Seasonal lead release to drinking water and the effect of aluminum

Benjamin F. Trueman,^{*,1} Aaron Bleasedale-Pollowy,¹ Javier A. Locsin,¹ Jessica L. Bennett,¹ Wendy H. Krkošek,² and Graham A. Gagnon¹

¹Centre for Water Resources Studies, Department of Civil & Resource Engineering, Dalhousie University, 1360 Barrington St., Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3H 4R2

²Halifax Water, 450 Cowie Hill Rd., Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, PO Box 8388, B3K 5M1

*Corresponding author

E-mail: benjamin.trueman@dal.ca

Tel: 902.494.6070

Fax: 902.494.3105

Abstract

Lead is a neurotoxin and an environmental contaminant. Many jurisdictions require that it be monitored in drinking water, especially where lead plumbing remains in use. But seasonal variation in lead concentrations can bias monitoring programs if it is not understood and accounted for. Here, we describe an unexpected pattern in lead release to drinking water, identified through point-of-use sampling. The median lead concentration representing paired first-draw water samples—collected in multiple years—was 46% lower in October compared to February. Seasonal variation in orthophosphate, pH, and alkalinity accounted for at least some of this pattern and predicted lead solubility in October was 76% of that in February. But seasonally varying aluminum may also have been a factor; as a supplement to the field study, we evaluated the effects of aluminum residual, temperature, and orthophosphate concentration on lead release from lead coupons. Increasing the orthophosphate concentration from 0–1 mg L⁻¹ decreased lead release by 34%, and increasing water temperature from 4–21°C increased lead release by 120%. Increasing the aluminum concentration from 20–500 µg L⁻¹ increased lead release by 41% and modified the

effect of orthophosphate, rendering it less effective in controlling lead release. We attributed this to a decrease in the concentration of soluble ($<0.45\ \mu\text{m}$) phosphorus with increasing aluminum and an accompanying increase in particulate lead and phosphorus ($>0.45\ \mu\text{m}$). These data suggest that residual aluminum from coagulation may interfere with orthophosphate corrosion control, especially when the treatment process does not allow the pH of minimum aluminum hydroxide solubility to be targeted.

Graphical abstract

Introduction

Lead is a contaminant of concern in drinking water due to its well-documented health effects.^{1,2} Many jurisdictions require that it be monitored, but seasonal variation in lead release can bias monitoring programs if it is not understood and accounted for. Temperature-driven seasonal lead release has been described in previous work,³ and sampling guidance is often designed to control for temperature effects.⁴

But water quality parameters other than temperature can also contribute to seasonal lead concentrations, and aluminum is an important example. Aluminum concentrations can vary seasonally when water is treated to remove particles and dissolved organic matter by coagulation. This is because the solubility of the aluminum hydroxide ($\text{Al}(\text{OH})_3$) that precipitates during coagulation with aluminum salts is highly temperature-dependent. Below the solubility minimum at pH 6–7,⁵ solubility decreases with increasing temperature, and above pH 6–7, solubility increases with temperature.⁶ Treatment facilities that coagulate below the pH of minimum solubility, then, tend to see high residual aluminum in winter, while facilities that coagulate at alkaline pH may see high aluminum in summer.⁷

This in turn may influence lead release, but the complex environment of a drinking water distribution system—and the possibility of multiple competing mechanisms—make it difficult to predict aluminum’s net effect. It might precipitate at the scale-water interface as a hydroxide or silicate mineral that slows lead diffusion to the bulk water,^{8–11} but this is controversial.^{12,13} It might also precipitate as a phosphate mineral, diminishing the activity of orthophosphate and preventing formation of hydroxylpyromorphite ($\text{Pb}_5(\text{PO}_4)_3\text{OH}$) and other low-solubility phases that control lead release.^{5,11,14–18} Aluminum precipitation that results in suspended particles or colloids may generate a mobile sink for lead, facilitating lead transport from source to tap.^{19–21}

Here, we consider aluminum and other seasonally varying water quality parameters as drivers of seasonal lead release patterns. We identify the possible origins of periodic lead release in the distribution system of Halifax, a mid-sized North American city, and we investigate a subset of these possible drivers using a lead coupon study. We find that interactions between orthophosphate and aluminum have an important effect on lead release and that seasonal variation in aluminum concentrations may play a key role in observed lead concentrations.

Materials and methods

Field sample collection

Point-of-use corrosion control monitoring

Samples were collected at residential (1 L volume) and non-residential (0.25 L volume) sites in the distribution system after a minimum 8 hour stagnation period (Table 1).²² Samples were collected over three years (2010–2012), representing two October and two February collection periods. All samples were collected in high-density polyethylene (HDPE) bottles, cleaned by immersion in ~2 M HNO₃ for at least 24 h and rinsed thoroughly with ultrapure water. Aluminum, lead, copper, and phosphorus were determined by ICP-MS (ThermoFisher X series II) according to Standard Method 3125,²³ with reporting limits of 4.0, 0.4, 0.7 and 10 µg L⁻¹, respectively.

Table 1. Data sources and the figures they appear in.

Data source	Analytes	Appears in Figure	Source
Volunteer-collected 1 L flushed samples	Al (total and 0.45 µm-filtered)	2, 4b, 6	Utility data
Plant/distribution system monitoring data	Al, PO ₄ , temperature, alkalinity, pH, orthophosphate product dose	2, 6	Utility data
Volunteer-collected 1 L profile samples	Al, Fe, Pb, via SEC-ICP-MS	4a	doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734
Residential 1 L first-draw and flushed samples	Pb, Cu, pH, temperature, turbidity	3	McIlwain ²² and doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734
Non-residential 0.25 L first-draw and flushed samples	Pb, Cu, pH, temperature, turbidity	3	McIlwain ²² and doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734
Coupon study	Pb, Al, P (total and 0.45 µm-filtered)	5	doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734

Distribution system monitoring

Volunteer residents collected 1 L samples at the point of use according to a fully flushed sampling protocol, as described elsewhere (Table 1).²⁴ We filtered a subset of these

using 0.45 μm membrane filters in a syringe-mounted apparatus, and aluminum was determined in all samples by ICP-MS (see previous subsection).²³ Distribution system monitoring samples were collected by utility staff and analyzed in the field for pH and temperature (Hach PH281 probe). Samples were sent to a third-party accredited laboratory for determination of alkalinity,²⁵ total aluminum,²⁶ and orthophosphate.²⁷

Size-exclusion chromatography

Volunteers collected 1 L samples at the point of use according to a 4 $\times$ 1 L profile sampling protocol with the addition of a flushed sample as litre 5. The protocol is described elsewhere.²⁴ A subset of these samples was analyzed by size-exclusion chromatography with multielement detection, as detailed in a previous publication.²⁰ Briefly, we separated samples on a stationary phase composed of cross-linked agarose and dextran (Superdex 200, 10 $\times$ 300 mm, 13 μm particle size, GE Healthcare) with 50 mM tris-HCl (pH 7.3) as the mobile phase. The flow rate was 0.5 mL min⁻¹ and the injection volume was 212 μL . We monitored ²⁷Al, ⁵⁶Fe, and ²⁰⁸Pb in the column effluent as a function of time by ICP-MS (see *Point-of-use corrosion control monitoring* above). The retention volume of thyroglobulin (669 kDa, Stoke's radius 8.5 nm), indicated in chromatograms as a qualitative point of reference, was monitored as ¹²⁷I. Chromatograms were summarized as the sum of two skewed or exponentially modified Gaussians using the R package *fffprocessr*,²⁸ as described elsewhere.²⁹ R code to reproduce the analysis is included as Supplementary Text S1, the individual chromatograms are shown in Figure S1, and the data are available at doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734.

Coupon study

Preparation of test water

Preparation of test water is summarized in Figure 1. We coagulated untreated source water from the water supply plant with Al₂(SO₄)₃ · 18H₂O (12 mg Al L⁻¹) in a 20 L HDPE plastic container. Immediately after adding the coagulant, water was mixed at

approximately 800 rpm for one minute using a magnetic stirplate. Coagulated water was then mixed for 12.5 minutes each at 600, 500, and 400 rpm. pH was maintained throughout at 6.3 using sodium hydroxide. The flocculated water was allowed to settle overnight, pumped into a separate reservoir, and filtered using a vacuum flask fitted with a $1.5\ \mu\text{m}$ glass-fibre filter membrane.

Figure 1. Summary of test water preparation for the coupon study (created with biorender.com).

This procedure reduced total organic carbon (TOC) to $1.8\ \text{mg L}^{-1}$ (standard deviation $0.02\ \text{mg L}^{-1}$). TOC samples were collected, headspace-free, in 40 mL clear glass vials and preserved with concentrated phosphoric acid to $\text{pH} < 2$. Vials were washed and then baked at 105°C for at least 24 h before use, and TOC was quantified using a Shimadzu TOC-V CPH analyzer.³⁰ A summary of untreated water quality is provided as Table S2.

