Contaminants of Emerging Concern in the Urban Aquatic Environment:

Targeted and Non-targeted Analysis

Joshua Onyeka Osagu

A Thesis In the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree of Master of Science (Chemistry) at Concordia University Montreal, Quebec, Canada

December 2023

© Joshua Onyeka Osagu, 2023

#### **CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY**

#### SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By:Joshua Onyeka OsaguTitled:Contaminants of Emerging Concern in the Urban Aquatic<br/>Environment: Targeted and Non-targeted Analysis

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

#### Master of Science (Chemistry)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

Dr. John Oh Chair

Dr. Dajana Vuckovic Examiner

Dr. John Oh Examiner

Dr. Xianming Zhang Supervisor

Approved by

Dr. Louis Cuccia Graduate Program Director

December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Dr. Pascale Sicotte Dean of Faculty of Art & Science

#### Abstract

# Contaminants of Emerging Concern in the Urban Aquatic Environment: Targeted and Non-targeted Analysis

#### Joshua Onyeka Osagu

The urban aquatic environment is a repository of anthropogenic organic chemicals. Some of these are classified as contaminants of emerging concerns (CEC) due to their newly discovered environmental and health risks. These chemicals enter the aquatic environment through various routes, including urban runoff, wastewater discharge and snow melting. While some efforts have been invested in monitoring these substances along these routes, the coverage is limited to a small set of chemicals. This thesis aims to address environmental exposures of CEC and identifying lesser-known chemicals of environmental concerns, e.g., transformation products (TPs). Targeted and non-targeted analyses were conducted on 42 surface water and 30 snow samples in Montreal. The analyses focused on automobile-derived compounds used as industrial antioxidants and vulcanization accelerators. Samples were processed using solidphase extraction (SPE). Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (Orbitrap LC-MS) was used for the sample analyses. Fifteen target compounds were quantified using internal standard calibration. Non-targeted screening of lesser-known contaminants and their TPs generated over 30,000 features in snow and 17,000 in surface water. Feature prioritization was based on peak intensity (>10000) and detection frequency ( $\geq 50\%$ ) while identification relied on retention time and substructural information. To further facilitate the identification of TPs, an additional oxidation experiment was conducted by exposing the parent compounds to ultra-violet (UV) radiation in a multi-lamp photochemical reactor. From the non-targeted analysis and transformation experiments, 37 analytes were identified. Our findings highlight the presence of lesser-known CEC including chemicals used as tire additives and their transformation products in the urban aquatic environment. This study also underscores the importance of using targeted and non-targeted screening approaches to identify and assess these compounds and

their TPs.

Keywords: urban pollution, surface water, snow, non-targeted analysis, contaminants of environmental concern, chemical additives, rubber, transformation products.

#### Acknowledgments

I would like to express my unreserved gratitude to all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this academic journey. This phase of study has been both exciting and challenging but the reward stretches into years to come.

May I first extend my heartfelt appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Xianming Zhang whose guidance and expertise have been invaluable throughout the study process. His prompt response to academic queries, insightful feedback, and commitment to academic excellence remains critical in shaping this work into its best possible form.

I am also thankful to the members of my advisory committee, Prof. John Oh and Prof. Dajana Vuckovic for their scholarly input, and valuable suggestions that have significantly enriched the content and quality of this research.

To Dr. Heng Jiang, bringing answer to my endless question on HRMS played a crucial role in the successful execution of this research.

To the academic community of Chemistry and Biochemistry and especially the graduate school led by Dr. Cuccia, I am grateful for your support.

How about my TA corner, Mr Khal, Aunty Neema, Marika, Rita, and TA mates. It was fun working with you all.

To my lab group, Cassandra, James, Kevin, Xue, Meng; your incredible support is greatly appreciated.

Special thanks are due to all my dear friends, and you know yourselves. Your calls, food, advice, encouragement, and prayers were the biggest incentive. Your sacrifices are eternally etched on my mind.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the support and encouragement received from my family. Your unwavering belief in my abilities have been a constant source of motivation. It has not only facilitated this journey to its completion but has also inspired me to strive for excellence in general academic pursuits.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of H	Figures	viii
List of S	Supplementary Figures	ix
List of 7	۲ables	x
List of S	Supplementary Tables	x
List of H	Equations	xi
List of A	Abbreviations	xii
Chapter	r 1 General Introduction	1
1.1	The Urban Area as a Repository of Organic Chemicals	1
1.2	Sources of Chemical Emissions in the Urban Environment	2
1.3	Rubber and Tire Derived Chemicals as Important Non-exhaust Pollutants	3
1.4	Occurrence, Transformation, and Environmental Risks of Tire-derived Chemi	cal6
1.5 Conce	HRMS-based Targeted and Non-targeted Analysis of Chemicals of Environmern	ental 8
1.6	Study Objectives	9
Chapter Aquatic	r 2 Snow Outweighs Surface Water as an Indicator for Emissions and c Loadings of P-Phenylenediamine Antioxidants and Their Transformation	11
2.1	Introduction	12
2.2	Materials and Methods	13
2.2.1	Sample Collection and Processing	13
2.2.2	Chemical Analysis and Quantification with HPLC-MS	14
2.2.3	Suspect Screening of PPDs and Their Transformation Products	15
2.2.4	Quality Control	15
2.2.5	Data Analysis and Statistics	16
2.2.6	Emissions of PPDs and their Transformation Products from Road Traffic	16
2.3	Results and Discussion	17
2.3.1	p-Phenylenediamines and Transformation Products in Snow and Surface Wate	er17
2.3.2	p-Phenylenediamines and Transformation Products in Surface Water	20
2.3.3	p-Phenylenediamine Loadings from Vehicular Emissions in Urban Roads	21
Chapter Transfo	r 3 Targeted and Non-Targeted Analysis of Rubber Additives and their ormation Products in Urban Snow and Surface Water	24
3.1	Introduction	25
3.2	Materials and Methods	27
3.2.1	Sampling Sites, Sample Collection and Processing	27
3.2.2	Chemical Analysis and Quantification	27
3.2.3	Quality Control	28
3.2.4	Suspect Screening and Non-target Analysis	28

3.2.5	Transformation Experiment	29
3.2.6	Data Analysis	29
3.3	Results and Discussion	30
3.3.1	Target Analysis of Vulcanization Accelerators in Snowmelts and Surface W	ater.30
3.3.2	Non-Target Chemicals: Classification and Prioritization	33
3.3.3	Identification of Prioritized Pollutants	34
3.3.4	Identification by Transformation Studies	37
3.3.4 Chapter 4.1. M	Identification by Transformation Studies	37 40 40
3.3.4 Chapter 4.1. M 4.2 Ta	Identification by Transformation Studies	37 40 40 41
3.3.4 Chapter 4.1. M 4.2 Ta 4.3 Su	Identification by Transformation Studies         4       Conclusions and Recommendations         ieasurement of Industrial Antioxidant in Urban Snow and Surface Water         rgeted and Non-Targeted Analysis of Lesser-known Rubber Tire Additives         mmary, Limitation and Recommendations for Further Study	37 40 41 42
3.3.4 Chapter 4.1. M 4.2 Ta 4.3 Su Referen Apper	Identification by Transformation Studies         4       Conclusions and Recommendations         Teasurement of Industrial Antioxidant in Urban Snow and Surface Water         rgeted and Non-Targeted Analysis of Lesser-known Rubber Tire Additives         mmary, Limitation and Recommendations for Further Study         ces         idix A	37 40 41 42 42 45 52

# List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Chemical identification and characterization by targeted, suspect and non-targ	geted		
analyses	9		
Figure 2.1: Spatial distribution of detected p-phenylenediamine antioxidants and their			
quinone transformation products	18		
Figure 2.2: p-Phenylenediamine antioxidants and their transformation products (TPs) in road-			
side snow samples	19		
Figure 2.3: Transformation pathways of 6PPD	21		
Figure 3.1: Concentrations of DPG, BTs, BTHs, and TMQ in snowmelt and surface wate	r		
samples	31		
Figure 3.2: Principal component analysis of chemical features	34		
Figure 3.3: Concentrations of identified chemicals in snow	35		
Figure 3.4: Transformation Experiment of Diphenylguanidine	38		

# List of Supplementary Figures

Figure S2.1: Snow and surface water sampling points across Greater Montreal	55
Figure S2.2: Road Classification: High, Medium and Low Traffic	56
Figure S2.3: Hourly traffic distribution in Montreal	56
Figure S2.4: Relationship between the concentration of 6PPD and its derivative	57
Figure S3.1: Concentration of non-targeted chemicals in surface water	68
Figure S3.2: Mass Spectra of N,N dicyclohexylmethylamine (DCMM)	69
Figure S3.3: Analytical Information of dicyclohexalamine and N,N dicyclohexylmethyla	mine
(DCMM) Compared	70
Figure S3.4: Confirmation of Hexa(methoxymethyl)melamine (HMMM) by RT and MS	
information of native standard	71
Figure S3.5: Relationship between DPG and its Transformation Products	72
Figure S3.6. Chromatographic profile of blank samples showing non-detection of target	
analytes except for diphenylguanidine	73

## List of Tables

Table 1.1: Chemical structures, leaching and production information of selected tire-derivedchemicals5

### List of Supplementary Tables

Table S2.1: Location and traffic information of sampling points	58
Table S2.2: Summary of Chemical Standards and LC-MS Parameters	59
Table S2.3: PPD Suspect List	61
Table S2.4: Recoveries, MDLs and MQLs of target contaminants	61
Table S2.5: Vehicular Emission of PPDs	62
Table S2.6: Concentration of PDDs Detected in Snow Samples	63
Table S2.7: Summary Concentration Data	64
Table S2.8: Non-Parametric Comparison Across Traffic Levels	64
Table S3.1: Target Analyte Information	75
Table S3.2: Internal Standards Peak Areas and Relative Standard Deviations	75
Table S3.3: Detection Limit, Recovery, Linearity, and Internal Standard	76
Table S3.4: Internal Standards and Matrix Effect	77
Table S3.5: Statistical Testing: Non-Parametric test	78
Table S3.6: Compound Discoverer Software Parameters	79
Table S3.7a: Concentration of Target Analytes (Surface water)	80
Table S3.7b: Concentration of Target Analytes (Snow)	81
Table S3.8: Summary of Analytes by Suspect and Non-Targeted Approach	82
Table S3.9: Expected Transformation Products of DPG, BZT and BTH	83

Equation S2.1: Relative Response Factor

## List of Abbreviations

СМР	Chemical Management Plan
CEC	Contaminants of emerging concerns
DF	Detection frequency
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
DS	Dumping site
HR-MS	High-Resolution mass spectrometry
HLB	Hydrophilic-Lipophilic Balanced
IAs	Industrial antioxidants
NPRI	National Pollutant Release Inventory
NEP	Non exhaust pollutants
NTA	Non-targeted analysis
PPDs	Para-phenylenediamines
PLS-DA	Partial least square-discriminant analysis
PAHs	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PCA	Principal component analysis
m/z	Mass-to-charge ratio
NTA	Non-targeted analysis
RT	Retention Time
SB	Snowbank
TCs	Tire Chemicals
TPs	Transformation products
WWTP	Wastewater treatment plant

## **Chemical Abbreviation**

BTHs Benzothiazoles

BTH	Benzothiazole
BTs	Benzotriazoles
BZT	Benzotriazole
CPPD-Q	CPPD-Quinone
DCH	Dicyclohexalamine
DPG	Diphenylguanidine
DPG-228	Diphenylguanidine-228
DPG-210	Diphenylguanidine-210
DPG-136	Diphenylguanidine-136
DPPD-Q	DPPD-Quinone
HMMM	Hexamethoxymethylmelamine
CPPD	N-Cyclohexyl-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine
DCMM	N,N Dicyclohexylmethylamine
DEET	N,N-diethyl-meta-toluamide
DPPD	N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine
6PPD	N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine
6PPD-Q	N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine-quinone
1,3_DMBA	1,3-dimethylbutylamine
DPU	1,3-diphenylurea
DTG	1,3-di-o-tolylguanidine
HBTH	2-hydroxybenzothiazole
MBTH	2-methylbenzothiazole
MTBTH	2-(methylthio)-benzothiazole
TMQ	2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline
CHD	3-Cyclohexyl-1,1-dimethylurea

- DBH 3,5-Di-tert-butyl-4-hydroxybenzaldehyde
- 4\_ADPA 4-aminodiphenylamine
- 4s\_DPA 4-nitrosodiphenylamine
- 4\_HDPA 4-Hydroxydiphenylamine
- MHBZT 5-methyl-1-H-benzotriazole

#### Chapter 1 General Introduction

#### 1.1 The Urban Area as a Repository of Organic Chemicals

Increasing urbanization brings an unprecedented spike in the release of organic contaminants to the immediate environment. One key factor responsible for such hike is the high population density of the urban area which dictates a huge demand for industrial and household materials. The production and usage of these materials may lead to a local discharge of organic chemicals and wastes in and around the city.<sup>1</sup> Many of these chemicals can be harmful, underscoring the urban area as a significant hub for chemical pollutants. Some of these pollutants eventually find their way into the aquatic ecosystem establishing a land-aquatic gradient of chemical contaminants.

Specific routes including roadway runoff, stormwater drain, and snow-melting represent critical pathways through which these chemicals are introduced to the aquatic media. Therefore, it can be inferred that elevated pollutant concentrations in the cities can lead to increased chemical exposures in aquatic systems. Hence, various monitoring campaigns have focused on deepening our understanding of the processes dictating the formation, release, and distribution of these contaminants.

To facilitate environmental monitoring of organic chemicals, different directories such as the Chemical Management Plan (CMP)<sup>2</sup> and National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI)<sup>3</sup> have been established. The NPRI, for instance, serves as a comprehensive national inventory of contaminants released from Canadian institutional sources into water, land, or air. It also includes substances that are either disposed of or transferred for treatment, or recycling.<sup>4</sup>Established under the 1999 Canadian Environmental Protection Act,<sup>5,6</sup> this inventory gathers data from industrial facilities, numbering over 7000 across more than 280 industrial sectors.<sup>6</sup>The collected data are then made publicly available<sup>7</sup> to keep the society abreast of pollutant emissions or disposal.

#### **1.2** Sources of Chemical Emissions in the Urban Environment

Certain urban pollutants occur as point source chemicals<sup>1</sup> because they originate from a single discrete source. This includes substances consistently discharged from industrial facilities or power plants, as well as those resulting from events triggered by natural disaster. Chemicals listed on the NPRI best describe this category of pollutants. Others pollutant may stem from a range (non-point source) of anthropogenic activities including those of vehicular emissions occurring along transit pathways.<sup>1</sup>

Vehicular emissions especially those from tailpipes have received an age-long scientific attention due to their direct implication on air pollution.<sup>8–12</sup> These emissions contain many harmful pollutants and are deemed the mainspring of global warming.<sup>13</sup> But beyond tailpipe emissions, concerns arise due to non-exhaust, chemical deposition from wearing of tires, brakes, and road surfaces. These chemical sources in conjunction with the resuspension of road dust currently exceed tailpipe emissions in many municipalities.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, the scope of more recent studies encompasses investigations of non-exhaust chemicals.

Despite coordinated efforts invested in monitoring non-exhaust contaminants, there is limited knowledge on the factors driving their concentration and distribution in the urban area. An ongoing question, related to the origin of these chemicals, is the extent to which critical environmental pathways to their introduction into the aquatic systems have been assessed. Also, within the aquatic media, many of these chemicals can degrade into more toxic, bioaccumulative, and persistent forms and the impacts of these degradation products remain largely unknown.

#### 1.3 Rubber and Tire Derived Chemicals as Important Non-exhaust Pollutants

While rubber is the main component of most vehicle tires, it is crucial to acknowledge that tires are intricate products with compositions extending to various other materials. These materials may differ based on the tire's intended use and origin. The rubber tire of a typical passenger car is mainly composed of polymeric materials (butadiene for example), fillers (such as zinc oxide and carbon black), and over 100 chemical additives of varying proportions.<sup>15–17</sup> Three (3) important categories of tire additives exist according to their roles in tire manufacturing; protective, vulcanizing and processing additives.<sup>16</sup>

The protective additives function to extend the durability of rubber tires. They could be antioxidants (like secondary naphthylamines) functioning to protect against the effects of temperature and oxygen, or antiozonants which safeguard tires against ozone degradation. The most commonly used protective additives are the industrial antioxidants (IAs) (Table 1.1) especially the substituted para-phenylenediamines (PPDs) used as synthetic chemicals in several commercial and industrial products to inhibit oxidation reaction.<sup>18</sup> 2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline (TMQ) is another prominent antioxidant that provides heat and anti-aging resistance to rubber materials.<sup>19</sup>

Vulcanizing additives represent chemical materials that speed up the vulcanization process. Vulcanization is the thermochemical process of rubber hardening necessary for the production of useful rubber materials. The process transforms the raw, sticky rubber into a more durable and usable material suitable for a wide range of applications, from tires to industrial products. It imparts several beneficial properties to the rubber products, including increased elasticity, strength, durability, and resistance to heat, abrasion, and aging. Important chemical agents necessary to bring about vulcanization (vulcanization accelerators, Table 1.1) include sulfurcontaining compounds (thiazoles, thiurams, sulfonamides) and the nitrogen-containing additives (triazoles, phenylguanidines) that improve the mechanical and physical properties of the vulcanizates.<sup>16</sup>

Lastly, processing additives include cross-linkers the such as hexamethoxymethylmelamine (HMMM), homogenizers and plasticizers which enhanced the production efficiency and general quality of rubber materials.<sup>16,20</sup> In the rubber blend, plasticizers like oils and resins are incorporated to minimize friction within the tire. Representative of commercial plasticizers are the phthalates including dibutyl phthalate, diethyl phthalate, di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, and diisobutyl phthalate.<sup>20</sup> However, given the widespread use of phthalate in numerous other products including plastics, personal care products and lubricating oils, caution must be applied to not attribute their presence in the environments as solely tire-derived.

# Table 1.1Chemical structures, leaching and production information of selected tire-<br/>derived chemicals (adapted from pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov).49

Class	Chemical Structure and Name	Abbreviation	Production Vol.	Solubility/Leaching Potential
	$C_{18}H_{24}N_2$ N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	6PPD	China: 200,000 tons <sup>23</sup> , US: <100,000,000 lb <sup>49</sup>	560 ± 200 μg/L <sup>23</sup>
	$C_{18}H_{22}N_2O_2$ 6PPD-quinone	6PPD-Q	NA	67 ± 5 μg/L <sup>23</sup>
	$C_{15}H_{18}N_2$ N-isopropyl-N'-phenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	IPPD	10-15,000 tons <sup>23</sup>	NF
Industrial Antioxidants	$C_{18}H_{22}N_2$	CPPD	NF	NF
	N-Cyclonexyi-N -phenyi-p-phenyienediamine $V_{26}H_{20}N_2$ N N'-di-2-naphthyl-n-phenylenediamine	DNPD	NF	NF
	N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	DPPD	US: <1,000,000 lb <sup>49</sup>	Less than 6PPD <sup>6</sup>
	$C_{12}H_{15}N$ 2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline	TMQ	US:25,100 lb <sup>49</sup>	NF
	$\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & \\ & \\ $	DPG	US: <10,000,000 lb <sup>49</sup>	NF

	$ \begin{array}{c}                                     $	BZT	US: <10,000,000 lb <sup>49</sup>	NF
	$H_3C$ N N N $C_7H_7N_3$	MHBZT	NF	NF
	5-metnyl-1-H-benzötrlazole			
ators	S OH C7H5NOS	НВТН	NF	NF
lera	Hydroxybenzothiazole			
on Accel	SCH3 C8H7NS2	MTBTH	NF	NF
zat	2-(methylthio)-benzothiazole			
Vulcaniz	Benzothiazole	ВТН	US: 1,325,064 lb <sup>49</sup>	NF
	S CH <sub>3</sub> C <sub>8</sub> H <sub>7</sub> NS	MBTH	NF	NF
	2-methylbenzothiazole			
	sн C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>5</sub> NS <sub>2</sub>	2-SH-BTH	US: <10,000,000 lb <sup>49</sup>	NF
	2-mercaptobenzothiazole			

NA=Not Applicable, NF=Not found.

