

NTP RESEARCH REPORT ON THE CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL Characterization of Recycled Tire Crumb Rubber

NTP RR 11

JULY 2019

NTP Research Report on the Chemical and Physical Characterization of Recycled Tire Crumb Rubber

Research Report 11

National Toxicology Program

July 2019

National Toxicology Program Public Health Service U.S. Department of Health and Human Services ISSN: 2473-4756

Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA

Table of Contents

Tables

Figures

About This Report

National Toxicology Program¹

¹Division of the National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA

Collaborators

Suramya Waidyanatha, Georgia Roberts, Scott Masten, Timothy Cristy

Division of the National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA

Designed study, evaluated and interpreted study findings Suramya Waidyanatha, Ph.D.

Designed study Scott Masten, Ph.D. Georgia Roberts, Ph.D.

Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio, USA

Conducted study, evaluated and interpreted study findings Timothy Cristy, B.A.

Contributors

Division of the National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA

Reviewed research report Brad Collins, M.S. David Crizer, Ph.D. Will Gwinn, Ph.D. Michelle Hooth, Ph.D., DABT Esra Mutlu, Ph.D. Matthew Stout, Ph.D., DABT Nigel Walker, Ph.D., DABT

Provided overall programmatic guidance and review Abee Boyles, Ph.D. John Bucher, Ph.D. Michelle Cora, D.V.M., DACVP Michael DeVito, Ph.D. Darlene Dixon, Ph.D. Dave Malarkey, Ph.D., D.V.M. Cynthia Rider, Ph.D., DABT

Provided oversight of external peer review Mary Wolfe, Ph.D.

National Exposure Research Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA

Provided internal peer review of draft report Kent Thomas, B.S.P.H.

ICF, Durham, North Carolina, USA

Prepared reports and conducted peer review David Burch, M.E.M., Principal Investigator Susan Blaine, B.A. Natalie Blanton, M.P.H. Jeremy Frye, M.S.L.S Lindsey Green, M.P.H. Tara Hamilton, M.S. Katherine Helmick, M.P.H. Penelope Kellar, M.S. Whitney Mitchell, B.S.

Peer Review

The draft research report, *NTP Research Report on the Chemical and Physical Characterization of Recycled Tire Crumb Rubber*, was evaluated by the reviewers listed below. These reviewers served as independent scientists, not as representatives of any institution, company, or governmental agency. In this capacity, reviewers determined if the design and conditions of these NTP studies were appropriate and ensured that this NTP Research Report presented the experimental results and conclusions fully and clearly.

Peer Reviewers

Joshua Kellogg, Ph.D.

Postdoctoral Research Fellow University of North Carolina at Greensboro Greensboro, North Carolina, USA

Robert J. Strife, Ph.D.

Senior Scientist, Consultant (Retired) Procter & Gamble, Research and Development West Chester, Ohio, USA

Publication Details

Publisher: National Toxicology Program

Publishing Location: Research Triangle Park, NC

ISSN: 2473-4756

DOI:<https://doi.org/10.22427/NTP-RR-11>

Report Series: NTP Research Report Series

Report Series Number: 11

Official citation: National Toxicology Program (NTP). 2019. NTP research report on the chemical and physical characterization of recycled tire crumb rubber. Research Triangle Park, NC: National Toxicology Program. Research Report 11.

Abstract

Public health concern for playing on synthetic turf fields with crumb rubber infill has increased in recent years. Crumb rubber manufactured from recycled automobile tires contains potential carcinogenic and toxic substances, and, with over 12,000 synthetic turf fields in the United States, the potential for exposure is widespread. The National Toxicology Program (NTP) conducted research to improve the understanding of potential human exposure to crumb rubber and its biological activity. As a part of the NTP research program, a crumb rubber lot, prepared by combining material from multiple commercial sources, was analyzed using a variety of techniques to generate information on chemical and physical characteristics.

Optical and scanning electron microscopy demonstrated that the lot consisted of a range of particle sizes (0.1–4 mm) and types (dark and light rubber, visible inclusions, fibers). Thermogravimetric analysis revealed that the lot contains a minute fraction of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and ~8% inorganics by weight. Elemental analysis by inductively coupled plasma with atomic emission spectrometry or mass spectrometry (MS) identified zinc, aluminum, cobalt, and other metals and metalloids totaling ~2.9% by weight. Analysis for VOCs by gas chromatography (GC) and MS with headspace sampling detected a large number of constituents; 33 compounds were identified totaling ~0.0007% by weight in crumb rubber.

Extraction of crumb rubber with multiple solvents covering different polarities showed that 0.6% and ~8% by weight, respectively, were extracted with water and methylene chloride, demonstrating that most of the extractable material consists of relatively non-polar organics. Analysis of methylene chloride extract by GC–MS identified 42 compounds with high confidence using authentic standards or reference library spectra, 7 of which were also identified in the VOC analysis, and 62 compounds with lower confidence using reference library spectra, 9 of which were also identified in the VOC analysis. An additional ~200 compounds previously reported to be in crumb rubber were investigated but were not detected in the extracts of the current lot under the conditions used. Analysis of ethanol extracts of crumb rubber by liquid chromatography coupled with MS did not reveal any new analytes not previously detected by GC–MS.

These data demonstrate that VOCs and metals constitute a very small fraction of the crumb rubber lot. In vitro bioaccessibility studies to mimic various routes of exposure showed that only a limited number of constituents are present in these fluids, regardless of the biofluid or the analytical method used.

Introduction

Synthetic turf fields are widely used in the United States, and their use is expanding. Although such fields historically have been installed in professional sports complexes, they are becoming increasingly popular in community recreational areas, including schools and public parks. These expanded applications include areas across the United States that are used by people of all ages, including young children. In a synthetic turf field, infill materials are spread between the "grass" fibers to provide cushioning and traction. Today, most commonly, the infill consists of granulated rubber pellets referred to as crumb rubber. Crumb rubber is manufactured by shredding used or recycled automobile tires. Recycled tires contain numerous, potentially carcinogenic and toxic substances, either as components of the original tire rubber or accumulated during normal use. While information is known about tire manufacturing, many variables are unknown, including persistence of byproducts, chemical changes during vulcanization, and adsorption of environmental chemicals, which might affect the chemical composition of the ultimate crumb rubber product. A recent literature review of crumb rubber chemical characterization studies outlines some chemicals of concern; using ADMET Predictor™, this study identified 197 predicted carcinogens, of which 52 have been previously classified as carcinogens by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) 1 . Other chemicals of concern as well as more information about crumb rubber manufacturing and synthetic turf construction and standards, are described in the 2016 EPA Federal Research Action Plan².

Public concerns about potential health impacts associated with the use of synthetic turf fields have risen dramatically in recent years due to the chemical composition of crumb rubber and the opportunity for widespread, frequent, and long-term exposure, particularly for young athletes. Considering that information to evaluate whether there are adverse health effects from playing on synthetic turf fields is currently limited, several governmental organizations at the international, federal, and state level recently launched research efforts to better understand human exposure and human health hazards focusing on crumb rubber. Internationally, ECHA³ and the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment $(RIVM)^4$ of the Netherlands have evaluated the health risks of playing sports on synthetic turf with crumb rubber. The Federal Research Action Plan⁵⁻⁷, which involves several U.S. federal agencies, aims to determine and fill important knowledge gaps (FRAP 2016, Appendix B), characterize constituents of recycled tire crumb, and identify ways that people are exposed to tire crumb rubber through typical field use activities. The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment $(OEHHA)^8$ is evaluating exposure scenarios, characterizing new and in-field crumb rubber, and developing biomonitoring protocols.

In 2015, OEHHA nominated synthetic turf/crumb rubber to the National Toxicology Program (NTP) for short-term in vivo and in vitro studies to generate information and improve understanding of potential health impacts of chemicals released from synthetic turf, with an emphasis on crumb rubber. The NTP research program⁹ developed in response to this request used in vitro and in vivo systems to address uncertainties about potential human exposure to hazardous components of crumb rubber. The NTP research approach included both in vivo and in vitro studies and considered the most likely routes of human contact with crumb rubber (e.g., ingestion, dermal contact, and inhalation). The study objective was to investigate which exposure conditions could have biological effects, with a focus on characterizing the bioaccessibility and systemic exposure of crumb rubber constituents.

The results of the NTP studies on crumb rubber are communicated in a series of Research Reports¹⁰⁻¹³. The crumb rubber used in the NTP studies was provided by OEHHA specifically for research purposes, and consisted of fresh recycled tire crumb rubber obtained from manufacturing facilities. The physical and chemical characteristics of the material were evaluated using a variety of analytical methods¹⁰. The characterization work provided an understanding of the material used in the NTP studies and helped interpret chemical analyses in the in vivo and in vitro studies. Characterization of the NTP material will allow interpretation of NTP study findings in relation to crumb rubber evaluated as part of the Federal Research Action Plan (FRAP) and OEHHA research efforts, including samples from new and weathered material, and samples from indoor and outdoor fields. For in vitro testing, multiple cell lines (representing skin, lung, and small intestine) were used to evaluate the extractability of crumb rubber and to look for evidence of biological activity of crumb rubber constituents via measurements of cytotoxicity¹¹. For in vivo studies, feasibility testing was conducted to determine what routes of exposure were possible¹². On the basis of this testing, 14-day in vivo studies were performed¹³ using oral exposure and exposure in bedding. Dermal studies were not conducted on the basis of feasibility work¹², and feasibility testing for particle and vapor inhalation studies is ongoing.

This report focuses on characterizing a crumb rubber lot for use in NTP research activities. A composite lot of crumb rubber was prepared from commercial material obtained from multiple sources via OEHHA (see [Materials and Methods\)](#page-12-0). The lot may or may not represent what is found from other sources or on synthetic turf fields of different ages. The lot was analyzed using a variety of techniques to generate information on its chemical and physical characteristics. The lot was sieved to generate different size fractions to be used in animal toxicology studies via different exposure scenarios^{12; 13}. In vitro bioaccessibility studies were conducted to mimic various routes of exposure to investigate potential crumb rubber constituents bioaccessible under these conditions.