Filtrate was dosed as needed with H_3PO_4 , $\text{Al}_2(\text{SO}_4)_3 \cdot 18\text{H}_2\text{O}$, and NaHCO_3 ($5\ \text{mg C L}^{-1}$) to achieve the experimental conditions listed in Table S1 (0 or $1\ \text{mg PO}_4\ \text{L}^{-1}$, 0.02 or $0.5\ \text{mg Al L}^{-1}$, 4 or 21°C). The initial pH for all test waters was adjusted to 7.5 with HNO_3 and NaOH . pH was measured using a combination electrode, and the nominal orthophosphate concentration was verified colorimetrically.²⁷

Construction

New lead coupons (Canada Metal North America, Québec, Canada) were cleaned by immersion for 2 minutes in 1.8 M HNO₃ followed by thorough rinsing with ultrapure water. This step was repeated with 40 mM HNO₃; afterward, lead coupons were fastened to the lids of 50 mL polypropylene centrifuge tubes with a silicone sealant.

Corrosion cells were refilled with 50 mL of fresh test water according to the experimental design summarized in Table S1; this volume was chosen to prevent contact with the sealant while minimizing headspace. We completed 42 changes of water before beginning to collect data. Lead in 0.45 μm filtrate agreed reasonably well with predicted equilibrium lead solubility, with a mean absolute error of 8 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ at the low level of aluminum, a temperature of 21°C, and either 0 or 1 mg PO₄ L⁻¹.

Sample collection

After a 24-hour stagnation period, each cell was mixed by inverting five times. Aliquots of 10 mL were then decanted into polypropylene tubes, acidified to pH < 2 with concentrated trace metal grade nitric acid, and held for a minimum of 24 hours before analysis. Separate 10 mL aliquots were filtered, immediately after collection, using 0.45 μm membrane filters in a syringe-mounted apparatus.

X-ray diffraction

We identified crystalline phases in coupon corrosion scale using X-ray diffraction (XRD). Coupons were dried and analyzed without removing scale from the surface. We used a Rigaku Ultima IV X-ray diffractometer with a copper K α radiation source, operated at 35 kV and 30 mA. Scans were acquired over the range 10–70° (2 θ) with a step size of 0.04° and a scan speed of 0.8°min⁻¹. The standard powder diffraction file numbers referenced in the manuscript are listed in Table S3.

X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS)

The elemental composition of corrosion scale was determined by XPS using a Thermo VG Scientific Multilab 2000 instrument. An aluminum X-ray source was used under a high vacuum, and a CLAM4 Hemispherical Analyzer with a multichannel detector was used to detect photoelectrons. Survey scans were acquired at a pass energy of 50 eV with a step size of 1.0 eV, and high-resolution scans were acquired at a pass energy of 30 eV with a step size of 0.1 eV. Binding energy was calibrated using the C 1s spectral line, due to adventitious carbon, at 285 eV.

Data analysis

We used R for data analysis and visualization,³¹ along with a collection of widely used contributed packages.^{32–35}

Paired comparisons of lead levels at the point of use

Paired measurements collected at the point of use in October and February were compared using the signed-rank test with a Pratt adjustment for pairs of equal or indistinguishable values, using the *cen_signedranktest()* function in the *NADA2* package.³⁶ (Indistinguishable values arose here from left-censoring of lead concentrations.) Duplicate measurements at sites within a single group were averaged; when one was observed and one left-censored, the duplicate measurements were re-censored at 1.01 times the observed value. Multiplicative differences between paired groups were estimated as the ratio of medians.^{37,38} R code required to reproduce the analysis is provided as Supplementary Text S2, and data are available at doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734.

Equilibrium lead solubility modeling

We modeled equilibrium lead solubility using *tidyphreeqc*,³⁹ an R interface for PHREEQC,⁴⁰ and *pbcusol*,⁴¹ an extension of *tidyphreeqc*. Thermodynamic data relevant to the lead-water-carbonate-orthophosphate system were sourced from Schock et al.⁴²

(Table S4), and activity coefficients were calculated as described in Parkhurst and Appelo.⁴⁰ Model inputs were pH, orthophosphate, and dissolved inorganic carbon concentration, calculated from pH and alkalinity.⁴³ We assumed that lead solubility was controlled by hydroxylpyromorphite, a mineral that has been identified in lead pipe corrosion scale recovered from the distribution system.⁴⁴

While there were not enough distribution system data to include aluminum in the model, we calculated hydroxylpyromorphite solubility on a grid of orthophosphate and aluminum concentrations at pH 7.5 and 5 mg L⁻¹ of dissolved inorganic carbon. Thermodynamic data describing variscite (AlPO₄ · 2H₂O) dissolution and two aqueous aluminum-phosphate species were sourced from Roncal-Herrero and Oelkers,⁴⁵ and R code to reproduce the analysis is included as Supplementary Text S3.

Distribution system monitoring data

We fit generalized additive models (equations 1–2)^{46,47} to a compiled dataset comprising fully-flushed residential samples, distribution system monitoring samples, and treated water samples collected at the water supply plant. We restricted our analysis to the period when a nominal orthophosphate concentration of 0.5 mg PO₄ L⁻¹ was dosed to the system (2003–2016, P dosed as a 3:1 ortho:polyphosphate blend). Time series included between 10 and 366 measurements per year.

Generalized additive models included a multi-year trend, a seasonal trend, and an autoregressive error term.⁴⁸ The multi-year trend was estimated using a thin plate regression spline and the seasonal trend using a cyclic cubic regression spline.⁴⁶ We fit separate cyclic splines to orthophosphate data collected at the treatment plant and in the distribution system, and we included a parametric term to model the difference in orthophosphate residual between these two groups. The autoregressive error term was second order in the model fit to the temperature series and continuous-time first-order otherwise. Equation (1) describes the basic model.

$$(1) y = \beta_0 + f_{trend}(t_1) + f_{seasonal}(t_2) + \epsilon$$

In equation (1), y is the response, t_1 is the numeric date, t_2 is the day of the year, β_0 is the intercept, ϵ is the error term, and the $f(t)$ are linear combinations of basis functions (equation 2).

$$(2) f(t) = \sum_{j=1}^k b_j(t) \beta_j$$

In equation (2), β_j is the weight associated with the j th basis function. The weighted basis functions $b_j(t)\beta_j$ comprising each model—and their sums, the fitted values—are shown in Figure S2–S4. While the utility data are confidential, we have included the code used to generate the models in Supplementary Text S4, along with a simulated dataset. Models are further summarized in Table S5; residuals were approximately Gaussian (Figure S5), homoscedastic (Figure S6–S7), and largely free from autocorrelation (Figure S8).

Static corrosion cell data

We fit a linear regression model to the 2^3 factorial coupon study after a natural log transformation of the response, as described in Montgomery.⁴⁹ Model residuals were approximately Gaussian and homoscedastic (Figure S9). A response surface was generated by predicting from the model over a grid of aluminum concentrations, orthophosphate concentrations, and water temperatures. R code to reproduce the results is provided as Supplementary Text S5 and experimental data are available at doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734.

Results and discussion

Seasonal variation in aluminum and orthophosphate

Aluminum levels were strongly seasonal in the distribution system we studied (Figure 2). Median aluminum was highest in February and lowest in July: 182 and 32 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ respectively. The aluminum residual in treated water is generally highest when water

temperature is lowest,²¹ due largely to the inverse temperature dependence of aluminum hydroxide solubility at the median coagulation pH of 5.75.^{6,50,51} Median water temperature in these two months was 5 and 20°C.

Figure 2. (a) Mean alkalinity (as CaCO₃), aluminum, predicted soluble lead, pH, aqueous orthophosphate, and water temperature by date. Due to orthophosphate demand in the distribution system, data are separated by sample location: source (treatment plant) or tap (distribution system). Source and tap are combined in the series representing alkalinity, aluminum, pH, predicted lead, and temperature. The long-term smooth component of the

additive fit to the data is superimposed. **(b)** The seasonal component of each additive model, along with the partial residuals representing the differences between the data and the non-seasonal components of the model, aggregated into weekly means. Both the data and the model are displayed on the transformed scale. Shaded regions represent point-wise 95% confidence intervals on the fitted values.

Orthophosphate also exhibited a seasonal pattern, due primarily to variation in the applied corrosion inhibitor dose (Figure S10). Minimum and maximum orthophosphate concentrations occurred in February and May respectively (130 and $170 \mu\text{g P L}^{-1}$), approximately opposite those of aluminum (Figure 2b). Orthophosphate was 11% lower in the distribution system compared to the treatment plant, as estimated by a parametric term in the generalized additive model (Table S5). Aluminum precipitates with orthophosphate as AlPO_4 ,⁵ which may contribute to this difference and to the seasonal pattern in the distribution system. Alkalinity exhibited a bimodal seasonal pattern, with maxima in March and July and a minimum in December, while seasonal maximum and minimum pH occurred in September and February, respectively.