#### 1.4 Occurrence, Transformation, and Environmental Risks of Tire-derived Chemical

Evidence suggests that rubber tire additives easily partitions out of the rubber material during wear and tear because they are usually not covalently bonded to the polymer matrix.<sup>20,21</sup> As a result, these chemicals can leach into the immediate environment leading to their detection in different environmental media. Notable research showing the occurrence and toxicity of these chemicals exist.<sup>16,22–27</sup> In Canada, elevated levels of the vulcanization accelerator, 1,3-diphenylguanidine (DPG) in snowmelt,<sup>28,29</sup>, HMMM in urban watershed,<sup>30</sup> IAs in surface water,<sup>31</sup> have been demonstrated. The concentration of some of these chemicals are reported in the  $\mu$ g/L range (more details in introductory section to chapter 3)

Tire chemicals (TCs) may undergo transformation either during their emission and retention on the road surface or even in the tire production process. Prominently, N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine-quinone (6PPD-Q) have been identified as an ozone-induced transformation product (TP) of the IA, N-(1,3-Dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine (6PPD),<sup>22,32</sup> and similar pathway have been unravelled for related compounds.<sup>26</sup> Also the vulcanization agent, benzotriazole (BZT) can be readily degraded by ozone resulting in the formation of 1H-1,2,3-triazole-4,5-dicarbaldehyde.<sup>33</sup> Beside ozonation, photochemical transformation of 6PPD in the aquatic environment was recently reported.<sup>34</sup> The unravelling of these transformation pathways continue to provide insight on the potential underestimation of urban chemicals and associated ecological risks. Thus, environmental monitoring of tire substances must not be limited to parent compounds.

Tire leachates and their TPs continue to generate interest across the globe due to their pervasiveness and ecotoxicological risks to aquatic lives and mammals. Beside the widely reported lethality of 6PPD-Q observed in Coho salmons,<sup>22</sup> acute toxicity of 6PPD and 6PPD-Q affecting heart rate, swimming behavior, and oxygen consumption of zebrafish larvae in laboratory controlled experiments have been documented.<sup>35</sup> Studies have also demonstrated that benzothiazoles (BTHs) induce cytotoxicity and a transient rise in reactive oxygen species levels in cell lines of rainbow trout epithelium.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, sublethal effects, such as increased lipofuscin content in mussels exposed to tire rubber leachates have been attributed to chemicals including BTHs, phthalates, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).<sup>37</sup> Given the ecological impact of tire additives on aquatic organisms, a systematic monitoring of tire derived compounds in urban aquatic systems has become critical.

In vivo assessments in rats demonstrate that TCs do not exhibit toxicity significant enough to affect pulmonary function but only results in minimal lung alterations.<sup>38</sup> However, in vitro analysis on human lung cells have revealed that exposure to TCs induces cell mortality,

inflammatory responses, and nucleic acid damage and may lead to alterations in protein levels.<sup>39,40</sup> Consistently, exposing human macrophages to photoaged TCs resulted in notable increased secretion of inflammatory factors, decreased cell viability and heightened oxidative stress response.<sup>41</sup>

Environmental occurrence and the toxicities of TCs become particularly important when taking into account the number of vehicles on the road globally, estimated at over 1 billion and determined to reach 2 billion mark by 2040.<sup>42</sup> By implication, the ubiquity of tire-wear chemicals is believed to reach alarming levels with increasing urbanization

# 1.5 HRMS-based Targeted and Non-targeted Analysis of Chemicals of Environmental Concern

Chemicals that fall under established regulatory frameworks constitute a tiny fraction of the extensive body of known and unknown contaminants occurring in the urban environment. Therefore, current target analysis methods, in which chemicals are preselected, are limited because they cover a minute fraction of these environmental contaminants. This selection process can introduce bias and potentially exclude important chemicals.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, one of the most prominent trends in environmental monitoring involves the analysis of suspect chemicals, which are substances with basic information available (accurate mass of interest and unambiguous molecular formular), but no authentic standard.<sup>43</sup> This approach usually extends to non-target analysis (NTA), where there is no preselection of analyte. The NTA has now been recognized as a powerful method for capturing chemicals with varying physiochemical properties.<sup>44</sup> Moreso, it has emerged as an important tool for the comprehensive characterization of contaminants of emerging concerns (CEC), which are substances that are not currently regulated but can cause adverse human health and ecological risks.<sup>45</sup> To achieve a comprehensive risk assessment, it is essential to complement targeted and suspect approaches with non-targeted (figure 1.1) environmental monitoring based on high resolution mass

spectrometry (HRMS). Such complementary approach has been employed in the analysis and monitoring of larger number of chemical stressors across different environmental media.<sup>43,46,47</sup>



Figure 1.1 Chemical identification and characterization by targeted, suspect and non-targeted analyses as adapted from Schymanski et al., 2014.

HRMS such as the orbitrap instrument has become a formidable tool in the characterization of environmental contaminants due to its high resolving power, excellent mass accuracy, speed and sensitivity. Whilst the resolving power measures the instrument's ability to distinguish two signals of similar mass-to-charge (m/z) ratio, the mass accuracy is a parameter that defines how close the measured m/z value is to the actual or experimental m/z value. The high mass accuracy and resolving power, with available acquisition modes for a wide m/z range make the HRMS the preferred tool for the analysis of tens of thousands of organic contaminants and their TPs in environmental matrices.<sup>48</sup>

#### 1.6 Study Objectives

Whilst huge attention has been paid to pollutants listed under different regulatory directives, a significant number of lesser-known compounds occurring within the urban aquatic

environment are yet to be unravelled. To assess environmental exposures and associated risk of these compounds, this study aims to:

- Investigate the occurrence of non-exhaust contaminants and a critical factor driving their mass loading in the urban environment. For this purpose, 15 TCs (Table 1.1) were selected based on their environmental importance. These chemicals are given priority over other contaminants of the same class because they are more widely reported as highlighted in section 1.4 above. These TCs also constitute the main tire additives used in rubber tire manufacturing as extensively discussed in sections 2.1 and 3.1.
- Identify and characterize lesser-known chemicals of environmental concern in environmental matrices (snow and surface water samples) through HRMS-based nontargeted approach.

This research has introduced novel quantitative chemical emission data that lays important foundation for improving public health and environmental policies. It has also identified lesserknown tire-derived chemicals of environmental concern and we believe these outcomes will have implications for a continued regulation of vehicle emissions standards and other transportation control measures.

# Chapter 2 Snow Outweighs Surface Water as an Indicator for Emissions and Aquatic Loadings of P-Phenylenediamine Antioxidants and Their Transformation Products in a Snow-Prone City

Joshua Onyeka Osagu<sup>1\*</sup>, Cassandra Johannessen<sup>1</sup>, James Barnwell<sup>1</sup>, Kevin Koueiki,<sup>2</sup> Tom Harner<sup>3</sup>, Xianming Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>

#### Abstract

Chemical emissions from tire have become an emerging environmental concern because tires are made of a complex mixture of rubber and various chemical additives. As tires wear down, these compounds can be released into the environment. Some have toxic or harmful effects on organisms in aquatic ecosystems. To understand the role of road-side snow in trapping chemical tire additives and the corresponding influence of traffic intensity on concentration, we conducted a monitoring study to measure the concentrations of p-phenylenediamines (PPD) and related chemical accumulated in snow. PPDs in surface water were also measured. Using liquid chromatography (LC) and high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS), result across traffic categories showed that 6PPD and 6PPD-quinone (6PPD-Q) in snow were the foremost tire chemicals present. 6PPD and 6PPD-Q were at median concentrations of 364 ng/L and 975 ng/L for high traffic level, 238 ng/L and 641 ng/L for medium traffic level, 131 ng/L and 430 ng/L for low traffic level respectively. 6PPD and 6PPDQ levels in water were below MDL. Statistical analysis (p < 0.05) showed a clear dependence of concentration on traffic intensity. Other than 6PPD-Q, 4 predominant TPs of 6PPD were identified through suspect screening. Among these TPs, 1,3-dimethylbutylamine (1,3 DMBA) and 4-aminodiphenylamine (4ADPA), showed the highest (185 ng/L) and lowest (56 ng/L) mean concentrations respectively. Significant evidence indicated that the occurrence of these TPs was also driven by traffic volume. To evaluate the quantitative impact of traffic, a vehicular emission factor (VEF) was derived to estimate the mass loading of these substances into the environment. The findings revealed a significant load of  $3000 \pm 708$  kg of 6PPD and 6PPDQ during a single winter season.

Keywords: traffic intensity, antioxidant, road snow, surface water, tire additive, pphenylenediamines (PPD)

#### 2.1 Introduction

The urban environment hosts numerous chemicals stemming from human activities and uses of commercial products. Among these chemical sources, traffic is a major contributor to urban chemical emissions and deterioration of various environmental media.<sup>25,50</sup> Beyond chemicals emitted from tailpipes, IAs originating from tire and rubber components of vehicles as non-exhaust emissions have become emerging environmental concern due to recently discovered environmental and health risks.<sup>45,51</sup>

The PPDs are IAs of high-production volume and used in the automobile industry for various rubber products such as seals, boots, hoses, and tires.<sup>26,52,53</sup> As one of the PPDs, 6PPD emerged as the most widely used antiozonant in the rubber industry during the early 2010s <sup>54</sup> and has been applied in approximately 2.3 billion tires globally.<sup>32</sup> Its annual production in 2020 reached 45,000 and 200,000 tons in the US and China, respectively.<sup>18,55</sup> Concern arises due to the toxicity of 6PPD-Q which is a transformation product of 6PPD reacted with ground-level ozone.<sup>22</sup> With various toxic effects, <sup>27,56–58</sup> 6PPD-Q has been identified as the primary toxin causing widespread pre-spawn coho salmon mortality.<sup>22,59</sup>

PPDs and their TPs enter receiving waters through different routes. These pathways include urban runoffs, wastewater discharge and snow melting.<sup>25,28,60–63</sup> Amongst these routes, snow melting is recognised as an important environmental pathway of different pollutants due to the snow's high capacity for these chemicals. <sup>64–66</sup> Some of these pollutants can volatilize back into the atmosphere, whilst others amass within the snow and are subsequently released into the urban aquatic media contributing up to 60% of the overall chemical load.<sup>25,66</sup> Recent studies have demonstrated the presence of PPDs and their TPs in snow.<sup>28,62,65</sup> However, due to low sample sizes, these studies did not comprehensively access factors such as traffic intensity that influence the abundance of the PPDs and their derivatives in snow.

To assess environmental exposure and associated risk, there is an urgent need to quantify emissions of PPDs from traffic. A recent study<sup>67</sup> found the total leachable 6PPD-Q accounts for 46% of 6PPD-Q present in tire wear particles (TWP), from which an emission factor of 5.2  $\mu$ g of 6PPD-Q per gram of TWP is derived.<sup>67</sup> However, this emission quantification is only limited to 6PPD-Q and it does not apply to regions with freezing winter during which leaching of 6PPD-Q from TWP through water does not occur. Considering that TWPs loading onto road sides ranges between 95-99% of total emitted TWP,<sup>68</sup> in snowy days, vehicle-emitted tire additives should be largely captured by snow on roads. As such, we hypothesized that concentrations of the tire additives in roadside snow can be linked to the traffic intensity.

In this study, through judgement sampling and monitoring of PPDs and their TPs in surface water and roadside snow, we demonstrated that for a snowy city, roadside snow is a better environmental monitoring medium for assessing emissions and potential aquatic risk. We explored traffic intensity as an important factor controlling concentrations of PPDs and their TPs in roadside snow, from which we estimated urban emissions of the tire additives with emerging environmental concern. The results of this study provide a valuable reference for developing routine monitoring plan and model simulations in a snow-prone city for the chemical assessment and regulations.

#### 2.2 Materials and Methods

#### 2.2.1 Sample Collection and Processing

Sampling of surface water and snow were conducted in Montreal, Quebec, which is a main metropolitan area and represent the typical climate in Canada. Collection of surface water (42 sites) and snow (30 sites) samples were carried out in August 2022 and January 2023 respectively (Text S2.1). The water sampling was designed to cover influences from roadway

runoffs, WWTP and stormwater drains. The snow samples were collected and covered a snow fall event over January 19-20, 2023. Twenty road snow samples were collected by pooling samples from different points of a road section with varying traffic intensities. Six snow samples were collected from natural parks (areas without traffic influence within 1 km radius) to serve as background references. In addition, two samples were obtained from snowbanks used as temporary dumping areas and two were collected from officially designated municipal snow dumping sites. The road snow were classified (Text S2.2) into high, medium and low road traffic samples according to available traffic information.<sup>69</sup> Both surface water and snow samples were transported on ice to the laboratory and processed using HLB Oasis solid-phase extraction (SPE) cartridges (6 mL, 200 mg, Sigma Millipore USA). For further details on sample collection, processing, and road classification, refer to Text S2.1, S2.2, Figure S2.1, and Table S2.1.

#### 2.2.2 Chemical Analysis and Quantification with HPLC-MS

Chemicals analyzed with standards include 6PPD, 6PPD-Q, N-isopropyl-N'-phenyl-1,4phenylenediamine (IPPD),N,N'-Di-2-naphthyl-p-phenylenediamine(DNPD),N-Cyclohexyl-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine CPPD) and N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine (DPPD). Detailed information on the solvents and chemical standards used in this study are presented in Text S2.3 and Table S2.2a and b. A high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) (Agilent 1100 series LC system, equipped with a binary pump, de-gasser and an autosampler). coupled to an LTQ orbitrap velos mass spectrometer (MS) (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA) was used for chemical analysis and the analytical method are detailed in Text S2.4. Briefly, full scan MS1 data were acquired with data-dependent MS/MS acquisition. Quantification was performed by the internal standard method with 7-point calibration curves (0.05–200 ng/ml,  $R^2$ > 0.995). Quantitation relied on peak area response, employing an automated processing method with Genesis integration in the XcaliburTM software (Thermo Scientific version 3.0.). The most intense ions of each quantified analyte were extracted using a  $\pm$  5 ppm window. Manual verification was performed for peak selection and integration.

#### 2.2.3 Suspect Screening of PPDs and Their Transformation Products

Suspect screening of transformation products was performed using the Compound Discoverer (CD) software (version 3.3) based on exact masses (MS 1 spectra) and corresponding fragmentation information (MS 2 spectra). MS data were fed into the CD software using optimized workflow for suspect and untargeted environmental studies to generate chemical features. Hits were prioritized if they had a detection frequency of  $\geq$  50 % in all samples and peak area > 10,000. Subsequently, suspect search was performed for PPD-related chemicals using an in-house list that was generated mainly from the NORMAN exchange list (More information on Text S2.5, Table S2.3). Chemicals reaching a level 2 confidence<sup>70</sup> where a probable structure is generated by diagnostic evidence and library spectrum match, but lacking native standards were semi-quantified using the relative response factor (RRF, equation S2.1)

#### 2.2.4 Quality Control

HPLC grade water was used as blanks (field, procedural) and was treated under the same conditions as samples during and after the sampling process. For every 10 samples, at least one field or procedure blanks and one samples of HPLC-grade water spiked with 50 ng of the targeted analytes were included for SPE processing and instrumental analysis. Method quantification limits (MQLs) were calculated as 3 times the standard deviation (SD) of the analyte concentration in the procedural blanks plus the average concentration of the analyte in the blanks. If the analyte was not detected in the blank, the MQL was established based on the concentration of standard that produces a peak in the matrix with a signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio

of 10. The method detection limit (MDL) was taken as the calibration standard that produced a S/N of 3. MDLs, M QLs and Recoveries of the target compounds are presented in Table S2.4.

#### 2.2.5 Data Analysis and Statistics

Statistical analysis was conducted using R-Studio 4.1.3. The normality and heteroscedasticity of the data were tested using Shapiro–Wilk and Bartlett's tests. Because the data set violated some of the normality and homogeneity of variance assumptions, the comparison of concentrations across different levels of traffic (Text S2.2, Table S2.5, S2.6, S2.7, S2.8) were performed using the non-parametric Kruskal–Wallis test followed by Wilcoxon post hoc test at a significant level of 0.05.

#### 2.2.6 Emissions of PPDs and their Transformation Products from Road Traffic

Following statistics showing that traffic levels significantly influence concentrations of PPDs and their TPs in roadside snow, we derived a vehicular estimation factor (VEF) that estimates the average emissions of PPDs and their TPs per vehicle per kilometre. Because we took a snow sample by pooling 3-5 snow samples from the cross-section of the road, we can assume that the snow samples we took represent snow on the whole road section since the snow fall began at 10 PM the previous day. As such, VEF ( $\mu$ g/vehicle/km) can be calculated as C (ng/L) \* 1000(L/m<sup>3</sup>) \* 0.001( $\mu$ g/ng) \* PQ(mm) \* 0.001(m/mm) \* W(m) \* 1000(m/km) / N(vehicle), where C is the concentration of a PPD or its TP measured in snowmelt, PQ and N are the precipitation quantity<sup>71</sup> and the number of vehicle passing through the cross-section of the road where a snow sample was taken. PQ was determined based on hourly precipitation rate from weather data archived by Environment and Climate Change Canada.<sup>71</sup> W was determined using the Google Earth Pro (version 7.3). While we could retrieve daily averaged traffic data<sup>72</sup> for the road we sampled, we do not have hourly traffic data for each of our sampled roads to determine

N. Therefore, we used hourly traffic data available for a road within our sampling area in Montreal<sup>72</sup> (Figure S2.3) and assumed that the hourly traffic pattern applies to all the roads, which enable us to scale the daily average traffic to hourly traffic which is essential to determine N.

#### 2.3 **Results and Discussion**

#### 2.3.1 *p*-Phenylenediamines and Transformation Products in Snow and Surface Water

10 phenylenediamines (PPDs) were frequently detected (>50%) with concentrations between 3 and 1276 ng/L (Supporting Information, Table S2.6). The most frequently detected PPDs in snow were 6PPD and 6PPD-Q (Figure 2.1 A-B, 2.2A). Across traffic categories, 6PPD and 6PPD-Q were the dominant pollutants with median concentrations of 364 ng/L and 975 ng/L for high RTL, 238 ng/L and 641 ng/L for medium RTL, 131 ng/L and 430 ng/L for low RTL, respectively (Table S2.6, S2.7). Thus, there was a discernible dependence of concentration on traffic intensity (Figure 2.2C). This trend was true of all measured PPDs and related compounds with high road traffic levels (High RTL) showing significantly higher concentrations than Low RTL. The concentrations of all target analytes in the high RTL group were significantly higher (p < 0.05) than those of the low RTL in all sites except for DPPD and DPPD-Q (Table S2.8) further indicating the influence of traffic volume on chemical loading. However, there was no significant difference (p > 0.05) between high and medium RTL or between medium and low RTL. Clearly, the concentration of 6PPD in comparison to 6PPDQ is consistently lower across all sites (Figure 2.2B). Across the three road levels, 6PPDQ showed about 3 times higher median concentration than its parent compound. In contrast, this trend was not observed for CPPD and CPPD-Q with the later showing a lesser concentration range (3 - 27 ng/L) compared to its parent compound, CPPD (4 -355 ng/L) across all sites. 6PPD showed a median concentration (290 ng/L) approximately 2-fold higher than CPPD (134 ng/L),

a pattern that can be attributed to the higher production volume of the principal antioxidant (6PPD) in rubber. However, the unusual CPPD/CPPDQ (Figure 2.2B) ratio remains unclear since the quinone derivative (CPPDQ) is expected to show higher concentrations than the parent CPPD across all sampling sites.



