

JGiesy@aol.com 03/26/2008 03:49 AM

- To wkreagen@mmm.com
- cc JNewsted@entrix.com PMehrle@entrix.com

bcc

Subject Re: Entrix Consulting

Bill:

I will forward the opportunities to you. Then you decide how you would like to proceed. I am attaching two papers that have been assigned to me to review. If you want to take them over, I will write to the journals and tell them that I can no loner review them and suggest that they be referred to whomever in 3M who is appropriate. Some journals will allow this, but others, for conflict of interest issues, will not allow an industry to review a paper about one of their products. That is where I came in for Dale. Since we had been set up as academic experts, about half of the papers published in the area in any given year came to me (continue to come to me) for review. In time sheets, I always listed these reviews as literature searches so that there was no paper trail to 3M.

I have attached the two papers that came this week. One from Environmental Pollution and one from ES&T.

Let me know if you want to take over the reviews of these papers and I will decline.

Sincerely,

John P. Giesy

Create a Home Theater Like the Pros. Watch the video on AOL Home. ENVPOL-D-08-00116.fdf
es-2008-00647k-supplimental.pdf s1-In327267-1522787456-1939656818Hwf-983624596IdV1891202298327267PDF_HI0001.pdf



3M_MN00110700

Environmental Pollution Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: ENVPOL-D-08-00116

Title: Perfluorooctanoic Acid and Perfluorooctane Sulfonate in the Sediment of the Roter Main River, Bayreuth, Germany

Article Type: Full Paper (max. 5000 words)

Keywords: perfluorooctanoic acid; perfluorooctane sulfonate; sediment; aquatic environment

Abstract: Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) are widely distributed in aquatic ecosystems. Their sources are known but few studies about their accumulation potential in river sediments exist.

The aim of the study is to assess the concentrations of PFOA and PFOS in sediments in relation to their levels in river water receiving effluent from a waste water treatment plant (WWTP). PFOS accumulates by a factor of about 40 relative to river water, PFOA only up to three-fold. In contrast to previous suggestions, enrichment on sediment is not correlated to the total organic carbon contents.

1	Perfluorooctanoic Acid and Perfluorooctane Sulfonate in the Sediment
2	of the Roter Main River, Bayreuth, Germany
3	
4	Anna M. Becker [§] , Silke Gerstmann [§] , Hartmut Frank [§] *
5	
6	[§] Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology,
7	University of Bayreuth, D-95440 Bayreuth, Germany
8	
9	*Corresponding author:
10	
11	Hartmut Frank,
12	Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology,
13	University of Bayreuth,
14	Universitätsstr. 30,
15	D-95440 Bayreuth, Germany
16	Tel.: + 49 921 55 22 52
17	Fax.: + 49 921 55 23 34
18	Email: encetox@uni-bayreuth.de
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Keywords: perfluorooctanoic acid; perfluorooctane sulfonate; sediment; aquatic
25	environment

26	ABSTRACT
27	Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) are
28	widely distributed in aquatic ecosystems. Their sources are known but few studies about
29	their accumulation potential in river sediments exist. The aim of the study is to assess
30	the concentrations of PFOA and PFOS in sediments in relation to their levels in river
31	water receiving effluent from a waste water treatment plant (WWTP). PFOS
32	accumulates by a factor of about 40 relative to river water, PFOA only up to three-fold.
33	In contrast to previous suggestions, enrichment on sediment is not correlated to the total
34	organic carbon contents.
35	CAPSULE
36	Rivers sediments constitute a sink of perfluorinated surfactants released from the waste
37	water treatment plant.
38	
39	INTRODUCTION
40	Over the last 50 years, perfluorochemicals (PFCs) such as perfluorooctanoic acid
41	(PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) have been widely used both in industry
42	and as components of consumer products (Kissa, 2001; Schulz et al., 2003). Due to their
43	specific physical-chemical properties, especially their chemical and thermal stability,
44	and their low surface free energy, especially their water- and fat-repellent properties
45	(Kissa, 2001), they have been used in numerous applications. At the same time, their
46	persistence and potential to bioaccumulate have led to their wide-spread presence in the
47	global environment (Prevendorous et al., 2006; Houde et al., 2006). Several direct and
48	indirect sources of PFCs-emission to the environment have been reported, such as

2

manufacturing processes in the polymer and electronics industries (Prevendorous et al.,

49

50 2006), in the degradation of volatile precursors (Ellis et al., 2004; Dinglasan et al.,

51 2004; Lange, 2000-2002), or in the release of treated waste waters (Becker et al., 2008a-

52 b; Boulanger et al., 2005; Schulz et al. 2006a, 2006b; Sinclair and Kannan, 2006).