Seasonal variation in predicted equilibrium lead solubility

Variation in orthophosphate, pH, and alkalinity predicted a complex seasonal pattern in equilibrium lead solubility, with two prominent peaks (Figure 2b). The first occurred in March, corresponding to the minimum seasonal orthophosphate concentration and the first of two seasonal alkalinity maxima. The second occurred in July, corresponding to the second seasonal alkalinity maximum. Both peaks in alkalinity yielded corresponding peaks in calculated dissolved inorganic carbon (Figure S10), and at circumneutral pH, equilibrium solubility increases with dissolved inorganic carbon in the presence of orthophosphate.⁴² Maximum and minimum predicted lead solubility occurred in March and May, respectively, with mean concentrations of 39 and $27 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$.

Periodic variation in observed lead release

Consistent with equilibrium solubility predictions, lead release exhibited periodic—possibly seasonal—variation concurrent with that of aluminum and opposite to that of orthophosphate. We compared lead levels in first-draw samples collected in October

with those measured in February at matched sites and drinking water outlets (Figure 3). Lead release to standing water in October was an estimated 54% of that in February ($p < 0.001$, $n = 134$, signed-rank test). Copper release exhibited a similar trend: its concentration in standing water in October was an estimated 66% of that in February ($p < 0.001$, $n = 134$).

On a percentage basis, differences in lead release were larger than expected based on lead solubility—predicted equilibrium lead concentrations were just 17.7% lower in October compared with February. This discrepancy suggests that factors not captured by the solubility model—particle-generating processes, for instance—were important. Observed differences were probably not due to water temperature: during overnight stagnation seasonal temperature variation is significantly damped,⁵² and October standing sample temperatures were 115% of February sample temperatures ($p < 0.001$, $n = 89$, signed-rank test). If anything, this would tend to increase October lead and copper levels relative to those in February.^{53,54}

Figure 3. Lead, copper, pH, water temperature, and turbidity at seasonally high (February) and low (October) aluminum concentrations (point-of-use samples). Grey lines represent $y = x$, and coloured vertical or horizontal lines represent left-censored lead measurements.

Colloidal aluminum and lead in the distribution system

While variation in equilibrium lead solubility probably explains at least some of the difference between October and February point-of-use lead levels, particle-generating mechanisms are also likely to be important, including partitioning of lead to particulate ($>0.45\ \mu\text{m}$) or colloidal ($<0.45\ \mu\text{m}$) aluminum. Particulate aluminum was seasonal in the distribution system we studied, with the median concentration in October less than half that in February (20 and $48\ \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, respectively, Figure 4b). This is consistent with turbidity in October being 64 and 24% of that in February in stagnant and flushed point-of-use samples, respectively ($p \ll 0.001$ and $\ll 0.001$, $n = 134$ and 32 , signed-rank tests).

Seasonally-varying particulate aluminum concentrations are also consistent with equilibrium aluminum solubility calculations at the expected distribution system water quality conditions. The aluminum hydroxide phases gibbsite ($\gamma\text{-Al(OH)}_3$), diaspore ($\alpha\text{-AlOOH}$), and boehmite ($\gamma\text{-AlOOH}$) are all predicted to precipitate at the seasonally-high total aluminum concentrations, and variscite ($\text{AlPO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$) is predicted to precipitate seasonally at a dose of $0.5\ \text{mg PO}_4\ \text{L}^{-1}$ (Supplementary Text S6).

Also consistent with equilibrium solubility predictions, a fraction of aluminum in $0.45\ \mu\text{m}$ filtrate was colloidal (Figure 4a). This fraction was sized nominally between $17\ \text{nm}$ —the hydrodynamic diameter of thyroglobulin ($19.6\ \text{min.}$ retention time)—and $450\ \text{nm}$ —the pore size at which samples were filtered. Colloids in this size range may have served as a mobile sink for lead, promoting release from corrosion scale. Relative size distributions of lead and aluminum were typically bimodal, with two incompletely resolved peaks representing colloids with different apparent molecular weights. Aluminum co-occurred with lead in at least one of these two fractions in all samples with detectable aluminum peaks (Figure 4 and S1). This is consistent with previous work documenting adsorption of lead to aluminum hydroxides,^{55–57} although the presence of aluminum and lead in distinct but overlapping colloid populations cannot be ruled out completely.

Figure 4. (a) Size-exclusion chromatograms representing the relative size distributions of aluminum, iron, and lead. Size distributions were correlated at high apparent molecular weight ($n = 16$ tap water samples representing 11 homes), and the colloidal fraction shown was sized nominally at 17–450 nm. Intensities have been normalized, baseline-corrected, and summarized as the mean intensity at each retention time. The retention time of thyroglobulin (669 kDa, 17 nm diameter) is indicated by the vertical dashed line. **(b)** Aluminum in fully-flushed residential samples in two size fractions: greater and less than 0.45 μm . Data are aggregated into means by week of the year, and a generalized additive fit to the data with a cyclic cubic regression spline basis is superimposed.

Interaction between aluminum and orthophosphate

Distribution system monitoring data suggest that variation in both aluminum and orthophosphate may have contributed to the seasonal differences in lead release, but it is not clear which factor was more important or to what extent they acted synergistically. We conducted a coupon study to evaluate these factors—along with water temperature—as predictors of lead release. While the effect of orthophosphate on equilibrium solubility is relatively well understood, its interactions with other species to form particles are less well characterized.⁵⁸

As expected, lead release from coupons increased with water temperature. Raising water temperature from 4 to 21°C caused a 120% increase in geometric mean lead release (Figure 5a). That is, $\overline{[Pb]}_{21^\circ\text{C}} / \overline{[Pb]}_{4^\circ\text{C}} - 1 = 1.2$. But while temperature-dependent lead release has been described elsewhere,^{24,59} the solubilities of several common lead minerals do not appear to be temperature-sensitive.⁵³ It is not clear

whether changes in solubility, dissolution, complex formation, or particle mobility are primarily responsible for temperature-driven seasonality.^{24,42,53,59}

Figure 5. (a) Effect estimates generated by the linear model (lead coupon experiment), along with their 95% confidence intervals. **(b)** Predicted lead concentrations generated by applying the linear regression model to a grid of inputs (aluminum, orthophosphate, temperature). **(c)** Median lead and phosphorus in corrosion cells as a function of temperature, aluminum concentration, and orthophosphate dose. Error bars span the interquartile range.

Adding 1 mg PO₄ L⁻¹ accompanied a 34% decrease in total lead release (Figure 5a), while aluminum had the opposite effect; increasing the aluminum concentration from 20 to 500 μg L⁻¹ accompanied a 41% increase in total lead. Adding orthophosphate *and* increasing aluminum concentration accompanied a 61% increase in lead. That is, the

combined effect of aluminum and orthophosphate was larger than would be expected based on the main effect of each factor. This may be due to the formation of particulate aluminum and phosphorus, perhaps as AlPO_4 . Suspended particulate phosphorus would presumably be less available to react with lead in a way that immobilized it at the scale-water interface (Figure 5c and Figure S11). Consistent with this interpretation, orthophosphate demand was lower at the high aluminum level, and particulate lead was greatest at the high aluminum and orthophosphate levels (Figure 5c).

In light of the higher levels of total phosphorus in the water phase at high aluminum concentrations (Figure 5c), aluminum appeared here to interfere with uptake of orthophosphate by corrosion scale. Previous work has also shown that aluminum interferes with orthophosphate control of lead release,¹⁴ and the effect on lead solubility—neglecting particles and surfaces—can be modeled by allowing coprecipitation of aluminum and phosphate (here as variscite, $\text{AlPO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$) in the presence of hydroxylpyromorphite (Figure 6). We applied this model over a grid of aluminum and orthophosphate concentrations (Figure 6a and b) and, neglecting other sources of variation, to the aluminum concentrations measured in the distribution system (Figure 6c).

Figure 6. (a) Predicted lead solubility due to dissolution of hydroxylpyromorphite, evaluated on a grid of orthophosphate and aluminum concentrations at pH 7.3 with 5 mg L⁻¹ of dissolved inorganic carbon. (b) Precipitated variscite, AlPO₄ · 2H₂O, at equilibrium under the same conditions. In (a) and (b), heavy dashed lines represent approximate variscite saturation. (c) Predicted lead solubility by day of the year, using distribution system aluminum data, pH 7.3, 5 mg L⁻¹ of dissolved inorganic carbon, and 0.5 mg PO₄ L⁻¹ as inputs. N.B., one anomalously high record with 0.96 mg Al L⁻¹ is omitted from the plot.

