOSA were detected, but Me-FOSE and Et-FOSE were not detected (FOSA standards not in house at time of writing)

4. 8-2 fluorotelomer acrylate was greater than LOD (100 pg/g), but less than LOQ (200 pg/g)

Table 3. Concentrations (s.d) of selected FTOHs in sludge/biosolids analyzed (ng/g ww)								
Source	7:2sFTOH	8:2FTOH	9:2sFTOH	10:2FTOH	11:2sFTOH	12:2FTOH		
Decatur, AL	4.63 (0.29)	59.93 (12.90)	3.28 (0.30)	49.20 (6.79)	0.99 (0.08)	8.13 (1.08)		
NY City A	3.51 (0.28)	23.79 (1.42)	0.92 (0.04)	19.61 (0.72)	0.30 (0.03)	3.38 (0.28)		
NY City B	1.80 (0.19)	37.04 (7.40)	0.75 (0.11)	22.77 (5.79)	0.25 (0.03)	4.17 (1.67)		
NY City C	2.08 (0.13)	159.24 (13.40)	0.73 (0.08)	60.16 (5.14)	0.24 (0.01)	8.05 (0.74)		
LOQ	0.20	0.45	0.10	0.40	0.25	0.15		

#### REFERENCES

- Washington, JW; Henderson, WM; Ellington, JJ; Jenkins, TM; Evans, JJ, 2008. Analysis
  of perfluorinated carboxylic acids in soils II: Optimization of chromatography and
  extraction. J. Chromatogr A, 1181: 21-32
- Ellington, JJ; Washington, JW; Evans, JJ; Jenkins, TM; Hafner SC; Neill, MP, 2009. Analysis of fluorotelomer alcohols in soils: Optimization of extraction and chromatography. J. Chromatogr A, 1216 5347-5354
- Yoo, H; Washington, JW; Jenkins, TM; Libelo EL. Analysis of perfluorinated chemicals in sludge: Method development and initial results. J. Chromatogr A (in review)

## ACS Fall 2009 National Meeting

August 16th - 20th, 2009, Washington D.C., USA