Figure 2.1 Spatial distribution of detected p-phenylenediamine antioxidants and their quinone transformation products in road-side snow samples from Montreal, (A-B) 6PPD and 6PPD-Q, (C-D) DPPD and DPPD-Q, (E-F) CPPD and CPPD-Q

The suspect screening analyses predominantly identified 4 compounds namely, 4nitrosodiphenylamine (4s-DPA), 4-aminodiphenylamine (4ADPA), 4-Hydroxydiphenylamine (4HDPA) and 1,3-dimethylbutylamine (1,3 DMBA) in the snow samples. These PPDs related chemicals are also associated with tire rubber manufacturing and were recently demonstrated as TPs of 6PPDs resulting from amine and ring oxidation side cleavage of 6PPD.<sup>23</sup> These chemicals demonstrate excellent linear relationships with 6PPDs (Figure S2.4) and their pathways of occurrence have been elucidated in Figure 2.3. All reported TPs were consistently detected across all snow sampling sites with 1,3 DMBA (185 ng/L) and 4ADPA (56 ng/L) showing the highest and lowest mean concentrations respectively. This concentration pattern could be due to the unique amine oxidation side cleavage pathway generating 4-ADPA from

6PPD. 4-ADPA formed can be further oxidized to other TPs including 4s-DPA and another terminal stable product known as 4-nitrodiphenylamine (4NDPA).<sup>23</sup> Zhao et al.,<sup>23</sup> reports that this pathway (Figure 2.3) results in a 33 % loss by mass of the starting TP (4ADPA) whilst 1,3-DMBA when formed is not further oxidized.



Figure 2.2 p-Phenylenediamine antioxidants and their transformation products (TPs) in road-side snow samples. (A) Concentration of detected traffic derived PPDs and their TPs. (B) Comparison of parent analytes and their quinone derivative. (C) Traffic influence on the concentration pattern of 6PPD and 6PPD-Q (D) Mass loading of detected chemicals released per vehicle per kilometre road section in a typical winter season. Boxplots are defined as follows: center line, median; boxplot edges, 25th and 75th percentiles; and whiskers, 5th and 95th percentiles of the distribution.

Concerning the background sample collected from all 3 natural parks, our findings showed that traffic related chemicals were largely non-detected. However, 6PPD and 6PPD-Q were detected at much lower concentrations (4-10 ng/L) compared to roadside snow which clearly

demonstrates that these chemicals are released as a result of urban activities. On the other hand, samples from the snow dump sites showed much higher concentrations reaching 100 ng/L for two of the four dumping sites. Interestingly, the dumping sites were hypothesized to show elevated level of these chemicals, but the resulting concentrations were much lower than those of the road traffic arterials. This could be attributed to the impact of dilution of freshly precipitated snow. Also, the fresh snow could have covered a significant portion of the preexisting snowpack at the time of sampling.

Generally, the concentration of tire wear compounds especially 6PPD-Q in the present study is consistent with reported results globally. The mean concentration of snowmelt samples from Saskatoon was reported at 80–370 ng/L<sup>28</sup>, although the authors indicated that these values might have been underestimated by a factor of 2 or more due to their quantitation approach. Similarly, traffic related chemicals recently identified in snow from Liepzig, Germany were in the range 1.3 ng/L to 75  $\mu$ g/L.<sup>25</sup> What is of concern is that the highest recorded 6PPDQ value in our current study, which stands at 1276 ng/L, exceeds the LC<sub>50</sub> value (95 ng/L) of the compound<sup>59</sup> for coho salmon by approximately 13 times. This indicates that coho salmon and other susceptible aquatic organisms in the Montreal area could be facing a potential threat from this toxic quinone compound.

#### 2.3.2 *p*-Phenylenediamines and Transformation Products in Surface Water

In contrast, the concentration of these compounds in surface water were found below MQL probably due to zero to light rainfall events prior to the sampling campaign. The closest heavy precipitation event (17.4 mm) occurred 10 days to the sampling,<sup>73</sup> followed by multiple dry weather conditions. Given the unstable nature of some of these compounds<sup>67</sup>, especially 6PPD, low detection is not unexpected. More so, the non-detects is also likely due to the grab sampling approach employed during the sampling campaign. Nonetheless, these results seem to align

with the findings of Johannessen et al reporting very low concentration of tire-wear compounds (1.8 ng/L) during low precipitation (9 mm) periods.



Figure 2.3 Transformation pathways (as adapted from Zhao et al., 2023) for 6PPD along with chemical formulas, and structures for detected TPs. All TPs are identified with confidence levels 1.

#### 2.3.3 *p*-Phenylenediamine Loadings from Vehicular Emissions in Urban Roads

The hierarchical classification of urban roads is dictated by the traffic volume. Hence, the deposition of tire wear particles (TWPs) within a road section is hypothesized to be proportional to traffic intensity across local and main traffic corridors. The present result has proven a clear dependence of the concentration of PPDs on traffic density (Figure 2.2C). Using the vehicular emission factor (VEF) the chemical loading of this group of contaminants was estimated and the amount of PPDs deposited per vehicle per km in a typical winter season is hereby reported (Table S2.5).

Corresponding to concentration, 6PPD and 6PPD-Q released were found in highest amounts ranging from 36-125 and 73-267 µg/vehicle/km respectively (Figure 2.3D, Table S2.5). The average amount of 6PPD-Q emitted per vehicle/kilometre into the environment was  $170 \,\mu\text{g/g}$  and it represents the highest amount of the reported chemical set in this study. Other analytes with high emission potentials include 6PPD, 4sDPA, 1,3-DMBA, CPPD, and 4HDPA with average emitted amounts 62, 37, 43, 33 and 29, µg//vehicle/km respectively. These values are likely to vary according to different seasons owing to the effect of temperatures on TWP deposition since it has been found that elevated temperatures lead to a higher production of tire wear particles, intensifying road surface wear, especially during the rapid increase in tread temperature.<sup>74</sup> The same report by Chang et al. shows that high temperatures significantly enhance the likelihood of larger particle deposition and also alters the mechanism of wear. These temperatures may cause the tire to deform more easily, leading to increased contact with the road surface and subsequent wear particle generation. Summing up the average emission rate for 6PPD and 6PPD-Q implies that  $180 \pm 59$  ug of these chemicals is released per vehicle/km. Since the lifespan of a set of car tires is approximately 5 years<sup>75</sup> (6000 km/winter)<sup>76</sup> and given an estimated 2 million cars in Montreal,<sup>77</sup> we can deduce that approximately 2160 kg of 6PPD & 6PPDQ are loaded into the environment from Montreal over a given winter season.

Our study highlights the ubiquity of tire rubber-derived compounds in the Montreal area of Quebec, Canada. Distinctive and consistent patterns of chemicals related to traffic were detected in snow collected from roads, clearly distinguishing them from the background reference samples taken from natural parks. The concentration of these chemicals and their transformation products showed a discernible influence of traffic volume, with the relationship particularly evident in the case of 6PPD and its quinone derivative. However, the quantity emitted by individual vehicle per kilometre remained consistent across different traffic
arterials. The present study not only offers valuable information about the occurrence and distribution patterns of tire-wear compounds, but of greater significance, it expands the limited emission and loading data of TWP-borne PPDs to the environment. This is critical for comprehending the quantitative introduction of these compounds to aquatic media and further highlights snowmelt as an important reservoir of this group of chemicals.

## **Author Contribution**

Joshua Osagu: Joshua Osagu: Conceptualization, Snow and Surface Water Sampling, Sample Preparation, Investigation/Instrumental analysis, Writing – original draft, all data analysis except for PCA, Writing – review & editing final draft. Kevin Koueiki: Assisted in Snow Sampling. Cassandra Johannessen: Assisted to review the first draft and supplied most of the chemicals used for the project. Xianming Zhang: Conceptualization, Surface water sampling, reviewing & correcting the thesis drafts, data analysis-PCA, and general supervision. Tom Harner: Conceptualization.

## Note

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests.

## Acknowledgement:

The authors would like to thank Dr. Heng Jiang, the Mass Spectrometry Specialist of the Centre for Biological Applications of Mass Spectrometry (CBAMS), Concordia University, Montreal, QC, Canada for facilitating access and usage of the HRMS instrument used for this research.

# Chapter 3 Targeted and Non-Targeted Analysis of Rubber Additives and their Transformation Products in Urban Snow and Surface Water

Joshua Onyeka Osagu<sup>1\*</sup>, Cassandra Johannessen<sup>1</sup>, Xianming Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>

### Abstract

The ubiquity of non-exhaust pollutants (NEP) derived from tire emissions in urban aquatic environments raises concerns about their potential ecological and human health impacts. This study employs a comprehensive analytical approach to investigate both targeted and nontargeted tire-derived chemicals We apply liquid chromatography (LC) and high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) for widely studied and lesser-known tire additives and their transformation product (TPs) in snowmelts and surface water in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. Targeted analysis highlights high concentrations of rubber additives, with 1,3diphenylguanidine (DPG) as the most prominent chemical in road-side snow (4600 ng/L median concentration). Detected vulcanization accelerators such as benzothiazole (BTH), 2hydroxybenzothiazole (HBTH), and 5-methyl-1-H-benzotriazole (MHBZT) also showed elevated concentrations in snowmelts indicating 1650 ng/L, 851 ng/L and 816 ng/L median concentrations respectively. These chemicals also occurred in surface water but at comparatively lower levels. The median levels of BZT (359 ng/L) and BTH (1650 ng/L) for snow samples were approximately 9 and 4 times higher than in surface water respectively. Additionally, suspect and non-targeted analysis identified 11 lesser-known compounds, (DCH), including Dicyclohexalamine diphenylguinidine-136 (DPG-136,) and Hexa(methoxymethyl)melamine (HMMM) corresponding to 1641 ng/L ,527 ng/L and 1908 ng/L median concentrations in snow samples. To enhance the confidence in the identification of TPs, a specific strategy based on H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>-induced transformation experiment was employed. This involved comparing the chromatographic and mass spectra information of experimental samples to field snow and surface water samples.

**Keywords:** tire-derived chemical, snowmelts, surface water, non-exhaust pollutants (NEP), vulcanization accelerator, rubber additive, liquid chromatography (LC)-high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS), targeted and non-targeted analysis.

#### 3.1 Introduction

The widespread production and use of organic chemicals for industrial and commercial purposes has resulted in the introduction of man-made chemicals into the aquatic environment posing potential risks to both aquatic organisms and the human population. In urban environmental systems, a great portion of these chemicals originates from traffic emissions, particularly non-exhaust pollutants (NEPs). NEPs comprise a complex mixture of particulate matter derived from road surface erosion, brake and tire wear, road dust resuspension, and volatile components from solvent release and fuel evaporation.<sup>14,78</sup> NEPs are unregulated although they account for up to 90% of the total mass of particulate matter emitted from traffic-related sources.<sup>78</sup> Thus, there is a growing interest to expand the development of solid analytical framework for the detection and characterization of these chemicals as NEPs in the environment.

Amongst the components of NEP, tire-originated emission stands out as a prominent source of traffic related contamination. Many tire additives including industrial IAs and vulcanization accelerators have been associated with ecotoxicological hazards.<sup>27,58,59,79–81</sup><sup>16,27,59</sup> IAs such as the PPDs are applied in the automobile industry to protect rubber materials including tires from deterioration caused by oxygen, heat or ozone.<sup>26,52</sup> Notable examples of PPDs are 6PPD and CPPD. Vulcanization accelerators, such as 1,3-diphenylguanidine (DPG), benzothiazoles (BTHs) benzotriazoles (BTs) and their derivatives also play crucial roles in tires by enhancing the thermochemical transformation of raw rubber materials into hardened, more durable and usable forms.<sup>16</sup> Due to their extensive use in tire industry, substantial amounts of these chemicals derived from tires can be released into different environmental media. Once released, these chemicals can undergo complex biotic and abiotic transformations, forming new toxic substances and further exacerbating the environmental concern associated with the chemicals used in tires.<sup>62,79</sup>

The prevalence of tire usage has resulted in the widespread occurrence of tire-derived chemicals and TPs in the environment, as documented in numerous studies.<sup>16,22,26,60,79,82</sup> Tirederived chemicals have been detected in various environmental matrices, including stormwater, snowmelt, surface water, wastewater, and sediments. 28,60,80,83 Often, the concentrations of the tire-derived chemicals including their TPs exceed those of many other emerging contaminants. A study by Challis et al. <sup>28</sup> reported one of the highest average DPG concentrations at 60  $\mu$ g/L and 1  $\mu$ g/L in stormwater and snowmelt respectively. The research indicated that up to 15 kg of DPG can be loaded to aquatic environment from a single rain event. Further, over 80% detection frequency was reported of 6PPD-Q in snowmelt samples (80-370 ng/L).<sup>28</sup> Other tire additives such as BZT and 5-methyl-1-H-benzotriazole (MHBZT) also known as tolyltriazole have been detected in surface and wastewater samples at concentrations in the µg/L range.<sup>83</sup> Elevated levels of BTHs are also documented in WWTPs, urban runoffs and water receiving bodies.<sup>80,84</sup> Although, the presence of BTHs and BTs in surface water can be attributed to incomplete elimination from WWTPs (with removal rates ranging from 20-70%),<sup>80,83,84</sup> further evidence suggests that other pathways such as urban runoff can be more significant sources of these contaminants.<sup>85</sup>

Contaminants originated from rubber can cause adverse effects on humans and aquatic organisms. A notable effect is the mortality syndrome observed in coho salmon in the Pacific Northwest (USA), due to the toxicity of 6PPD-Q, present in stormwater runoff.<sup>22</sup> Another tire-derived compounds, DPG has also been reported to exhibit acute toxicity (48-hour LC<sub>50</sub>) and (96-hour LC<sub>50</sub>) for water fleas and bluegill fish respectively at moderate exposure concentration (0.5-10 mg/L).<sup>86</sup> Since the detection of benzothiazole (BTH) in human atherosclerotic aortas (10 ng/g, mean concentration),<sup>87</sup> several other studies have documented BTH-induced genotoxicity, cytotoxicity, and carcinogenicity.<sup>88,89</sup> More so, In vivo and in vitro investigations of these chemicals have revealed evidence of endocrine disruption..<sup>90</sup>

Despite extensive research on tire additives (especially vulcanization accelerators) in WWTPs, urban runoffs, stormwater, <sup>83,84,91,92</sup> knowledge of lesser-known chemicals originated from tire additives in critical pathways such as snow melting is limited. Considering evidence suggesting the exposure to these chemicals in urban area and the resulting adverse aquatic effects, it is imperative to explore major sources through which these substances are mobilized into the urban aquatic environment. To address the research needs in this study, we collected snow and surface water samples and analysed well-known and lesser-known compounds related to rubber additives using LC and HRMS-based targeted and non-targeted approaches. Oxidation experiment was conducted for the identification of TPs in environmental samples. The results of this study suggest that road snow is an environmental medium of concern for tire additives and their TPs in snow prone cities like Montreal and can be the medium for environmental monitoring for source tracking.

## 3.2 Materials and Methods

### 3.2.1 Sampling Sites, Sample Collection and Processing

Sampling and processing were carried out as described in chapter 2, section 2.2.1

#### 3.2.2 Chemical Analysis and Quantification

Surface water and snow sample extracts were analysed using a LC (detail information in Text S2.4 and Table S2.2) coupled to orbitrap mass spectrometer (LTQ orbitrap velos, Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA) for targeted analysis of nine compounds known as rubber tirederived additives, including DPG, BZT, MHBZT, BTH, 2-hydroxybenzothiazole (HBTH), 2methylbenzothiazole (MBTH), 2-(methylthio)-benzothiazole (MTBTH), 2mecaptobenzothiazole (2-SH-BTH) and TMQ. Detailed Information on the chemical standards and solvents used are presented in Text S2.3 and Table S3.1. For HRMS detection using orbitrap MS, a full scan (m/z 100–500, resolving power 100,000) was combined with datadependent MS/MS acquisition (for details, see Text S2.4 and Table S2.2b). The internal standard method was used for quantitation with a 7-point calibration curves (0.1–1000 ng/ml,  $R^2 > 0.995$ ). Other details are captured in section 2.2.2.

#### 3.2.3 Quality Control

HPLC grade water (Fisher Scientific, Waltham, Massachusetts, USA). was used for solvent, field and procedural blanks. Blanks were treated under the same conditions as samples during and after the sampling process. More details in section 2.2.4

Recoveries (Table S3.3) were assessed in snowmelts and river water by comparing the differences between standard fortified blanks spiked before and after extraction. Recoveries represent losses incurred during sample processing including solid-phase extraction (SPE) and evaporation by nitrogen gas. Matrix effects (Table S3.4) were analysed using the isotopically labelled internal standard Dimethoate-D6 (for BTs and BTHs), N,N-diphenylguanidine-D10 (for DPG) and 6PPD-quinone-d5 (TMQ). This was achieved by spiking 7 random processed snowmelt samples and 7 Milli-Q water blank samples at the same concentration of 50 ng/mL.

### 3.2.4 Suspect Screening and Non-target Analysis

Analysis of lesser-known compounds and TPs was performed using the Compound Discoverer software (version 3.3) with an optimized workflow for suspect and untargeted environmental studies (details on software parameters are in Table S3.6). Chemical features, i.e. extracted chromatographic peaks with given retention times (RT), masses and intensities, were retrieved and prioritized with detection frequency of  $\geq$  50% across the water or snow samples and a peak area greater than or equal to 10,000. Identification of compounds was based on information generated from MS1 and MS2, isotope pattern matching and relevant chemical databases. Suspect searches were initially performed for mass to charge ratios (m/z) of rubber tire compounds within the prioritized list. Firstly, the optimized suspect screening workflow

was validated with all target compounds (BTHs, BTs, DPG and TMQ) treated as synthetic suspects. The only preliminary information available was the exact mass of the protonated species [M + H]<sup>+</sup> deduced from the chemical formulae. The chemicals were tentatively identified using a combination of data sources including the mzCloud, Massbank and Chemspider information. Validated workflow was applied to "real" suspect compounds and suggested hits were primarily ranked based on accuracy of exact m/z, fragmentation match and application/uses of the chemical. Chemicals with a level 2a identification,<sup>70</sup> i.e., a likely structure is proposed based on diagnostic evidence and a match with library spectra but lacking native standards, were semi-quantified using relative response factors (details in S2.1). Reference standards for selected compounds were used to help compound identification by comparing the RT, m/z values, and MS2 spectra (Supplementary figure S3.4)

## 3.2.5 Transformation Experiment

Batch transformation experiments of model analytes including DPG, BZT and BTH were performed in 15 ml quartz flat bottom vials containing 10mM hydrogen peroxide (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) and 5uM of individual analyte. An aliquot of 2 ml samples was collected and stored as 0 h control. The flasks were immediately exposed to ultra-violet (UV) radiation in a multi-lamp photochemical reactor for 2 and 8 hours. Other controls were set up to investigate the effect of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> on DPG without UV influence as well as the influence of UV radiation in the absence of the oxidizing agent, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. Blank control was prepared at the same concentration, stored, and protected from light until instrumental analysis.

#### **3.2.6 Data Analysis**

Statistical analysis was conducted using R-Studio 4.1.3. The normality and heteroscedasticity of the data were tested using Shapiro–Wilk and Bartlett's tests. Because the data set violated some of the normality and homogeneity of variance assumptions, the

comparison of concentrations across and within sample matrices (Table S3.5) were achieved using the non-parametric Kruskal–Wallis test followed by Wilcoxon post hoc test at a significant level of 0.05.

Using the R package of *rplos* (v 1.28.2), principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted to explore the influence of traffic on the chemical compositions of snow samples.

#### **3.3** Results and Discussion

## 3.3.1 Target Analysis of Vulcanization Accelerators in Snowmelts and Surface Water

In the snow samples, eight of the nine target analytes were detected (Figure 3.1 and Table S3.7). The distribution of the chemicals varied significantly within the sample matrix. DPG, BZT, MHBZT, HBTH, MTBTH, and BTH were detected in every sample while TMQ and MBTH were detected in over 65 % of the samples. DPG had a median concentration of 4600 ng/L, followed by BTH (1650 ng/L), HBTH (851 ng/L), and MHBZT (816 ng/L). The occurrence of MHBZT and HBTH exhibited a similar trend, suggesting a common pattern of usage in tire manufacturing.



Figure 3.1 Concentrations of Diphenylguanidine (DPG), Benzotriazoles (BTs), Benzothiazoles (BTHs), and 2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline (TMQ) in snowmelt and surface water samples.