With lead in 0.45 μm filtrate as the response, several effect estimates in the linear model were notably different. Adding orthophosphate, for instance, caused a much larger percentage decrease in filtrate lead levels (78%, Figure 5a). This is consistent with orthophosphate's expected effect on lead solubility, while effective control of particulate lead by orthophosphate requires that lead-phosphate precipitates become immobilized in corrosion scale. Here, P:Pb molar ratios were much greater than one, a threshold that has been noted previously to promote formation of dispersed lead-

phosphate precipitates.⁵⁸ In addition to the effect of aluminum in boosting particulate lead concentrations, the dispersive effect of orthophosphate may be especially pronounced at the relatively low hardness ($3.9 \text{ mg CaCO}_3 \text{ L}^{-1}$, Table S2) characteristic of our experimental water. Orthophosphate-induced dispersion is also enhanced in the presence of humic and fulvic acids.⁵⁸ And while coagulation here would have removed the majority of the hydrophobic acid fraction,⁶⁰ natural organic matter may still have played a role in dispersing particulate lead.⁶¹

In contrast to its effect on total lead release, aluminum decreased lead in filtrate by 21% (Figure 5a, neglecting the aluminum-orthophosphate interaction). This agrees with previous work suggesting that aluminum may promote formation of a diffusion barrier on lead composed of aluminum hydroxide, silicate, or other compounds.¹¹ Alternatively, aluminum may have facilitated partitioning of soluble lead to suspended particles, shifting the size distribution of lead in the test waters.

Corrosion scale

Aluminum was not identified in any crystalline mineral forms by XRD, and the experimental patterns representing coupons exposed to 20 and $500 \mu\text{g Al L}^{-1}$ were similar (Figure 7). As expected, hydroxylpyromorphite formed in the presence of orthophosphate, while hydrocerussite ($\text{Pb}_3(\text{CO}_3)_2(\text{OH})_2$) was identified in scale from all coupons. Massicot ($\beta\text{-PbO}$) was also present in all scale samples, but the intensities of the (111) and (200) peaks at 29.1° and 30.3° , respectively, were not consistent with the standard pattern. This may have been due to preferential orientation of crystallites on the coupon surface.

Figure 7. XRD patterns representing corrosion scale on lead coupons at each treatment combination. Intensities are scaled to a [0, 1] interval in all patterns and standards.

Aluminum was not detectable by XPS in the top few nanometers of corrosion scale exposed to the high level of aluminum (0.5 mg Al L^{-1}) (Figure S12). Thus it is likely that the aluminum content of scale was relatively low, although XPS detection limits for light elements (e.g., Al) in a heavy element matrix (e.g., Pb) tend to be above 1 at. %.⁶² The low surface concentration of aluminum is consistent with our interpretation that aluminum acted primarily by promoting particulate lead formation and limiting the activity of orthophosphate in solution. The apparent effect of aluminum in limiting dissolved lead release in the absence of orthophosphate was relatively small.

Environmental implications

Seasonal variation in orthophosphate, pH, and alkalinity in distributed water predicted an inverse seasonal pattern in equilibrium lead solubility. And while lead release to drinking water followed a similar pattern, seasonal variation in aluminum may have also been a driver. In a supplementary coupon study, aluminum increased lead release. As expected, orthophosphate decreased lead release, but high levels of aluminum and orthophosphate together resulted in greater lead release than would be predicted based on the main effects of orthophosphate and aluminum. These data suggest that treatment facilities applying aluminum-based coagulants without controlling pH to minimize aluminum hydroxide solubility may experience seasonal variation in the performance of orthophosphate-based corrosion inhibitors.

In the distribution system we studied, a recent increase in coagulation pH to 6.2 has decreased the median April aluminum concentration at the treatment plant by a factor of more than four relative to the 2003–2016 study period. At the more recent concentrations, predicted variscite ($\text{AlPO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$) precipitation is minimal ($<1 \mu\text{mol}$), even at a higher orthophosphate dose of $1 \text{ mg PO}_4 \text{ L}^{-1}$. The predicted effect of aluminum on equilibrium lead solubility, then, is also much smaller.

More generally, high aluminum in the distribution system appears to impact orthophosphate control of lead release, making it less effective. We suggest that this interference is due largely to precipitation of aluminum phosphate, which limits the activity of orthophosphate and may provide a surface to which soluble lead can partition, increasing the total lead content of drinking water. This interaction highlights an important connection between corrosion control and the treatment process.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the financial and technical support provided by Halifax Water through the NSERC/Halifax Water Industrial Research Chair program (Grant no. IRCPJ:

349838-16) and the technical support provided by Heather Daurie, Andrew George, Caitlin Sampson, and Halifax Water staff.

References

- (1) Dignam, T.; Kaufmann, R. B.; LeStourgeon, L.; Brown, M. J. Control of Lead Sources in the United States, 1970-2017: Public Health Progress and Current Challenges to Eliminating Lead Exposure. *J. Public Health Manag. Pract.* **2019**, *25* (1), S13–S22. DOI: [10.1097/PHH.0000000000000889](https://doi.org/10.1097/PHH.0000000000000889).
- (2) Zahran, S.; McElmurry, S. P.; Sadler, R. C. Four Phases of the Flint Water Crisis: Evidence from Blood Lead Levels in Children. *Environ. Res.* **2017**, *157*, 160–172. DOI: [10.1016/j.envres.2017.05.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.05.028).
<https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0013935117303717>.
- (3) Colling, J. H.; Whincup, P. A. E.; Hayes, C. R. The Measurement of Plumbosolvency Propensity to Guide the Control of Lead in Tapwaters. *Water Environ. J.* **1987**, *1* (3), 263–269. DOI: [10.1111/j.1747-6593.1987.tb01224.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-6593.1987.tb01224.x).
- (4) Health Canada. *Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality: Guideline Technical Document, Lead*; 2019.
http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2019/sc-hc/H144-13-11-2018-eng.pdf.
- (5) Frommell, D. M.; Feld, C. M.; Snoeyink, V. L.; Melcher, B.; Feizoulof, C. Aluminum Residual Control Using Orthophosphate. *J. Am. Water Works Assoc.* **2004**, *96* (9), 99–109. DOI: [10.1002/j.1551-8833.2004.tb10707.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1551-8833.2004.tb10707.x).
- (6) Pernitsky, D. J.; Edzwald, J. K. Selection of Alum and Polyaluminum Coagulants: Principles and Applications. *J. Water Supply Res. Technol. AQUA* **2006**, *55* (2), 121–141. DOI: [10.2166/aqua.2006.062](https://doi.org/10.2166/aqua.2006.062).
- (7) Health Canada. Aluminum in Drinking Water: Guideline Technical Document for Consultation, 2019. <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/programs/consultation-aluminum-drinking-water/document.html>.
- (8) Mishra, A.; Wang, Z.; Sidorkiewicz, V.; Giammar, D. E. Effect of Sodium Silicate on Lead Release from Lead Service Lines. *Water Res.* **2021**, *188*, 116485. DOI: [10.1016/j.watres.2020.116485](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116485).
- (9) Kim, E. J.; Herrera, J. E.; Huggins, D.; Braam, J.; Koshowski, S. Effect of pH on the Concentrations of Lead and Trace Contaminants in Drinking Water: A Combined Batch, Pipe Loop and Sentinel Home Study. *Water Res.* **2011**, *45* (9), 2763–2774. DOI: [10.1016/j.watres.2011.02.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2011.02.023).

