Oil-Spill Identification by Gas Chromatography– Mass Spectrometry

A. Pavlova and D. Papazova

Refining and Petrochemistry Institute, Analytical Department, LUKOIL-NEFTOCHIM-BOURGAS JSC, 8104 Bourgas, Bulgaria

Abstract

Two approaches are proposed for the identification of a contaminant caused by the spilling of oil or oil products in water. A capillary gas chromatography (CGC)-mass spectrometry (MS) method for oil spill identification is applied. The presented approaches describe the use of MS data of 18 selective ions of spilled product and the probable pollutant. The spill identification is accomplished on the bases of a quantitative comparison between the ion chromatograms of the samples taken from the probable pollutant and from the spill itself. The other approach is made by chemometric treatment of complete CGC-MS data.

Introduction

Crude oil and its waste pollutions in developed industrial countries are widely distributed. They form up to 30–40% of common water pollution. The scale of the oil problems ranks highly along with those of nitrogen, sulphur, chlorine, and phosphorous (1).

The pollution of soil and bodies of water by emergency oil spills is another substantial problem. The quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the available components of spilled oil (such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, *n*-alkanes, isoprenoids, etc.) could be useful in establishing probable ways of loss and transformation of oil hydrocarbons in various sites of the environment. An adequate comparison between the chemical composition and the compound concentrations in the spilled oil and the compound concentrations in the potential source can be used for identification goals.

The modern oil spill identification methods include gas chromatography (GC) (2–4), GC–mass spectrometry (MS) (3,5–12), infrared spectroscopy (13,14), and fluorescent spectroscopy (15). Of these methods, capillary GC (CGC) with flame ionization detection is the most wide spread (4,16,17). This method is fast, intelligent, and in most cases provides enough information for the elimination of many of the potential pollution sources.

However, when the GC information is not sufficient for an unambiguous conclusion about the identity between the spill and the potential source, it is necessary to give more proof using an additional analytical method.

The task of the present study is to suggest two approaches for

oil spill identification in seawater by means of complete GC–MS analysis and chemometric treatment of data. The spill identification is accomplished on the basis of a comparison between the mass chromatograms of samples taken from the probable pollutant and from the spill itself.

Experimental

Crude oil samples

Six different crude oil samples (from three different Russian oils: Novorosijski, Bozachinski, and Iranian heavy oil) have been analyzed with regard to the distribution of *n*-alkanes, isoprenoids, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and their alkyl-homologues, and biomarker compounds (hopanes and steranes). The sampling

Table I. Selective Ions									
Compounds	Group	m/z	C _n interval						
Norhopanes	А	177	13–36						
Hopanes	А	191	13–36						
Methylhopanes	А	205	13–36						
14α (H)steranes	А	217	16–32						
14β (H)steranes	А	218	14–32						
Alkanes	В	113	13-36						
Alkanes and acyclic isoprenoids	В	183	13–36						
Hopanes	В	191	13–36						
C ₂ -Naphthalenes	В	156	13–15						
C ₃ -Naphthalenes	В	170	14–16						
C ₄ -Naphthalenes	В	184	15–17						
Hopanes	С	191	16–36						
Phenanthrene, anthracene	С	178	16–20						
C ₁ -Phenanthrenes	С	192	17–19						
C ₂ -Phenanthrenes	С	206	19–21						
C ₃ -Phenanthrenes	С	220	19–22						
Hopanes	D	191	16-36						
Dibenzothiopene	D	184	16–18						
C ₁ -Dibenzothiopenes	D	198	17–19						
C ₂ -Dibenzothiopenes	D	212	17–20						
C ₃ -Dibenzothiopenes	D	226	19–22						

of different oil-spill samples has been made according to the Nordtest Method NT CHEM 001 (16) and ASTM D 4489-85 (17).

CGC-MS

CGC–MS has been carried out by means of an HP 5890-II series GC connected to a mass selective detector (MSD) 5970 (Hewlett-Packard, Palo Alto, CA). The system control and the data acquisition have been executed by an HP 59970 ChemStation (Hewlett-Packard). The MSD was operated in selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode, which allowed for the study of the ions that were selective for the previously mentioned compounds with respect to the identification goals.