Materials and Methods

Materials

Three lots of fresh crumb rubber, two from one facility manufactured by an ambient or a cryogenic process and one from one facility manufactured by an ambient process were received in multiple 1-L glass jars via OEHHA. First, the material from one facility and one type of processing was combined to produce three individual lots representing each original lot; each lot was approximately 5 kg. Subsequently, all material was combined into one homogeneous lot. All equipment and containers used during handling were cleaned with ASTM Type 1 water and dried in an oven at 150°C before use. The homogenized material was assigned lot number CRM06092016, repackaged into 1-L amber glass bottles with Teflon-lined lids, and stored in the refrigerator.

Individual and mixtures of standards of potential crumb rubber constituents were procured from Alpha Aeser (Ward Hill, MA), Sigma-Aldrich (Milwaukee, WI) or Spex Certiprep, Metuchen, NJ [\(Appendix A\)](#page-54-0).

Optical Microscopy

Optical micrographs of crumb rubber were obtained using an Olympus SZX12 stereo microscope with an Olympus DP-71 camera (Tokyo, Japan). The software used was PAX-it! (MIS, Villa Park, IL, version 8.0.0). A sample of crumb rubber was obtained from the bulk lot. Seven regions of this sample were micrographed to determine variations in size and coloration.

Scanning Electron Microscopy and Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy

Selected crumb rubber grains were cut with a clean razor blade to generate a flat surface required for this analysis and to expose the interior surface and any inclusions in rubber grains. The cut grains were mounted onto carbon tabs with the cut surfaces up, and the mounts were lightly coated with Au-Pd target. The mounts were examined using a JEOL 7600-F (JOEL, Tokyo, Japan) scanning electron microscope (SEM), and images were obtained using secondary and back-scattered electrons. Elemental analysis of the crumb rubber mounts, including inclusions, was obtained by energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) using an Apollo X silicon drift detector (EDAX, Mahwah, NJ). Spectra of six particles were analyzed and weight percent of the elements detected was estimated.

Thermogravimetric Analysis

The crumb rubber (~18 mg per analysis) was analyzed in duplicate on a Pyris 1 (PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA) thermal gravimetric analyzer with software package v. 11.0.3.0470. Samples were heated from 30°C to 700°C in a nitrogen (inert) atmosphere and then from 700°C to 900°C in an air (oxidative) atmosphere to combust any remaining organic material. The temperature was increased at a rate of 20°C per minute. An auto stepwise software method was used to improve resolution between differing weight loss events. This method allows for the definition of a set of parameters that, when met, will switch the constant temperature scan to an isothermal hold at the current temperature when a significant weight loss event is detected. Once the weight

loss slows, the temperature scan resumes. This technique is especially useful in analyzing crumb rubber, as the oil and polymer components tend to have similar weight loss onsets.

Inorganic Analysis

Inorganic constituents were determined by Galbraith Laboratories, Inc. (Knoxville, TN), using inductively coupled plasma (ICP)–mass spectrometry (MS) or ICP–atomic emission spectrometry (AES). Briefly, duplicate samples of 150–300 mg of crumb rubber were analyzed for arsenic, lead, barium, manganese, nickel, cadmium, and tin by ICP–MS (Galbraith method ME-30) using a Sciex Elan 6000, 6100, or 9000 (PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA) and for aluminum, cobalt, chromium, copper, iron, potassium, magnesium, sodium, silicon, and zinc by ICP–AES (Galbraith method ME-70) using a PerkinElmer Optima 4300 (PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA).

Headspace Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Analysis for Volatile and Semivolatile Organic Compounds

Crumb rubber was analyzed using a headspace gas chromatography (GC)–MS method to determine volatile (VOC) and semivolatile (SVOC) organic compounds. The method was based on EPA method 8620B, which is designed to analyze for volatile organic compounds with boiling points less than 200ºC in solid matrices by GC–MS. The system used was a CTC Analytics CombiPAL autosampler (Leap Technologies, Carrboro, NC), coupled to a 6890 GC and a 5973 MSD (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA). Duplicate crumb rubber samples (2 g) were weighed into 10-mL headspace vials and capped (Supelco, Bellefonte, PA). Vials were incubated at varying temperatures (ambient, 50°C or 100°C) for 40 minutes. One mL was sampled from the vial headspace and injected at 500 μL/second into the GC injector port at 240°C in splitless mode. An RTX-VMS column (60 m \times 0.25 mm, 1.4-µm film thickness, Restek, Bellefonte, PA) was used with the following oven temperature program: 40°C held for 5 minutes, increased at 2^oC per minute to 80^oC, followed by increases at 4^oC per minute to 245°C, and held for 15 minutes. The mass spectrometer conditions were ionization mode, electron ionization; auxiliary temperature, 240°C; ion source temperature, 250°C; quadrupole temperature, 150°C; and scan range, m/z 35 to 500. Total run time was ~81 minutes.

A single concentration of standards of potential crumb rubber constituents (~130), a subset of those given in [Appendix A,](#page-54-0) except the alkanes mix (see below), was prepared in either 2-phenoxyethanol or methanol. The concentration of individual standards ranged from 0.1 to 160 μg/mL, to cover the expected range in crumb rubber, based on preliminary experiments. The compounds with low boiling points were prepared in the late-eluting 2-phenoxyethanol and compounds with higher boiling points were prepared in the early-eluting methanol to prevent interference of the solvent with the standard during analysis. Because the alkanes mix was procured in hexane, it was diluted with hexane. The standards were spiked (25 μL) into 10-mL headspace vials approximately half filled with 1-mm glass beads (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO*)*. Method blanks were prepared by using glass beads or glass beads spiked with 25 μL of the respective solvent used for the standards that were prepared for analysis.

Constituents in crumb rubber were identified using a combination of retention times of analytical standards and their mass spectra and library matches of mass spectra using the combined NIST 2014 and Wiley 11th Edition Mass Spectral Library (NIST/Wiley Library) (Wiley, Hoboken,

NJ). For the alkanes larger than decane, the abundance of the higher mass fragments ($>m/z$ 100) was too low to be detected in the samples (and sometimes in the standards with higher concentration), so the identity was based on the pattern of low mass fragments (serial losses of CH2) and retention time match with the standard. Although straight-chain alkane standards were used for identification, the identified peaks could be branched isomers of other alkanes. Because the profiles of the duplicate samples were nearly identical, peaks were identified using one replicate only.

Under the experimental conditions mentioned above, the level of each compound in the samples that matched with a standard was estimated using the response factor of a single concentration of standard. This estimate assumes the compounds volatilized similarly in the crumb rubber samples and standards spiked on glass beads. Meta- and para-xylene were not separated by this method and have nearly identical mass spectra. Therefore, the concentration for the peak was estimated using the m-xylene response factor given that commercial xylenes are predominantly m-xylene.

Estimation of Solvent-Extractable Constituents Fraction

To determine the solvent-extractable fraction, 0.5-g portions of crumb rubber were extracted, in duplicate, by rotation overnight at ambient temperature at ~70 rpm with 10 mL of water, ethanol, ethyl acetate, hexane, methylene chloride, or carbon disulfide. Samples were centrifuged for 5 minutes at 3,000 rpm and the supernatant removed. The residual crumb rubber was dried at 60°C for 2 days and weighed to determine the percentage extracted.

Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Analysis of Solvent-Extractable Constituents Fraction

All solvent extracts from above were analyzed by GC–MS using a 7890 GC coupled to a 5975 MSD (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA). One μL of extract was injected into the GC injector port at 300°C in splitless mode. A DB-5MS column (60 m \times 0.25 mm, 0.25-µm film thickness, Agilent, Santa Clara, CA) was used with a helium carrier gas flow at 1 mL per minute. The initial oven temperature was 40°C, which was ramped to 330°C, at 5°C per minute and held for 5 minutes. The mass spectrometer conditions were ionization mode, electron ionization; auxiliary temperature, 300°C; ion source temperature, 250°C; quadrupole temperature, 200°C; and scan range, m/z 35 to 650. Total run time was \sim 68 minutes.

Chromatograms from methylene chloride extract were used to identify crumb rubber constituents. Standards for some potential crumb rubber constituents (listed in [Appendix A\)](#page-54-0) that are expected to elute after the solvent were prepared in methylene chloride (except the alkanes mix) or hexane (alkanes mix). All standards were prepared at a sufficiently high concentration (40 μg/mL) to be able to obtain mass spectra with sufficient fragments above the detection limit to allow for identification. Blanks containing either the solvent used for the extraction and the standards also were prepared for analysis.

To identify as many constituents as possible, the following criteria were used: (1) comparison with the retention time and spectra of analytical standards followed by comparison of mass spectra to the NIST/Wiley library (Wiley, Hoboken, NJ) (targeted analysis); (2) search for potential crumb rubber constituents [\(Appendix B\)](#page-66-0) in the chromatogram using extracted ion

chromatograms for the parent and significant unique fragment ions such as halides, followed by comparison of the mass spectrum to the NIST/Wiley library (suspect screening); and (3) comparison of mass spectra of unknown peaks with area percent greater than 0.1% in the total chromatogram with the NIST/Wiley library (non-targeted analysis).

Liquid Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Analysis of Solvent-Extractable Constituents

An ethanol extract (prepared as described above, except using 2 g crumb rubber) was analyzed by LC–MS using an Agilent 1100 Liquid Chromatograph (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA) coupled to an API 4000 QTrap MS (Sciex, Toronto, Canada) using electrospray ionization (ESI) and atmospheric pressure chemical ionization (APCI) sources in both positive and negative ion modes. The data system used was Analyst (1.6.1), ACD (Toronto, Canada) Spectrus (2017.1.2). The mass spectrometer was operated in enhanced MS mode with dynamic ion trap fill time, 1000 Da/sec ion trap readout rate, and scanning from m/z 50 to 450. A low wavelength UV (210 nm) chromatogram also was collected. Analyte separation was achieved on a Phenomenex (Torrance, CA) Kinetex Biphenyl column (150×3.0 mm, 2.6-um particle size). Mobile phases, 0.1% formic acid in water (A), and 0.1% formic acid in acetonitrile (B), were used at a linear gradient of 10% B to 13.4% B over 3 minutes, followed by 100% B over 77 minutes with a flow rate of 300 μL/minute.