- (10) Zhang, Y.; Shi, B.; Zhao, Y.; Yan, M.; Lytle, D. A.; Wang, D. Deposition Behavior of Residual Aluminum in Drinking Water Distribution System: Effect of Aluminum Speciation. *J. Environ. Sci.* **2016**, *42*, 142–151. DOI: [10.1016/j.jes.2015.05.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jes.2015.05.010).
- (11) Snoeyink, V. L.; Schock, M. R.; Sarin, P.; Wang, L.; Chen, A. S.-C.; Harmon, S. M. Aluminium-Containing Scales in Water Distribution Systems: Prevalence and Composition. *J. Water Supply Res. Technol. AQUA* **2003**, *52* (7), 455–474. DOI: [10.2166/aqua.2003.0042](https://doi.org/10.2166/aqua.2003.0042).
- (12) Kvech, S.; Edwards, M. Role of Aluminosilicate Deposits in Lead and Copper Corrosion. *J. Am. Water Works Assoc.* **2001**, *93* (11), 104–112. DOI: [10.1002/j.1551-8833.2001.tb09339.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1551-8833.2001.tb09339.x).
- (13) Holmes, H. Probing the Role of Silicates for Corrosion Control in Lead Plumbing. PhD thesis, The University of Western Ontario, 2021.
- (14) Li, G.; Bae, Y.; Mishra, A.; Shi, B.; Giammar, D. E. Effect of Aluminum on Lead Release to Drinking Water from Scales of Corrosion Products. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *54* (10), 6142–6151. DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.0c00738](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c00738).
- (15) Crawford, Harold B. *Water quality and treatment: a handbook of community water supplies*, 4th ed.; McGraw Hill: Washington, DC, 1990.
- (16) Wasserstrom, L. W.; Miller, S. A.; Triantafyllidou, S.; Desantis, M. K.; Schock, M. R. Scale Formation Under Blended Phosphate Treatment for a Utility with Lead Pipes. *J. Am. Water Works Assoc.* **2017**, *109*, E464–E478. DOI: [10.5942/jawwa.2017.109.0121](https://doi.org/10.5942/jawwa.2017.109.0121).
- (17) Doré, E.; Deshommes, E.; Laroche, L.; Nour, S.; Prévost, M. Study of the Long-Term Impacts of Treatments on Lead Release from Full and Partially Replaced Harvested Lead Service Lines. *Water Res.* **2019**, *149*, 566–577. DOI: [10.1016/j.watres.2018.11.037](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.11.037).
- (18) Doré, E.; Deshommes, E.; Laroche, L.; Nour, S.; Prévost, M. Lead and Copper Release from Full and Partially Replaced Harvested Lead Service Lines: Impact of Stagnation Time Prior to Sampling and Water Quality. *Water Res.* **2019**, *150*, 380–391. DOI: [10.1016/j.watres.2018.11.076](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.11.076).
- (19) Mora, S. J. de; Harrison, R. M.; Wilson, S. J. The Effect of Water Treatment on the Speciation and Concentration of Lead in Domestic Tap Water Derived from a Soft Upland Source. *Water Res.* **1987**, *21* (1), 83–94. DOI: [10.1016/0043-1354\(87\)90102-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0043-1354(87)90102-3).
- (20) Trueman, B. F.; Gagnon, G. A. A New Analytical Approach to Understanding Nanoscale Lead-Iron Interactions in Drinking Water Distribution Systems. *J. Hazard. Mater.* **2016**, *311*, 151–157. DOI: [10.1016/j.jhazmat.2016.03.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2016.03.001).
- (21) Knowles, A. D.; Nguyen, C. K.; Edwards, M. A.; Stoddart, A.; McIlwain, B.; Gagnon, G. A. Role of Iron and Aluminum Coagulant Metal Residuals and Lead Release

- from Drinking Water Pipe Materials. *J. Environ. Sci. Health. Part A Environ. Sci. Eng.* **2015**, 50 (4), 414–423. DOI: [10.1080/10934529.2015.987550](https://doi.org/10.1080/10934529.2015.987550).
- (22) McIlwain, B. Investigating sources of elevated lead in drinking water. Master's thesis, Dalhousie University, 2013.
- (23) American Public Health Association. 3125 Metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma—Mass Spectrometry (2017). In *Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater*, 2018.
<https://www.standardmethods.org/doi/abs/10.2105/SMWW.2882.048>.
- (24) Trueman, B. F.; Camara, E.; Gagnon, G. A. Evaluating the Effects of Full and Partial Lead Service Line Replacement on Lead Levels in Drinking Water. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, 50 (14), 7389–7396. DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.6b01912](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b01912).
- (25) USEPA. *Method 310.2: Alkalinity (Colorimetric, Automated, Methyl Orange) by Autoanalyzer*, 1974.
- (26) USEPA. *Method 6020B (SW-846): Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry, Revision 2*; 2014.
- (27) American Public Health Association, W. E. F., American Water Works Association. 4500-P Phosphorus. In *Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater*, 2018.
<https://www.standardmethods.org/doi/abs/10.2105/SMWW.2882.093>.
- (28) Trueman, B. fffprocessr: Process FFF-UV-MALS-ICP-MS Data, 2021.
<https://github.com/bentrueman/fffprocessr>.
- (29) Trueman, B. F.; Anaviapik-Soucie, T.; L'Hérault, V.; Gagnon, G. A. Characterizing Colloidal Metals in Drinking Water by Field Flow Fractionation. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.* **2019**, 5 (12), 2202–2209. DOI: [10.1039/C9EW00560A](https://doi.org/10.1039/C9EW00560A).
- (30) American Public Health Association. 5310 Total Organic Carbon (TOC) (2017). In *Standard Methods For the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater; 2018.
<https://doi.org/10.2105/SMWW.2882.104>.
- (31) R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, 2020.
<https://www.R-project.org/>.
- (32) Wickham, H. tidyverse: Easily Install and Load the 'tidyverse', 2017.
<https://tidyverse.tidyverse.org/>.
- (33) Ram, K.; Wickham, H. Wesanderson: A Wes Anderson Palette Generator, 2018.
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=wesanderson>.
- (34) Grolemund, G.; Wickham, H. Dates and Times Made Easy with **Lubridate**. *J. Stat. Soft.* **2011**, 40 (3). DOI: [10.18637/jss.v040.i03](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v040.i03).

- (35) Allaire, J.; Xie, Y.; McPherson, J.; Luraschi, J.; Ushey, K.; Atkins, A.; Wickham, H.; Cheng, J.; Chang, W.; Iannone, R. *rmarkdown: Dynamic Documents for R*, 2021. <https://github.com/rstudio/rmarkdown>.
- (36) Julian, P.; Helsel, D. *NADA2: Data Analysis for Censored Environmental Data.*, 2021. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=NADA2>.
- (37) Helsel, D. R.; Hirsch, R. M. *Statistical methods in water resources*; U.S. Geological Survey, 2002.
- (38) Helsel, D. R. *Statistics for Censored Environmental Data Using Minitab and R*, 2nd ed.; Wiley series in Statistics in Practice; Wiley: Hoboken, N.J, 2012.
- (39) Dunnington, D. *tidyphreeqc: Tidy Geochemical Modeling Using PHREEQC*, 2020. <https://github.com/paleolimbot/tidyphreeqc>.
- (40) Parkhurst, D. L.; Appelo, C. A. J. *Description of Input and Examples for Phreeqc Version 3—a Computer Program for Speciation, Batch-Reaction, One-Dimensional Transport, and Inverse Geochemical Calculations*; Techniques and methods; U.S. Geological Survey, 2013; Vol. book 6, p 497. <http://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/06/a43>.
- (41) Trueman, B. *pbcusol: Predict Lead and Copper Solubility*, 2021. <https://github.com/bentrueman/pbcusol>.
- (42) Schock, M. R.; Wagner, I.; Oliphant, R. J. Corrosion and solubility of lead in drinking water. In *Internal corrosion of water distribution systems*; American Water Works Association Research Foundation: Denver, CO, 1996; pp 131–230.
- (43) Schock, M. R. Response of Lead Solubility to Dissolved Carbonate in Drinking Water. *J. Am. Water Works Assoc.* **1980**, 72 (12), 695–704. DOI: [10.1002/j.1551-8833.1980.tb04616.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1551-8833.1980.tb04616.x).
- (44) Trueman, B. F.; Krkošek, W. H.; Gagnon, G. A. Effects of Ortho- and Polyphosphates on Lead Speciation in Drinking Water. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.* **2018**, 4 (4), 505–512. DOI: [10.1039/C7EW00521K](https://doi.org/10.1039/C7EW00521K).
- (45) Roncal-Herrero, T.; Oelkers, E. H. Does Variscite Control Phosphate Availability in Acidic Natural Waters? An Experimental Study of Variscite Dissolution Rates. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **2011**, 75 (2), 416–426. DOI: [10.1016/j.gca.2010.10.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2010.10.012).
- (46) Wood, S. N. *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*, 2nd ed.; Chapman; Hall/CRC, 2017.
- (47) Simpson, G. L. *gratia: Graceful 'ggplot'-Based Graphics and Other Functions for Gams Fitted Using 'mgcv'*, 2021. <https://gavinsimpson.github.io/gratia/>.