A quartz capillary column (25-m × 0.32-mm × 0.52-µm film Ultra-2) was used. The GC operation conditions were as follow: carrier gas, helium (1.4 mL/min); and injector and detector temperature, 300°C. The temperature program was 0 min at 90°C, then ramped to 270°C at 6°C/min, and held for 30 min at 270°C. The injected quantity was 1 µL of 2% volume solution in tetra-chloromethane of the spill sample. The selective ions that are characteristic of the different compound types were chosen. Four groups of compounds (namely, A, B, C, and D) were created. Additionally, the ions were distributed into 14 C_n intervals (Table I). For example, the interval C_n 13–15 indicates that the peaks eluted between *n*-C₁₃H₂₈ to *n*-C₁₅H₃₂ (i.e., the retention times of the respective *n*-alkanes in the mass spectrograms were used as bench marks for certain C_n interval fixation.

Results and Discussion

Method validation

The validity of the analytical method by laboratory studies using standards and samples has been verified. The standards contain target compounds like *n*-alkanes and isoprenoids, naphthalenes, phenanthrenes, and dibenzothiophenes in the range of 0.1 up to 30% in *n*-hexane. It has been proven that the intensity of the ions is linearly related to the standard concentrations. The ions intensity used in the calculations was a result of four consectuive sample analyses that provided data about the quantitative presence of different types of compounds. The quantitative determination of each ion in the obtained mass spetrograms was made by normalization. The spilled sample was Russian crude oil. Parameters of CGC–MS method validation have been shown in Table II.

Oil-spill identification

Quantitative comparisons of the groups

The highest repeatability of 1.9% was accepted to be the maximum admissible difference in parallel determinations of all ions. In case the absolute differences in the concentrations comparing the spill sample and the probable pollutant were higher than \pm 1.9%, then the compared samples were nonidentical. The identity of the compared samples spill-probable pollutant are illustrated in Figure 1. In this case, the difference in concentrations was less than \pm 1.9%.

Table II. Method Validation Parameters of the Ion Contents by CGC–MS Analysis

					lon <i>m</i> /z				
Parameter	113	183	156	170	205	177	218	217	191
SD of amounts (%)	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.6
%RSD	2.0	4.1	1.0	2.6	4.1	5.7	7.8	9.2	12.0
Calculated range (%)	3–8	3–16	3–25	2-20	2–7	8–32	3–18	6–21	2–1.
LOQ	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.6	2.1	1.8	2.1	1.8
Repeatability (%)	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.6	1.9	1.7	1.9	1.7
* Al-lana datiana CD atau				·		2 (D)			

Chemometric treatment of GC–MS data

This approach allowed for comparison against five summarized characteristic parameters. These parameters were carriers of valuable information for oil spill identification and extremely powerful tools for oil differentiation. These were the area ratio of n-C₁₇/pristane, n-C₁₈/phytane, pristane/ phytane, Σn -alkanes/ Σi -alkanes, and Σ odd nalkanes/ Σ even n-alkanes. Table III shows that the data of these are ratios for the analyzed crude oil on the basis of detection m/z 113 and 183 and their repeatabilities. It has been established that crude oils differ against two or more parameters. The most different is the Bozachinski crude oil,

The second of th	Table III. Summary for Co	mparison of Different Cru	de Oil Samples on the Basis	Detection of <i>m</i> / <i>z</i> 113 and 183
--	---------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	--

	Repeatability*		Iranian crude oil-1		Russian crude oil-1		Russian crude oil-2		Russian crude oil-3		Novorosjiski crude oil		Bozachinski crude oil	
Parameter	<i>m/z</i> 113	<i>m/z</i> 183	<i>m/z</i> 113	<i>m/z</i> 183	<i>m/z</i> 113	<i>m/z</i> 183	<i>m/z</i> 113	<i>m/z</i> 183	<i>m/z</i> 113	<i>m/z</i> 183	<i>m/z</i> 113	<i>m/z</i> 183	<i>m/z</i> 113	<i>m/z</i> 183
Σ <i>n</i> -alkanes														
Σ <i>i</i> -alkanes	0.08	0.06	2.60	0.93	2.60	0.85	2.40	0.99	2.50	0.99	2.50	0.94	1.30	0.56
<i>n</i> -C ₁₇ /pristane	0.06	0.03	0.87	0.41	0.92	0.44	0.84	0.43	0.80	0.39	0.81	0.45	0.41	0.33
pristane/phytane	0.03	0.06	1.08	1.95	0.96	1.75	1.08	1.76	1.31	2.33	1.12	1.73	1.22	2.43
<i>n</i> -C ₁₈ /phytane	0.03	0.06	0.93	0.65	0.87	0.64	0.83	0.67	1.02	0.78	0.92	0.73	0.50	0.49
Σ odd <i>n</i> -alkanes														
Σ even <i>n</i> -alkanes	0.03	0.03	0.90	1.22	0.88	0.96	0.88	1.22	0.90	1.20	0.88	0.95	0.89	1.37
* <i>n</i> = 4.														

which shows a difference in four of the characteristic parameters for m/z 113 and in all five for m/z 183.