Standards of several of the largest constituents observed in the GC–MS analyses of VOCs, SVOCs, and solvent extracts were prepared in ethanol at 10 and 100 μg/mL. The standards and blank ethanol were analyzed using the same methods used for the samples.

To identify constituents in crumb rubber, the following approach was used: (1) combination of retention times of analytical standards and corresponding spectra (targeted analysis), (2) search for molecular weight of the constituents identified in the GC–MS analysis and in the *Handbook for the Chemical Analysis of Plastic and Polymer Additives*¹⁴ (suspect screening), and (3) comparison of the mass spectra of unknown peaks against the Massbank (http://www.massbank.jp) library (non-targeted analysis).

Size Fractionation of Crumb Rubber Lot and Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Profiling of Fractions

To generate different sized fractions for use in NTP research, samples of the crumb rubber lot were sieved using mesh sizes 14 (\geq 1.41 mm), 40 (0.420–1.41 mm), 80 (0.177–0.420 mm), and 400 (0.037–0.177 mm), and the weight % of each fraction was recorded (note: theoretical particle sizes are given in parentheses). Small aliquots from 14-, 40-, and 80-mesh sizes were removed for analysis, and the remaining material was combined to generate one fraction (14- to 80-mesh). The 400-mesh was saved separately. Duplicate samples from mesh fractions 14-, 40-, 80-,14- to 80-, and 400-mesh were analyzed, along with the original bulk material, by the headspace GC–MS method as described above using 100°C as the incubation temperature. Concentrations of selected VOCs and SVOCs were estimated as described above for the unsieved bulk material.

The spectral data from duplicate analyses were imported into XCMS software [\(https://xcmsonline.scripps.edu\)](https://xcmsonline.scripps.edu/) for non-targeted analysis using multivariate statistics and settings used are given in [Appendix D.](#page-86-0) The software was set to find features that differed between samples at the 95% confidence level and had at least a 3:1 signal-to-noise ratio to find the most significant differences. The data were presented as a cloud plot and principal component analysis (PCA) score plot using both spectral features and peaks.

Solo v8.5.1 software (Eigenvector Research, Manson, WA) was used to perform PCA analysis and hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward's method using peaks in the profiles (instead of spectral features). This technique compares the overall profile of peaks rather than extracted ion chromatograms for every mass.

Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy of Crumb Rubber Fractions

The bulk material was size fractionated (mesh sizes 400, 80, 40, and 14) and the three larger particle size fractions (mesh sizes 80, 40, and 14) were combined, resulting in two fraction lots [Lot No. CRM12052016 (combined material) and Lot No. CRM09132016 $(400$ -mesh¹²)]. EDS were done on both these lots using an Apollo X silicon drift detector (EDAX, Mahwah, NJ). Spectra of 10 particles from each lot were analyzed and the weight percent of the elements detected were estimated.

Bioaccessibility In Vitro

To determine whether crumb rubber constituents are bioaccessible, crumb rubber was extracted with simulated biofluids to mimic dermal, inhalation, and oral (ingestion) routes of exposures. The simulated sweat, lung fluid, saliva, gastric fluid, and intestinal fluid, and their combination in ingestion pathway fluid, were prepared as described by Pavilonis et al. $(2016)^{15}$; the composition of each fluid are given in [Appendix E.](#page-88-0) Briefly, for simulated dermal exposure, 400-mg aliquots of crumb rubber were incubated in 20 mL of simulated sweat medium at 37ºC for approximately 1 hour. For simulated inhalation exposure, 200 mg of crumb rubber were incubated in 10 mL of simulated lung fluid for approximately 24 hours. For simulated ingestion exposure, 8 mL of simulated saliva were added to 2 g of crumb rubber and shaken for \sim 30 seconds. After adding 100 mL of simulated gastric fluid, the sample was incubated at 37°C for approximately 2 hours. Approximately 50 mL of the extract was pipetted into another bottle to serve as the gastric phase-only sample. To the remaining sample (containing the crumb rubber) 100 mL of simulated intestinal fluid was added (final pH 6.5) and incubated at 37ºC for approximately 2 hours. All extracts from the above-mentioned incubations were filtered through 0.45-μm syringe filters to remove any crumb rubber particles and analyzed as described below.

The headspace GC–MS analysis of samples was conducted as described previously using a 300 μL of each extract in duplicate in 10-mL vials containing ~2 g of glass beads. For the analysis by liquid injection GC–MS under the conditions described previously, 4 mL of each crumb rubber extract prepared as described above were rotated end over end with 4 mL of methylene chloride for approximately 1 hour. The samples were centrifuged for 5 minutes at 1,800 g, and the methylene chloride layers were transferred to autosampler vials for analysis. For the LC–MS analysis, the simulated biofluid extracts and blanks were analyzed as is. Method blanks were prepared similarly for all analysis methods except for the addition of crumb rubber. Instruments and the chromatographic methods used were the same as those described above except for the following: Both headspace and liquid injection GC–MS analyses were performed

for constituents identified in crumb rubber above using selected ion monitoring (SIM) where one ion (generally the m/z of the molecular ion) was used as the quantitation ion and a second ion as a confirmation ion that must be present to confirm identity. To keep the mass spectrometer data acquisition cycle time short enough to generate a sufficient number of data points to improve sensitivity, the samples and blanks were injected three times with a different set of SIM ions monitored each time. The grouping of ions was based on mass and retention time. Compounds with similar masses or retention times were assigned into different groups to prevent any potential interferences from closely eluting compounds. The LC–MS analyses were performed using full scan (m/z 50 to 450), and extracted ion chromatograms for the $[M+H]$ ⁺ ion of each compound were generated. An estimated concentration of each compound found in the analyses was calculated using the response factor of the standard.

Stock standards of 32 selected compounds (based on the analytes found in crumb rubber and previous screening; see [Results](#page-18-0) section) were prepared at 2 mg/mL in methylene chloride (except 2-methylnaphthalene and 1-methylnaphthalene, which were purchased as a 1-mg/mL and 2 mg/mL solution in methanol). The stock standards were combined into three intermediate standard mixes containing approximately 100 μg/mL of each compound in methylene chloride. For the headspace GC–MS analysis, 50 μL of each intermediate standard mix was diluted to 10 mL in ASTM Type 1 water to produce standards at 500 ng/mL. As with the samples, 300 μL of each standard mix was pipetted into 10-mL headspace vials containing ~2 g of glass beads. For the liquid injection GC–MS analysis, 50 μL of each intermediate standard mix was diluted to 10 mL in methylene chloride to produce standards at 500 ng/mL. For LC–MS analysis, stock standards were combined into three standard mixes containing approximately 20 μg/mL of each compound in ethanol. The standards were prepared at a higher concentration than the GC–MS due to the lower sensitivity of the full-scan analysis.

Results

Optical Microscopy

Seven regions of a sample of the crumb rubber lot were micrographed. Micrographs from two selected regions are shown in [Figure](#page-37-0) 1. The crumb rubber lot consists of irregular particles in a wide range of sizes, from approximately <0.1 to 4 mm. Particles consisting of both dark and light rubber and visible non-rubber inclusions and fibers were observed.

Scanning Electron Microscopy and Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy

SEM images for six individual crumb rubber grains were obtained, four of which are shown in [Figure](#page-38-0) 2 as images representative of the variations between different grains. Elemental composition of the analyzed areas for six grains are given in [Table](#page-26-0) 1. These data represent the elemental composition of the analyzed areas of different rubber grains and not the composition of bulk crumb rubber. The data demonstrate variability in composition between crumb rubber grains, which may have derived from different tires or different parts of the same tire. As would be expected of material consisting primarily of polymer, carbon $(87.2 \pm 6.6\%)$ makes up most of the crumb rubber with much lower percentages of sulfur $(3.5 \pm 1.3\%)$, zinc $(3.0 \pm 1.8\%)$, and oxygen $(3.5 \pm 1.3\%)$, likely derived from the sulfur and zinc oxide used in the vulcanization process. A few other elements were detected at <1% [\(Table](#page-26-0) 1). Elemental composition of inclusions observed in crumb rubber also was measured and identified as likely clay (aluminum silicates), calcium carbonate, and talc (magnesium silicates) based on high levels of silicon, calcium, oxygen, aluminum, and magnesium detected in these inclusions.

Thermogravimetric Analysis

Duplicate samples were analyzed to estimate the composition of the crumb rubber lot. Samples were heated from 30°C to 700°C in a nitrogen (inert) atmosphere and then from 700°C to 900°C in an ambient air (oxidative) atmosphere to combust any remaining organic material. According to the thermogram [\(Figure](#page-39-0) 3), a minimal weight loss occurs below 200°C suggesting that VOCs and SVOCs comprise a very small fraction of the crumb rubber lot. The significant weight loss up to \sim 400 $\rm ^oC$ is likely due to extender oils such as paraffinic, naphthenic, or aromatic oils^{16; 17}. The weight loss between $\sim 400^{\circ}$ C and $\sim 520^{\circ}$ C may be due to decomposition of polymers with two steps indicating likely presence of two types of polymers. The last step is combustion of any uncombusted carbon-containing material including carbon black. The residue remaining after ~800°C represents the total inorganics present in the material. Based on this assessment, the crumb rubber lot contains a very small faction of VOCs and SVOCs, approximately 25%, and extender oils; 29.9% polymeric material; 37.1% carbon black (arising likely from a combination of uncombusted material and original carbon black present in crumb rubber); and 7.7% inorganics.

Inorganics Analysis

Inorganics were determined in duplicate using ICP–MS or ICP–AES, shown in [Table](#page-26-1) 2. Only zinc (1.68%), silicon (0.932%), and aluminum (0.106%) were detected above 0.1%. All other

analytes were below 0.1% [\(Table](#page-26-1) 2). The level of chromium was below the limit of quantitation for the method.