In the surface water, the chemical distribution profile was more uniform except for BTH (378 ng/L, median value) which was one order of magnitude higher than other detected compounds. Other analytes including BZT, MHBZT, HBTH, and MTBTH, had median concentration in the range of 10 to 45 ng/L. However, there were significant differences in concentration between all four compounds except BZT (Table S3.5).

The concentrations of tire additives were consistently higher in snowmelts than surface water samples. This difference was particularly pronounced for DPG, with a maximum concentration of 59,200 ng/L in snowmelts, which was four orders of magnitude greater than the MDL in surface water samples. Similarly, the concentrations of BTs and BTHs (Figure 3.1) were significantly higher in snowmelts than in surface water (p<0.05) (Table S3.5). The median BZT concentration in snow (359 ng/L) was approximately nine times higher than in surface water, while the median BTH concentration in snow (1650 ng/L) was four times higher. This

pattern holds true for TMQ with a maximum concentration of 928 ng/L in snowmelts but below the MDL in surface water.

The reference snow background samples collected from the three natural parks indicated that BTs, BTHs, and DPG were largely present but at generally lower concentrations than those from traffic routes (Table S3.7b). This suggests that the emissions of these compounds are largely due to urban influences. TMQ concentrations were below its MDL in samples from natural parks except for one sample site, PA 2, (Table S3.7b). The closeness of the sample location to vehicular tracts within the park could be responsible for the detection in the sample.

DPG concentration in snow analyzed in the present study had a range of <1-59.2 µg/L, while that of Leipzig, Germany, was 3-14 µg/L<sup>25</sup> and Saskatoon, Canada, ranged <1-8.7 µg/L. <sup>28</sup> Comparing maximum detected concentrations, the present work is approximately 4-fold greater than in Leipzig snow and 7-fold higher than that of Saskatoon. Such result approximately match the differences in the population of the three cities (Montreal  $\approx$ 1, 800,000,<sup>93</sup> Leipzig  $\approx$ 600,000<sup>94</sup> and Saskatoon $\approx$ 270,000.<sup>95</sup>) and the population of a city is generally correlated with the average traffic intensities.

The concentration of DPG in surface water samples measured in this study was below the MDL. This is in contrast to DPG reported in surface water at concentrations of 8.14-188 ng/L<sup>16</sup> in Southern China, above 9.8 ng/L<sup>29</sup> in Ontario Canada, and 5 –540 ng/L in the US.<sup>96</sup> Reasons for these differences may relate to a complex interplay of several factors, including drought, occasional or intense rainfall events preceding sampling campaigns, road conditions, fluctuating temperatures, and humidity, which potentially influence the deposition/emission of these chemicals during wear and tear. These results also suggest that the tire-derived chemicals in surface water are highly episodic. Thus, snap-shot sampling might not be good in capturing the contamination condition and aquatic exposures to these chemicals. Time integrated sampling is merited if a routine water monitoring campaign is to be implemented for monitoring this group of contaminants in aquatic systems.

Different from DPG, which was only detected in the snow but not in the surface water, BTHs were detected in both media with concentrations of 110-1271 ng/L and 76-4606 ng/L (Table S3.7a and b) in surface water and snow respectively. The concentration range of BTHs in surface water were in similar range to measurements conducted in China (30-1465 ng/L),<sup>97</sup> and (2-1993 ng/L)<sup>16</sup>. Our measured BTHs concentrations in snow were also within the previously reported range in Germany (40- 50000 ng/L).<sup>25</sup> The detection of BTHs but no detection of DPGs in surface water suggests that there are sources of BTHs in urban environment other than rubber tire in which BTHs are used as vulcanization accelerators. Various BTHs are used as corrosion inhibitors or biocides<sup>84</sup> so in addition to emission from vehicle tires, other urban sources can predominantly contribute their presence in the surface water.

## 3.3.2 Non-Target Chemicals: Classification and Prioritization

Through filtering of the detected chemical features based on detection frequency and peak abundance, an initial of 17,000 (surface water) and over 30,000 (snow) features generated by the HRMS analysis and non-targeted data processing were reduced to 183 and 2005 respectively. Figure 3.2 shows the data analysis of the chemical features using principal component analysis (PCA). The PCA score plot (Figure 3.2) shows the clustering pattern of snow samples and field blanks only. PC1, accounting for 55% of the data variability, separate the samples with traffic influence from background sites and field blanks. This suggests that PC1 can be interpreted as traffic influenced. The chemical profiles in samples from the background sites are closer to the field blanks, in which chemicals detected can be from the sample containers, solvents used and instrument background. PC2 and PC3 accounts for only 9% and 8% of the data variability respectively. Snow samples from roads of varying traffic

intensity had no clear separation on the dimensions defined by PC2 and PC3. This suggests that the samples from varying traffic sites had little difference in the chemical profiles despite differences in absolute concentrations. Thus, traffic can be the major contributor for the chemicals in all the snow samples collected from the roads.



Figure 3.2 Principal component analysis (PCA, Q2 = 0.72) based on the internal standard normalized abundance of chemical features extracted and prioritized using the non-targeted workflow. PCA score plot shows snow and blank samples with site colored based on the traffic influence classification.

### 3.3.3 Identification of Prioritized Pollutants

Efforts were made to identify the chemicals prioritized based on their abundances and detection frequencies in the snow and surface water matrices. Figure 3.3, S3.1, S3.2 and S3.3 shows the profile of chemicals identified with a level 1 or 2 confidence (Table S3.8) based on the Schymanski classification scheme.<sup>70</sup>



Figure 3.3 Concentrations of identified chemicals in snow matrix based on available native standard and transformation experiments. Concentrations of these compounds were quantified based on the relative response factors (RRF) described in SI text S2.1.

Figure S3.2 shows the mass spectra of one of the identified chemicals, N,N Dicyclohexylmethylamine (DCMM), a rubber tire additive detected with high frequency of 82 % in surface water and 76 % in snowmelts. The MS2 in ESI(+) gave a good match with the spectrum generated from MassBank database. This procedure was applied to other level 2a chemicals (Figure 3.3) for identification in conjunction with other observable analytical patterns. This approach facilitated the identification of dicyclohexalamine (DCH) through direct comparison with its derivative, DCMM (Figure S3.3). HMMM was unambiguously

identified and confirmed with the authentic standard and matching the RT, MS1 and MS2 to reach a level 1 confidence (Figure S3.4). Most of the tentatively identified compounds had mass spectral information on mass library however, further identification of other compounds with missing library information have been designed to follow manual deduction of loss of common MS2 fragments and the possibilities of their environmental occurrence based on applications. Apart from the manual deduction of the MS/MS spectra, additional experiment was conducted to identify TPs of well-known chemicals. Overall, 37 substances were tentatively identified (Figure 3.3 and more details on table S3.8), 11 with MS2 spectra evidence and 14 without such evidence, but with supporting information including excellent chromatographic peak shape and reasonable RT supporting their likelihood of occurrence. 12 chemicals were rejected based the absence of relevant supporting evidence including invalid MS2 and RT information. In the end, 4 of the 11 chemicals shown in Figure 3.3 above have been confirmed and thus, designated as level 1 compounds. These includes, HMMM (Figure S3.4), diphenylguanidine-228 (DPG-228, Fig. 3.4a-b), diphenylguinidine-210 (DPG-210, Fig. 3.4c-d) and diphenylguinidine-136 (DPG-136, Fig. 3.4e-f). Other chemicals of the set yet to be confirmed include DCH, 1,3-di-o-tolylguanidine (DTG), 3-Cyclohexyl-1,1-dimethylurea (CHD), N'N Dicyclohexylmethylamine (DCMM), 1,3-Diphenylurea (DPU), 3,5-Di-tertbutyl-4-hydroxybenzaldehyde (DBH) and N,N-diethyl-meta-toluamide (DEET)-the only tentatively identified chemical belonging to the pesticide class. Amongst these, HMMM, DCH and DPG-136 were prominent with median concentrations, 1908 ng/L, 1641 ng/L and 527 ng/L respectively. The confidence in the quantitation of these chemicals is further strengthen by their zero to minimal occurrence in blanks except for DPG (Figure S3.6) for which blank subtraction was performed. This study confirm the presence of abundant species of rubber chemicals and it is consistent with the snowmelt assessment recently conducted in Germany.<sup>25</sup> This work

identified the antioxidant DBH that to the best of our knowledge has not been reported in roadsides snow.

### 3.3.4 Identification by Transformation Studies

A simple strategy based on the suspect screening of expected TPs (Table S3.9) were applied for identification. Firstly, chromatographic peaks, full-scan-MSI and MS2 data of DPG, BZT, and BTH exposed to  $H_2O_2$  under UV-radiation in a photochemical reactor were obtained by LC-HRMS-analysis. A suspect search of accurate m/z was conducted for predicted TPs (Table S3.9). Experimental hits were compared with field samples to examine analytical information match including RT and fragmentation patterns. Based on the interpretation of the chromatography and mass spectra evidence, DPG showed three prominent TPs (Figure 3.4) in the snow samples; DPG-228, DPG 210 and DPG-136. A fourth TP was also identified but the detection frequency (3 %) was way less than the minimum threshold of  $\geq$  50 % set for this study. Since the parent DPG was not detected in surface water, the absence of its TPs in the matrix was not unexpected. The result of the top 3 TPs of DPG showed excellent RT match between the experimental and field samples. The elution order of the 3 chemicals follows LC chromatographic principle with DPG-210 (resulting from the dehydroxylation of the parent compound) eluting last being the most hydrophobic (figure 4c-d). Also, dephenylation product, DPG-136 (Figure 4e-f) as the most hydrophilic was only retained in the LC column for an average of 3.49 minutes with consistent mass spectra information between field and experimental samples. However, the spectral match between the field and experimental DPG-210 is quite poor based on the relative intensity of the two most prominent fragments- 168 and 192 as shown in Figure 3.4c-d. Moreso, the chromatogram of the field samples is suggestive of possible co-eluting substances present in the sample. Further analysis (Figure S3.5) was performed to evaluate the relationship between these TPs and their parent compound, DPG.

The results showed a non-linear relationship, and this may relate to a combination of factors including the transformation rate of TPs and non-point source influence.



Figure 3.4 Transformation Experiment of DPG. (a) DPG-288 resulting from the oxidation of DPG-Experimental and (b) field sample (c) DPG-210 from dihydroxylation of DPG-experimental sample and (d) field sample (e) DPG-136 from dephenylation-experimental and (f) field sample

The same approach of identification was performed for BTH and BZT, however, the results were either a zero or low detection frequency hits except for hydroxybenzothiazole ( $C_7H_5NOS$ ) which is also one of the target analytes in this study. The reason for these zero observations is unclear but might not be unrelated to instability of compounds.

These findings highlight the presence of important tire additives detected in surface water and snow matrices through HRMS-based targeted and non-targeted approach. To the best of our knowledge, the results of this work represent the first elucidation of traffic-driven occurrence of NEP in the Quebec region of Canada. It further shows the importance of snow

as a critical environmental reservoir from which harmful organic substances can be released

into the environment. Some of the chemicals detected showed elevated levels especially DPG,

BTH, HMMM, DCH and DPG-136. Given the impact of previously reported additives in

different species of organisms, it is pertinent to further evaluate the fate and toxicity of some

of the lesser- known compounds reported in this work.

## **Author Contribution**

**Joshua Osagu: Joshua Osagu:** Conceptualization, Snow and Surface Water Sampling, Sample Preparation, Investigation/Instrumental analysis, Writing – original draft, all data analysis except for PCA, Writing – review & editing final draft. **Cassandra Johannessen:** Supplied most of chemicals used for the project. **Xianming Zhang:** Conceptualization, Surface water sampling, reviewing & correcting the thesis drafts, data analysis-PCA, and general supervision.

## Note

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests. authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests.

## Acknowledgement:

The authors would like to thank Dr. Heng Jiang, the Mass Spectrometry Specialist of the Centre for Biological Applications of Mass Spectrometry (CBAMS), Concordia University, Montreal, QC, Canada for assisting in the analysis of the samples used for this research.

The authors would like to thank Tom Haner of Environment and Climate Change Canada for contributing conceptual ideas that were instrumental in actualizing the goals of this work.

#### Chapter 4 Conclusions and Recommendations

The main objective of this research was to examine the emissions and fate of tirederived chemicals and TPs in the urban environment. This study not only captured the occurrence of well-known non-exhaust contaminants but also identified and characterized lesser-known chemical analogues of environmental concern in urban snow and surface water samples through HRMS-based targeted and non-targeted approach. The research design centred around two major categories of rubber tire additives, IAs and vulcanization accelerators and offers insight for source-tracking and advancement of environmental policies. In the first part of the research, the quantitative emission rate of industrial antioxidants and TPs was studied while the second part involved the investigation of snow as a critical reservoir of lesserknown pollutants in the environment. The current chapter highlights and summarizes key results of both aspects as well as limitations and recommendations for future work.

#### 4.1. Measurement of Industrial Antioxidant in Urban Snow and Surface Water

Concentrations of IAs and TPs were measured in 30 snow and 42 surface water samples in the Montreal region of Quebec, Canada. Snow sampling was designed along road traffic and non-traffic areas to capture point and non-point sources influences while surface water samples included source contributions from wastewater treatment plants (WWTP), stormwater drains, urban runoffs and snow melting. Measurement of analytes in both matrices was conducted using targeted and suspect screening approaches based on HRMS. Target compounds quantified includes, 6PPD, 6PPD-Q, CPPD, and DPPD while the suspect screening revealed the presence of TPs such as CPPD-Q, DPPD-Q, 4\_HDPA, 4\_ADPA, and 1,3\_DMBA. These compounds were only detected and quantified in snow but were below MDLs in surface water. Quantified compounds had median concentration range of 3-1276 ng/L. Chemical analysis of snow and surface water samples revealed the presence of various rubber tire additives. 6PPD and 6PPD-Q were the most prominent analytes across the samples of the snow and showed 100 % detection frequencies. Their concentrations were significantly influenced by traffic intensity. The high dependence of chemical concentrations on traffic intensities was largely highlighted by the low detections in natural parks. 6PPD-Q in road snow was over a 100-fold greater in concentrations than that in snow samples from local parks. This trend holds for other analytes. The high dependence of chemical concentrations on traffic intensities highlights the need to estimate the mass loading of these chemicals into the environment. The result showed that an alarming  $2160 \pm 480$  kg of 6PPD & 6PPDQ are loaded into the environment from Montreal over a given winter season.

#### 4.2 Targeted and Non-Targeted Analysis of Lesser-known Rubber Tire Additives

Whilst the goal of the first part of this study was centred on targeted analysis, the second aspect of the research extended to captured lesser-known contamination through non-targeted analysis (NTA). Target compounds included in this part of the study were the BTHs, BTs, DPG and TMQ. These analytes also served as performance compounds for the validation of the NTA workflow. Quantification of target compounds achieved through the internal standard calibration method revealed high intensity of rubber chemicals in both sample matrices.

DPG exhibited the highest concentration (median concentration of 4600 ng/L) in snowmelt. The vulcanization accelerator, BTH was the second most abundant analyte in snowmelt (1650 ng/L median concentration) and was detected in every sample. The analyte was also detected in surface water at approximately 4-fold lower concentrations than median concentration in snow melt. The ubiquity of other vulcanization accelerators (e.g. HBTH; 851 ng/Lmedian snowmelt concentration) was observed.

Suspect and non-targeted analysis of rubber tire substances in snow and surface water matrices using the orbitrap HRMS instrument detected over 17000 features in surface water and greater than 30000 in snow samples. Peak filtering and prioritization based on detection

frequency ( $\geq$  50%) and peak intensity ( $\geq$  10,000) reduced the number of features to 183 and 2005 in surface water and snowmelt, respectively. Statistical analysis using OPLS-DA, was further used to prioritize chemical hits based on differences in the chemical profiles between snow and surface water. Among the top 50 chemical features with significantly higher abundance in snow, 37 were identified through both the suspect and NTA approach. Among these, 11 (classified as level 2 compounds) exhibited credible MS2 spectra evidence, while 14 lacked such MS2 evidence but contain other diagnostic information, such as well-defined chromatographic peak shapes and reasonable RT supporting the presence of suggested compounds. Ultimately, 4 out of the 11 chemicals were confirmed through either a native standard (HMMM) or transformation experiment (DPG-228, DPG-210, DPG-136), thus earning designations as level 1 compounds.

## 4.3 Summary, Limitation and Recommendations for Further Study

The results of this study highlight the presence of tire rubber-derived compounds in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, underscoring the impact of traffic on PPD+PPDQ concentrations. This study contributes novel quantitative emission data obtained through the VEF deduction, which considered the snowpack depth, contaminant's mass in the snow, and traffic volume experienced by the road. However, accurately estimating traffic volume proved challenging due to the absence of comprehensive hourly data for all sampled roads. To address this, percentage normalized hourly traffic data from a major road in Montreal<sup>72</sup> was used, assuming a similar distribution for other local and medium road arterials. Determining the VEF also took into account certain assumptions including (a) uniform vehicle types in urban road traffic, (cars and trucks) (b) consistent tire abrasion rates, and (c) analytes following the same leaching kinetics from tire wear particles. Considering the VEF's reliance on traffic volume, strategic sampling of the region becomes essential to include roads with available hourly traffic data for a more accurate insight of organic chemical mass loading. Additionally, it may be beneficial to incorporate specific truck routes in the analysis to compare emissions between trucks and cars whilst increasing the number of replicates per sampling points of the sampling region. Besides, sampling could include days without snow events to the circumvent the impact of fresh snow precipitation on dumping sites and better capture non-point source influence. The VEF was extended to estimate 6PPD and 6PPDQ loading taking into account the lifespan of winter tires at 5 years<sup>75</sup> (30000-50000 km).<sup>76</sup> Taking the lower limit, it implies that approximately 6000 km is covered per winter season. This information combined with the number of cars in Montreal resulted in the emission and subsequent mobilization of about 2160 kg of 6PPD & 6PPDQ into the environment. Although this mathematical approach provides a good insight of the contaminants' loading estimate, the result may be influenced by factors including tread depth, weather conditions, driving habits amongst others.

The quantitation of analytes in this work utilized the internal standard method. However, not all quantified analytes had available internal standards. Therefore, the quantification of analytes lacking internal standards was performed using alternative internal standards with close retention times or belonging to the same chemical group. In principle, the selection of internal standard in chemical analyses such as those performed in this work follows that standards are chemically similar to analyte of interest, stable under experimental conditions, soluble in analytic solvent of choice, absent in sample under analysis and exhibits detector response per unit concentration similar to that analyte of interest. Although the responses of all the internal standards used match with those of their respective analytes in terms of RTs and validation study assessment, (recovery, Table S3.3), it would be advantageous to broaden the internal standard list to ensure representation for all chemical groups.

The overall findings of this research are not only critical in advancing our understanding of snow as a reservoir of chemical additives, but also further highlights the importance of mass loading of PPDs from snow melt into the aquatic media. Our research also suggests that road snow is an environmental medium of concern for tire additives and their TPs. It may play a more crucial role in the mobilization of organic chemicals into the urban aquatic environment compared to sources that are more commonly reported. Thus, this work readily provides an important framework for advancing environmental monitoring and policy making related to regulatory measures. Further research is needed to understand the environmental fate and cumulative effects of detected chemicals and their TPs. Monitoring of these substances along the snow melting pathway should be a future research priority.