The GC–MS data present the difference of the Bozachinski crude oil to the rest of the analyzed crude oils with regard to the content of isoprenoids i-C₁₆H₃₄, i-C₁₈H₃₈ (norpristane), i-C₁₉H₄₀ (pristane) and i-C₂₀H₄₂ (phytane) (m/z 113 and 183), C₂-naph-thalenes (m/z 156), dibenzothiophene (m/z 184), C₁-dibenzothiophenes (m/z 198), and C₃-phenanthrenes (m/z 220).

The present work demonstrates that efficient oil-spill identification can be accomplished with the use of characteristic parameters capable of providing high specificity within the oil samples.



Figure 1. GC–MS-extracted ion profiles of norhopanes, hopanes, methyl hopanes, stearances, and monoaromatic stearanes in oil samples (DG1A and DG2A) at *m*/*z* 177, 191, 205, 217, 218, and 253. Application of probable match samples.

Conclusion

The proposed GC–MS approaches, when applied to crude oilspill identification, possess good demarcating ability and high strength of identification, and they provide sufficient and important information regarding the structure of different compound types that belong to the spill and the probable pollutant.

References

- 1. U.M. Arsky. *Likvidasya razlivov nefty*. Informsouz, Moscow, Russia, 1995, p. 2.
- Z. Wang, M. Fingas, and K. Li. Fractionation of a light crude oil and identification and quantitation of aliphatic, aromatic, and biomarker compounds by GC–FID and GC–MS, part I. J. Chromatogr. Sci. 32: 361–66 (1994).
- Z. Wang, M. Fingas, and K. Li. Fractionation of a light crude oil and identification and quantitation of aliphatic, aromatic, and biomarker compounds by GC–FID and GC–MS, part II. J. Chromatogr. Sci. 32: 367–82 (1994).
- ASTM D 3328-82. Standard Test Methods for Comparison of Waterborne Petroleum Oils by Gas Chromatography, vol. 11.02, Director Standards Publications, Easton, MD, 1990, p. 268.
- Z. Wang, M. Fingas, and G. Sergy. Study of 22-year-old Arrow oil samples using biomarker compounds by GC/MS. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 28: 1733–46 (1994).
- M.I. Badawy, I.S. Al-Mujainy, and M.D. Hernandez. Petroleumderived hydrocarbons in water, sediment and biota from the Mina al Fahal coastal waters. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 26: 457–60 (1993).
- F.D. Hostettlet and K.A. Kvenvolden. Geochemical changes in crude oil spilled from the Exxon Valdez supertanker into Prince William Sound, Alaska. Org. Geochem. 21: 927–36 (1994).
- J.K. Volkman, D.G. Holdsworth, G.P. Neill, and H.J. Bavor, Jr. Identification of natural, anthropogenic and petroleum hydrocarbons in aquatic sediments. *Sci. Total Environ.* **112**: 203–19 (1992).
- Z. Wang, M. Fingas, and G. Sergy. Chemical characterization of crude oil residues from an arctic beach by GC/MS and GC/FID. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 29: 2622–31 (1995).
- Z. Wang and M. Fingas. Use of methyldibenzothiophenes as markers for differentiation and source identification of crude and weathered oils. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 29: 2842–49 (1995).
- Z. Wang and M. Fingas. Study of the effects of weathering on the chemical composition of a light crude oil using GC/MS and GC/FID. *J. Microcolumn Sep.* 7(6): 617–39 (1995).
- Z. Wang and M. Fingas. Differentiation of the source of spilled oil and monitoring of the oil weathering process using gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. J. Chromatogr. A 712: 321–43 (1995).
- Z. Ge, C.W. Brown, and J.J. Alberts. Infrared fiber optic sensor for petroleum. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 29: 878–82 (1995).
- ASTM D 3414-85. Standard Test Method for Comparison of Waterborne Petroleum Oils by Infrared Spectroscopy, vol. 11.02, 1990, p. 277.
- ASTM D 3650-82. Standard Test Method for Comparison of Waterborne Petroleum Oils by Fluoresceencee Analysis, vol. 11.02, Director Standards Publications, Easton, MD, 1990, p. 263.
- Nordtest Method NT CHEM 001. Oil Spill Identification, 2nd ed. Approved 1991–02.
- ASTM D 4489-85. Standard Practices for Sampling of Waterborne Oils, vol. 11.02, Director Standard Publications, Easton, MD, 1990, p. 295.

Manuscript accepted April 10, 2003.