Headspace Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Analysis for Volatile and Semivolatile Organic Compounds

Duplicate samples of crumb rubber were analyzed using headspace GC–MS to determine VOCs and SVOCs using varying incubation temperatures. The temperatures were selected to cover a potential range of temperatures on playing fields including worst case scenarios¹⁸⁻²⁰. [Figure](#page-40-0) 4 shows a comparison of chromatograms from ambient temperature, 50°C, and 100°C. Very few analytes were present in chromatograms incubated at ambient temperature; as the temperature increased, the number and level of constituents in chromatograms increased. For example, the approximate number of peaks increased from ~7 at ambient temperature to >150 at 100°C. Therefore, samples from 100°C incubation were selected for identifying and quantifying constituents using the conditions described under methods. Of the large number of peaks detected (~150), 33 were identified using a combination of retention times of analytical standards (targeted analysis) and library matches of mass spectra; as an example, comparison of spectra leading to identification of methyl isobutyl ketone is shown in [Figure](#page-41-0) 5. The identified peaks constituted a majority (~86%) of the total peak area. The remaining peaks had low confidence library matches. Using the conditions described under methods, the estimated levels of the 33 compounds identified are given in [Table](#page-27-0) 3, totaling ~0.0007% by weight in crumb rubber.

Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Analysis of Solvent-Extractable Constituents Fraction

Duplicate samples of the crumb rubber were extracted with different solvents across the polarity range from water to hexane. The average estimated extractable material, expressed as a percentage, is given in [Table](#page-28-0) 4. Ethyl acetate, methylene chloride, hexane, and carbon disulfide yielded similar amounts of extractable material, and ethanol extracted approximately half as much material. Using water as the solvent yielded less than 1%. This observation indicates most extractable materials from crumb rubber are relatively non-polar organic compounds.

All samples were analyzed by GC–MS, the chromatograms for which are given in [Figure](#page-43-0) 6 including for blank solvents. Under these conditions, the pattern of profiles is similar except for the water extract, where very few discernible peaks were observed [\(Figure](#page-44-0) 7). No peaks were detected in corresponding solvent blanks (data not shown).

The chromatogram for the methylene chloride extract was selected for identification of peaks using the criteria given under methods. Compounds identified with high confidence are presented in [Table](#page-29-0) 5. To qualify for high confidence identification, the peak in the extract had to have either a matching retention time and mass spectrum of a standard or a $>85\%$ match with a library reference spectrum, or both. As an example, comparison of spectra leading to identification of n-(1,3-dimethylbutyl)-n'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine (6PPD) is shown in [Figure](#page-45-0) 8. Compounds that did not meet the criteria for the first category were assigned medium confidence. For these compounds, matching retention time and mass spectrum with a standard was difficult due to co-eluting or small peaks, or the match with the library spectrum was lower (30–84%); these data are presented in [Appendix C,](#page-78-0) [Table](#page-78-1) C-1. In cases of multiple, very similar isomers (such as the xylenes), standards would be required to determine which isomers might be present. [Appendix C,](#page-78-0) [Table](#page-80-0) C-2 lists potential crumb rubber constituents based on the literature [\(Appendix A\)](#page-54-0), which were investigated but not found in the current lot under these instrumental and test conditions.

Liquid Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Analysis of Solvent-Extractable Constituents Fraction

Ethanol extract was analyzed by LC–MS using positive and negative ion modes of ESI and APCI sources. The APCI source resulted in better ionization and detection of more peaks. Similarly, positive ionization resulted in more peaks. Because extensive investigation was conducted using GC and the LC profiles had fewer peaks, only the chromatograms from APCI positive ion mode were used for analyte identification (although this may have limited the identification of unique compounds that ionize only in negative ion mode). Total ion chromatograms following analyses of samples by positive and negative ion modes are shown in [Figure](#page-46-0) 9. The blank ethanol chromatograms were subtracted from the sample chromatograms to produce the blank-subtracted total ion chromatograms. A list of analytes identified under the conditions mentioned above is given in [Table](#page-30-0) 6.

The largest peak observed in both the positive and negative ion modes (29.7 minutes) the matched retention time and mass spectrum with the standard for 6PPD, which was also the largest peak observed in the GC–MS analysis of solvent extracts. The 21.6-minute peak matched retention time and mass spectrum with the standard for benzothiazole, which was also one of the major peaks observed in the volatiles analysis. The Massbank library identified the 19.8-minute peak as 2-hydroxybenzothiazole and the 22.5-minute peak as hexa(methoxymethyl)melamine. Several remaining unknown peaks matched molecular weight with either previously observed crumb rubber constituents or known polymer additives, but library spectra were not available and standards for those compounds had not been included in the analysis, so their identities could not be confirmed.

Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry Analysis of Crumb Rubber Fractions

Duplicate samples of crumb rubber from different mesh sizes were analyzed along with the bulk material to determine differences, if any, between different mesh sizes. [Figure](#page-47-0) 10 shows a comparison of chromatographic profiles between samples; duplicates were similar and hence the chromatogram from only one replicate is shown in the figure. In general, the pattern of profiles was similar in each sample. Visually, most of the peaks show little or no change except the peak at 26.60 minutes, which was identified as toluene. As the particle size decreases, the intensity of toluene peak increases, with the 400-mesh fraction showing a significantly elevated peak compared to the unsieved bulk crumb rubber.

Spectral data from samples were compared to each other using multivariate statistics. Each peak in chromatogram is associated with a mass-to-charge ratio, retention time, fold change between different samples, p-value, and relative intensity. A cloud plot, which is a visualization of this multidimensional data to facilitate compound identification and data interpretation, identifying 177 significantly different spectral features is shown in [Figure](#page-48-0) 11. The cloud plot shows all chromatograms overlaid along the x-axis based on the retention time and red circles at each mass-to-charge ratio (y-axis) that met the significance criteria (with size of the circle showing the relative difference between the samples). Because the mass spectrum of each compound contains multiple fragments, it is possible to have several circles over one chromatographic peak (for example, as seen for the toluene peak labeled 4 on the plot). Upon closer examination of the data, a significant number of these features were found to arise from changes in levels of toluene and methyl isobutyl ketone in these fractions [\(Figure](#page-48-0) 11). Although several small peaks such as xylenes also met the criteria for significance, the large cyclohexane and benzothiazole peaks did not. Other small peaks that also met the criteria for significance included 2,4,4,-trimethylpentene (-19.5 minutes) , naphthalene (-51.5 minutes) , methyl vinyl ketone (-16.1 minutes) , and acetone (-10.5 minutes) [\(Figure](#page-48-0) 11).

PCA score plots, generated using the features described above from mass fragments, are shown in [Figure](#page-49-0) 12A. This analysis shows that the 14-mesh and 40-mesh fractions were similar to the bulk crumb rubber lot; the pooled 14- to 80-mesh fraction was less similar to the bulk lot, likely due to inclusion of the 80-mesh fraction. Individual 80-mesh samples were not analyzed due to limitation in available material. The 400-mesh fraction differed markedly from the bulk lot and all other mesh sizes analyzed. As mentioned above, this difference between the bulk lot and mesh sizes likely stems from the changes in levels of toluene and methyl isobutyl ketone in these fractions. Because using mass fragments potentially overemphasizes the contribution from compounds such as toluene and methyl isobutyl ketone that have multiple fragments, the PCA analysis also was performed using peaks in the chromatographic profiles [\(Figure](#page-49-0) 12B). The outcome was similar, with the 400-mesh differing from the others.

Hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted on individual replicates using Ward's method; the corresponding dendrogram is shown in [Figure](#page-50-0) 13. The replicates for each sample were closest to each other, demonstrating the reproducibility in sample analysis. For the different mesh-size fractions, all except the 400-mesh fraction fell in one branch of the dendrogram. The unsieved material and 14-mesh fraction clustered, and the 40-mesh and pooled 14- to 80-mesh fractions clustered.

In conclusion, GC–MS data show differences between the bulk and sieved materials. The unsieved, 14-mesh, 40-mesh, and pooled 14- to 80-mesh fractions are more similar to each other than any of them are to the 400-mesh fraction.

Concentrations of selected VOCs and SVOCs, based on those estimated previously in the bulk crumb rubber lot, were estimated for different mesh fractions, under the experimental conditions described. The estimated values are shown in [Table](#page-31-0) 7 along with the bulk crumb rubber. Percent change observed for different size fractions with respect to the bulk sample was estimated as shown in [Table](#page-31-0) 7. Toluene showed the greatest differences between the fractions, with the amount increasing as particle size decreased. The 400-mesh fraction contained 15 times as much toluene as the unsieved material. The second largest relative difference was with hexanal, where the 400-mesh sample had 2.5 times as much as the unsieved material. Benzothiazole and cyclohexanone, although some of the largest constituents, showed relatively little difference (<25%) between the samples.

Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectroscopy of Crumb Rubber Fractions

The weight percent of the elements detected in the two fractions are given in [Table 8.](#page-32-0) The composition of elements between the fractions, in general, are similar to each other and consistent with the data observed for the bulk material [\(Table 1\)](#page-26-0).

Bioaccessibility In Vitro

During development of a method, crumb rubber was extracted using simulated biofluids from ISO Method 17294²¹ (which is based the Bioaccessibility Research Group of Europe Unified Bioacessibility Method) and Pavilonis et al. $(2016)^{15}$. The ISO method biofluids, which were more complex mixtures, were found to have much higher background interferences with common crumb rubber constituents than the simpler biofluid formulation used by Pavilonis et al $(2016)^{15}$. The EPA proposed simulated biofluids²² are even more complex than the ISO method; for example, the gastric fluid alone contains 37 ingredients and hence was expected to have similar or higher background interferences. Hence, the Pavilonis et al. $(2016)^{15}$ method, which has a simpler formula, was used in the current assessment.