53 Sediments have been suggested as one of two final sinks of PFCs, the other 54 being the deep oceans (Prevendorous et al., 2006). Most of the earlier studies have 55 focused on water and biological matrices; little information is available on PFC 56 concentrations in soils and sediments. Relatively low concentrations of PFOA and 57 PFOS were found in sediments collected from four Rivers in the San Francisco Bay, 58 USA (Higgins et al., 2006), from the Tidal Flat Areas of Ariake Sea (Nakata et al., 59 2006) or from the rivers Kamo, Uji, and Tanjin in Japan (Senthilkumar et al, 2007).

60 The aim of this study was to determine the accumulation potential of PFOA and 61 PFOS in sediments relative to the water of the river Roter Main; a well quantified 62 source of these compounds into the river is the municipal waste water treatment plant 63 (WWTP) of Bayreuth (Becker et al, 2008 a-b).

64

MATERIALS AND METHODS

65 Chemicals and Equipment

PFOA (95 %, Lancaster Eastgate, UK), [1, 2-¹³C₂]-PFOA (98 %, 10 mg, Perkin 66 67 Elmer, Boston, USA), perfluorooctane sulfonate potassium salt (98 %, Fluka, Buchs, Germany), [1, 2, 3, 4-¹³C₄]-perfluorooctane sulfonate sodium salt (99 %, 50 µg/mL-68 69 solution in methanol, Campro Scientific, Berlin, Germany), acetic acid (100 %, Merck, 70 Darmstadt, Germany), ammonium acetate (99.0 %, Fluka, Buchs, Germany), methanol, 71 and acetonitrile (picograde, Promochem, Wesel, Germany) were used as obtained. The 72 equipment was pre-cleaned as described previously (Weremiuk et al., 2006); Teflon 73 equipment was avoided.

74 Sampling Location and Collection

3

The investigation area was the river Roter Main flowing through Bayreuth, Upper Franconia, Germany, which has an average daily flow of 270 000 m³ day⁻¹ and receives treated waste waters of industrial, commercial and domestic origin from the municipal WWTP, having a daily flow of 40 000 m³ and serving a population of 72 000 inhabitants. Based on our previous studies it was estimated that about 1.2 ± 0.5 g PFOA and 4.7 ± 2.3 g PFOS are daily released from the plant into the river (Becker et al, 2008 a-b).

82 On 19 October 2006, sediment samples were collected at four different 83 locations: a) 1 km upstream, b) 50 m downstream, c) 500 m downstream, and d) 1 km 84 downstream the WWTP. At each location, 11 individual samples (Fig. 1) from the 85 upper sediment (~ 15 cm) were collected with a polypropylene (PP) tube ($\emptyset = 10$ cm) 86 and transferred into 250-mL PP-bottles. Water samples (n = 3) were also collected at 87 each location with 2-L PP-bottles.

88 Sample Preparation and Analysis

Sediment samples were weighed into aluminium boxes precleaned with hexane
und methanol, freeze-dried, sieved (0.63 mm mesh), transferred into clean 50-mL PPbottles, and stored at room temperature until analysis. Their total organic carbon (TOC)
content was determined and the samples were extracted as described previously (Becker
et al., 2008 b).

Mixed sediment samples were also prepared for each location by weighing 1 g of each of the 11 individual samples of the respective location into a 50 mL PPcentrifuge tube. Each sample was thoroughly mixed and extracted in triplicate as described above.

