Nanomaterial Fate and Exposure Research: Where we are now and where we need to be to model environmental exposures

#### Greg Lowry and Bernd Nowack Carnegie Mellon University Walter J. Blenko, Sr. Professor of Civil & Env. Eng. Deputy Director, (CEINT)

Empa-Swiss Federal Laboratories for Materials Science and Technology Technology & Society Laboratory Environmental Risk Assessment and Management Group

Sus-Nano 2015, March 9-11, Venice





# **Environmental Fate Modeling**

#### NM Sources/Inputs





#### In the Beginning.....



![](_page_3_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Figure_0.jpeg)

## Key Questions to Address?

- What models, systems, and model frameworks do we need?
- What are the key parameters and inputs needed in those models?
- How do we measure those parameters for nanomaterials in complex systems?
- How can we validate our models?

![](_page_5_Picture_5.jpeg)

## Some Key Models are Required

![](_page_6_Figure_1.jpeg)

materials Science & recrinology

## What Model Parameters Best Describe Fate?

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

Meade (ed.) USGS Circular 1133, 1995

Westerhoff and Nowack, 2013, Accounts in Chemical Research 46: 844-853.

![](_page_7_Picture_4.jpeg)

# Most Fate Work Can *Inform* Models, but cannot *Parameterize* the Models

![](_page_8_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_4.jpeg)

Levard et al., ES&T 2011 45 (12), 5260. Ma et al., 2013 ES&T 47 (6), pp 2527–2534; Ma et al., 2014 ES Nano 1 347-357.

![](_page_8_Picture_6.jpeg)

DI 1% SDS SR water

Hyung, et al. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2006 41(1) 179-184

![](_page_8_Picture_9.jpeg)

Li et al., ES&T 44 (9) 3462-346

![](_page_8_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_12.jpeg)

## **"Functional Assay" Approach to Parameterize Models**

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

# This becomes more important as nanomaterial complexity increases

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

Fig. 3 Schematic showing the ever-expanding space of nanomaterial conjugation and the resulting permutations of nanomaterials.

![](_page_10_Picture_3.jpeg)

Saleh et al., 2015 ES Nano 2 11-18

![](_page_10_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Modeling environmental exposure

#### Material-flow modeling

- Sources: Production, use
- Fate in technical systems: wastewater, solid waste, recycling
- Provides flows to the environment
- Environmental fate modeling
  - Provides predicted environmental concentrations
  - First tier: Simple box models
  - Second tier: Mechanistic models

![](_page_11_Picture_9.jpeg)

# Information needs for release modeling

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Production and use

ENM	(Schmid	(Hendren	(Piccinno	(Keller	(ANSES,	Sun et
	and	et al.,	et al.,	et al.,	2013)	al.,
	Riediker,	2011)	2012)	2013)		2014
	2008)					
TiO <sub>2</sub>	11'500	8'600-	550	20'000	92'000	10,000
		42'000				
Ag	82	3-20	6	100	0.006	30
ZnO	1,900	-	55	7,900	1,900	1,600
CNT	26	60-1,200	550	740	-	380
C <sub>60</sub>	-	2-90	0.6	-	< 100	20
CeO <sub>2</sub>	-	40-770	55	2,300	700	-
Al-ox	0.1	-	550	8,100	15,000	-
Fe-ox	9,700	-	550	9,700	6,100	-
SiO <sub>2</sub>	2,000	-	5500	22,000	990,000	-
Nanoclays	-	-	-	2,400	<100	-
Cu	-	-	-	46	< 100	-
Quantum	-	-	0.6	-	-	-
dots						

![](_page_13_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_3.jpeg)

Sun et al., (2014) Environ. Pollut. 185: 69-76

![](_page_13_Picture_5.jpeg)

## Modeling flows to the environment

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Material-flow model for nano-TiO<sub>2</sub> in the EU

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_2.jpeg)

## **Environmental concentrations**

		EU		
	Mode	<b>Q</b> <sub>0.15</sub>	<b>Q</b> <sub>0.85</sub>	
		Ν	2	
STP Effluent	16	13	110	µg/L
Surface water	0.53	0.40	1.4	µg/L
Sediment	1.9	1.4	4.8	mg/kg∙y
STP sludge	170	150	540	mg/kg
Natural and urban soil	0.13	0.09	0.24	µg/kg∙y
Sludge treated soil	1200	940	3600	µg/kg∙y
Air	0.001	0.000	0.001	µg/m³
Solid waste	12	8.3	20	mg/kg
WIP bottom ash	120	82	230	mg/kg
WIP fly ash	150	110	310	mg/kg

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Fate models for nanomaterials

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_3.jpeg)

Praetorius (2012) ES&T 46, 6705

Meesters (2014) ES&T 48, 5726

## Conclusions

- Life-cycle based material flow models are well established
  - Able to provide flows to the environment and estimates of concentrations
  - More production and use data needed
  - Transformations during use and release needs to be included
  - Next level of complexity involves dynamic processes
- First versions of environmental fate models available
  - Rely on flow models for input
  - Average region vs. spatially-resolved
  - Heteroagglomeration as main unknown input
  - Experimental data on heteroagglomeration needed
  - Transformations only marginally covered

![](_page_18_Picture_12.jpeg)