Chromatograms of combined SIM ions for the headspace GC–MS, liquid injection GC–MS, and LC–MS from simulated ingestion fluid samples, and corresponding blanks are shown respectively, i[n Figure 14](#page-51-0)[, Figure 15, and Figure 16](#page-53-0) as examples. SIM ion Sets 1 through 3 denote multiple injections needed to cover multiple SIM ions as described in methods.

Due to its high carbon black composition, crumb rubber can act as a sorbent, in addition to leaching its own constituents. In many of the simulated biofluids, this phenomenon is evident, as many of the peaks in the blank biofluids are reduced or eliminated in the crumb rubber extracts. The method blanks had small background peaks (generally less than 10 ng/mL) for many of the compounds, so the detection limit for this analysis was set to three times the response in the blanks. The concentrations of the analytes observed in the blanks (calculated as equivalent μ g/g in the crumb rubber based on the amount of crumb rubber extracted and volume of the extracts) are shown in [Table 9.](#page-33-0) Any results for the samples where the blanks contained a large background (greater than 20 ng/mL) were marked with an I (for interference) in the results tables (calculated values for the samples are shown only if the sample response was at least three times that of interference peak). More of the peaks in the liquid injection GC–MS and the LC–MS analyses showed interference than in the headspace GC–MS.

The peaks identified and corresponding estimated concentration in simulated biofluids using each technique are shown in [Table 10.](#page-35-0) Overall, a limited number of constituents present in crumb rubber were observed in these extracts, regardless of the biofluid or the analytical method used. In addition, hexa(methoxymethyl)melamine was identified by LC–MS in the simulated inhalation extract by library match $(\sim 80\%$ match), but no standard was available to confirm the identity.

Conclusions

A crumb rubber lot prepared by combining material from multiple commercial sources was analyzed using a variety of techniques to generate information on chemical and physical characteristics. Optical and scanning electron microscopy demonstrated that the lot consisted of a range of particle sizes (<0.1–4 mm). Data from a combination of analyses demonstrate that VOCs, SVOCs, and metals constitute a very small fraction of the crumb rubber lot. Size fractionation of crumb rubber showed that chemical profiles are fairly similar between different size fractions except the 400-mesh fraction. Bioaccessibility studies conducted in vitro to mimic various routes of exposure showed that only a few constituents present in crumb rubber are present in these extracts under the conditions used, regardless of the biofluid or the analytical method used.

References

1. Perkins AN, Inayat-Hussain SH, Deziel NC, Johnson CH, Ferguson SS, Garcia-Milian R, Thompson DC, Vasiliou V. Evaluation of potential carcinogenicity of organic chemicals in synthetic turf crumb rubber. Environ Res. 2019; 169:163-172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.10.018>

2. United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Federal research action plan (FRAP) on recycled tire crumb used on playing fields and playgrounds. 2016. EPA/600/R-16/364. [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-12/documents/federal_research_action_plan_on_recycled_tire_crumb_used_on_playing_fields_and_playgrounds_status_report.pdf)

[12/documents/federal_research_action_plan_on_recycled_tire_crumb_used_on_playing_fields_a](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-12/documents/federal_research_action_plan_on_recycled_tire_crumb_used_on_playing_fields_and_playgrounds_status_report.pdf) nd playgrounds status report.pdf [Accessed: 3 Oct, 2017]

3. European Chemicals Agency (ECHA). Annex XV Report: An evaluation of the possible health risks of recycled rubber granules used as infill in synthetic turf sports fields. 2017. [https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13563/annex](https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13563/annex-xv_report_rubber_granules_en.pdf/dbcb4ee6-1c65-af35-7a18-f6ac1ac29fe4)[xv_report_rubber_granules_en.pdf/dbcb4ee6-1c65-af35-7a18-f6ac1ac29fe4](https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13563/annex-xv_report_rubber_granules_en.pdf/dbcb4ee6-1c65-af35-7a18-f6ac1ac29fe4)

4. Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu [Netherlands National Institute for Public Health and the Environment] (RIVM). Evaluation of health risks of playing sports on synthetic turf pitches with rubber granulate. 2017. Report Number: 2017-0016. [https://www.rivm.nl/dsresource?objectid=a397bdf3-7aa7-490a-85bd-](https://www.rivm.nl/dsresource?objectid=a397bdf3-7aa7-490a-85bd-5992b78bcb42&type=pdf&disposition=inline)[5992b78bcb42&type=pdf&disposition=inline](https://www.rivm.nl/dsresource?objectid=a397bdf3-7aa7-490a-85bd-5992b78bcb42&type=pdf&disposition=inline)

5. United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Federal research on recycled tire crumb used on playing fields. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; 2016. <https://www.epa.gov/chemical-research/federal-research-recycled-tire-crumb-used-playing-fields> [Accessed: 2017]

6. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). Federal research action plan on recycled tire crumb used on playing fields and playgrounds. 2016. <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/frap/index.html> [Accessed: 2017]

7. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). Crumb rubber information center. 2016. [https://www.cpsc.gov/Safety-Education/Safety-Education-Centers/Crumb-Rubber-Safety-](https://www.cpsc.gov/Safety-Education/Safety-Education-Centers/Crumb-Rubber-Safety-Information-Center)[Information-Center](https://www.cpsc.gov/Safety-Education/Safety-Education-Centers/Crumb-Rubber-Safety-Information-Center) [Accessed: 2017]

8. Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). Synthetic turf studies. 2017. <https://oehha.ca.gov/risk-assessment/synthetic-turf-studies> [Accessed: 2017]

9. National Toxicology Program (NTP). Synthetic turf/recycled tire crumb rubber. 2017. <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/results/areas/syntheticturf/index.html> [Accessed: 2017]

10. National Toxicology Program (NTP). NTP research report on chemical and physical characterization of crumb rubber. Research Triangle Park, NC: National Toxicology Program; 2019. Research Report 11. https://doi.org/10.22427/NTP-RR-11

11. National Toxicology Program (NTP). NTP research report on synthetic turf/recycled tire crumb rubber: Characterization of the biological activity of crumb rubber in vitro. Research

Triangle Park, NC: National Toxicology Program; 2019. Research Report 12. <https://doi.org/10.22427/NTP-RR-12>

12. National Toxicology Program (NTP). NTP research report on synthetic turf/recycled tire crumb rubber: Feasibility study in support of non-inhalation in vivo exposures of synthetic turf/recycled tire crumb rubber. Research Triangle Park, NC: National Toxicology Program; 2019. Research Report 13. https://doi.org/10.22427/NTP-RR-13

13. National Toxicology Program (NTP). NTP research report on synthetic turf/recycled tire crumb rubber: 14-day exposure characterization studies of crumb rubber in female mice housed on mixed bedding or dosed via feed or oral gavage. Research Triangle Park, NC: National Toxicology Program; 2019. Research Report 14. https://doi.org/10.22427/NTP-RR-14

14. Bolgar MH, J; Groeger, J; Meronek, S. Handbook for the Chemical Analysis of Plastic and Polymer Additives, Second Edition. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press; 2015.

15. Pavilonis BW, CP; Buckley, B; Lioy, PJ,. Bioaccessibility and risk of exposure to metals and SVOCs in artificial turf field fill materials and fibers. Risk Anal. 2014; 34(1):44-55. <http://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12081>

16. PerkinElmer. Compositional Analysis of Tire Elastomers Using AutoStepwise TGA. 2012.

17. Cambridge Polymer Group. CPGAN #025 Car Tire Composition Analysis by TGA-FTIR. 2014.

18. McNitt A, Petrunak D, Serensits T. Temperature amelioration of synthetic turf surfaces through irrigation. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University. <https://plantscience.psu.edu/research/centers/ssrc/documents/temperature-irrigation.pdf>

19. Williams C, Pulley G. Synthetic surface heat studies. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University. <https://aces.nmsu.edu/programs/turf/documents/brigham-young-study.pdf>

20. AST temps and TPG temps. 2016. [http://www.synturf.org/images/AST-Temps-TPG-Temps-](http://www.synturf.org/images/AST-Temps-TPG-Temps-Rev1-20161007.pdf)[Rev1-20161007.pdf](http://www.synturf.org/images/AST-Temps-TPG-Temps-Rev1-20161007.pdf)

21. International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (International Organization for Standardization). Soil quality - Assessment of human exposure from ingestion of soil and soil material - Procedure for the estimation of the human bioaccessibility/bioavailability of metals in soil. 2016. ISO/DIS 17924:2016(E).

22. United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). Research Protocol: Collections Related to Synthetic Turf Fields with Crumb Rubber Infill. 2016. [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-08/documents/tcrs_research_protocol_final_08-05-2016.pdf) [08/documents/tcrs_research_protocol_final_08-05-2016.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-08/documents/tcrs_research_protocol_final_08-05-2016.pdf)

Element	$\frac{6}{6}$					
$\mathbf C$	87.2(6.6)					
\mathbf{O}	3.5(1.3)					
Mg	0.1(0.1)					
A ₁	1.2(2.5)					
Si	1.4(2.2)					
${\bf S}$	3.5(1.7)					
Ca	0.1(0.2)					
T _i	0.0(0.1)					
Zn	3.0(1.8)					

Table 1. Elemental Composition^a (Wt %) of Six Individual Crumb Rubber Grains by Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy

aData given are for the analyzed area of individual grains to show the composition difference between different grains and do not represent composition of the bulk crumb rubber.