- (48) Pinheiro, J.; Bates, D.; DebRoy, S.; Sarkar, D.; R Core Team. nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models, 2020. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme>.
- (49) Montgomery, D. C. *Design and Analysis of Experiments*, Eighth edition.; John Wiley & Sons, Inc: Hoboken, NJ, 2013.
- (50) Knowles, A. D.; MacKay, J.; Gagnon, G. A. Pairing a Pilot Plant to a Direct Filtration Water Treatment Plant. *Can. J. Civ. Eng.* **2012**, *39* (6), 689–700. DOI: [10.1139/2012-060](https://doi.org/10.1139/2012-060).
- (51) Vadasarukkai, Y. S. Investigation of the mixing energy consumption affecting coagulation and floc aggregation. PhD thesis, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 2016.
- (52) Britton, A.; Richards, W. Factors influencing plumbsolvency in Scotland. *J. Inst. Water Eng. Sci.* **1981**, *35*, 349–64. <http://pascal-francis.inist.fr/vibad/index.php?action=getRecordDetail&idt=PASCAL8130373380>.
- (53) Masters, S.; Welter, G. J.; Edwards, M. Seasonal Variations in Lead Release to Potable Water. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2016**, *50* (10), 5269–5277. DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.5b05060](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b05060).
- (54) Boulay, N.; Edwards, M. Role of Temperature, Chlorine, and Organic Matter in Copper Corrosion by-Product Release in Soft Water. *Water Res.* **2001**, *35* (3), 683–690. DOI: [10.1016/S0043-1354\(00\)00320-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(00)00320-1).
- (55) Kinniburgh, D. G.; Jackson, M. L.; Syers, J. K. Adsorption of Alkaline Earth, Transition, and Heavy Metal Cations by Hydrous Oxide Gels of Iron and Aluminum. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* **1976**, *40* (5), 796–799. DOI: [10.2136/sssaj1976.03615995004000050047x](https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1976.03615995004000050047x).
- (56) McBride, M. Processes of Heavy and Transition Metal Sorption by Soil Minerals. In *Interactions at the soil colloid—soil solution interface*; Springer, 1991; pp 149–175.
- (57) Saha, U. K.; Taniguchi, S.; Sakurai, K. Adsorption Behavior of Cadmium, Zinc, and Lead on Hydroxyaluminum- and Hydroxyaluminosilicate-Montmorillonite Complexes. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* **2001**, *65* (3), 694–703. DOI: [10.2136/sssaj2001.653694x](https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2001.653694x).
- (58) Zhao, J.; Giammar, D. E.; Pasteris, J. D.; Dai, C.; Bae, Y.; Hu, Y. Formation and Aggregation of Lead Phosphate Particles: Implications for Lead Immobilization in Water Supply Systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2018**, *52* (21), 12612–12623. DOI: [10.1021/acs.est.8b02788](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b02788).
- (59) Cartier, C.; Laroche, L.; Deshommes, E.; Nour, S.; Richard, G.; Edwards, M.; Prévost, M. Investigating Dissolved Lead at the Tap Using Various Sampling

Protocols. *J. Am. Water Works Assoc.* **2011**, *103* (3), 55–67. DOI: [10.1002/j.1551-8833.2011.tb11420.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1551-8833.2011.tb11420.x).

- (60) Korshin, G. V.; Ferguson, J. F.; Lancaster, A. N.; Wu, H. *Corrosion and Metal Release for Lead-Containing Materials: Influence of NOM*; AWWA Research Foundation; American Water Works Association: Denver, 1999.
- (61) Liu, H.; Schonberger, K. D.; Korshin, G. V.; Ferguson, J. F.; Meyerhofer, P.; Desormeaux, E.; Luckenbach, H. Effects of Blending of Desalinated Water with Treated Surface Drinking Water on Copper and Lead Release. *Water Res.* **2010**, *44* (14), 4057–4066. DOI: [10.1016/j.watres.2010.05.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2010.05.014).
- (62) Shard, A. G. Detection Limits in XPS for More Than 6000 Binary Systems Using Al and Mg K α X-Rays: XPS Detection Limits. *Surf. Interface Anal.* **2014**, *46* (3), 175–185. DOI: [10.1002/sia.5406](https://doi.org/10.1002/sia.5406).

Supplementary information for Seasonal lead release to drinking water and the effect of aluminum

Benjamin F. Trueman,^{*,1} Aaron Bleasdale-Pollowy,¹ Javier A. Locsin,¹ Jessica L. Bennett,¹ Wendy H. Krkošek,² and Graham A. Gagnon¹

¹Centre for Water Resources Studies, Department of Civil & Resource Engineering, Dalhousie University, 1360 Barrington St., Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3H 4R2

²Halifax Water, 450 Cowie Hill Rd., Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, PO Box 8388, B3K 5M1

*Corresponding author

E-mail: benjamin.trueman@dal.ca

Tel: 902.494.6070

Fax: 902.494.3105

This document contains 13 figures, 5 tables, 6 text blocks, and 28 pages

Figures

Figure S1. As determined by size-exclusion chromatography, the relative size distributions of aluminum, iron, and lead were correlated at high apparent molecular weight ($n = 16$ tap water samples). The colloidal fraction shown was sized nominally at 17–450 nm. Intensities have been normalized for improved visualization, and the retention volume of thyroglobulin (669 kDa, 17 nm hydrodynamic diameter) is indicated by the vertical dashed line.

Figure S2. Weighted basis functions comprising the long-term time series trends.

Figure S3. Weighted basis functions comprising the seasonal time series trends.

Figure S4. Generalized additive model predictions for each water chemistry time series.

Figure S5. Model residuals plotted against the standard normal quantiles, by parameter.

Figure S6. Model residuals plotted against the fitted values, by parameter.

Figure S7. Model residuals over time, by parameter.

Figure S8. Autocorrelation functions of the raw and normalized model residuals. Shaded grey bands denote the critical values $\pm 1.96/\sqrt{n}$. Normalization here refers to raw residuals divided by their corresponding standard errors and pre-multiplied by the inverse square-root factor of the estimated error correlation matrix (i.e., the R function *residual.lme()*).

Figure S9. After a natural log transformation of the response variable, linear model residuals were **(a)** approximately Gaussian and **(b)** homoscedastic.

Figure S10. (a) Mean alkalinity (as CaCO_3), pH, and orthophosphate product dose by date. Source and tap are combined in the series representing aluminum, predicted lead, and temperature. The long-term smooth component of the additive fit to the data is superimposed. **(b)** The seasonal component of each additive model, along with the partial residuals representing the differences between the data and the non-seasonal components of the model, aggregated into weekly means. Shaded regions represent point-wise 95% confidence intervals on the fitted values.

Figure S11. Median aluminum in static corrosion cells as a function of temperature, aluminum concentration, and orthophosphate dose. Error bars span the interquartile range.

Figure S12. High resolution XPS scans of lead coupons exposed to 0.5 mg Al L⁻¹, before and after removal of corrosion scale. The feature at 73 eV was present in scans acquired before and after removal of the corrosion scale, and was not attributable to aluminum.

Tables

Table S1. Static corrosion cell experimental design. [Al] represents observations in 24-hour stagnant test water, while the other settings are nominal.

[PO ₄] _{initial} (mg L ⁻¹)	Temperature (deg. C)	[Al] (μg L ⁻¹)	Replicates
0	4	20	2
0	4	500	2
0	21	20	2
0	21	500	2
1	4	20	6
1	4	500	6
1	21	20	6
1	21	500	6

Table S2. Chemical analysis of untreated water from the water supply plant (source: utility data).

Parameter	Untreated water
Alkalinity (mg CaCO ₃ L ⁻¹)	<5.0
Calcium (mg L ⁻¹)	1
Chloride (mg L ⁻¹)	6.4
True colour (PtCo)	17
Conductivity (μS cm ⁻¹)	32
Hardness (mg CaCO ₃ L ⁻¹)	3.9
Magnesium (mg L ⁻¹)	0.39
pH	6.1
Potassium (mg L ⁻¹)	0.23
Sodium (mg L ⁻¹)	4.3
Sulfate (mg L ⁻¹)	3.2
Total Organic Carbon (mg C L ⁻¹)	3.8

Table S3. Standard XRD patterns and their PDF entry numbers.

Phase	PDF entry no.
Hydroxypyromorphite	00-086-0236
Hydrocerussite	96-210-8232
Massicot	96-900-7711
Lead	96-153-1229

Table S4. Summary of thermodynamic data used in equilibrium solubility modeling (LEADSOL values).

Phase	Equation	log K
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{PbOH}^+ + \text{H}^+$	-7.22
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{Pb}(\text{OH})_2 + 2\text{H}^+$	-16.91
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + 3\text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{Pb}(\text{OH})_3^- + 3\text{H}^+$	-28.08
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + 4\text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{Pb}(\text{OH})_4^{2-} + 4\text{H}^+$	-39.72
—	$2\text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{Pb}_2\text{OH}^{+3} + \text{H}^+$	-6.36
—	$3\text{Pb}^{+2} + 4\text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{Pb}_3(\text{OH})_4^{+2} + 4\text{H}^+$	-23.86
—	$4\text{Pb}^{+2} + 4\text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{Pb}_4(\text{OH})_4^{+4} + 4\text{H}^+$	-20.88
—	$6\text{Pb}^{+2} + 8\text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{Pb}_6(\text{OH})_8^{+4} + 8\text{H}^+$	-43.62
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{CO}_3^{2-} = \text{PbCO}_3$	7.10
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + 2\text{CO}_3^{2-} = \text{Pb}(\text{CO}_3)_2^{2-}$	10.33
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{CO}_3^{2-} + \text{H}^+ = \text{PbHCO}_3^+$	12.59
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{PO}_4^{3-} + \text{H}^+ = \text{PbHPO}_4$	15.41
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{PO}_4^{3-} + 2\text{H}^+ = \text{PbH}_2\text{PO}_4^+$	21.05
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{SO}_4^{2-} = \text{PbSO}_4$	2.73
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + 2\text{SO}_4^{2-} = \text{Pb}(\text{SO}_4)_2^{2-}$	3.50
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{Cl}^- = \text{PbCl}^+$	1.59
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + 2\text{Cl}^- = \text{PbCl}_2$	1.80
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + 3\text{Cl}^- = \text{PbCl}_3^-$	1.71
—	$\text{Pb}^{+2} + 4\text{Cl}^- = \text{PbCl}_4^{2-}$	1.43
Cerussite	$\text{PbCO}_3 = \text{Pb}^{+2} + \text{CO}_3^{2-}$	-13.11
Hydrocerussite	$\text{Pb}(\text{OH})_2:2\text{PbCO}_3 + 2\text{H}^+ = 3\text{Pb}^{+2} + 2\text{CO}_3^{2-} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$	-18.00
Hydroxylpyromorphite	$\text{Pb}_5(\text{PO}_4)_3\text{OH} + \text{H}^+ = 5\text{Pb}^{+2} + 3\text{PO}_4^{3-} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	-62.83

Table S5. Terms in the generalized additive models fit to water chemistry time series $f(\text{day})$ is a function of the day of the year and $f(\text{date})$ is a function of the date.