98 Briefly, 1 g of sediment was weighed into a new, clean 50-mL PP-centrifuge 99 tube and 50 μ L of a standard solution containing 10 μ g L⁻¹ each of ¹³C-PFOA and ¹³C-

4

100 PFOS were added. Each sample was sonicated in 10 mL 1 % (vol.) aqueous acetic acid, 101 centrifuged, and the supernatant was collected. The pellet was re-suspended in 2.5 mL 102 of a mixture of methanol and 1 % aqueous acetic acid (90:10, vol-%), sonicated, 103 centrifuged again, and the supernatant was combined with the first one. The procedure 104 was repeated one more time to yield 25 mL extract. A final wash with acetic acid (1 %, 105 10 mL) yielded a total volume of 35 mL. The analytes were extracted by solid phase 106 extraction (SPE) using a C18 cartridge (200 mg, 6.0 mL, Oasis HLB Waters Corp., 107 Milford, USA), eluted with methanol, the solvent was evaporated, and the residue was 108 redissolved in 0.5 mL of a mixture (50:50, vol.) of aqueous ammonium acetate (10 109 mmol/L, pH = 4.1) and acetonitrile. The solution was filtered and transferred to PP-snap 110 ring vials (0.75 mL) with polyethylene (PE) caps, and analysed by HPLC-ESI-MS/MS 111 (Weremiuk et al., 2006).

Water samples were prepared and analysed as described previously (Weremiuket al., 2006, Becker et al. 2008 a).

114 Quantification

For calibration, stock solutions of ¹³C-PFOA, ¹³C-PFOS, PFOA, PFOS and two working standard solutions, one containing 10 μ g L⁻¹ of each ¹³C-PFOA and ¹³C-PFOS, the other 10 μ g L⁻¹ of each non-labelled PFOA and PFOS, were prepared as described previously (Becker et al., 2008 a-b).

For quantitative analysis of sediment extracts, standard solutions containing nonlabelled PFOA and PFOS in the range from 0.5 to 2.5 μ g L⁻¹ and 1 μ g L⁻¹ of each ¹³Clabelled analyte were used for calibration. For analysis of water sample extracts, standard solutions containing non-labelled PFOA and PFOS in a range from 1 to 8 μ g L⁻¹ and 1 μ g L⁻¹ of each ¹³C-PFOA and ¹³C-PFOS were used. Calibration curves were constructed by plotting analyte and internal standard peak area ratios versus

analyte concentrations; regression coefficients were higher than 0.995. The limits of quantification (LOQ, signal to noise ratio 7) for sediments were 25 ng kg⁻¹ PFOA and 50 ng kg⁻¹ PFOS, for river water 0.06 ng L⁻¹ PFOA and 0.12 ng L⁻¹ PFOS. Procedural blanks for sediment samples were below the limit of detection (LOD), for water it was 0.015 ng PFOA, PFOS was below LOD.

130

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

PFOA concentrations in sediment samples were frequently below LOQ cspecially at the location upstream the WWTP, but also reached 175 ng kg⁻¹ dry weight (Table 1). Obviously the variability between individual samples is rather high, the being widest observed 0.5 km downstream the WWTP, potentially reflecting incomplete mixing of waste and river waters at this location.

PFOS concentrations ranged from <50 and 570 ng kg⁻¹ dw, with the highest variations 500 m downstream the WWTP (Table 1). PFOS was up to 17-fold higher than PFOA, due to its stronger adsorption potential. A mixed sample of each location was prepared, extracted and analysed. Results of the mixed samples analysis (Table 2) were in a good agreement with the average values calculated for each location (Table 1), and confirmed that concentrations of the analytes downstream the plant were significantly increased.

143TOC of sediment samples ranged between 0.06 and 0.78 % (Table 1). PFOA and

144 PFOS concentrations in river water were between 10 and 23 ng L^{-1} , and 1.7 and 16

145 ng L^{-1} , respectively (Table 2).

PFOA concentrations in sediment samples downstream the WWTP were about
3-fold higher than upstream, but lower than reported for four rivers located in the San
Francisco Bay, USA (< LOD – 1300 ng kg⁻¹) (Higgins et al., 2005), in Tidal Flat Areas
of the Ariake Sea (840 – 1100 ng kg⁻¹) (Nakata et al., 2006) or in rivers Kamo, Uji and

6

150 Tenjin in Japan (1300 - 3900 ng kg⁻¹) (Senthilkumar et al., 2007). The sediment 151 concentrations were about 3-fold higher than in the respective water sample.