Element	Replicate 1	Replicate 2	Average
Zinc	1.62%	1.74%	1.68%
Silicon	0.898%	0.966%	0.932%
Aluminum	0.104%	0.108%	0.106%
Potassium	473 ppm	438 ppm	456 ppm
Iron	523 ppm	340 ppm	432 ppm
Magnesium	367 ppm	321 ppm	344 ppm
Sodium	304 ppm	300 ppm	302 ppm
Cobalt	153 ppm	136 ppm	145 ppm
Copper	51.6 ppm	37.5 ppm	44.6 ppm
Lead	12.1 ppm	12.9 ppm	12.5 ppm
Nickel	4.53 ppm	7.32 ppm	5.93 ppm
Manganese	5.78 ppm	5.99 ppm	5.89 ppm
Barium	4.95 ppm	5.48 ppm	5.22 ppm
Tin	1.51 ppm	2.39 ppm	1.95 ppm
Arsenic	0.929 ppm	0.680 ppm	0.805 ppm
Cadmium	0.715 ppm	0.582 ppm	0.649 ppm
Chromium	$<$ LOQ ^b	$<$ LOQ	$<$ LOQ

Table 2. Estimated Levels of Metals in Crumb Rubber Lot^a

aAnalyses were conducted either by ICP–MS or ICP–AES. Data are shown for duplicate analyses. Data are organized based on the levels estimated with highest shown on top.

 $bLOQ =$ limit of quantitation. For chromium, LOQ was ~13 ppm.

^aThe data presented are following incubation at 100 °C and under conditions described in methods.

^bThe compounds in this table were identified by matching retention time and mass spectra with standards. The match score with a library spectrum is included as a confirmation.

^cThe match score with the library spectrum was low because the peak in the sample was poorly resolved from neighboring peaks and its mass spectrum contained fragments contributed by those peaks.

^dFor the larger alkanes, the response in the samples was too low to detect the low abundance of higher mass fragments, but the peak did match retention time and lower mass fragments with the corresponding standard.

Solvent	Average $(\%)$
Water	0.60
Ethanol	4.19
Ethyl Acetate	7.21
Hexane	7.39
Methylene Chloride	7.98
Carbon Disulfide	8.35

Table 4. Percent of Extractable Crumb Rubber in Various Solvents^a

^aThe amount extracted by solvent under the conditions described in the method was calculated by subtracting the weight of the dried residual crumb rubber from the starting crumb rubber weight. The percent extracted was calculated by dividing the extracted weight by the starting crumb rubber weight.

Name	CAS Number	ID by Match with Standard ^a	ID by Match with Library ^b		
Naphthalene	$91 - 20 - 3$	Yes	Yes		
Acenaphthene	83-32-9	Yes	Yes		
Phenanthrene	65996-93-2	Yes	Yes		
Fluoranthene	206-44-0	Yes	Yes		
Pyrene	129-00-0	Yes	Yes		
2-Methylnaphthalene	$91 - 57 - 6$	No	Yes		
1-Methylnaphthalene	$90 - 12 - 0$	No	Yes		
1,2-Dihydro-2,2,4-trimethylquinoline	147-47-7	No	Yes		
Benzothiazole	95-16-9	Yes	Yes		
Butylated Hydroxytoluene	128-37-0	Yes	Yes		
4-Tert-octylphenol	140-66-9	Yes	Yes		
Heptadecane	629-78-7	Yes	Yes		
Octadecane	593-45-3	Yes	Yes		
Nonadecane	629-92-5	Yes	Yes		
Icosane	112-95-8	Yes	Yes		
Heneicosane	629-94-7	Yes	Yes		
Docosane	629-97-0	Yes	Yes		
Tricosane	638-67-5	Yes	Yes		
Tetracosane	$646 - 31 - 1$	Yes	Yes		
Pentacosane	629-99-2	Yes	Yes		
Hexacosane	630-01-3	Yes	Yes		
Heptacosane	593-49-7	Yes	Yes		
Octacosane	630-02-4	Yes	Yes		
Nonacosane	630-03-5	Yes	Yes		
Triacontane	638-68-6	Yes	Yes		
Hentriacontane	630-04-6	N _o	Yes		
Dotriacontane	544-85-4	$\rm No$	Yes		
Tritriacontane	630-05-7	No	Yes		
Pentatriacontane	630-07-9	No	Yes		
Phthalimide	$85-41-6$	Yes	Yes		
Cyclopropyl Methyl Ketone	765-43-5	Yes	Yes		
Toluene	108-88-3	Yes	Yes		
4-Methyl-2-pentanone (MIBK)	$108 - 10 - 1$	$\rm No$	Yes		

Table 5. Constituents of Crumb Rubber in Methylene Chloride Extract Identified by GC–MS with High Confidence^a

a Identification of constituents was done with retention time and mass spectral match with a standard, a >85% match, or both with a library reference spectrum.

 $b \ge 85\%$ match with a library spectrum.

Compound	Bulk Lota	Pooled 14-80-Mesh (ppm)	14 -Mesh $^{\rm b}$ (ppm)	40-Mesh (ppm)	400-Mesh (ppm)
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	4.34	3.50	4.05	3.54	2.73
Toluene	0.454	0.218	0.875	1.12	6.80
Aniline	1.28	0.689	1.04	1.22	2.00
Benzothiazole	0.629	0.474	0.615	0.633	0.563
Cyclohexanone	0.464	0.361	0.438	0.422	0.347
Diphenylamine	0.0502	0.0343	0.0667	0.0606	0.0280
2,4,4-Trimethylpentene	0.0779	0.0470	0.0699	0.0537	0.0363
Hexamethylcyclotrisiloxane	0.207	0.125	0.179	0.144	0.133
5-Methyl-2-hexanone	0.330	0.201	0.274	0.265	0.139
Phenol	0.0696	0.0196	0.0367	0.0315	0.0311
Hexanal	0.128	0.0830	0.119	0.100	0.316
m/p-Xylene	0.0795	0.0566	0.0703	0.0615	0.0256
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.00352	0.00219	0.00313	0.00311	0.00139
Napthalene	0.0121	0.00727	0.0104	0.00923	0.00531
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.0150	0.00993	0.0124	0.0116	0.00210
2-Methylnaphthalene	0.00598	0.00408	0.00539	0.00514	0.00289
Butylated Hydroxytoluene	0.00298	0.00123	0.00314	0.00178	0.000503
Ethylbenzene	0.00423	0.00280	0.00389	0.00338	0.00242
Styrene	0.0169	0.0129	0.0192	0.0160	0.0126
3-Ethyltoluene	0.00390	0.00231	0.00335	0.00315	0.000279

Table 7. Average Estimated Levels of Volatile and Semivolatile Organic Compounds in Various Crumb Rubber Fractions by Headspace GC–MS

^aThe bulk lot values were obtained in a different analysis using slightly different methodology and the duplicate samples analyzed differed by as much as 30%, so differences between samples of less than $2\times$ are unlikely to be significant.

^bThe mesh size is the size sieve the crumb rubber was collected on, so the samples contain particles between the mesh size of the sieve above it in the stack and the mesh size of the sieve that the material did not go through. The 14-mesh sample (the largest sieve used) contained all of the particles larger than 1.41 mm. The 40-mesh sample contained the particles between 0.420 mm and 1.41 mm. The 80-mesh sample (not analyzed) contained particles between 0.177 and 0.420 mm. The 400-mesh sample contained particles between 0.037 mm and 0.177 mm. The pooled 14- to 80-mesh sample would, therefore, contain all particles greater than 0.177 mm.

Element	Lot CRM12052016 ^b	Lot CRM09132016 ^c
\mathcal{C}	80.0(5.2)	81.9(1.9)
$\mathbf O$	10.5(1.1)	9.67(1.86)
Mg	0.14(0.06)	0.16(0.07)
A ₁	0.39(0.65)	0.11(0.15)
Si	3.60(5.22)	0.17(0.15)
S	2.53(0.67)	3.90(1.21)
C ₁	0.26(0.30)	0.33(0.13)
Ca	0.35(0.64)	0.07(0.08)
Ti	0.01(0.02)	0.00(0.01)
Zn	2.23(1.21)	3.64(1.71)

Table 8. Elemental Composition (Wt %) of Crumb Rubber Fractions by Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy^a

^aAverage (standard deviation) for 10 particles is shown.

^bCrumb rubber lot made from combined mesh sizes 14, 40, and 80.

^cCrumb rubber lot made from mesh size 400.