## References

- (1) Diamond, M. L.; Hodge, E. Urban Contaminant Dynamics: From Source to Effect. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2007**, *41* (11), 3796–3800. https://doi.org/10.1021/es072542n.
- (2) Government of Canada. *Chemicals Management Plan*. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/chemical-substances/chemicals-management-plan.html (accessed 2023-12-03).
- (3) Government of Canada. *National Pollutant Release Inventory*. https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/pollution-waste-management/national-pollutant-release-inventory.html (accessed 2023-12-03).
- (4) Berthiaume, A. New Sustainability Perspectives on Pollutant Releases from Canada's Nuclear Sector. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2023**, *57* (35), 12958–12968. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c03669.
- (5) Branch, L. S. *Consolidated federal laws of Canada, Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999.* https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-15.31/ (accessed 2023-11-21).
- (6) Government of Canada, P. W. and G. S. C. *Canada Gazette, Part 1, Volume 156, Number 7:* https://www.gazette.gc.ca/rp-pr/p1/2022/2022-02-12/html/sup1-eng.html (accessed 2023-11-21).
- (7) Government of Canada, E. and C. C. *Explore data*. https://www.canada.ca/en/environmentclimate-change/services/national-pollutant-release-inventory/tools-resourcesdata/exploredata.html (accessed 2023-11-21).
- (8) Hirschler, D. A.; Gilbert, L. F.; Lamb, F. W.; Niebylski, L. M. Particulate Lead Compounds in Exhaust Gas. *Ind. Eng. Chem.* **1957**, *49* (7), 1131–1142. https://doi.org/10.1021/ie50571a037.
- (9) Derwent, R. G.; Hov, Oeystein. Computer Modeling Studies of the Impact of Vehicle Exhaust Emission Controls on Photochemical Air Pollution Formation in the United Kingdom. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1980**, *14* (11), 1360–1366. https://doi.org/10.1021/es60171a013.
- (10) Bishop, G. A.; Stedman, D. H. A Decade of On-Road Emissions Measurements. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2008**, *42* (5), 1651–1656. https://doi.org/10.1021/es702413b.
- (11) Schauer, J. J.; Kleeman, M. J.; Cass, G. R.; Simoneit, B. R. T. Measurement of Emissions from Air Pollution Sources. 2. C1 through C30 Organic Compounds from Medium Duty Diesel Trucks. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1999**, *33* (10), 1578–1587. https://doi.org/10.1021/es980081n.
- (12) Bej, D.; Chattaraj, N. Air Pollution from Vehicle-Tailpipe Emissions and Diagnostic Approaches through Cyber–Physical Platform - a Review. *Microprocessors and Microsystems* 2023, 98, 104805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpro.2023.104805.
- (13) Scheringer, M.; Johansson, J. H.; Salter, M. E.; Sha, B.; Cousins, I. T. Stories of Global Chemical Pollution: Will We Ever Understand Environmental Persistence? *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2022, 56 (24), 17498–17501. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c06611.
- (14) Fussell, J. C.; Franklin, M.; Green, D. C.; Gustafsson, M.; Harrison, R. M.; Hicks, W.; Kelly, F. J.; Kishta, F.; Miller, M. R.; Mudway, I. S.; Oroumiyeh, F.; Selley, L.; Wang, M.; Zhu, Y. A Review of Road Traffic-Derived Non-Exhaust Particles: Emissions, Physicochemical Characteristics, Health Risks, and Mitigation Measures. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2022, *56* (11), 6813–6835. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c01072.
- (15) Sommer, F.; Dietze, V.; Baum, A.; Sauer, J.; Gilge, S.; Maschowski, C.; Gieré, R. Tire Abrasion as a Major Source of Microplastics in the Environment. *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.* 2018, 18 (8), 2014–2028. https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.2018.03.0099.
- (16) Zhang, H.-Y.; Huang, Z.; Liu, Y.-H.; Hu, L.-X.; He, L.-Y.; Liu, Y.-S.; Zhao, J.-L.; Ying, G.-G. Occurrence and Risks of 23 Tire Additives and Their Transformation Products in an Urban Water System. *Environ. Int.* 2023, *171*, 107715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2022.107715.

- (17) Wagner, S.; Hüffer, T.; Klöckner, P.; Wehrhahn, M.; Hofmann, T.; Reemtsma, T. Tire Wear Particles in the Aquatic Environment - A Review on Generation, Analysis, Occurrence, Fate and Effects. *Water Research* 2018, *139*, 83–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.03.051.
- (18) Greer, J. B.; Dalsky, E. M.; Lane, R. F.; Hansen, J. D. Establishing an *In Vitro* Model to Assess the Toxicity of 6PPD-Quinone and Other Tire Wear Transformation Products. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 2023, acs.estlett.3c00196. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.3c00196.
- (19) Ibrahim, B.; Wiranata, A.; Malik, A. The Effect of Addition of Antioxidant 1,2-Dihydro-2,2,4-Trimethyl-Quinoline on Characteristics of Crepe Rubber Modified Asphalt in Short Term Aging and Long Term Aging Conditions. *Appl. Sci* **2020**, *10* (20), 7236. https://doi.org/10.3390/app10207236.
- (20) Johannessen, C.; Liggio, J.; Zhang, X.; Saini, A.; Harner, T. Composition and Transformation Chemistry of Tire-Wear Derived Organic Chemicals and Implications for Air Pollution. *Atmos. Pollut. Res* 2022, *13* (9), 101533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apr.2022.101533.
- (21) Fred-Ahmadu, O. H.; Bhagwat, G.; Oluyoye, I.; Benson, N. U.; Ayejuyo, O. O.; Palanisami, T. Interaction of Chemical Contaminants with Microplastics: Principles and Perspectives. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2020, 706, 135978. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135978.
- (22) Tian, Z.; Zhao, H.; Peter, K. T.; Gonzalez, M.; Wetzel, J.; Wu, C.; Hu, X.; Prat, J.; Mudrock, E.; Hettinger, R.; Cortina, A. E.; Biswas, R. G.; Kock, F. V. C.; Soong, R.; Jenne, A.; Du, B.; Hou, F.; He, H.; Lundeen, R.; Gilbreath, A.; Sutton, R.; Scholz, N. L.; Davis, J. W.; Dodd, M. C.; Simpson, A.; McIntyre, J. K.; Kolodziej, E. P. A Ubiquitous Tire Rubber–Derived Chemical Induces Acute Mortality in Coho Salmon. *Science* 2021, *371* (6525), 185–189. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd6951.
- (23) Zhao, H. N.; Hu, X.; Gonzalez, M.; Rideout, C. A.; Hobby, G. C.; Fisher, M. F.; McCormick, C. J.; Dodd, M. C.; Kim, K. E.; Tian, Z.; Kolodziej, E. P. Screening P-Phenylenediamine Antioxidants, Their Transformation Products, and Industrial Chemical Additives in Crumb Rubber and Elastomeric Consumer Products. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2023, *57* (7), 2779–2791. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c07014.
- (24) Johannessen, C.; Saini, A.; Zhang, X.; Harner, T. Air Monitoring of Tire-Derived Chemicals in Global Megacities Using Passive Samplers. *Environ. Pollut.* 2022, 314, 120206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2022.120206.
- Maurer, L.; Carmona, E.; Machate, O.; Schulze, T.; Krauss, M.; Brack, W. Contamination Pattern and Risk Assessment of Polar Compounds in Snow Melt: An Integrative Proxy of Road Runoffs. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2023, 57 (10), 4143–4152. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c05784.
- (26) Cao, G.; Wang, W.; Zhang, J.; Wu, P.; Zhao, X.; Yang, Z.; Hu, D.; Cai, Z. New Evidence of Rubber-Derived Quinones in Water, Air, and Soil. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2022, 56 (7), 4142– 4150. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c07376.
- (27) Hiki, K.; Asahina, K.; Kato, K.; Yamagishi, T.; Omagari, R.; Iwasaki, Y.; Watanabe, H.; Yamamoto, H. Acute Toxicity of a Tire Rubber-Derived Chemical, 6PPD Quinone, to Freshwater Fish and Crustacean Species. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 2021, 8 (9), 779–784. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00453.
- (28) Challis, J. K.; Popick, H.; Prajapati, S.; Harder, P.; Giesy, J. P.; McPhedran, K.; Brinkmann, M. Occurrences of Tire Rubber-Derived Contaminants in Cold-Climate Urban Runoff. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 2021, 8 (11), 961–967. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00682.
- (29) Johannessen, C.; Helm, P.; Lashuk, B.; Yargeau, V.; Metcalfe, C. D. The Tire Wear Compounds 6PPD-Quinone and 1,3-Diphenylguanidine in an Urban Watershed. Arch Environ Contam Toxicol 2022, 82 (2), 171–179. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-021-00878-4.
- (30) Johannessen, C.; Helm, P.; Metcalfe, C. D. Runoff of the Tire-Wear Compound, Hexamethoxymethyl-Melamine into Urban Watersheds. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* 2022, *82* (2), 162–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-021-00815-5.

- (31) Castilloux, A. D.; Houde, M.; Gendron, A.; De Silva, A.; Soubaneh, Y. D.; Lu, Z. Distribution and Fate of Ultraviolet Absorbents and Industrial Antioxidants in the St. Lawrence River, Quebec, Canada. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2022, 56 (8), 5009–5019. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c07932.
- (32) Zhang, S.-Y.; Gan, X.; Shen, B.; Jiang, J.; Shen, H.; Lei, Y.; Liang, Q.; Bai, C.; Huang, C.; Wu, W.; Guo, Y.; Song, Y.; Chen, J. 6PPD and Its Metabolite 6PPDQ Induce Different Developmental Toxicities and Phenotypes in Embryonic Zebrafish. J. Hazard. Mater 2023, 455, 131601. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2023.131601.
- (33) Mawhinney, D. B.; Vanderford, B. J.; Snyder, S. A. Transformation of 1 *H*-Benzotriazole by Ozone in Aqueous Solution. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012**, *46* (13), 7102–7111. https://doi.org/10.1021/es300338e.
- (34) Zhou, Y.; Yixi, L.; Kong, Q.; Peng, J.; Pan, Y.; Qiu, J.; Yang, X. Sunlight-Induced Transformation of Tire Rubber Antioxidant N-(1,3-Dimethylbutyl)-N'-Phenyl-p-Phenylenediamine (6PPD) to 6PPD-Quinone in Water. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 2023, 10 (9), 798–803. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.3c00499.
- (35) Varshney, S.; Gora, A. H.; Siriyappagouder, P.; Kiron, V.; Olsvik, P. A. Toxicological Effects of 6PPD and 6PPD Quinone in Zebrafish Larvae. *J. Hazard. Mater* **2022**, *424*, 127623. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.127623.
- (36) Zeng, F.; Sherry, J. P.; Bols, N. C. Use of the Rainbow Trout Cell Lines, RTgill-W1 and RTL-W1 to Evaluate the Toxic Potential of Benzotriazoles. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 2016, 124, 315– 323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2015.11.003.
- (37) Capolupo, M.; Gunaalan, K.; Booth, A. M.; Sørensen, L.; Valbonesi, P.; Fabbri, E. The Sub-Lethal Impact of Plastic and Tire Rubber Leachates on the Mediterranean Mussel Mytilus Galloprovincialis. *Environ. Pollut.* 2021, 283, 117081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.117081.
- (38) Evaluation of potential for toxicity from subacute inhalation of tire and road wear particles in rats. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.3109/08958378.2012.730071?src=getftr (accessed 2023-11-14).
- (39) Gualtieri, M.; Rigamonti, L.; Galeotti, V.; Camatini, M. Toxicity of Tire Debris Extracts on Human Lung Cell Line A549. In Vitro Toxicol. 2005, 19 (7), 1001–1008. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tiv.2005.06.038.
- (40) Gustafsson, M.; Blomqvist, G.; Gudmundsson, A.; Dahl, A.; Swietlicki, E.; Bohgard, M.; Lindbom, J.; Ljungman, A. Properties and Toxicological Effects of Particles from the Interaction between Tyres, Road Pavement and Winter Traction Material. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2008, 393 (2), 226–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2007.12.030.
- (41) Chen, H.; Jiang, Y.; Gu, Y.; Ding, P.; Wang, C.; Pan, R.; Shi, C.; Zeng, L.; Chen, X.; Li, H. The Generation of Environmentally Persistent Free Radicals on Photoaged Microbeads from Cosmetics Enhances the Toxicity via Oxidative Stress. *Environ. IntEmiss* 2023, 174, 107875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2023.107875.
- (42) *The number of cars worldwide is set to double by 2040.* World Economic Forum. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/04/the-number-of-cars-worldwide-is-set-to-double-by-2040/ (accessed 2023-11-12).
- (43) Gago-Ferrero, P.; Schymanski, E. L.; Bletsou, A. A.; Aalizadeh, R.; Hollender, J.; Thomaidis, N. S. Extended Suspect and Non-Target Strategies to Characterize Emerging Polar Organic Contaminants in Raw Wastewater with LC-HRMS/MS. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2015, 49 (20), 12333–12341. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b03454.
- (44) Hulleman, T.; Turkina, V.; O'Brien, J. W.; Chojnacka, A.; Thomas, K. V.; Samanipour, S. Critical Assessment of the Chemical Space Covered by LC–HRMS Non-Targeted Analysis. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2023, 57 (38), 14101–14112. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c03606.

- (45) US EPA, O. Contaminants of Emerging Concern including Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care Products. https://www.epa.gov/wqc/contaminants-emerging-concern-including-pharmaceuticals-and-personal-care-products (accessed 2022-11-28).
- (46) Zhang, X.; Saini, A.; Hao, C.; Harner, T. Passive Air Sampling and Nontargeted Analysis for Screening POP-like Chemicals in the Atmosphere: Opportunities and Challenges. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry* 2020, *132*, 116052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2020.116052.
- (47) Hohrenk-Danzouma, L. L.; Vosough, M.; Merkus, V. I.; Drees, F.; Schmidt, T. C. Non-Target Analysis and Chemometric Evaluation of a Passive Sampler Monitoring of Small Streams. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2022**, *56* (9), 5466–5477. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c08014.
- (48) Celma, A.; Sancho, J. V.; Schymanski, E. L.; Fabregat-Safont, D.; Ibáñez, M.; Goshawk, J.; Barknowitz, G.; Hernández, F.; Bijlsma, L. Improving Target and Suspect Screening High-Resolution Mass Spectrometry Workflows in Environmental Analysis by Ion Mobility Separation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *54* (23), 15120–15131. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c05713.
- (49) PubChem. *PubChem*. https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ (accessed 2023-11-19).
- (50) Markiewicz, A.; Björklund, K.; Eriksson, E.; Kalmykova, Y.; Strömvall, A.-M.; Siopi, A. Emissions of Organic Pollutants from Traffic and Roads: Priority Pollutants Selection and Substance Flow Analysis. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2017, 580, 1162–1174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.12.074.
- (51) Pastorino, P.; Ginebreda, A. Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs): Occurrence and Fate in Aquatic Ecosystems. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **2021**, *18* (24), 13401. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182413401.
- (52) Huntink, N. M. Durability of Rubber Products: Development of New Antidegradants for Long-Term Protection. **2003**.
- (53) Xu, J.; Hao, Y.; Yang, Z.; Li, W.; Xie, W.; Huang, Y.; Wang, D.; He, Y.; Liang, Y.; Matsiko, J.; Wang, P. Rubber Antioxidants and Their Transformation Products: Environmental Occurrence and Potential Impact. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022, *19* (21), 14595. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192114595.
- (54) Rader, C. P.; Dick, J. S. Raw Materials Supply Chain for Rubber Products.
- (55) *Chemview* | *US EPA*. https://chemview.epa.gov/chemview/ (accessed 2023-07-21).
- (56) Di, S.; Liu, Z.; Zhao, H.; Li, Y.; Qi, P.; Wang, Z.; Xu, H.; Jin, Y.; Wang, X. Chiral Perspective Evaluations: Enantioselective Hydrolysis of 6PPD and 6PPD-Quinone in Water and Enantioselective Toxicity to Gobiocypris Rarus and Oncorhynchus Mykiss. *Environ. Int.* 2022, 166, 107374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2022.107374.
- (57) Brinkmann, M.; Montgomery, D.; Selinger, S.; Miller, J. G. P.; Stock, E.; Alcaraz, A. J.; Challis, J. K.; Weber, L.; Janz, D.; Hecker, M.; Wiseman, S. Acute Toxicity of the Tire Rubber-Derived Chemical 6PPD-Quinone to Four Fishes of Commercial, Cultural, and Ecological Importance. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 2022, 9 (4), 333–338. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00050.
- (58) Fang, L.; Fang, C.; Di, S.; Yu, Y.; Wang, C.; Wang, X.; Jin, Y. Oral Exposure to Tire Rubber-Derived Contaminant 6PPD and 6PPD-Quinone Induce Hepatotoxicity in Mice. *Sci Total Environ* 2023, *869*, 161836. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.161836.
- (59) Tian, Z.; Gonzalez, M.; Rideout, C. A.; Zhao, H. N.; Hu, X.; Wetzel, J.; Mudrock, E.; James, C. A.; McIntyre, J. K.; Kolodziej, E. P. 6PPD-Quinone: Revised Toxicity Assessment and Quantification with a Commercial Standard. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 2022, 9 (2), 140–146. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00910.
- (60) Johannessen, C.; Helm, P.; Lashuk, B.; Yargeau, V.; Metcalfe, C. D. The Tire Wear Compounds 6PPD-Quinone and 1,3-Diphenylguanidine in an Urban Watershed. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* **2022**, *82* (2), 171–179. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-021-00878-4.
- (61) French, B. F.; Baldwin, D. H.; Cameron, J.; Prat, J.; King, K.; Davis, J. W.; McIntyre, J. K.; Scholz, N. L. Urban Roadway Runoff Is Lethal to Juvenile Coho, Steelhead, and Chinook

Salmonids, But Not Congeneric Sockeye. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2022**, *9* (9), 733–738. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00467.

- (62) Seiwert, B.; Nihemaiti, M.; Troussier, M.; Weyrauch, S.; Reemtsma, T. Abiotic Oxidative Transformation of 6-PPD and 6-PPD Quinone from Tires and Occurrence of Their Products in Snow from Urban Roads and in Municipal Wastewater. *Water Res.* 2022, 212, 118122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.118122.
- (63) Kryuchkov, F.; Foldvik, A.; Sandodden, R.; Uhlig, S. Presence of 6PPD-Quinone in Runoff Water Samples from Norway Using a New LC–MS/MS Method. *Front. Chem.Axcr* 2023, *4*.
- (64) Glenn, D. W.; Sansalone, J. J. Accretion and Partitioning of Heavy Metals Associated with Snow Exposed to Urban Traffic and Winter Storm Maintenance Activities. II. *Environ. Eng.* 2002, *128* (2), 167–185. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9372(2002)128:2(167).
- (65) Popick, H.; Brinkmann, M.; McPhedran, K. Traffic-Derived Contaminant Loading in Snow Storage Facilities during Spring Melt. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 2022, 29 (19), 27875–27893. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-18340-2.
- (66) Nazarenko, Y.; Fournier, S.; Kurien, U.; Rangel-Alvarado, R. B.; Nepotchatykh, O.; Seers, P.; Ariya, P. A. Role of Snow in the Fate of Gaseous and Particulate Exhaust Pollutants from Gasoline-Powered Vehicles. *Environ. Pollut.* 2017, 223, 665–675. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.01.082.
- (67) Hu, X.; Zhao, H. (Nina); Tian, Z.; Peter, K. T.; Dodd, M. C.; Kolodziej, E. P. Chemical Characteristics, Leaching, and Stability of the Ubiquitous Tire Rubber-Derived Toxicant 6PPD-Quinone. *Environ. Sci.: Processes Impacts* 2023, 25 (5), 901–911. https://doi.org/10.1039/D3EM00047H.
- Panko, J. M.; Chu, J.; Kreider, M. L.; Unice, K. M. Measurement of Airborne Concentrations of Tire and Road Wear Particles in Urban and Rural Areas of France, Japan, and the United States. *Atmos. Environ.Hour* 2013, 72, 192–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.01.040.
- (69) *Traffic Flow Dashboard*. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/71-607-x/71-607-x2022018-eng.htm (accessed 2023-04-29).
- Schymanski, E. L.; Jeon, J.; Gulde, R.; Fenner, K.; Ruff, M.; Singer, H. P.; Hollender, J. Identifying Small Molecules via High Resolution Mass Spectrometry: Communicating Confidence. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2014, 48 (4), 2097–2098. https://doi.org/10.1021/es5002105.
- (71) Government of Canada, E. and C. C. *Hourly Data Report for January 20, 2023 Climate -Environment* and *Climate* Change Canada. https://climate.weather.gc.ca/climate\_data/hourly\_data\_e.html (accessed 2023-09-01).
- (72) *Débit de circulation Données Québec*. https://www.donneesquebec.ca/recherche/dataset/debit-de-circulation (accessed 2023-06-11).
- (73) Canada, E. and C. C. Daily Data Report for August 2022 Climate Environment and Climate Change Canada.
   https://climate.weather.gc.ca/climate\_data/daily\_data\_e.html?StationID=51157&timeframe=2 &StartYear=1840&EndYear=2023&Day=15&Year=2022&Month=8# (accessed 2023-06-15).
- (74) Chang, X.; Huang, H.; Jiao, R.; Liu, J. Experimental Investigation on the Characteristics of Tire Wear Particles under Different Non-Vehicle Operating Parameters. *Tribol. Int.* 2020, 150, 106354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.triboint.2020.106354.
- (75) SAAQ. *Winter Tires: Safe Winter Driving*. SAAQ. https://saaq.gouv.qc.ca/en/road-safety/modes-transportation/automobile/maintenance-safety/winter-tires (accessed 2024-01-25).
- (76) *How Long Does Car Tire Thread Last? And Why Should You Know It*. LeaseCosts Canada. https://www.leasecosts.ca/en/articles/how-long-does-car-tire-thread-last-and-why-should-you-know-it (accessed 2024-01-25).

