

University of New Hampshire College of Engineering and Physical Sciences

Civil and Environmental Engineering

Characteristics of PFAS Source Signatures in Wastewater Systems

Dr. Paula J. Mouser and Sydney Adams, Presenters Eamon Twohig, Coauthor NEWMOA Conference - April 6th, 2022

Wastewater treatment facilities play a central role in concentrating and fractionating PFAS



Modified from Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86510_88079-476131--,00.html

PFAS signatures in WW effluent differ from sludge



Mixture of PFAAs, percursors - influent Shorter chain, PFCAs – effluent Longer chain, PFSAs, percursors – sludge Partitioning driven by log(K_d)



Elham Tavasoli,^{ab} Jenna L. Luek, ^(D)^a James P. Malley Jr ^(D)^a and Paula J. Mouser ^(D)*^a

Fractionation occurs through facility



Percent of short chain PFAAs increases in aqueous phase during treatment

Long chain PFAAs and precursors/FT sequestered in sludge

Fate of long- and short-chain PFAS, pharmaceuticals, and personal care products in wastewater biosolids

SYDNEY ADAMS, CASSIDY YATES, CARMELA ANTONELLIS, JENNA LUEK, PhD, JAMES P. MALLEY, JR., PhD, and PAULA MOUSER, PhD, PE (corresponding author) Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire

Fractionation occurs through facility

250



Σ PFAS concentrated 850 to 1850x higher in sludge

Fate of long- and short-chain PFAS, pharmaceuticals, and personal care products in wastewater biosolids

ADAMS, CASSIDY YATES, CARMELA ANTONELLIS, JENNA LUEK, PhD, JAMES P, MALLEY, JR., PhD, and PAULA MOUSER, PhD, PE (corresponding author) Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire

BACKGROUND 5

PFAS fingerprinting commonly applied to surface waters, but not wastewater



Toxicology and Chemistry

Hazard/Risk Assessment 🛛 🔂 Full Access

Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) in Surface Water Near US Air Force Bases: Prioritizing Individual Chemicals and Mixtures for Toxicity Testing and Risk Assessment

Andrew East, Richard H. Anderson, Christopher J. Salice 🔀



Isolating the AFFF Signature in Coastal Watersheds Using Oxidizable PFAS Precursors and Unexplained Organofluorine

Bridger J. Ruyle,* Heidi M. Pickard, Denis R. LeBlanc, Andrea K. Tokranov, Colin P. Thackray, Xindi C. Hu, Chad D. Vecitis, and Elsie M. Sunderland



Characterizing sources could help reduce PFAS from WWTF

LOCAL & STATE > Pusted Detober 12, 2021 Updated October 12, 2021

Maine to investigate more than 500 sludge sites for contamination by 'forever chemicals'

With \$30 million in state funding, officials plan an unprecedented effort to test sites statewide for chemicals known as PFAS and assist people affected by the pollution.

BY KEVIN MILLER STAFF WRITER



IABRIBLD, ME - OCTOBER 11: Veromique Plesch's home is next to fields where sludge was spread over the years. Thanks to a rearry passed aw, her dimining water's contaminature level qualited har for a filmation upsiere for her form. The state budge possed earlier this summer statement 30 million for the Mains DEP and DUC's to use new then 500 attact statement that recorded ministigal sludge, or bissolids, for use as femilier. (Staff photo by their McCanna/Staff Photographer) *Ben McCanna*/Staff Photographer

PFAS chemicals found in some garden fertilizers, according to study

According to an Ecology Center and Sierra Club study, all of the fertilizers investigated contain biosolids, leftover sludge from wastewater treatment plants



'Forever chemicals' contaminate milk on Maine dairy farm

by WGME | Thursday, February 17th 2022



A farm in Albion has discovered harmful forever chemicals in some of their products. (WGME)

- f
- ALBION (WGME) A farm in Albion has discovered harmful forever chemicals in some of their products.
- Also read: Maine farmers could face financial ruin amid 'forever chemical' crisis

Late last week, the owners of Misty Brook Farm found out some of their cow milk was contaminated with PFAS.

Now they're waiting for test results from the state.

Rulemaking ongoing for: -Biosolids -Surface Water -NPDES Permitholders BACKGROUND 7

What tools target PFAS mass reduction in WW?