Simulated Fluid Analytical Technique	Dermal GC-MS Headspace	Dermal GC-MS Liquid	Dermal $LC-MS$	Inhalation GC-MS Headspace	Inhalation $GC-MS$ Liquid	Inhalation LC-MS	Gastric GC-MS Headspace	Gastric GC-MS Liquid	Gastric LC-MS	Ingestion GC-MS Headspace	Ingestion GC-MS Liquid	Ingestion $LC-MS$
2,4,4-Trimethylpentene	0.368	0.00590	\equiv	0.625	0.0141	$=$	0.483	0.00627	\equiv	0.717	0.0360	$\overline{}$
Ethylbenzene	0.00192	0.108	$\overline{}$	0.00142	0.122	$=$	0.00191	0.0286	$\overline{}$	0.00238	0.124	
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.00367	0.0218	$\overline{}$	0.00442	0.0253	\equiv	0.00310	0.0124	$\overline{}$	0.00506	0.0404	$\qquad \qquad -$
Aniline	0.475	0.0159	$\overline{}$	0.408	0.0273	$\overline{}$	0.411	0.0469	$\overline{}$	0.789	0.0937	\equiv
Naphthalene	0.00604	0.0569	$\overline{}$	0.00254	0.0629	\equiv	0.00274	0.0226	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.00573	0.0649	$\qquad \qquad -$
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.00451	0.0195	$\overline{}$	0.00130	0.0207	\equiv	0.00100	0.00730	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.00249	0.0291	$\overline{}$
BHT	0.00815	0.0830	0.576	0.00355	0.164	0.585	0.00275	0.129	0.125	0.00509	0.234	1.20
2-Mercaptobenzothiazole	$\overline{}$	1.70	0.00364	\equiv	1.12	0.00151	\equiv	0.222	0.00290	\equiv	11.2	0.00557
Pyrene	\equiv	0.168	0.102	$\overline{}$	0.291	0.0331	$\overline{}$	0.0166	0.135	$\overline{}$	0.187	0.323
Bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate	$\overline{}$	$\rm ND$	1.11	\equiv	$\rm ND$	$\rm ND$	$=$	${\rm ND}$	4.09	$\overline{}$	ND	1.29
Toluene	0.0458	ND	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.0327	$\rm ND$	$\overline{}$	0.0440	16.1	$\overline{}$	0.477	$\rm ND$	$\qquad \qquad -$
Hexamethylcyclotrisiloxane	2.69	3.91	$\qquad \qquad -$	3.24	3.65	$\qquad \qquad -$	3.29	3.87	$\qquad \qquad -$	3.80	6.68	
m-Xylene	0.00568	0.0360	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.00350	0.0558	\equiv	0.00497	0.0357	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.00754	0.107	$\overline{}$
Styrene	0.00389	0.446	÷,	0.00194	0.481	$=$	0.0323	0.205	\equiv	0.00729	0.667	$\overline{}$
3-Ethyltoluene	${\rm ND}$	0.0243	÷,	ND	0.0327	\equiv	ND	0.0157	\equiv	ND	0.134	\equiv
Benzothiazole	0.216	69.1	ND	0.129	63.7	$\rm ND$	0.137	29.0	38.1	0.186	69.9	0.853
Dicyclohexylamine	\equiv	$\rm ND$	0.322	$\overline{}$	$\rm ND$	0.266	\equiv	0.0908	59.4	\equiv	ND	23.5
Diphenylamine	0.0364	0.0987	0.546	0.0154	0.136	0.211	0.0309	0.0193	0.142	0.0739	0.132	0.509
4-Tert-octylphenol	$\overline{}$	$\rm ND$	$\qquad \qquad -$		$\rm ND$	\equiv	$\overline{}$	ND	$\overline{}$	$\overline{}$	ND	$\qquad \qquad -$
6PPD	\equiv	0.336	ND	$\overline{}$	0.973	$\rm ND$	\equiv	ND	ND	$\overline{}$	0.254	${\rm ND}$
Bisphenol P	$\overline{}$	3.86	0.883	$\overline{}$	2.42	1.61	$\overline{}$	ND	1.45	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\rm ND$	6.68
MIBK	0.0977	0.0383	$-$	0.0567	$\rm ND$	$\overline{}$	0.0814	ND	$\overline{}$	0.232	0.0478	$\overline{}$
Hexanal	0.520	0.253	$\overline{}$	0.557	1.71	$\overline{}$	1.19	0.238	$\qquad \qquad -$	2.34	0.320	$\overline{}$
Cyclohexanone	0.402	3.44	ND	0.457	3.53	ND	0.699	4.38	1.02	6.73	5.06	${\rm ND}$

Table 9. Estimated Blank Biofluid Concentration (Equivalent μg in Extract per g of Crumb Rubber Extracted)^a

aData shown are those estimated under different experimental conditions used as described under methods.

 $bND = No peak detected; - = Standard not seen on this method.$

Simulated Fluid Analytical Technique	Dermal GC-MS Headspace	Dermal GC-MS Liquid	Derma $ILC-$ MS	Inhalation $GC-MS$ Headspace	Inhalation GC-MS Liquid	Inhalation $LC-MS$	Gastric GC-MS Headspace	Gastric GC-MS Liquid	Gastric LC-MS	Ingestion GC-MS Headspace	Ingestion GC-MS Liquid	Ingestion $LC-MS$
2,4,4-Trimethylpentene	ND^{b}	ND	\equiv	$\rm ND$	ND	\equiv	${\rm ND}$	ND	\equiv	$\rm ND$	$\rm ND$	\equiv
Ethylbenzene	ND	ND	$\overline{}$	$\rm ND$	ND	$\overline{}$	$\rm ND$	ND	\equiv	$\rm ND$	ND	$\overline{}$
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	ND	ND	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\rm ND$	ND	$\overline{}$	${\rm ND}$	0.0772 I	$\overline{}$	ND	ND	$\overline{}$
Aniline	4.23 I	2.80	\equiv	14.1	2.07	\equiv	1.54 I	1.06	\equiv	56.0	39.2	$\overline{}$
Naphthalene	ND	ND	$\overline{}$	$\rm ND$	ND	\equiv	${\rm ND}$	ND	$\overline{}$	$\rm ND$	ND	$\overline{}$
1-Methylnaphthalene	$\rm ND$	${\rm ND}$	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\rm ND$	${\rm ND}$	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\rm ND$	0.0386 I	\equiv	ND	$\rm ND$	\equiv
BHT	ND	ND	ND	$\rm ND$	ND	ND	ND	ND	0.727I	0.0254 I	ND	ND
2-Mercaptobenzothiazole	$\qquad \qquad -$	11.0 _I	ND	$\overline{}$	17.6	0.503	$\overline{}$	55.0	5.51	$\overline{}$	41.2 I	0.615
Pyrene	$\overline{}$	ND	ND	\equiv	ND	ND	\equiv	ND	ND	$\overline{}$	ND	ND
Bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate	\equiv	ND	$\rm NDI$	\equiv	ND	1.90	$\qquad \qquad -$	ND	$\rm ND$	$\overline{}$	ND	$\rm ND$
Toluene	0.246I	${\rm ND}$	$\overline{}$	0.278 I	2.17	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.362I	NDI	\equiv	ND	3.77	$\overline{}$
Hexamethylcyclotrisiloxane	NDI	NDI	$\overline{}$	NDI	NDI	$\overline{}$	NDI	NDI	$\overline{}$	NDI	NDI	$\overline{}$
m-Xylene	ND	ND	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\rm ND$	ND	$\overline{}$	ND	ND	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\rm ND$	ND	$\overline{}$
Styrene	ND	ND	\equiv	$\rm ND$	ND	\equiv	ND	ND	\equiv	$\rm ND$	ND	\equiv
3-Ethyltoluene	$\rm ND$	ND	\equiv	$\rm ND$	$\rm ND$	$\overline{}$	ND	ND	$\overline{}$	$\rm ND$	$\rm ND$	$\overline{}$
Benzothiazole	14.5	NDI	34.7	29.6	$\rm NDI$	77.9	26.6	$\mathop{\rm NDI}\nolimits$	380 I	27.8	NDI	171
Dicyclohexylamine	\equiv	ND	47.4	\equiv	18.7	218	$\overline{}$	ND	387 I	$\overline{}$	7.26	385
Diphenylamine	${\rm ND}$	ND	ND	$\rm ND$	ND	$\rm ND$	ND	ND	ND	$\rm ND$	ND	ND
4-tert-Octylphenol	$\qquad \qquad -$	ND	$\overline{}$	\equiv	ND	$\qquad \qquad -$	\equiv	ND	\equiv	$\overline{}$	ND	$\overline{}$
6PPD	\equiv	${\rm ND}$	ND	\equiv	ND	ND	$\qquad \qquad -$	26.3	ND	$\overline{}$	1.79 I	ND
Bisphenol P	$\overline{}$	NDI	ND	$\overline{}$	NDI	NDI	$\qquad \qquad \longleftarrow$	ND	NDI	$\overline{}$	ND	NDI
MIBK	22.0	2.83	$\overline{}$	8.52	3.40	$\overline{}$	0.496I	3.28	$\overline{}$	1.63I	2.32	\equiv
Hexanal	ND	ND	$\qquad \qquad -$	ND	NDI	$\qquad \qquad -$	NDI	ND	\equiv	NDI	ND	\equiv
Cyclohexanone	6.09	$\mathop{\rm NDI}$	$\rm ND$	3.91 I	$\mathop{\rm NDI}\nolimits$	$\rm ND$	11.4	$\rm NDI$	NDI	$\mathop{\rm NDI}\nolimits$	$\mathop{\rm NDI}\nolimits$	12.2

Table 10. Estimated Bioaccessible Constituent Concentration (μg in Extract per g of Crumb Rubber Extracted)^a

^aData shown are those estimated under different experimental conditions used as described under methods.

 $b_{\text{ND}} = 3 \times b$ lank and blank response small (<20 ng/mL); NDI = <3 × blank and blank response large (>20 ng/mL); Number and I = >3 × blank but blank response large (>10% on Sample Response); $-$ = Standard not seen on this method.

Chemical and Physical Characterization of Recycled Tire Crumb Rubber

Figure 1. Representative Optical Micrographs of Two Crumb Rubber Regions

Chemical and Physical Characterization of Recycled Tire Crumb Rubber

Figure 2. Representative Scanning Electron Micrographs of the Cut Surfaces of Four Dissected Crumb Rubber Grains

Figure 3. Representative Thermogram from Thermo Gravimetric Analysis of Crumb Rubber

Figure 4. Comparison of GC–MS Chromatograms at Varying Incubation Temperatures in Headspace GC–MS Analysis: (A) Full Scale (B) Expanded Scale

Figure 5. GC–MS Spectra for Methyl Isobutyl Ketone: (A) Standard Spectrum, (B) Crumb Rubber Sample Spectrum, and (C) Library Spectrum

 $\mathbf A$

Figure 6. Comparison of GC–MS Chromatograms of Crumb Rubber Following Extraction with Various Solvents: (A) Full- and (B) Expanded-Scale Chromatograms, and (C) Blank Solvents

Figure 7. GC–MS Chromatogram of Crumb Rubber Following Extraction with Water

Figure 8. GC–MS Spectra for the n-(1,3-Dimethylbutyl)-N'-phenyl-p-phenylenediamine (6PPD): (A) Standard Spectrum, (B) Crumb Rubber Sample Spectrum, and (C) Library Spectrum

Figure 9. LC–MS Total Ion Chromatograms of Ethanol Extract of Crumb Rubber: Comparison of Blank-Subtracted Extract of Crumb Rubber, (A) Positive Ion Mode and (B) Negative Ion Mode

Figure 10. Comparison of Headspace GC–MS Chromatograms of Various Crumb Rubber Fractions and Unsieved Bulk Material Following Incubation at 100C: (A) Full- and (B) Expanded-Scale Chromatograms

Cloud Plot 177 features with p-value ≤ 0.05

Figure 11. Cloud Plot of GC–MS Non-Targeted Data Showing 177 Significantly Different Features Between Various Crumb Rubber Fractions

Each peak in the chromatogram is associated with a mass-to-charge ratio, retention time, fold change between different samples, p*-*value, and relative intensity. A cloud plot, which is a visualization of this multidimensional data to facilitate compound identification and data interpretation, identifying 177 significantly different spectral features is shown. The cloud plot shows all chromatograms overlaid along the x-axis based on the retention time and red circles at each mass-to-charge ratio (y-axis) that met the significance criteria (with size of the circle showing the relative difference between the samples).