PFOS sediment concentrations were comparable to those of the Ariake Sea $(90 - 140 \text{ ng kg}^{-1})$ (Nakata et al., 2006) or in four rivers from the San Francisco Bay $(160 - 230 \text{ ng kg}^{-1})$ (Higgins et al., 2005), but lower than reported for the rivers Tenjin or Osaka in Japan $(3800 - 11000 \text{ ng kg}^{-1})$ (Senthilkumar et al., 2007). The sediment concentrations were up 40-fold higher than in the respective water samples.

In the present study a correlation of the PFC content of the sediments to TOC
was not found, although this has been suggested previously (Higgins & Luthy, 2006).
According to Johnson et al. (2007), it is likely that adsorption of PFOA and PFOS is
also partially controlled by electrostatics meaning that also inorganic materials will
influence their fate and transport in aquatic system.

162

CONCLUSIONS

163 Treated waste water released from local WWTPs is a main source of PFOA and 164 PFOS in rivers. Once released, PFCs partition into the sediment. Higgins at al. (2007) 165 have suggested that they are readily bioavailable; thus, studies with fish from such 166 rivers are required to assess to which extent these compounds enter the aquatic food 167 chain.

168 ACKNOLEDMENTS

169 We acknowledge the financial support of the Bayerische Forschungsstiftung.

- 170 REFERENCES
- Becker, A.M., Suchan, M., Gerstmann, S., Frank, H. 2008 a. Perfluorooctanoic Acid
 and Perflorooctane Sulfonate Released from a Waste Water Treatment Plant in
 Bavaria, Germany, submitted for publication to *Environ. Sci. Poll.*.

7

174	Becker, A.M., Gerstmann, S., Frank. H. 2008 b. Perfluoroocatane Surfactants in Waste
175	Waters, the Major Source of Hydrosphere Pollution, Chemosphere, In Press.
176	Boulanger, B., Vargo, J.D., Schnoor, J.L., Hornbuckle, K.C., 2005. Evaluation of
177	Perfluorooctane Surfactants in Wastewater Treatment System and in
178	Commercial Surface Protection Product. Environ. Sci. Technol. 39, 5524-5530.
179	Dinglasan, M., Ye, Y., Edwards, E., Mabury, S., 2004. Fluorotelomer Alcohol Yields
180	Poly and Perfluorinated Acids. Environ. Sci. Technol. 38, 2857-2664.
181	Ellis, D.A., Martin, J.W., De Silva, A.O., Mabury, S.A., Hurley, M.D., Sulbaek
182	Andersen, M.P., Wallington, T.J. 2004. Degradation of Fluorotelomer Alcohols:
183	A Likely Source of Perfluorinated Carboxylic Acids. Environ. Sci. Technol. 38,
184	3316-3321.
185	Higgins, C. P., Field, J. A., Criddle, C. S., Luthy, R. G. 2005. Quantitative
186	Determination of Perfluorochemicals in Sediments nd Domestic Sludge. Eviron.
187	Sci. Technol. 39, 3946-3956.
188	Higgins, C.P., Luthy, R.G. 2006. Sorption of Perfluorinated Surfactants on Sediments.
189	Environ. Sci. Technol. 40, 7251-7256.
190	Higgins, C.P., McLeod, P.B., Macmanus-Spencer, L.A., Luthy R.G. 2007. Bio-
191	accumulation of Perfluorochemicals in Sediments by the Aquatic Oligochaete
192	Lumbriculus variegates. Environ. Sci. Technol. 41, 4600-4606.
193	Houde, M., Martin, J.W., Letcher, R.J., Solomon, K.R., Muir, D.C.G. 2006. Biological
194	Monitoring of Perfluoroalkyl Substances: A Rewiev. Environ. Sci. Technol. 40,

- 195 3463-3473.
- 196 Johnson, R.L., Anschutz, A.J., Smolen, J.M., Simcik, M.F., Penn, R.L. 2007. The
- Adsorption of Perfluorooctane Sulfonate onto Sand, Clay and Iron Oxide
 Surfaces. J. Chem. Eng. Data 52, 1165-1170.