Parameter	Term	Estimate	p-value	Adjusted R ²
Alkalinity (mg CaCO ₃ L ⁻¹)	$f(\text{date})$	.	<<0.001	0.33
.	$f(\text{day})$	.	<<0.001	.
.	Intercept (β_0)	19.00	<<0.001	.
.	ϕ	0.86	.	.
Aluminum ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	$f(\text{date})$	.	<<0.001	0.76
.	$f(\text{day})$	.	<<0.001	.
.	Intercept (β_0)	78.00	<<0.001	.
.	ϕ	0.83	.	.
Predicted [Pb] ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$)	$f(\text{date})$	.	<<0.001	0.44
.	$f(\text{day})$	.	<<0.001	.
.	Intercept (β_0)	32.00	<<0.001	.

Parameter	Term	Estimate	p-value	Adjusted R ²
.	ϕ	0.51	.	.
pH	$f(\text{date})$	.	<<0.001	0.13
.	$f(\text{day})$	.	<<0.001	.
.	Intercept (β_0)	7.50	<<0.001	.
.	ϕ	0.79	.	.
Orthophosphate (mg P L ⁻¹)	$f(\text{date})$	.	<<0.001	0.71
.	$f(\text{day})_{\text{source}}$	.	<<0.001	.
.	$f(\text{day})_{\text{tap}}$	.	<<0.001	.
.	Intercept (β_0)	0.15	<<0.001	.
.	Tap (β_1)	-11.00	<<0.001	.
.	ϕ	0.83	.	.
Orthophosphate (mg product L ⁻¹)	$f(\text{date})$	.	<<0.001	0.91
.	$f(\text{day})$	.	<<0.001	.
.	Intercept (β_0)	1.30	<<0.001	.
.	ϕ_1	0.44	.	.
.	ϕ_2	0.13	.	.
Temperature (°C)	$f(\text{date})$	.	<<0.001	0.78
.	$f(\text{day})$	.	<<0.001	.
.	Intercept (β_0)	12.00	<<0.001	.
.	ϕ_1	0.11	.	.
.	ϕ_2	0.82	.	.

R code

Supplementary text 1

```
library("tidyverse")

# from doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734
sec_data_zenodo <- read_csv("zenodo/2021-06-01_sec_cleaned.csv")

sec_out <- sec_data_zenodo %>%
  # linear baseline correction:
  fffprocessr::correct_baseline(left = 2.5, right = 47.5) %>%
  # normalize to [0, 1]
  group_by(date, sample, param) %>%
```

```

mutate(conc = conc / max(conc)) %>%
ungroup() %>%
# aggregate data by analyte and timeslice (each equal to 0.1 min.):
filter(time > 14, time < 21) %>%
group_by(param, time = round(time, 1)) %>%
summarize(conc = mean(conc)) %>%
ungroup() %>%
# fit data as sum of component peaks:
group_by(param) %>%
nest() %>%
ungroup() %>%
mutate(
  func = if_else(param == "208Pb", "emg", "skew_gaussian"),
  param = str_remove(param, "\\d+")
) %>%
mutate(
  model = map2(
    data, func,
    ~ fffprocessr::deconvolve_fff(
      .x$time, .x$conc,
      # initial guesses for peak parameters:
      h = c(.5, .8), mu = c(15.8, 17.3), s = c(2, 1), g = c(1, 2),
      fn = .y
    )
  ),
  fitted = map(model, "fitted"),
  peaks = map(model, "peaks")
) %>%
unnest(c(data, fitted, peaks))

sec_out %>%
pivot_longer(starts_with("peak")) %>%
ggplot(aes(time)) +

```

```

facet_wrap(vars(param)) +
geom_point(aes(y = fitted, fill = "fitted"), alpha = .3) +
geom_line(aes(y = conc)) +
geom_line(aes(y = value, col = name)) +
labs(col = NULL, fill = NULL)

```

Supplementary text 2

```

library("tidyverse")

# from doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734
mthesis <- read_csv("zenodo/2021-06-01_mcilwain_thesis_cleaned.csv")

mthesis_out <- mthesis %>%
  mutate(param = str_remove(param, "\\\\")) %>%
  pivot_wider(
    id_cols = c(
      address, building, type, outlet, location,
      manufacturer, site_type, param
    ),
    names_from = date,
    values_from = c(value, censored)
  ) %>%
  janitor::clean_names() %>%
  # following two lines remove rows with no values
  # for oct or feb in either year
  filter_at(vars(matches("value_\\d{4}_10_")), any_vars(!is.na(.))) %>%
  filter_at(vars(matches("value_\\d{4}_02_")), any_vars(!is.na(.))) %>%
  rowwise() %>%
  mutate(
    # we have data from oct and feb in 2 years each
    # for each site and month, if one value is censored and the other not,
    # recensor at the larger value
    # 1. calculate midpoints for noncensored observations:

```



```

value_oct = mean(c_across(matches("value_\\d{4}_10_")), na.rm = TRUE),
value_feb = mean(c_across(matches("value_\\d{4}_02_")), na.rm = TRUE),
# 2. for censored observations in at least one year, calculate
# maxima (plus 1%) to recensor at:
value_oct_bdl = max(
  c_across(matches("value_\\d{4}_10_")), na.rm = TRUE
) * 1.01,
value_feb_bdl = max(
  c_across(matches("value_\\d{4}_02_")), na.rm = TRUE
) * 1.01,
# 3. coalesce censoring indicator columns:
cen_oct = coalesce(censored_2010_10_01, censored_2011_10_01),
cen_feb = coalesce(censored_2011_02_01, censored_2012_02_01),
# 4. if there is a censored observation in one and only one year,
# replace with value_*_bdl, recensor at that value
value_oct = case_when(
  censored_2010_10_01 == "<" &
    is.na(censored_2011_10_01) ~ value_oct_bdl,
  is.na(censored_2010_10_01) &
    censored_2011_10_01 == "<" ~ value_oct_bdl,
  TRUE ~ value_oct
),
value_feb = case_when(
  censored_2011_02_01 == "<" &
    is.na(censored_2012_02_01) ~ value_feb_bdl,
  is.na(censored_2011_02_01) &
    censored_2012_02_01 == "<" ~ value_feb_bdl,
  TRUE ~ value_feb
),
) %>%
ungroup() %>%
# convert censoring indicator to logical:
mutate_at(

```

```

vars(starts_with("cen_")),
~ str_detect(.x, "<") %>% replace_na(FALSE)
) %>%
group_by(param, type) %>%
nest() %>%
ungroup() %>%
arrange(param, type) %>%
mutate(
  n = map(data, nrow),
  # fraction censored:
  frac_cen = map(data, ~ with(.x, mean(c(cen_oct, cen_feb)))),
  m_est = map(data,
    ~ with(.x, median(value_oct, na.rm = TRUE) /
      median(value_feb, na.rm = TRUE))
  ),
  # signed rank test from the NADA2 package:
  nada2_signed_rnk = map(
    data,
    ~ with(.x,
      NADA2::cen_signedranktest(
        value_oct, value_feb,
        cen_oct, cen_feb, printstat = FALSE
      )
    )
  ),
  nada_pval = map(nada2_signed_rnk, "p.value")
) %>%
unnest(c(n, frac_cen, m_est, nada_pval)) %>%
select(where(~!is.list(.)))