- (77) webadmin. *Le parc de véhicules de promenade continue de croître dans le Grand Montréal*. Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal - CMM. https://cmm.qc.ca/communiques/le-parc-de-vehicules-de-promenade-continue-de-croitre-dans-le-grand-montreal/ (accessed 2024-01-25).
- (78) Piscitello, A.; Bianco, C.; Casasso, A.; Sethi, R. Non-Exhaust Traffic Emissions: Sources, Characterization, and Mitigation Measures. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *766*, 144440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144440.
- (79) Shi, Z.-Q.; Liu, Y.-S.; Xiong, Q.; Cai, W.-W.; Ying, G.-G. Occurrence, Toxicity and Transformation of Six Typical Benzotriazoles in the Environment: A Review. *Science of The Total Environment* **2019**, *661*, 407–421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.01.138.
- (80) Farré, M. la; Pérez, S.; Kantiani, L.; Barceló, D. Fate and Toxicity of Emerging Pollutants, Their Metabolites and Transformation Products in the Aquatic Environment. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry* 2008, 27 (11), 991–1007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2008.09.010.
- (81) Baensch-Baltruschat, B.; Kocher, B.; Stock, F.; Reifferscheid, G. Tyre and Road Wear Particles (TRWP) - A Review of Generation, Properties, Emissions, Human Health Risk, Ecotoxicity, and Fate in the Environment. *Sci. Total Environ.* 2020, 733, 137823. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137823.
- (82) Mawhinney, D. B.; Vanderford, B. J.; Snyder, S. A. Transformation of 1H-Benzotriazole by Ozone in Aqueous Solution. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2012, 46 (13), 7102–7111. https://doi.org/10.1021/es300338e.
- (83) Reemtsma, T.; Miehe, U.; Duennbier, U.; Jekel, M. Polar Pollutants in Municipal Wastewater and the Water Cycle: Occurrence and Removal of Benzotriazoles. *Water Res.Screening Assessment for the Challenge.* 2010, 44 (2), 596–604. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2009.07.016.
- (84) Liao, C.; Kim, U.-J.; Kannan, K. A Review of Environmental Occurrence, Fate, Exposure, and Toxicity of Benzothiazoles. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2018, 52 (9), 5007–5026. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b05493.
- (85) Kloepfer, A.; Jekel, M.; Reemtsma, T. Occurrence, Sources, and Fate of Benzothiazoles in Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2005, *39* (10), 3792–3798. https://doi.org/10.1021/es048141e.
- (86) Robinson, P. D. Behavioural Toxicity of Organic Chemical Contaminants in Fish: Application to Ecological Risk Assessments (ERAs). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 2009, 66 (7), 1179–1188. https://doi.org/10.1139/F09-069.
- (87) Ferrario, J. B.; DeLeon, I. R.; Tracy, R. E. Evidence for Toxic Anthropogenic Chemicals in Human Thrombogenic Coronary Plaques. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 1985, 14 (5), 529– 534. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01055381.
- (88) Sorahan, T. Cancer Risks in Chemical Production Workers Exposed to 2-Mercaptobenzothiazole. J. Occup. Environ. Med. Modula 2009, 66 (4), 269–273. https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2008.041400.
- (89) Bladder cancer risks in workers manufacturing chemicals for the rubber industry | Occupational Medicine | Oxford Academic. https://academic.oup.com/occmed/article/58/7/496/1546362?login=false (accessed 2023-11-20).
- (90) Hornung, M. W.; Kosian, P. A.; Haselman, J. T.; Korte, J. J.; Challis, K.; Macherla, C.; Nevalainen, E.; Degitz, S. J. In Vitro, Ex Vivo, and In Vivo Determination of Thyroid Hormone Modulating Activity of Benzothiazoles. *Toxicol. Sci.* 2015, *146* (2), 254–264. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfv090.
- (91) Carpinteiro, I.; Abuin, B.; Ramil, M.; Rodríguez, I.; Cela, R. Simultaneous Determination of Benzotriazole and Benzothiazole Derivatives in Aqueous Matrices by Mixed-Mode Solid-Phase Extraction Followed by Liquid Chromatography–Tandem Mass Spectrometry. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 2012, 402 (7), 2471–2478. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-012-5718-z.

- (92) Canada, E. and C. C. *Draft screening assessment Benzotriazoles and Benzothiazoles Group*. https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/evaluating-existing-substances/draft-screening-assessment-benzotriazoles-benzothiazoles-group.html (accessed 2023-04-26).
- (93) Government of Canada, S. C. Profile table, Census Profile, 2021 Census of Population -Montréal, Ville (V) [Census subdivision], Quebec. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/censusrecensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E (accessed 2023-11-29).
- (94) *Leipzig, Germany Population (2023) Population Stat.* https://populationstat.com/germany/leipzig (accessed 2023-11-29).
- (95) Government of Canada, S. C. Profile table, Census Profile, 2021 Census of Population -Saskatoon, City (CY) [Census subdivision], Saskatchewan. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E (accessed 2023-11-29).
- (96) Hou, F.; Tian, Z.; Peter, K. T.; Wu, C.; Gipe, A. D.; Zhao, H.; Alegria, E. A.; Liu, F.; Kolodziej, E. P. Quantification of Organic Contaminants in Urban Stormwater by Isotope Dilution and Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 2019, *411* (29), 7791–7806. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-019-02177-3.
- (97) Peng, Y.; Fang, W.; Krauss, M.; Brack, W.; Wang, Z.; Li, F.; Zhang, X. Screening Hundreds of Emerging Organic Pollutants (EOPs) in Surface Water from the Yangtze River Delta (YRD): Occurrence, Distribution, Ecological Risk. *Environ. Pollut.* 2018, 241, 484–493. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.05.061.

# Appendix A

## **Supporting Information for Chapter 2**

Supplementary Text on Materials and Methods

- S2.1: Sample Collection and Processing
- S2.2: Road Classifications
- S2.3: Analytical Standards and Solvents
- S2.4: Instrument Method and Data Analysis
- S2.5: In-House Suspect list

Supplementary Equation

S2.1: Relative Response Factor (RRF)

Supplementary Figures

- S2.1: Snow and surface water sampling points across Greater Montreal
- S2.2: Road Classification: High, Medium and Low Traffic
- S2.3: Hourly traffic distribution in Montreal
- S2.4: Relationship between the concentration of 6PPD and its quinone derivative

Supplementary Tables

- S2.1: Location and traffic information of sampling points
- S2.2: Summary of Chemical Standards and LC-MS Parameters
- S2.3: PPD Suspect List
- S2.4: Recoveries, MDLs and MQLs of target contaminants
- S2.5: Vehicular Emission of PPDs
- S2.6: Concentration of PDDs Detected in Snow Samples
- S2.7: Summary Concentration Data
- S2.8: Non-Parametric Comparison Across Traffic Levels

## Text S2.1 Sample Collection and Processing

A surface water sampling campaign was conducted across forty-two sites in August 2022. Surface water samples were collected at a depth of 1-2 m in precleaned, borosilicate glass bottles using a stainless-steel deep-water sampler and surface water sampling pole (6 m long) on August 19 and 20, 2022. Sampling sites were located in the north-western region of Quebec between the islands of Montreal and Laval ( $45.74^{\circ}$  N,  $73.88^{\circ}W-45.41^{\circ}$ N,  $74.00^{\circ}$  W). Sampling sites were selected to capture influences from a variety of point-sources and non-point sources such as municipal wastewater treatment plants, roadway runoffs, local roads, and storm water drains. Similarly, a snow sampling campaign was conducted during a snow fall event on January 20, 2023, from thirty (30) sampling points across different natural parks (n = 6), snow dumping sites (n= 2), temporal

snowbanks (n = 2), and varying road categories (n=20) in Montreal ( $45.53^{\circ}$  N,  $73.56^{\circ}$ W- $45.44^{\circ}$ N, 74.64° W). To create a representative sample, metallic scoops were utilized to collect piled and roadside snow from various surfaces, sides, and depths (5-10 cm for snow piles). Aggregate samples collected from different points within a sample location were pooled into 1 L polypropylene bottles. Both the surface water and snow samples were processed using solid-phase extraction (SPE) with Oasis hydrophilic-lipophilic balance (HLB) cartridges (6 mL, 200 mg, Sigma Millipore USA). Initially, a mixture of Isotopically labelled internal standard was spiked into approximately 200 mL samples to achieve a concentration of 50 ng/mL. HLB Cartridges were pre-conditioned with 5 mL of methanol, then rinsed with 5 mL LC-MS grade water (3 mL/min). Extraction (100-200 mL per samples) utilized a SPE vacuum manifold (Supelco 12-port model, Milipore Sigma, MA, USA) at a maximum flow rate of 3 mL/min. Rinsing of sample bottles at the end of extraction was deemed unnecessary as each bottle contained volumes exceeding the required samples. After extraction, SPE cartridges were air-dried for 3 minutes, eluted with 2 \* 5 mL aliquots of methanol, and concentrated under a gentle stream of nitrogen gas to approximately 0.5 mL. The resulting extracts were then transferred into 1.5-mL HPLC vials and diluted 2-10 times (depending on sample type) prior to LC-MS analysis.

#### Text S2.2 Road Classification: High, Medium and Low Traffic.

The snow samples were collected from roads that have varying daily average traffic densities. In order to investigate the relationship between the volume of traffic and chemical loading in the snow samples on road surfaces, traffic information was extracted from the Canadian traffic flow dashboard<sup>69</sup> and used to classify each road into different categories. Traffic information obtained for the sampling locations indicated that the least dense traffic road had a traffic volume of 1226 vehicles per day while the densest traffic road had a daily traffic volume of 6031 (Table S1). To simplify the classification, a non-overlapping histogram (Figure S2) was employed to categorize the sampled roads into three distinct groups. The first group consisted of average daily vehicular

volume  $\leq 2000$  and was tagged as low Road Traffic Level (RTL), the second category as medium RTL ( $2000 < x \le 4000$ ), while the third group with volume > 4000 was represented as high RTL. Table S1 presents the information on exact location, sampling time and number of replicates in each category.

#### Text S2.3 Analytical standards, Solvents and Additive

The *p*-phenylenediamines (PPDs) and 6PPD-quinone were purchased as analytical grade (98 % purity) from Sigma Aldrich (Atlanta, GA, USA) and the internal standard 6PPD-quinone-D5 was purchased from Toronto Research Chemicals (Toronto, ON, Canada). All solid standards were stored in airtight bags at either 4 °C or -20 °C according to manufacturer's recommendation, whilst dissolved standards (stock and sub-stock solutions) were stored at -20 °C. LC-MS grade methanol and water were purchased from Fisher Scientific (Waltham, Massachusetts USA). Formic acid (98% purity) and acetonitrile ( $\geq$  99.9 % purity) were purchased from Honeywell and Sigma-Aldrich respectively.

## Text S2.4 Instrumental Method: High-Resolution Mass Spectrometry

The Orbitrap was operated in positive mode with electrospray ionization source (ESI). The mass analyser was utilized in the full scan mode (m/z 100–500, mass resolution, 100,000) and data-dependent acquisition (collision induced dissociation, collision energy =35 eV) mode. Optimized electrospray ionization (ESI) parameters which includes capillary temperature, capillary voltage, source heater temperature, and sheath gas flow, were 275 °C, 4 kV in the positive ion mode, 300 °C, and 10 arbitrary units, respectively. Liquid chromatographic separation was performed on a reverse phase C-18 phenomenex column (3.0 µm, 3 × 100 mm) with mobile phases consisting of (A) 0.1% formic acid in water and (B) 0.1% formic acid in acetonitrile by volume. The flow rate of the mobile phase was optimized at 0.3 mL/min. The elution process followed a gradient profile: starting with 5 % B (0–1 min), increased to 98 % B (1–19 min), held for 3 min (19–21 min), then back to 5 % B, and re-equilibrated for 3 min. (See Table S2.2b for a comprehensive summary).

## **Text S2.5 In-House Suspect list**

An in-house suspect list was generated mainly from the NORMAN 2022 suspect list. Compounds ending with -N, -N<sub>2</sub>, -N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and -NO were searched, filtered and subsquently fed into the compound discoverer software. Hits were prioritized based on full chemical formulae, existing literature information and general uses.

# **Equation S2.1 Relative Response Factor**

$$RRF_{6PPD-Q} = ((C_{6PPD-Q})/C_{IS})/((A_{6PPD-Q})/(A_{IS})).....1$$
$$RRF_{6PPD-Q} = (C_x/C_{IS})/(A_x/A_{IS})......2$$

Where  $C_{6PPD-Q}$  and  $A_{6PPD-Q}$  are the concentrations and peak areas of 6PPD-Q respectively.  $C_{IS}$  and  $A_{IS}$  are internal standard concentration and its corresponding peak area while  $A_x$  and  $C_x$  are the peak area and the unknown concentration of the suspect analytes.



Figure S2.1 Snow and surface water sampling points across Greater Montreal (a) Surface water spatial map and sampling activity (b) Spatial map of urban snow and sampling activity



Figure S2.2 Road traffic levels separated into three distinct categories based on traffic information on sampling day.



Figure S2.3 A typical hourly traffic distribution of a high traffic arterial in Montreal, QC, Bd Décarie during the winter season<sup>72</sup>.



Figure S2.4 A Linear fit for the relationship between the concentration of 6PPD and its quinone derivative

Water Sample (August 19 and 20, 2022)			Snow Smaple (Janaury 20, 2022)				
Site Tog	Latituda	Longitudo	Site Teg	Latituda	Longitudo	Sampling	Daily Traffic
Site Tag	Latitude	Longitude	Sile lag	Latitude	Longitude	time	Volume
SL_1	45.523661	-73.883400	RTL 1A	45.512500	-73.568333	13:41	5663
SL_2	45.558516	-73.881698	RTL 1B	45.456944	-73.640277	10:02	5073
SL_3	45.577770	-73.841010	RTL 1C	45.490800	-73.586552	12:33	5500
SL_4	45.641522	-73.774237	RTL 1D	45.502478	-73.619786	16:31	4570
SL_5	45.692678	-73.637835	RTL 1E	45.480333	-73.577222	11:28	5346
SL_6	45.699629	-73.563534	RTL 1F	45.499166	-73.578888	12:58	6031
SL_7	45.699235	-73.509219	RTL 1G	45.510000	-73.570278	13:33	5615
SL_8	45.697756	-73.497924	RTL 1H	45.482878	-73.627778	17:33	5028
SL_9	45.672456	-73.543372	RTL 2A	45.532777	-73.600000	14:21	3876
SL_10	45.640479	-73.602598	RTL 2B	45.537500	-73.615555	14:33	3163
SL_11	45.564547	-73.664186	RTL 2C	45.511105	-73.595111	15:44	3267
SL_12	45.533368	-73.726330	RTL 2D	45.490555	-73.586388	11:53	3047
SL_13	45.515363	-73.794432	RTL 2E	45.495555	-73.579166	12:49	2635
SL_14	45.487863	-73.863560	RTL 2F	45.453333	-73.583333	16:39	3876
SL_15	45.462948	-73.918258	RTL 3A	45.486667	-73.626667	11:18	1773
SL_16	45.418505	-74.004446	RTL 3B	45.518113	-73.568969	13:48	1389
SL_17	45.407630	-73.956951	RTL 3C	45.531111	-73.623888	15:37	1226
SL_18	45.423341	-73.861720	RTL 3D	45.513333	-73.600278	15:56	1773
SL_19	45.446539	-73.796844	RTL 3E	45.523611	-73.581944	14:06	1844
SL_20	45.439820	-73.763490	RTL 3F	45.501944	-73.566944	13:14	1741
SL_21	45.438774	-73.723824	PMR 1	45.503147	-73.591252	16:09	NA
SL_22	45.432478	-73.694428	PMR 2	45.503147	-73.591252	16:12	NA
SL_23	45.431606	-73.675232	PJ 1	45.535277	-73.630555	15:14	NA
SL_24	45.429987	-73.669117	PJ 2	45.535452	-73.630838	15:18	NA
SL_25	45.441319	-73.645583	DS 1	45.451286	-73.616861	10:21	NA
SL_26	45.464920	-73.595907	DS 2	45.451111	-73.616944	10:25	NA
SL_27	45.463275	-73.580685	SB 1	45.481036	-73.577383	11:41	NA
SL_28	45.488959	-73.559232	SB 2	45.537630	-73.615677	14:49	NA
SL_29	45.473642	-73.536797	PA 1	45.445833	-73.602222	10:54	NA
SL_30	45.447528	-73.568679	PA 2	45.441944	-73.599166	10:59	NA
SL_31	45.444335	-73.596871					
SL_32	45.429431	-73.609260					
SL_33	45.414992	-73.628376					
SL_34	45.407094	-73.654109					
SL_35	45.403680	-73.579698					
SL_36	45.402799	-73.537457					
SL_37	45.419965	-73.499377					
SL_38	45.473620	-73.499904					
SL_39	45.533308	-73.524423					
SL_40	45.628809	-73.495408					
SL_41	45.676819	-73.490539					

# Table S2.1 Location and traffic information of sampling points

SL\_42

45.739256

-73.438622
# Table S2.2a Summary of Chemical Standards

Name	Abbreviation	Formula	Structure	m/z	RT
N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	DPPD	$C_{18}H_{16}N_2$		261.1386	18.77
N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	6PPD	$C_{18}H_{24}N_2$		269.2012	11.43
6PPD-quinone	6PPD-Q	$C_{18}H_{22}N_2O_2$		299.1754	18.51
N-isopropyl-N'-phenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	IPPD	$C_{15}H_{18}N_2$		227.1542	9.66
N-Cyclohexyl-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	CPPD	$C_{18}H_{22}N_2$		267.1886	11.51
N,N'-di-2-naphthyl-p-phenylenediamine	DNPD	C <sub>26</sub> H <sub>20</sub> N <sub>2</sub>		361.1699	20.98

### Table S2.2b LC-MS Parameters

LC gradient using a Pheno	omenex C18 (3.0 x 100 mm, 3.0µm) equip	pped with a guard column; T: Room Temp; i	njection volume: 5 $\mu$ L
Time (min)	%A (0.1% formic acid in LC-MS water)	%B (0.1% formic acid in acetonitrile)	Flow Rate (mL/min)
0	95	5	0.3
1	95	5	0.3
19	2	98	0.3
21	2	98	0.3
21	95	5	0.3
32	95	5	0.3

Mass Spectrometer							
LTQ orbitrap velos.							
ESI in positive mode							
MS1 mass range = 100-500, Resolution = 100	), 000						
MS2- Acquisition mode: DDA MS/MS of 5 top	o ions, CID (linear ion trap = low resolution)						
Dynamic exclusion: time= 25 s, no charge sta	ate selection, repeated MS/MS acquisition= 2x						
Other Parameters	Value						
Capillary Temperature °C	275						
Source Heat Temperature °C	300						
Sheath Gas Flow (AU)	10						
Aux Gas Flow (AU)	10						
Ion spray voltage (4kV) 4							
Source Current (uA)	100						
S-Lens RF Level (AU)	60						