Figure 12. Principal Component Analysis Scores Plots of GC–MS Non-Targeted Data Comparing Various Crumb Rubber Fractions: (A) Using Mass Fragments (177 Features) and (B) Using Individual Peaks

Individual data point reflects a single sample.

Figure 13. Hierarchical Cluster Analysis of GC–MS Non-Targeted Data Comparing Various Crumb Rubber Fractions Using Individual Peaks

Data from individual replicates are shown.

Figure 14. Headspace GC–MS Chromatograms at 100C Incubation for Crumb Rubber Extracts Using Simulated Ingestion Fluid Extract and Corresponding Method Blanks

Due to the large number of analytes, each sample was injected three times with a subset of analytes in each run.

Figure 15. GC–MS Liquid Injection Chromatograms for Crumb Rubber Extracts Using Simulated Ingestion Fluid Extract and Corresponding Method Blanks

To keep the mass spectrometer cycle time short enough to generate a sufficient number of data points to improve sensitivity, the samples and blanks were injected three times, each time with a different set of SIM ions monitored (SIM ion Sets 1 to 3) as shown in the figure.

Figure 16. LC–MS Chromatograms for Crumb Rubber Extracts Using Simulated Ingestion Fluid Extract and Corresponding Method Blank

Appendix A. Individual and Mixtures of Standards Procured to Identify Crumb Rubber Constituents

Tables

Table A-1. Individual Standards Procured^a

a Information from the vendors certificate of analysis.

 $b1$ = Headspace GC/MS Characterization, 2 = Liquid Injection GC/MS Characterization, 3 = LC/MS Characterization, 4 = Bioaccessibility and Size Fractionation Analyses.

^aSee Tables A-3 through A-13 for composition of each mixture.^bInformation from the vendors certificate of analysis.

 c_1 = Headspace GC/MS Characterization, 2 = Liquid Injection GC/MS Characterization, 3 = LC/MS Characterization, 4 = Bioaccessibility and Size Fractionation Analyses.

Table A-3. EPA VOC Mix 1 Components

Table A-4. EPA VOC Mix 2 Components

Compound	Lot No.	CAS No.	Analytical Conc. (µg/mL)
1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropropane	LB06608	$96 - 12 - 8$	2008.7
1,2-Dibromoethane	LB42792	106-93-4	2000.0
1,2-Dichloroethane	LB74294	107-06-2	2005.7
1,2-Dichloropropane	LC14320	78-87-5	2030.8
1,3-Dichloropropane	LC10811	142-28-9	2025.3
1,1-Dichloropropene	LC11148	563-58-6	1837.7
$cis-1,3$ -Dichloroprepene	LB96292	10061-01-5	2044.2
<i>trans-1,3-Dichloropropene</i>	LC11733	$10061 - 02 - 6$	2004.4
Hexachlorobutadiene	LB75566	$87 - 68 - 3$	2006.7
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	LC14810	630-20-6	2017.2
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	LB51327	79-34-5	2052.4
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	LB87978	$79-00-5$	1993.0
Trichloroethene	LB56674	$79-01-6$	1977.5
1,2,3-Trichloropropane	LB82841	$96 - 18 - 4$	2016.0

Table A-5. EPA VOC Mix 3 Mix Components

Table A-6. EPA VOC Mix 4 Mix Components

Table A-7. EPA VOC Mix 5 Mix Components

Compound	Lot No.	CAS No.	Analytical Conc. $(\mu g/mL)$
Bromomethane	LB22203	74-83-9	2030
Chloroethane	LB55667	$75-00-3$	2029
Chloromethane	LB64986	74-87-3	2063
Dichlorodifluoromethane	LB68837	$75 - 71 - 8$	1867
Trichlorofluoromethane	LA91320	$75-69-4$	2086
Vinyl Chloride	LB66643	$75-01-4$	2031

Table A-8. EPA VOC Mix 6 Mix Components

Table A-9. Phthalates in Methanol Components

^aSeparate lot numbers for constituents not provided.

Compound	Lot No.	CAS No.	Analytical Conc. (µg/mL)
n-Decane	LC07947	$124 - 18 - 5$	1025.3
n-Docosane	LC11073	629-97-0	1018.5
n-Dodecane	LC08158	112-40-3	1025.1
n-Eicosane	LB97320	112-95-8	1016.7
n-Heneicosane	LB85393	629-94-7	1017.1
n-Heptacosane	LC11618	593-49-7	1015.7
n-Heptadecane	LC12302	629-78-7	1023.6
n-Heptane	LC07614	142-82-5	1028.0
n-Hexacosane	LC11398	630-01-3	1016.8
n-Hexadecane	LC02125	544-76-3	1021.0
n-Nonacosane	LC08881	630-03-5	1012.7
n-Nonadecane	LB30980	629-92-5	1018.1
n-Nonane	LC00219	111-84-2	1026.5
n-Octacosane	LB95341	630-02-4	1018.8
n-Octadecane	LB89629	593-45-3	1019.6
n-Octane	LB63797	111-65-9	1028.1
n-Pentacosane	LC15080	629-99-2	1016.8
n-Pentadecane	LC08640	629-62-9	1022.8
n-Tetracosane	LC13242	$646 - 31 - 1$	1018.9
n-Tetradecane	LC15053	629-59-4	1019.8
n-Triacontane	LC07823	638-68-6	1019.1
n-Tricosane	LB36889	638-67-5	1018.3
n-Tridecane	LC14314	629-50-5	1022.2
n-Undecane	LC08959	1120-21-4	1025.2

Table A-10. C7–C30 Saturated Alkanes

Table A-11. Multicomponent Alcohol Mix-100

Table A-12. PAH Analyte Mix

^aSeparate lot numbers for constituents not provided.

Table A-13. EPA 610 PAH Mix

Appendix B. Potential Crumb Rubber Constituents Identified in the Literature and Initial Screening Analyses

Table B-1. Potential Constituents in Crumb Rubber Based on Literature^a and Initial Screening

Chemical and Physical Characterization of Recycled Tire Crumb Rubber

Chemical and Physical Characterization of Recycled Tire Crumb Rubber

^aFor references used please refer to Table 1 in Perkins et al.¹.

Appendix C. Additional Constituents of Crumb Rubber Identified by Various Techniques

Table C-1. Constituents of Crumb Rubber in Methylene Chloride Extract Identified by GC–MS with Low Confidence^a

a Identification of constituents was done with retention time and a partial mass spectral match with a standard, a 30–84% match with a library reference spectrum, or both.

b Indicates a 30–84% match with a library reference spectrum.

aNo peak for the molecular ion or with a library match exceeding 30%.

Appendix D. Settings Used in XCMS Software

The XCMS software can be found online here: [https://xcmsonline.scripps.edu.](https://xcmsonline.scripps.edu/) --XCMSOnline version 2.3.0 XCMS version 1.47.3 CAMERA version 1.26.0 --General parameters Polarity positive Retention time format minutes 2. Feature detection method : matchedFilter fwhm 15 snthresh 3 max 100 step 0.5 steps 2 mzdiff 0.5 Feature detection results : 26sep17-04.cdf [Unsieved] --> 176 Features. 26sep17-03.cdf [Unsieved] --> 204 Features. 26sep17-05.cdf [14_Mesh] --> 176 Features. 26sep17-06.cdf [14_Mesh] --> 177 Features. 26sep17-08.cdf [40_Mesh] --> 176 Features. 26sep17-07.cdf [40_Mesh] --> 186 Features. 26sep17-11.cdf [400_Mesh] --> 169 Features. 26sep17-12.cdf [400_Mesh] --> 163 Features. 26sep17-10.cdf [Pooled_14-80_Mesh] --> 155 Features. 26sep17-09.cdf [Pooled_14-80_Mesh] --> 142 Features. 3. Retention time correction method : peakgroups Initial grouping : ignore sample class TRUE Initial grouping : bw 3 Initial grouping : mzwid 0.5 Initial grouping : minfrac 1 Initial grouping : minsamp 1 missing 1 extra 1 smooth loess family gaussian 4. Grouping method : density bw 10 mzwid 0.5 minfrac 0.5 minsamp 1 5. FillPeaks 6. Diffreport classes Unsieved classes 14_Mesh classes 40_Mesh

```
classes 400_Mesh 
      classes Pooled_14-80_Mesh 
      statistical test ANOVA parametric
      statistics.threshold.pvalue 0.05
      statistics.diffReport.value into
Finished Running Statistical tests
7. Additional Plots & Statistics 
     Running mummichog
     Printing MDS plot
     Printing static PCA and Select Scaling plot
8. Annotation (isotopes & adducts)
      featureAnnotation.CAMERA.annotate isotopes 
      featureAnnotation.CAMERA.mzabs 0.25 
      featureAnnotation.CAMERA.ppm 100 
      featureAnnotation.CAMERA.sigma 6 
      featureAnnotation.CAMERA.perfwhm 0.6 
      featureAnnotation.CAMERA.maxcharge 3 
      featureAnnotation.CAMERA.maxiso 4 
      featureAnnotation.CAMERA.intensity into 
9. Putative ID's (METLIN)
      identification.METLIN.ppm 100 
      identification.METLIN.adducts M+H
```
Appendix E. Bioaccessibility Studies

aGastric only ingestion phase consisted of extraction with simulated saliva followed by simulated gastric fluid. Total ingestion consisted of simulated saliva followed by simulated gastric fluid and then simulated intestinal fluid.

National Toxicology Program

NTP Central Data Managment, MD K2-05 National Insitute of Enviromental Health Sciences P.O. Box 12233 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

http://ntp.niehs.nih.gov

ISSN 2473-4756