8

- Kissa, E. 2001. Fluorinated Surfactants and Repellents, 2nd ed.; Marcel Dekker: New
 York.
- 201 Lange, C.C. 2000. 3M Environmental Laboratory. The Aerobic Biodegradation of N-
- 202 EtFOSE Alcohol by the Microbial Activity Present in Municipal Wastewater
- 203 Treatment Sludge; Report CA058; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- 204 Docket AR226-1030a078.
- Lange, C.C. 2001. The 18-Day Aerobic Biodegradation Study of Perfluorooctanesulfonyl-Based Chemistries; 3M, Docket AR-226-E01-0415; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Washington, DC.
- 208 Lange, C. C. 2002. 3M Environmental Laboratory. Biodegradation Screen Study for
- 209 Telomer Type Alcohols. Docket AR226-1149; U.S. Environmental Protection
 210 Agency: Washington, DC, November 6.
- Nakata, H., Kannan, K., Nasu, T., Cho, H., Sinclair, E., Takemura, A. 2006.
 Perfluorinated Contaminats in Sediments and Aquatic Organisms Collected from
 Shallow Water and Tidal Flat Areas of the Ariake Sea, Japan: Environmental
 Fate of Perfluoroctane Sulfonate in Aquatic Ecosystems. *Environ. Sci.*
- 215
 Technol. 40, 4916-4921.
- Schultz, M.M., Barofsky, D.F., Field, J.A. 2003. Fluorinated Alkyl Surfactants. *Environ. Eng. Sci.* 20, 487-501.
- 218 Schultz, M.M., Barofsky, D.F., Field, J.A., 2006 a. Quantitative Determination of
- 219 Fluorinated Alkyl Substances by Large-Volume-Injection Liquid Chromatogra-
- 220 phy Tandem Mass Spectrometry Characterization of Municipal Wastewaters.
- 221 Environ. Sci. Technol. 40, 289-295.
- 222 Schultz, M.M., Higgins, C. P., Huset, C.A., Luthy, R. G., Barofsky, D.F., Field, J.A.,
- 223 2006 b. Fluorochemical Mass Flow in a Municipal Wastewater Treatment
- 224 Facility. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 40, 7350-7357.

9

225	Senthilkumar, K., Ohi, E., Sajwan, K., Takasuga, T., Kannan, K. 2007. Perfluorinated
226	Compounds in River Water, River Sediment, Market Fish, and Wildlife Samples
227	from Japan. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 79, 427-431.
228	Sinclair, E., Kannan, K., 2006 Mass Loading and Fate of Perfluoroalkyl Surfactants in
229	Wastewater Treatment Plants. Environ. Sci. Technol. 40, 1408-1414.
230	Prevendorous, K., Cousins, I.T., Buck, R.C., Korzeniowski, S.H. 2006. Sources, Fate
231	and transport of Perfluoroocarboxylates. Environ. Sci. Technol. 40, 32-44.
232	Weremiuk, A.M., Gerstmann, S., Frank, H. 2006. Quantitative Determination of
233	Perfluorinated Surfactants in Water by LC-ESI-MS/MS. J. Sep. Sci. 29, 2251-
234	2255.
235	
236	
237	FIGURES AND TABLES
238	Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed.
238 239	Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed.
238 239 240	Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed.Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment
238 239 240 241	 Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed. Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment samples, Roter Main near Bayreuth, 19 October 2006. (UpS – upstream the WWTP,
 238 239 240 241 242 	Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed. Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg ⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment samples, Roter Main near Bayreuth, 19 October 2006. (UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP, $LOQ_{PFOA} = 25$ ng kg ⁻¹ , $LOQ_{PFOS} = 50$ ng kg ⁻¹). Mean
 238 239 240 241 242 243 	Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed. Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg ⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment samples, Roter Main near Bayreuth, 19 October 2006. (UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP, $LOQ_{PFOA} = 25$ ng kg ⁻¹ , $LOQ_{PFOS} = 50$ ng kg ⁻¹). Mean is calculated using a half of the LOQ.
 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 	Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed. Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg ⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment samples, Roter Main near Bayreuth, 19 October 2006. (UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP, $LOQ_{PFOA} = 25 \text{ ng kg}^{-1}$, $LOQ_{PFOS} = 50 \text{ ng kg}^{-1}$). Mean is calculated using a half of the LOQ.
 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 	 Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed. Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment samples, Roter Main near Bayreuth, 19 October 2006. (UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP, LOQ_{PFOA} = 25 ng kg⁻¹, LOQ_{PFOS} = 50 ng kg⁻¹). Mean is calculated using a half of the LOQ. Table 2. Comparison of PFOA and PFOS concentrations in water [ng L⁻¹] and sediment
 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 	 Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed. Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment samples, Roter Main near Bayreuth, 19 October 2006. (UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP, LOQ_{PFOA} = 25 ng kg⁻¹, LOQ_{PFOS} = 50 ng kg⁻¹). Mean is calculated using a half of the LOQ. Table 2. Comparison of PFOA and PFOS concentrations in water [ng L⁻¹] and sediment (mixed sample) [ng kg⁻¹] at four locations (Sampling: 19 October 2006, UpS – upstream
 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 	 Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed. Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment samples, Roter Main near Bayreuth, 19 October 2006. (UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP, LOQ_{PFOA} = 25 ng kg⁻¹, LOQ_{PFOS} = 50 ng kg⁻¹). Mean is calculated using a half of the LOQ. Table 2. Comparison of PFOA and PFOS concentrations in water [ng L⁻¹] and sediment (mixed sample) [ng kg⁻¹] at four locations (Sampling: 19 October 2006, UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP).
 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 	 Figure 1. Sediment Sampling Scheme at the four locations of the river bed. Table 1. Concentrations of PFOA, PFOS [ng kg⁻¹] and TOC [%] in river sediment samples, Roter Main near Bayreuth, 19 October 2006. (UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP, LOQ_{PFOA} = 25 ng kg⁻¹, LOQ_{PFOS} = 50 ng kg⁻¹). Mean is calculated using a half of the LOQ. Table 2. Comparison of PFOA and PFOS concentrations in water [ng L⁻¹] and sediment (mixed sample) [ng kg⁻¹] at four locations (Sampling: 19 October 2006, UpS – upstream the WWTP, DwS – downstream the WWTP).