Name	Monoisotopic Mass
N,N-Dicyclohexyl-2-benzothiazolesulfenamide	346.1537
Diphenylamine	169.0886
Methenamine	140.1056
N,N'-1,3-Phenylenedimaleimide	268.0478
Triisopropanolamine	191.1516
1,4-Benzenediamine, N-(1,4-dimethylpentyl)-N'-phenyl-	282.2090
2-Methylundecanal	184.1822
4-Hydroxydiphenylamine	185.0835
4-aminodiphenylamine	184.0995
4-nitrodiphenylamine	214.0737
4-nitrosodiphenylamine	198.0788
1,3-dimethylbutylamine	101.1199
N,N-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	260.1308
N,N-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	290.1050
N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	268.1934
N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine-quinone	298.1676
N-isopropyl-N'-phenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	226.1465
N-isopropyl-N'-phenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine-quinone	256.1206
N-Cyclohexyl-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	266.1778
N-Cyclohexyl-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine- quinone	296.1519
Hexa(methoxymethyl)melamine	390.2221
N,N'-ditolyl-p-phenylenediamine	288.1621
N,N'-ditolyl-p-phenylenediamine-quinone	318.1363
N,N'-di-2-naphthyl-p-phenylenediamine	360.1621
N,N'-di-2-naphthyl-p-phenylenediamine-quinone	390.1363
N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	260.1308
N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	290.1050

## Table S2.3 PPD Suspect List

## Table S2.4 Recoveries, MDLs and MQLs of target contaminants (Snowmelts)

				· · · · ·				
Name	Abbreviation	Recovery (%) 1	Recovery (%) 2	Recovery (%) 3	Avg. Recovery (%)	RSD (%)	MDL (ng/mL)	MQL (ng/mL)
N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	DPPD	67	82	69	73	11	3.9	14.8
N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	6PPD	89	77	68	78	14	1.0	3.9
6PPD-quinone	6PPD-Q	81	86	74	80	8	0.9	3.6
N-isopropyl-N'-phenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	IPPD	78	64	85	76	14	0.8	3.2
N-Cyclohexyl-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	CPPD	92	86	73	84	12	0.4	1.5
N,N'-di-2-naphthyl-p-phenylenediamine	DNPD	80	66	69	72	10	4.4	16.6

Table S2.5 Ve	hicular	Emission	of PPDs
---------------	---------	----------	---------

								Emissio	on Factor (	µg/vehicle	/kilometre)	l.		
	Sample Location	Site Tag	Sampling time	Snow Volume/km (dm3)	6-PPD	6-PPD-Q	DPPD	DPPD-Q	CPPD	CPPD-Q	4_HDPA	4_ADPA	4s_DPA	1,3_DMBA
1	Road Traffic Level 1	RTL 1A	13:41	42000	72	172	12	3	45	5	21	12	17	42
2	1	RTL 1B	10:02	40600	65	93	11	10	41	2	50	12	18	48
3	1	RTL 1C	11:33	41300	58	250	10	3	40	6	16	12	7	65
4	1	RTL 1D	14:51	40600	70	201	9	1	48	1	15	14	7	37
5	1	RTL 1E	17:28	50820	89	126	4	11	45	1	49	20	52	40
6	1	RTL 1F	15:58	46800	80	104	5	3	19	4	31	8	39	29
7	1	RTL 1G	13:33	41300	69	187	4	17	41	4	63	17	151	56
8	1	RTL 1H	13:03	41300	72	196	5	16	44	2	67	17	160	55
9	Road Traffic Level 2	RTL 2A	12:01	41650	40	257	9	1	25	4	7	9	6	31
10	2	RTL 2B	14:33	34300	65	276	10	4	40	3	18	13	7	61
11	2	RTL 2C	15:44	38400	50	73	9	5	29	2	37	11	14	40
12	2	RTL 2D	16:53	47880	125	165	5	14	49	1	62	26	78	56
13	2	RTL 2E	12:49	40600	77	151	9	8	37	2	39	15	50	33
14	2	RTL 2F	16:39	41160	36	137	5	4	18	1	16	8	34	27
15	Road Traffic Level 3	RTL 3A	11:18	32900	47	177	14	20	27	5	22	10	26	39
16	3	RTL 3B	13:48	32200	50	111	7	2	23	3	15	7	10	29
17	3	RTL 3C	15:37	36800	44	145	10	2	26	1	9	8	4	59
18	3	RTL 3D	15:56	36400	36	225	8	1	21	1	6	8	5	29
19	3	RTL 3E	14:06	31850	45	176	6	9	26	1	21	10	39	33
20	3	RTL 3F	10:14	32200	48	186	16	18	25	2	22	10	25	47

Sample Location	6-PPD (ng/L)	6-PPD-Q (ng/L)	DPPD (ng/L)	DPPD-Q (ng/L)	CPPD (ng/L)	CPPD-Q (ng/L)	4_HDPA (ng/L)	_ADPA (ng	4s_DPA (ng/L)	1,3_DMBA (ng/L)
RTL 1A	358	855	58	14	221	27	102	60	83	210
RTL 1B	243	346	41	37	152	9	185	45	66	180
RTL 1C	239	1033	40	14	167	25	68	48	28	268
RTL 1D	444	1276	55	4	305	9	96	87	47	233
RTL 1E	709	1005	29	88	355	8	391	155	416	321
RTL 1F	588	759	40	21	137	26	230	55	285	214
RTL 1G	370	1007	24	90	220	24	338	90	812	304
RTL 1H	348	945	24	76	210	9	321	82	771	265
RTL 2A	108	687	25	3	66	10	18	25	15	83
RTL 2B	257	1096	40	16	160	12	71	50	28	243
RTL 2C	226	327	40	23	130	8	165	48	64	179
RTL 2D	740	976	27	82	288	4	367	154	463	330
RTL 2E	250	491	29	27	119	5	128	50	161	107
RTL 2F	155	595	23	16	78	3	68	35	147	115
RTL 3A	79	296	24	43	45	8	37	16	43	65
RTL 3B	158	354	23	7	73	9	47	21	33	91
RTL 3C	152	505	35	8	91	5	30	28	15	206
RTL 3D	110	681	24	3	63	3	19	23	15	87
RTL 3E	173	675	24	33	98	3	80	39	151	126
RTL 3F	77	299	25	29	41	3	35	16	40	76
Park Mount Royal 1	7	6	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Park Mount Royal 2	6	7	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Park Jarry 1	5	10	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Park Jarry 2	4	7	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Dumping Site 1	24	47	30	nd	4	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Dumping Site 2	25	44	34	nd	6	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Snowbank 1	36	100	39	nd	6	7	nd	nd	nd	21
Snowbank 2	34	102	40	nd	8	8	nd	nd	nd	24
Park Angrignon 1	6	7	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Park Angrignon 2	5	5	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd

 Table S2.6 Concentration of PDDs Detected in Snow Samples

Median Sample Concentration	6-PPD	6-PPD-Q	DPPD	DPPD-Q	CPPD	CPPD-Q	4_HDPA	4_ADPA	4s_DPA	1,3_DMBA
High Traffic Level (ng/L)	364	975	40	29	215	17	208	71	184	249
Medium Traffic Level (ng/L)	238	641	28	20	125	7	100	49	86	147
Low Traffic Level (ng/L)	131	430	24	19	68	4	36	22	37	89
Parks - Background Samples (ng/L)	6	7	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Dumping Sites (ng/L)	30	74	37	nd	6	8	nd	nd	nd	23
MIN. Concentration (ng/L)	5	5	23	3	4	3	18	16	15	21
MAX. Concentration (ng/L)	740	1276	58	90	355	27	391	155	471	330

Emission Rate	6-PPD	6-PPD-Q	DPPD	DPPD-Q	CPPD	CPPD-Q	4_HDPA	4_ADPA	4s_DPA	1,3_DMBA
Maximum (µg/vehicle/kilometre)	125	276	16	20	49	6	67	26	160	65
Minimum (μg/vehicle/kilometre)	36	73	4	1	18	1	6	7	4	27
Average (µg/vehicle/kilometre)	62	170	8	8	33	3	29	12	37	43

# Table S2.8 Non-Parametric Statistical Comparison Across Traffic Levels (<0.05 = significant )</th>

Name	Abbreviation	Kruskal Wallis test (P-Value)	Pairwise comparison (Post Hoc)
4-Hydroxydiphenylamine	4-HDPA	0.0120	High RTL Sig diff from Low RTL
4-aminodiphenylamine	4-ADPA	0.0029	High RTL Sig diff from Low RTL
4-nitrosodiphenylamine	4s DPA	0.0921	N/A
1,3-dimethylbutylamine	1,3 DMBA	0.0096	High RTL Sig diff from Low RTL
N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine	DPPD	0.0674	N/A
N,N'-Diphenyl-1,4-phenylenediamine-quinone	DPPD-Q	0.3064	N/A
N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	6PPD	0.0045	High RTL Sig diff from Low RTL
N-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine - quinone	6PPD-Q	0.0270	High RTL Sig diff from Low RTL
N-Cyclohexyl-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine	CPPD	0.0022	High RTL Sig diff from Low RTL
N-Cyclohexyl-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine - quinone	CPPD-Q	0.0213	High RTL Sig diff from Low RTL

### Appendix **B**

### **Supporting Information for Chapter 3**

Supplementary Text on Materials and Methods

S3.1: Analytical Standards and Solvents

S3.2: Instrument Method and Data Analysis

- S3.3: Detection Limits, Recoveries and Matrix Effects
- S3.4: Data Preprocessing and Reduction

### **Supplementary Figures**

S3.1: Concentrations distribution of non-targeted chemicals in surface water

S3.2: Mass Spectra of N,N dicyclohexylmethylamine (DCMM)

S3.3: Analytical Information of dicyclohexalamine and N,N dicyclohexylmethylamine (DCMM) Compared.

S3.4: Confirmation of Hexa(methoxymethyl)melamine (HMMM) by RT and MS information of native standard

S3.5: Relationship between DPG and its Transformation Products

S3.6. Chromatographic profile of blank samples showing non-detection of target analytes except for diphenylguanidine.

### **Supplementary Tables**

- S3.1: Target Analyte Information
- S3.2 Internal Standards Peak Areas and Relative Standard Deviations (Surface Water)
- S3.3: Method Detection Limit (MDL), Recovery Matrix, Linearity, and Internal Standard
- S3.4: Internal Standards and Matrix Effect
- S3.5: Statistical Testing: Non-Parametric test
- S3.6: Compound Discoverer Software Parameters
- S3.7a: Concentration of Target Analytes (Surface water)
- S3.7b: Concentration of Target Analytes (Snow)

S3.8: Summary of Analytes by Suspect and Non-Targeted Approach

S3.9: Expected Transformation Products of Diphenylguanidine, Benzotriazole and Benzothiazole

#### Text S3.1 Analytical standards, Solvents and Additives

The benzotriazoles (BTs), benzothiazoles (BTHs) and 6PPD-quinone were purchased as

analytical grade (98 % purity) from Sigma Aldrich (Atlanta, GA, USA) and the internal

standard 6PPD-quinone-D5 was purchased from Toronto Research Chemicals (Toronto, ON,

Canada). All solid standards were stored in airtight bags at either 4 °C or -20 °C according to

manufacturer's recommendation, whilst dissolved standards (stock and sub-stock solutions)

were stored at -20 °C. LC-MS grade methanol and water were purchased from Fisher Scientific

(Waltham, Massachusetts, USA). Formic acid (98% purity) and acetonitrile ( $\geq$  99.9 % purity) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Atlanta, GA, USA) respectively.

#### **Text S3.2 LC-HRMS Analysis and Parameters**

Text S2.4 and Table S2.2 summarize the LC-MS information.

#### **Text S3.3 Detection Limits, Recoveries and Matrix Effects**

Method quantification limits (MQLs) were calculated as 10 times the standard deviation (SD) of the analyte concentration in the procedural blanks plus the average concentration of the analyte in the blanks. If the analyte was not detected in the blank, the MQL was established based on the concentration of standard that produces a peak in the matrix with a signal-to-noise (S/N) ratio of 10. The method detection limit (MDL) was taken as the calibration standard that produced a S/N of 3. Recoveries, matrix effect, MDLs and MQLs of the target compounds are presented in Table S4.

Recoveries (Table S4a) were assessed in snowmelts and river water as (Pre-extraction addition/Post extraction addition) \* 100. Absolute recoveries for snow samples ranged from 67 -92%

Matrix effects were analysed using the isotopically labelled internal standard Dimethoate-D6 (for benzothiazoles and triazoles), N,N-Diphenylguanidine-D10 (for diphenyl guanidine) and 6PPD-quinone-d5 (for 2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline). This was done by spiking 7 random processed snowmelt samples and 7 Milli-Q water blank samples at the same concentration 50 ng/mL. Peak areas in snowmelt matrix were on average approximately 50 % of the peak areas in the water matrix (Table S4b). The results of matrix effect assessment suggest that without the use of internal standards, the quantification of target compounds may lead to a 2-fold underestimation of analytes' concentrations.

#### **Text S3.4 Data Preprocessing and Reduction**

Initial steps of data pretreatment involved log scaling the snow and surface water data to promote normal distribution and reduce skewness of variables. Row-wise scaling through total area normalization, was also performed to diminish systematic variations inherent in the experimental process. Finally, column-wise mean-centering was applied to emphasize variability by removing overall shift or offsets, focus fluctuating feature intensities around zero and facilitate data interpretation. An Additional autoscaling step was implemented during the Principal Component Analysis (PCA).

The PCA as an exploratory method, was applied to examine the relationship between the varying traffic levels of snow samples. The PCA score plot served for both data visualization and to select site-specific markers.



Figure S3.1 Non-targeted approach target chemicals in surface water



Figure S3.2 Experimental vs Library Mass Spectra of N,N Dicyclohexylmethylamine (DCMM)



Figure S3.3 Analytical Information of Dicyclohexalamine and N,N Dicyclohexylmethylamine (DCMM) Compared



Figure S3.4 Confirmation of Hexa(methoxymethyl)melamine HMMM by RT and MS information of native standard



Concentration of Diphenylguanidine (ng/L)

Figure S3.5 Relationship between DPG and its Transformation Products: Concentrations of Transformation Products (TPs) does seem to show a linear relationship with the parent compound, Diphenyl guanidine (DPG)





Figure S3.6 Chromatographic profile of blank samples showing non-detection of target analytes except for diphenylguanidine.

Table S3.1	<b>Target Analytes Information</b>
------------	------------------------------------

Compound	Manufacturer	Purity
Diphenylguanidine (DPG)		97%
Benzothiazole (BTH)		96%
2-hydroxybenzothiazole (HBTH)		98%
2-(methylthio)-benzothiazole (MTBTH)		97%
2-mercaptobenzothiazole (2-SH-BTH)	Sigma-Aldrich (Oakville, ON)	97%
2-methylbenzothiazole (MBTH)		99%
Benzotriazole (BZT)		99%
5-methyl-1H-benzotriazole (MHBZT)		98%
2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline (TMQ)	Toronto Research Chemicals (Toronto, ON)	>85%

Table S3.2Internal Standards Peak Areas and Relative Standard Deviation (Surface<br/>Water)

,							
Sample No	6PPD D5	DPG D10	DTH D6	Sample No	6PPD D5	DPG D10	DTH D6
1	6839489	13729692	1432457	22	7501570	13788835	1583158
2	8027698	16670560	1897406	23	6880234	5317149.14	1649814
3	6022203	14436207	1648415	24	8205097	12586057.3	1999716
4	10353248	16500733	2106045	25	7035052	16778859.6	2146869
5	5378524	14322266	1731091	26	7809693	17535870.5	2107140
6	8282991	15121016	1871453	27	6373874	11865182.7	1235147
7	7102370	16233327	1842810	28	9519493	18544799.9	2205239
8	7806585	12996892	1533297	29	5662491	12390254.2	1805259
9	6220138	16175425	1701040	30	6596058	17412585.8	1772627
10	6075422	13774311	1536312	31	8074732	15036687.7	1666749
11	6875628	11012873	1469487	32	6006392	16830464.7	1992915
12	7454601	12717504	1778426	33	5489731	10825886.5	1571221
13	7396972	17722097	2040055	34	5060826	10639021.1	1739253
14	6007775	12956604	1523609	35	7093152	13646898.9	1428067
15	6980081	17520156	1911319	36	5808234	9551577.31	1984671
16	5723483	11556503	1573489	37	5633850	10820495.1	1832772
17	7908155	14523840	2157796	38	6300804	13015990.7	1672915
18	8303401	16801595	2561410	39	5394403	14793383.2	1744381
19	7469908	17169968	2188062	40	5329524	11670073.7	1446290
20	6605722	14572835	1750135	41	6527595	15648514.9	1780585
21	7876110	16907131	2035460	42	6722226	12572477	1999125
			6PPD D5	DPG D10	DTH D6		
		Average	6898465	14159347.6	1801273		
		SD	1154142	2727081.5	267055.4		
		RSD	17%	19%	15%		
		6PPD D5	6PPD-quin	one-D5			

DPG D10 N,N-diphenylguanidine-D10

DTH D6 Dimethoate-D6

Compound	Abbroviation		Surface Water	Snowmelt		
Compound	Appreviation	Recovery (%)	MDL (ng/ml)	Recovery (%)	MDL (ng/ml)	
Benzotriazole	BZT	79	4.0	86	2.9	
5-methyl-1-hydroxyl-benzotriazole	MHBZT	74	0.1	67	1.6	
Hydroxybenzothiazole	HBTH	88	0.5	92	4.1	
2-(methylthio)-benzothiazole	MTBTH	81	0.1	78	1.4	
Benzothiazole	BTH	88	2.4	85	6.9	
2-methylbenzothiazole	MBTH	84	1.5	78	1.2	
Diphenylguanidine	DPG	90	14.4	78	35.2	
2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline	TMQ	84	0.9	80	1.1	

 Table S3.3
 Method Detection Limit (MDL), Recovery Matrix, Linearity, and Internal Standard

Compound	Abbreviation	linearity (R <sup>2</sup> )	Internal Standard
Benzotriazole	BZT	>0.9991	Dimethoate-D6
5-methyl-1-hydroxyl-benzotriazole	MHBZT	>0.9992	Dimethoate-D6
Hydroxybenzothiazole	HBTH	>0.9987	Dimethoate-D6
2-(methylthio)-benzothiazole	MTBTH	>0.9981	Dimethoate-D6
Benzothiazole	BTH	>0.9996	Dimethoate-D6
2-methylbenzothiazole	MBTH	>0.9993	Dimethoate-D6
Diphenylguanidine	DPG	>0.9984	N,N-Diphenylguanidine-D10
2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline	TMQ	>0.9979	6PPD-quinone-D5

Sample No	Peak Area (Milli-Q Water)	Peak Area (Snowmelt)
1	4788192	1670629
2	5107700	1587167
3	4911298	1587167
4	4798424	1414084
5	4786994	1544257
6	4659131	1531299
7	4537158	1724088
Average	4798414	1579813
latrix Effect		33%
areas of 6PPD-qui	none-d5 internal standard spiked at 50 ng/mL	in Milli-Q Water and snowmelt processed sa
Sample No	Peak Area (Milli-Q Water)	Peak Area (Snowmelt)
1	1845378	1340947
2	1944649	1098380
3	1919332	1025717
4	1836371	1050611
5	1866298	1243208
6	1856776	1128632
7	1798522	1371681
8	1866761	1179882
		63%
eak areas of N.N-Di	phenylguanidine-D10 internal standard spiked	at 50 ng/mL in Milli-Q Water and snow sam
Sample No	Peak Area (Milli-Q Water)	Peak Area (Snowmelt)
1	51541396	39127021
2	52125407	38713200
	16986732	13646217
3	40580752	
3 4	47882266	12214435
3 4 5	47501859	12214435 11790692
3 4 5 6	47882266 47501859 45246823	12214435 11790692 11082213
3 4 5 6 7	47882266 47501859 45246823 49526040	12214435 11790692 11082213 34024317