```

Supplementary text 3

```

library("tidyverse")
# remotes::install_github("bentrueman/pbcusol")

```

```

library("pbcusol")

variscite <- list(
  "Variscite",
  "AlPO4:2H2O = Al+3 + PO4-3 + 2H2O",
  "log_k" = -22.36 # https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2010.10.012
)

aqueous_species <- list(
  # from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2010.10.012 and
  # https://doi.org/10.1080/09593332708618735
  "HPO4-2 + Al+3 = AlHPO4+",
  "log_k" = 7.4,
  "HPO4-2 + H+ + Al+3 = AlH2PO4+2",
  "log_k" = 3.1
)

future::plan("multisession")

solution_pH <- 7.5

out <- crossing(
  po4 = seq(0.1, 1, length.out = 15),
  al = seq(0, .5, length.out = 15)
) %>%
  rowid_to_column() %>%
  group_by(rowid) %>%
  nest() %>%
  ungroup() %>%
  mutate(
    output = furrr::future_map(data,
      ~ pbcusol::eq_sol_fixed(element = "Pb",
        solution_pH, 5, .x$po4, "Hxypyromorphite",

```

```

    Al = .x$a1 / chemr::mass("Al"),
    Na = 10 / chemr::mass("Na"),
    eq_phase_components = list("Variscite" = c(0, 0)),
    new_species = aqueous_species,
    new_phase = variscite,
    phase_out = "Variscite"
  )
)
)

out %>%
  unnest(c(data, output)) %>%
  ggplot(aes(po4, al, fill = pb_ppb)) +
  geom_raster() +
  geom_contour(aes(z = pb_ppb), col = "white")

```

Supplementary text 4

```

library("tidyverse")

chn_g_yr <- function(date, new_yr) {
  lubridate::year(date) <- new_yr
  date
}

# simulate data:

simul_data <- tibble(
  date = seq(as.Date("2005-01-01"), as.Date("2010-01-01"), by = "1 week"),
  numeric_date = as.numeric(date) - min(as.numeric(date)) + 1,
  yday = lubridate::yday(date),
  long_trend = numeric_date / max(numeric_date)
) %>%
  crossing(location = paste0("l", 1:2)) %>%

```

```

mutate(
  param = "param_1",
  location_numeric = if_else(location == "l1", -1, 1),
  location = factor(location),
  seasonal_trend = sin(2 * pi * yday / 365),
  long_trend = long_trend + long_trend ^ 2,
  noise = withr::with_seed(123,
    {arima.sim(model = list(ar = .8), n = length(date)) %>% as.numeric()}
  ),
  value = 5 + long_trend + seasonal_trend + location_numeric + noise
)

simul_gam <- simul_data %>%
  group_by(param) %>%
  nest() %>%
  ungroup() %>%
  mutate(
    model = map(data,
      ~ mgcv::gamm(
        log(value) ~
          s(numeric_date) + s(yday, by = location, bs = "cc") + location,
        correlation = corCAR1(form = ~ numeric_date | location),
        method = "REML",
        data = .x
      )
    ),
    # Linear predictor matrix:
    lpmat = map2(model, data,
      ~ predict(.x$gam, newdata = .y, type = "lpmatrix")
    ),
    # modify lpmat to exclude the long term trend:
    lpmod = map(
      lpmat,

```

```

~ .x %>%
  as_tibble() %>%
  mutate_at(
    vars(matches("numeric_date"),
      matches("Intercept")), ~ 0
  ) %>%
  as.matrix()
),
preds = map2(model, data,
  ~ predict(.x$gam, newdata = .y, type = "items", se = TRUE)
),
seasonal = map2(
  lpmod, model,
  ~ tibble(
    fit = rowSums(.x %**% coef(.y$gam)),
    se_fit = rowSums(.x %**% vcov(.y$gam) * .x) %>% sqrt(),
    lwr = fit - qt(.975, df = df$residual(.y$gam)) * se_fit,
    upr = fit + qt(.975, df = df$residual(.y$gam)) * se_fit
  )
),
longtrend = map2(
  preds, model,
  ~ .x %>%
    with(
      tibble(
        crit_val = qt(.975, df = df$residual(.y$gam)),
        longsmooth = fit[, "s(numeric_date)"] + attr(.x, "constant"),
        se_longsmooth = se.fit[, "s(numeric_date)"],
        lwr = longsmooth - crit_val * se_longsmooth,
        upr = longsmooth + crit_val * se_longsmooth
      )
    )
)
)

```

```

)

p1 <- simul_gam %>%
  unnest(c(data, longtrend)) %>%
  ggplot() +
  geom_line(
    data = function(data) data %>%
      group_by(param, date, location) %>%
      summarize(
        value = mean(value)
      ),
    aes(date, value, col = location)
  ) +
  geom_ribbon(aes(date, ymin = exp(lwr), ymax = exp(upr)), alpha = .2) +
  geom_line(aes(date, exp(longsmooth))) +
  labs(x = NULL, y = NULL, col = NULL)

p2 <- simul_gam %>%
  unnest(c(data, seasonal, longtrend), names_repair = tidyr_legacy) %>%
  mutate(
    date = chng_yr(date, 2000),
    location = factor(location)
  ) %>%
  ggplot(aes(date, fit, col = location, fill = location)) +
  geom_point(
    data = function(data) data %>%
      group_by(param, location, week = lubridate::week(date)) %>%
      summarize(
        value = mean(log(value) - longsmooth),
        date = median(date)
      ),
    aes(date, value, col = location),
    alpha = .5, shape = 16, show.legend = FALSE
  )

```

```

) +
geom_ribbon(
  aes(ymin = lwr, ymax = upr), alpha = .2, col = NA
) +
geom_line() +
theme(
  axis.line.y = element_blank(),
  axis.text.y = element_blank(),
  axis.ticks.y = element_blank()
) +
scale_x_date(date_labels = "%b") +
labs(x = NULL, y = NULL, col = NULL) +
guides(fill = "none")

```

Figure S13. Plot of gam components fit to simulated data described in supplementary text 4. Panel (a) shows the data and the longterm trend with a pointwise 95% confidence interval. Panel (b) shows the seasonal trend and its 95% pointwise confidence interval along with the partial residuals aggregated into weekly means. See Figure 2 in the article body.

Supplementary text 5

```
library("tidyverse")
```



```

# from doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5139734
coupon_data <- read_csv("zenodo/2021-06-01_cleaned_data_coupon_study.csv")

fit_in <- coupon_data %>%
  filter(element == "208Pb") %>%
  rename(po4_mg_l = initial_po4_mg_l) %>%
  mutate_at(vars(-matches("conc_ppb")), as.factor) %>%
  mutate(
    po4_mg_l = fct_relevel(po4_mg_l, "1", after = 0),
    temp_c = fct_relevel(temp_c, "21", after = 0)
  ) %>%
  group_by(filtered, element, code, al_level, temp_c, po4_mg_l) %>%
  # typical value from each cell:
  summarize(conc_ppb = median(conc_ppb)) %>%
  ungroup() %>%
  select(-code, -element)

fit <- fit_in %>%
  group_by(filtered) %>%
  nest() %>%
  ungroup() %>%
  mutate(
    model = map(
      data,
      ~ lm(
        log(conc_ppb) ~ . ^ 3,
        data = .x,
        # -1, 1 coding:
        contrasts = list(
          al_level = "contr.sum",
          temp_c = "contr.sum",
          po4_mg_l = "contr.sum"
        )
      )
    )
  )

```

```

    )
  ),
  tidied = map(model, ~ broom::tidy(.x, conf.int = TRUE)),
  retransformed = map(tidied,
    ~ .x %>%
      filter(term != "(Intercept)") %>%
      mutate_at(
        vars(c(estimate, matches("conf"))),
        ~ 100 * (exp(2 * .x) - 1)
      )
    )
  )
)

percent_change <- fit %>%
  unnest(retransformed) %>%
  select(where(~ !is.list(.)))

```

Supplementary text 6

```

library("tidyverse")
# remotes::install_github("bentrueman/pbcusol")
library("pbcusol")

variscite <- list(
  "Variscite",
  "AlPO4:2H2O = Al+3 + PO4-3 + 2H2O",
  "log_k" = -22.36 # https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2010.10.012
)

aqueous_species <- list(
  # from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2010.10.012 and
  # https://doi.org/10.1080/09593332708618735
  "HP04-2 + Al+3 = AlHP04+",
  "log_k" = 7.4,

```

```

"HP04-2 + H+ + Al+3 = AlH2PO4+2",
"log_k" = 3.1
)

tibble(phases = c("Variscite", "Gibbsite(C)", "Diaspore", "Boehmite")) %>%
  rowwise() %>%
  mutate(
    model = list(
      pbcusol::eq_sol_fixed(
        phase = phases,
        # primary arguments:
        ph = 7.3,
        dic = 4.8,
        phosphate = .16,
        element = "Al",
        phase_quantity = 0,
        Al = .1 / chemr::mass("Al"),
        # other elements:
        Ca = 4.3 / chemr::mass("Ca"),
        Cl = 4.3 / chemr::mass("Cl"),
        K = 0.4 / chemr::mass("K"),
        Mg = 0.4 / chemr::mass("Mg"),
        Na = 12 / chemr::mass("Na"),
        temp = 5,
        # database additions:
        new_phase = variscite,
        new_species = aqueous_species
      )
    )
  ) %>%
  unnest(model) %>%
  select_at(vars(-starts_with("mol_"))) %>%
  arrange(al_ppb)

```