Mean		27 ± 18		105 ± 85				<u>70</u> ± 60		280 ± 120				85 ± 60		250 ± 150				50 ± 30		200 ± 90		
R3		46 (17)	01	76 (10)	4	0.076		175 (5)	00	506 (10)	40	0.241	-	80 (12)	0	301 (4)	50	0.151		50 (14)	5	307 (5)	90	0.097
R2		26 (8)	an R1-R3 4	91 (6)	an R1-R3 (0.058	-	106 (14)	un R1-R3 1	331 (7)	un R1-R3 3	0.380	-	<25	an R1-R3 4	179 (4)	un R1-R3 3	0.260		72 (2)	an R1-R3 4	264 (10)	un R1-R3 3	0.096
RI		49 (16)	Me	<50	Me	0.072		<25	Mea	183 (13)	Mea	0.784		34 (24)	Me	537 (10)	Mea	0.200		<25	Me	348 (10)	Mea	0.348
M5		<25		116 (9)		0.071		135 (17)		381 (6)		0.076		141 (6)		235 (11)		0.086		105 (20)		170 (2)		060.0
M4	\$	52 (4)	30	95 (14)	65	0.075	S	41 (20)	65	130 (3)	270	0.156	S	168 (6)	110	378 (5)	50	0.061		79 (12)	65	296 (9)	60	0.097
M3	0.1 km Up	48 (6)	un M1-M5	80 (9)	an M1-M5	0.279	0.05 km Dv	70 (4)	an M1-M5	415 (3)	n M1-M5	0.095	0.5 km Dw	142 (10)	n M1-M5	227 (13)	n M1-M5	0.089	1 km DwS	(01) 22	an M1-M5	92 (6)	n M1-M5	0.082
M2		<25	Mea	230 (8)	Me	0.177		<25	Me	153 (14)	Mea	0.062	-	48 (4)	Mea	72 (4)	Mea	0.084		53 (13)	Me	143 (29)	Mea	0.111
MI		25	-	50 (10)	-	0.056	-						-	64 (11)	-	348 (7)		0.105		<25		82 (15)		0.081
L3	-	<25	15	290 (12)	0	0.294	-	120 (16)	0	120 (10)	5	0.073	-	60 (2)	9	170 (10)	0	0.140	-	55 (2)	4	100 (5)	-	0.109
L2		<25	an L1-L3 <	66 (1)	an L1-L3 13	0.128		<25	an L1-L3 5	218 (15)	an L1-L3 23	0.084		91 (3)	an L1-L3 7	226 (2)	an L1-L3 15	0.084		33 (3)	an L1-L3 3	237 (9)	an L/1-L/3 17	0.077
L1	-	<25	Me	<50	Mei	0.504	-	<25	Me	264 (2)	Mei	0.098	-	<25	Me	56 (19)	Mei	0.133		<25	Me	176 (7)	Me	0.082
		PFOA	1	PFOS	<u>I</u>	TOC		PFOA	1	PFOS	1	TOC		PFOA	I	PFOS	<u>I</u>	TOC		PFOA	1	PFOS	<u>I</u>	TOC