### Table S3.4 Internal Standards and Matrix Effect

Name	Abbreviation	Kruskal Wallis test (P-Value)	Remark				
Benzotriazole	BZT	3.18E-06	Significant				
Benzothiazole	BTH	6.41E-06	Significant				
5-methyl-1-hydroxyl-benzotriazole	MHBZT	1.19E-06	Significant				
Hydroxybenzothiazole	HBTH	8.35E-13	Significant				
2-(methylthio)-benzothiazole	MTBTH	6.69E-10	Significant				
	Within Water	Comparison (<0.05 = significant)	-	-			
	1	2	3	4			
2	0.28						
3	6.7E-15	4.2E-16					
4	1.7E-15	< 2E-16	3.1E-10				
5	< 2E-16	< 2E-16	< 2E-16	< 2E-16			
		Within Snow Comparison (<0.05 = signi	ficant)				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	0.02474						
3	0.02474	1.00000					
4	0.00984	0.00028	3.40E-05				
5	1.40E-05	0.02497	0.00984	4.20E-12			
6	3.40E-05	0.00984	0.00489	3.20E-13	0.09582		
7	0.00054	0.00051	1.20E-10	1.70E-05	7.10E-12	7.10E-12	
8	0.26043	0.01836	0.01982	0.02497	3.50E-07	8.70E-08	1.60E-09
	1	Benzotriazole	BZT				
	2	5-methyl-1-hydroxyl-benzotriazole	MHBZT	1			
	3	Hydroxybenzothiazole	HBTH				
	4	2-(methylthio)-benzothiazole	MTBTH	1			
	5	Benzothiazole	BTH	1			
	6	Diphenyl guanidine	DPG	1			
	7	2-methylbenzothiazole	MBTH	1			
	8	2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-dihydroquinoline	TMQ	1			

# Table S3.5Non-Parametric test: Comparison between Snow and Water (<0.05 = significant)</th>

		-			-
1	Select Spectra		8	Search mzCloud	
	Lower PT Limit:	2		Compound Classes	All
		5			All
	Upper RT Limit:	26		Precursor Mass Tolerance:	10 ppm
	First Scan: 0	0		FT Fragment Mass Tolerance:	10 ppm
	Last Scan: 0	0		IT Fragment Mass Tolerance	0.4 Da
	Lust statil o	0		The second	D-frames
	Lowest Charge State:	U		Library: Autoprocessed;	Reterence
	Highest Charge State:	0		Post Processing	Recalibrated
	Min. Precursor Mass	100 Da		Max # Results:	10
		200 Da		Anneteta Matchina Francesta	TRUE
	Wax. Precursor Wass:	500 Da		Annotate Matching Fragments:	TRUE
	Total Intensity Threshold:	0		Search MSn Tree:	False
	Minimum Peak Count:	1		DDA Search:	
-		_		Life at the Connection	Ulah Charas DD
4	Align Retention Times			Identity Search:	HighChem DP
	Suitable reference file			Match Activation Type:	TRUE
-	Detect Compounds			Match Activation Energy	Match with Tolerance
<u> </u>		_		Match Activation Energy	Water with forefallee
	Mass Tolerance [ppm]:	5		Activation Energy Tolerance:	20
	Min. Peak Intensity:	10000		Apply Intensity Threshold:	TRUE
	Min # Scans per Peak	5		Similarity Search	Similarity Forward
	With # Searis per reak.	5 1 1 0 5			Similarity Forward
	Use Most Intense Isotope Only:	FALSE		Match Factor Threshold:	50
	Peak Detection		9	Predict Compositions	
1	Chromatographic S/N Threshold	15	1	Mass Tolerance	5 nnm
1	shi shatographic synt threshold.		1		5 ppm
1	Kemove Baseline:	Fasle	1	IVIIN. Element Counts:	СН
1	Isotope Pattern Detection:		1	Max. Element Counts:	C90 H190 Br3 Cl8 F18 N10 O18 P3 S5
1	Group Isotopes for: Br: Cl	Br Cl	1	Min RDBE	0
	Group isotopes for. Br, ci	BI, CI		WITH, RODE.	0
1	Filter out Features with Bad Peaks Only:	TRUE	1	Max. RDBE:	40
	Zig-Zag Index Threshold:	0.2		Min. H/C:	0.1
1	laggedness Threshold:	0.4	1	Max H/C	3 5
	Jaggeuness miesnolu.	0.4		Widx. TI/C.	5.5
	Modality Threshold:	0.9		Max. # Candidates:	10
	Remove Potentially False Positive Isotopes:	FALSE		Max. # Internal Candidates:	500
	Compound Detection			Battorn Matching	
	Compound Detection			Fattern Matching.	
		[M+2H]+2: [M+ACN+H]+1:			
				1	20
	lons:	[M+H]+1; [M+H+K]+2		Intensity Tolerance [%]:	30
	Base lons:	[M+H]+1; [M+NH4]+1		Intensity Threshold [%]:	0.1
	Group Compound Node			S/N Threshold:	3
	Group compound Node			Syn micshold.	5
4	NA T 1	-			20
	Mass Tolerance	5 ppm		Min. Spectral Fit [%]:	30
	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]:	5 ppm 0.1		Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]:	30 80
	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE		Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Lise Dynamic Becalibration:	30 80 TRUE
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE		Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration:	30 80 TRUE
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1		Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching:	30 80 TRUE
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion		Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching:	30 80 TRUE TRUE
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion		Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance:	30 80 TRUE 5 ppm
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion		Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: CNL Therefold:	30 80 TRUE 5 ppm 2
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3		Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider	30 80 TRUE 5 ppm 3
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider	30 80 TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider	30 80 TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocetalysis (Biodegradation
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: EWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s):	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s):	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database
4	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s):	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox
	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s):	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast
5	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: Fill Gaps	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s):	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast EPA Toxcast
5	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s):	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM
5	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass
5	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: <u>Jaggedness Contribution</u> : <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm
5	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Dection: Apply Bertricture Con Fillinger	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: May # of ensults per compound:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 30
	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: <b>Mark Background Compounds</b> Max. Sample/Blank:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds Max, Sample/Blank: Max Blank/Sample.	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: Syln Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogie:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Ercampent Mass Tolerance:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: <b>Mark Background Compounds</b> Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold:	30 80 TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACToR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30
5	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: Assign Compound Annotations	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: Syln Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Search Settings	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: <b>Mark Background Compounds</b> Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: <b>Apstrance:</b>	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mode: March Litts:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30
5	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: Assign Compound Annotations Mass Tolerance: Mass Tolerance:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: Syn Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mode: Mass Lists: Mass Lists:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: Assign Compound Annotations Mass Tolerance: Data Sources:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mass Lists: Mass Tolerance: Mass Tolerance:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30 In-house 5 ppm
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: <b>Mark Background Compounds</b> Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: <b>Assign Compound Annotations</b> Mass Tolerance: <b>Data Source #1</b> :	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mode: Mass Lists: Mass Tolerance: Use Retention Time:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30
	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: <b>Mark Background Compounds</b> Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: <b>Assign Compound Annotations</b> Mass Tolerance: <b>Data Sources:</b> Data Source #1: Data Source #1:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: Syln Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mode: Mass Lists: Mass Tolerance: Use Retention Time: PT Tolerance (min):	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: Assign Compound Annotations Mass Tolerance: Data Source #1: Data Source #2:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mass Lists: Mass Lists: Mass Tolerance: Use Retention Time: RT Tolerance [min]:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30 In-house 5 ppm TRUE 0.5
	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: <b>Mark Background Compounds</b> Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Bank/Sample: Hide Background: <b>Assign Compound Annotations</b> Mass Tolerance: <b>Data Sources</b> : Data Source #1: Data Source #2: Data Source #3:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mass Lists: Search Settings Mass Tolerance: Use Retention Time: RT Tolerance [min]: Merge Features: Peak Consolidation	30 80 TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACToR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30 In-house 5 ppm TRUE 0.5
	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: <b>Assign Compound Annotations</b> Mass Tolerance: <b>Data Source #1:</b> Data Source #3: Data Source #4:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10 11 11 12	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Moss Lists: Search Settings Mass Tolerance: Use Retention Time: RT Tolerance [min]: Merge Features: Peak Consolidation Mass Tolerance: 5 nom	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30 In-house 5 ppm TRUE 0.5
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: FWHM to Base Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: <b>Mark Background Compounds</b> Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: <b>Assign Compound Annotations</b> Mass Tolerance: <b>Data Source #1</b> : Data Source #3: Data Source #4: Data Source #4: Data Source #4: Data Source #4:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10 11 11 12	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Mass Tolerance: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Mats Lists: Search Settings Mass Lists: Mass Tolerance: Use Retention Time: RT Tolerance [min]: Merge Features: Peak Consolidation Mass Tolerance: 5 ppm	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30 In-house 5 ppm TRUE 0.5
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred Ions: Area Integration <b>Peak Rating Contributions</b> Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: <b>Fill Gaps</b> Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: <b>Mark Background Compounds</b> Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: Hide Background: <b>Assign Compound Annotations</b> Mass Tolerance: Data Source #1: Data Source #1: Data Source #4: Data Source #5:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10 11 12	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: Syn Threshold: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogic:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mass Lists: Search Settings Mats Lists: Mass Tolerance: Use Retention Time: RT Tolerance [min]: Merge Features: Peak Consolidation Mass Tolerance [min]:	30 80 TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30 In-house 5 ppm TRUE 0.5
6	Mass Tolerance RT Tolerance [min]: Align Peaks: False Preferred lons: Area Integration Peak Rating Contributions Area Contribution: CV Contribution: CV Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Jaggedness Contribution: Modality Contribution: Zig-Zag Index Contribution: Fill Gaps Mass Tolerance: S/N Threshold: Use Real Peak Detection: Apply Restrictive Gap Filling: Mark Background Compounds Max. Sample/Blank: Max. Blank/Sample: Hide Background: Mass Tolerance: Data Source #1: Data Source #3: Data Source #4: Data Source #5: Scoring Rules:	5 ppm 0.1 FALSE [M+H]+1 Most Common Ion 3 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10 11 11 12 13	Min. Spectral Fit [%]: Min. Pattern Cov. [%]: Use Dynamic Recalibration: Fragments Matching: Use Fragments Matching: Mass Tolerance: Search ChemSpider Database(s): Database(s): Search Mode: Max. # of results per compound: Apply mzLogie:Search Settings: FT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: IT Fragment Mass Tolerance: Match Factor Threshold: Search Mass Lists: Search Settings Mass Lists: Mass Tolerance: Use Retention Time: RT Tolerance [min]: Merge Features: Peak Consolidation Mass Tolerance: 5 ppm RT Tolerance [min]: Post Processing node:	30 80 TRUE TRUE 5 ppm 3 ACTOR: Aggregated Computational Toxicology Resource DrugBank EAWAG Biocatalysis/Biodegradation Database EPA DSSTox EPA Toxcast FDA UNII - NLM By Formula or Mass 5 ppm 20 10 ppm 0.4 Da 30 In-house 5 ppm TRUE 0.5

Surface Water (ng/L)								
CITE	Benzotriazole	5-methyl-1H-	Hydroxybenzothiazole	2-(methylthio)-	Benzothiazole			
SITE	(BZT)	benzotriazole (MHBZT)	(HBTH)	benzothiazole (MTBTH)	(BTH)			
1	37	31	18	14	438			
2	9	27	27	10	305			
3	45	32	17	9	382			
4	106	70	11	10	162			
5	140	95	19	16	658			
6	161	118	26	14	423			
7	35	31	14	14	562			
8	39	33	14	10	273			
9	33	32	35	19	993			
10	38	34	17	10	436			
11	40	33	16	10	541			
12	40	34	16	14	936			
13	38	35	17	13	467			
14	30	25	14	8	372			
15	35	31	16	9	295			
16	26	24	17	8	364			
17	224	192	17	10	219			
18 35		33	19	8	222			
19 31		42	34	10	429			
20 37		37	19	20	816			
21 37		46	16	9	123			
22	48	84	14	10	375			
23	32	48	23	9	388			
24	38	42	12	9	353			
25	42	44	9	9	165			
26	37	40	12	9	293			
27	40	51	20	10	472			
28	39	56	28	25	1046			
29	44	60	16	8	176			
30	35	43	22	/	222			
31	6	8	21	14	814			
32	49	53	13	8	323			
33	52	58	15	/	110			
34	52	58	19	8	315			
35	48	54	32	9	536			
36	64	8/	19	1/	3/1			
37	19	67	105	315	12/1			
38	53	60	10	10	398			
39	46		20	42	1190			
40	40	50 70	15	0	405			
41	5/ 114	70	14	0 10	200			
42	224	102	14	215	1271			
Maximum Concentration	224 C	192	201	315	110			
Median Value	20	٥ ٨٢	17	/ 10	270			
iviedian value	39	45	1 1/	10	5/8			

# Table S3.7a Concentration of Target Analytes (Surface water)

Snowmelt (ng/L)									
	Benzotriazole	5-methyl-1H-	Hydroxybenzothiazole	2-(methylthio)-	Benzothiazole	2-methylbenzothiazole	2,2,4-trimethyl-1,2-	Diphenylguanidine	
SITE TAO	(BZT)	benzotriazole (MHBZT)	(HBTH)	benzothiazole (MTBTH)	(BTH)	(MBTH)	dihydroquinoline (TMQ)	(DPG)	
HRT 1	587	1889	1717	87	3163	<mdl< td=""><td>928</td><td>54518</td></mdl<>	928	54518	
HRT 2	584	1886	1802	87	3197	<mdl< td=""><td>812</td><td>57111</td></mdl<>	812	57111	
HRT 3	663	1416	1197	208	4606	<mdl< td=""><td>107</td><td>7082</td></mdl<>	107	7082	
HRT 4	391	847	964	140	4036	<mdl< td=""><td>51</td><td>19841</td></mdl<>	51	19841	
HRT 5	363	926	806	95	3366	<mdl< td=""><td>109</td><td>15142</td></mdl<>	109	15142	
HRT 6	742	2143	1715	164	4108	13.7	183	11923	
HRT 7	370	1582	2060	374	1187	<mdl< td=""><td>180</td><td>59197</td></mdl<>	180	59197	
HRT 8	471	3898	1734	165	3999	10.8	493	38945	
MRT 1	204	524	684	72	1513	<mdl< td=""><td>123</td><td>8488</td></mdl<>	123	8488	
MRT 2	355	892	949	96	3418	16.6	93	16032	
MRT 3	368	784	990	133	3536	14.7	44	18182	
MRT 4	477	3918	1611	167	3964	12.5	399	38771	
MRT 5	428	864	902	84	1502	9.5	351	1433	
MRT 6	503	1250	935	76	1788	<mdl< td=""><td>107</td><td>4657</td></mdl<>	107	4657	
LRT 1	430	859	896	85	1385	<mdl< td=""><td>399</td><td>1571</td></mdl<>	399	1571	
LRT 2	516	1325	961	73	1837	<mdl< td=""><td>103</td><td>4542</td></mdl<>	103	4542	
LRT 3	251	565	475	79	1804	9.8	41	3062	
LRT 4	127	287	346	57	1787	14.6	87	2740	
LRT 5	200	500	621	65	1464	<mdl< td=""><td>106</td><td>8265</td></mdl<>	106	8265	
LRT 6	530	1324	1130	132	2325	10.9	102	24097	
PMR 1	7	8	27	13	258	9.2	<mdl< td=""><td>140</td></mdl<>	140	
PMR 2	8	9	36	14	341	10.7	<mdl< td=""><td>179</td></mdl<>	179	
PJ 1	8	9	33	15	410	9.8	<mdl< td=""><td>191</td></mdl<>	191	
PJ 2	8	8	40	14	383	<mdl< td=""><td><mdl< td=""><td>237</td></mdl<></td></mdl<>	<mdl< td=""><td>237</td></mdl<>	237	
DS 1	54	294	113	15	280	14.0	<mdl< td=""><td>483</td></mdl<>	483	
DS 2	56	296	126	15	359	13.7	<mdl< td=""><td>472</td></mdl<>	472	
SB 1	300	281	242	39	891	16.4	57	404	
SB 2	296	290	257	37	893	16.0	54	424	
PA 1	64	72	87	48	76	50.7	93	144	
PA 2	5	7	26	9	140	6.8	<mdl< td=""><td>578</td></mdl<>	578	
Minimum Concentration	5	7	26	9	76	7	41	140	
Maximum Concentration	742	3918	2060	374	4606	51	928	59197	
Median Value	359	816	851	78	1650	13	107	4600	

# Table S3.7b Concentration of Target Analytes (Snow)

Table S3.	8 St	immarv o	f Analytes	Identified	d and (	Ouantified	by Sus	pect and	Non-Targ	eted Ar	proach
	~~~					~	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	peer man			

No	Analyte	RT [min]	Formula	m/z	Approach	Concentration Range (Snow) ng/L	Median Concentration (ng/L)	Internal Standard	Status
1	Diphenylguanidine-228 (DPG-228)	7.26	$C_{13}H_{13}N_{3}O$	228.1130	Non-Targeted	3.6-1333	115	N,N-Diphenylguanidine-D10	Confirmed
2	Diphenylguanidine-210 (DPG-210)	8.84	$C_{13}H_{11}N_{3}$	210.1026	Non-Targeted	47-632	180	N,N-Diphenylguanidine-D10	Confirmed
З	Diphenylguanidine-136 (DPD-136)	3.49	$C_7H_7N_3$	136.0869	Non-Targeted	18-527	1673	N,N-Diphenylguanidine-D10	Confirmed
4	1,3-di-o-tolylguanidine (DTG)	8.95	$C_{15}H_{17}N_{3}$	240.1495	Suspect	10-441	51	N,N-Diphenylguanidine-D10	Level 2a
5	Hexa(methoxymethyl)melamine (HMMM)	12.66	$C_{15}H_{30}N_6O_6$	391.2300	Suspect	665-10258	1908	6PPD-quinone-D5	Confirmed
6	3-Cyclohexyl-1,1-dimethylurea (CHD)	11.20	$C_9H_{18}N_2O$	171.1492	Non-Targeted	47-580	112	6PPD-quinone-D5	Level 2a
7	Dicyclohexalamine (DCH)	8.37	$C_{12}H_{23}N$	182.1903	Non-Targeted	4-7136	1641	N,N-Diphenylguanidine-D10	Level 2a
8	N,N Dicyclohexylmethylamine (DCMM)	8.50	$C_{13}H_{25}N$	196.2060	Non-Targeted	6-1263	181	N,N-Diphenylguanidine-D10	Level 2a
9	1,3-Diphenylurea (DPU)	13.40	$C_{13}H_{12}N_2O$	213.1023	Non-Targeted	35-4952	191	6PPD-quinone-D5	Level 2a
10	N,N-diethyl-meta-toluamide (DEET)	14.10	$C_{12}H_{17}NO$	192.1383	Suspect	3-1664	288	6PPD-quinone-D5	Level 2a
11	3,5-Di-tert-butyl-4-hydroxybenzaldehyde (DBH)	18.90	$C_{15}H_{22}O_2$	235.1693	Suspect	47-545	144	6PPD-quinone-D5	Level 2a

Table S8: Summary of Analytes Identified and (	Quantified by Sus	spect and Non-Targeted	Approach
Tuble 50. Builling of That yes Renative and	Zuunnineu og bu	speet and rion rangeted	rippiouen

Analyte	Concentration Range (Water) ng/l	Median Concentration (ng/L)
HMMM	2.8-54	11
DCH	2.7-31	3.8
DEET	4-1042	49

Transformation Product	[M+H]+	Formula
DPG-228	228.1131	$C_{13}H_{13}N_{3}O$
DPG-210	210.1026	$C_{13}H_{11}N_3$
DPG-244	244.1081	$C_{13}H_{13}N_{3}O_{2}$
DPG-136	136.0869	$C_7H_9N_3$
DPG-134	134.0712	$C_7H_7N_3$
BZT-136	136.0505	$C_6H_5N_3O$
BZT-152	152.0455	$C_6H_5N_3O_2$
BTH-152	152.0165	C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>5</sub> NOS
BTH-168	168.0114	C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>5</sub> NO <sub>2</sub> S

Table S3.9Expected Transformation Product of Diphenylguanidine, Benzotriazoleand Benzothiazole