Table 1.

3M_MN00110712

11

Table	2.
-------	----

		PFOA		PFOS					
Sampling location	Water	Sediment	Ratio (Sediment/ Water)	Water	Sediment	Ratio (Sediment/ Water)			
1 km UpS WWTP	10 ± 1	18 ± 5	1.8	1.7 ± 0.3	72 ± 14	42			
0.05 km DwS WWTP	23 ± 2	68 ± 2	3.0	16 ± 0.3	310 ± 20	19			
0.5 km DwS WWTP	23 ± 1	40 ± 14	1.7	14 ± 0.5	230 ± 20	17			
1 km DwS WWTP	23 ± 3	35 ± 9	1.5	11 ± 0.2	240 ± 22	22			



3M_MN00110714

Table 1. Instrument performance standards used to account for matrix effects for each analyte and MS/MS
 Multiple Reaction Monitoring Parameters are provided. For analytes in which two transitions were

 monitored the first transition listed was used for quantitation.

Analyte	Performance Standard	Mass Transition	Cone voltage	Collision energy		
Perfluoroheptanoate	1,2-13C	262.0	10	15		
(PFHpA)	perfluorooctanoate	$362.9 \rightarrow 318.8$	10	15		
Perfluorooctanoate	1,2-13C	$412.9 \rightarrow 368.8$	10	15		
(PFOA)	perfluorooctanoate	$412.9 \rightarrow 168.8$		15		
Perfluorononanoate	1,2,3,4,5-C13	$462.8 \rightarrow 418.8$	12	18		
(PFNA)	perfluorononanoate	$462.8 \rightarrow 218.8$	16	18		
Perfluorodecenoate	1,2-13C	$512.8 \rightarrow 468.9$	15	18		
(PFDA)	perfluorodecanoate	$512.8 \rightarrow 218.9$	15	18		
Perfluoroundecanoate	1,2-13C	$562.9 \rightarrow 518.9$	15	15		
(PFUA)	perfluorodecanoate	$562.9 \rightarrow 268.8$	15	15		
Perfluorododecanoate	1,2-13C	612.8 → 568.8	10	20		
(PFDoDA)	perfluorodecanoate	$612.8 \rightarrow 318.9$	12	.50		
Perfluorotetradecanoate	1,2-13C	$712.9 \rightarrow 668.9$	17	22		
(PFTeDA)	perfluorodecanoate	$712.9 \rightarrow 168.8$		22		
Perfluorooctane	18O ₂ perfluorooctane	$498.9 \rightarrow 98.9$	50	60		
sulfonate (PFOS)	sulfonate	$498.9 \rightarrow 79.9$	50	00		
6:2 Fluorotelomer unsaturated carboxylate (6:2 FTUCA)	2H-Perfluoro-[1,2- $^{13}C_2$]-2-octenoate	356.9 → 292.9	15	17		
8:2 Fluorotelomer unsaturated carboxylate (8:2 FTUCA)	2H-Perfluoro-[1,2- ¹³ C ₂]-2-decenoate	457 → 392.9	18	20		
10:2 Fluorotelomer unsaturated carboxylate (10:2 FTUCA)	2H-Perfluoro-[1,2- $^{13}C_2$]-2-dodecenoate	557 → 493	20	25		