From: https://www.lanl.gov/environment/sustainability/pollution-prevention.php

BACKGROUND 8

What tools target PFAS mass reduction in WW? Pollution Prevention (P2)



From: https://www.lanl.gov/environment/sustainability/pollution-prevention.php

BACKGROUND 9

Our "Fingerprinting" Approach...

Overarching Objective:

Mine growing PFAS databases to evaluate sources and removal patterns in different wastewater media (with the ultimate goal of elimination)

Research Questions:

1. Are there differences in influent, effluent, and sludge PFAS signatures?

2. Are known upstream sources associated with predictable PFAS compositions?

3. Does sludge handling influence PFAS signatures?



A word about methods...



RETURN TO ISSUE < PREV LETTER NEXT >

Source Attribution of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) in Surface Waters from Rhode Island and the New York Metropolitan Area

Xianming Zhang^{*†‡}, Rainer Lohmann[§], Clifton Dassuncao^{†‡}, Xindi C. Hu^{†‡}, Andrea K. Weber[†], Chad D. Vecitis[†], and Elsie M. Sunderland^{†‡}

Multivariate statistics are a valuable tool to explore relationships between variables (PFAS) and samples

Examples include:

- Principle Component Analyses (PCA)
- Hierarchical Clustering
- Non-multidimensional scaling (NMDS)
- Analysis of Similarity (AOSIM)
- Indicator Species Analysis
- Artificial Neural Networks (ANNs) inc. SOMs

Data and databases used...

- "PFAS at Wastewater Treatment Facilities and Landfill Leachate", (2019) Weston & Sampson, available from VTDEC
- PFAS in WWTF influent, effluent, sludges, biosolids, available through NHDES "One-Stop" database (accessed 2020)
- Other growing databases (Michigan EGLE, Maine DEP, others)



westonandsampson.con

98 South Main Street, Suite 2 Waterbury, VT 05676 tel: 802.244.5051



January 30, 2020

Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances at Wastewater Treatment Facilities and Landfill Leachate

2019 Summary Report

an official NEW HAMP Environmental Ionday, Jan. 11, 2021 OneStop - Search 🙆 Any DES Interest Id: Enter NHDES is working to make all of our online documents fully accessible. If you have any problems access sing a particular file, please contact us and we will make the necessa us. Click the eas of Interest 🗟 🔞 General Areas of Interest: - Optional × If you are unsure which Specific Areas of Interest you want, tr Aboveground Storage Tank Air Stationary Source Alteration of Terrain Permit Asbestos Disposal Site (Inactive) Auto Salvage Yard Beaches Groundwater Discharge Site Hazardous Waste Generator Initial Response Spi Bottled Water Site Public Pools/Spas Public Water System Registered Water User Remediation Site Solid Waste Facilit Underground Storage Tank Water Well Before hitting the Enter key, if you have checked specific area(s) of interest, you may want to scroll down to check other Interest Specific Criteria you can search or ✓ Include other interests found at location(s) Return only results that exist in <u>ALL</u> selected areas of interest

12

1. Are there differences in influent, effluent, and sludge PFAS signatures?



Modified from Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86510_88079-476131--,00.html

Applied NMDS with analysis of similarity (AOSIM) to W&S data



Adams et. al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of influent PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont WWTFs (AOSIM, Figure S1, p<0.001, R=0.3234 ; Pairwise ADONIS, INF & EFF p<0.001, INF & Sludge p<0.001, EFF & Sludge p<0.001).

Applied NMDS with analysis of similarity (AOSIM) to W&S data

PFAS composition was distinct between wastewater medium



Adams et. al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of influent PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont WWTFs (AOSIM, Figure S1, p<0.001, R=0.3234; Pairwise ADONIS, INF & EFF p<0.001, INF & Sludge p<0.001, EFF & Sludge p<0.001).

Venn diagram illustrating indicator species analysis results





Indicator analysis

1.5 Effluent fluent Sludge 1.0 NMDS2 **HETEO** 0.0 OSAA -0.5 6:2 FTS -1.0 -0.5 0.5 1.0 0.0 NMDS1

RESULTS 16

1. Are there differences in influent, effluent, and sludge PFAS signatures?



Summary/key points

- PFAS fractionate during treatment, dissimilar signatures in effluent and sludge
- Long chain, precursor, and sulfonates PFAS in primarily in biosolids

Modified from Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86510_88079-476131--,00.html

2. Are known upstream sources associated with certain PFAS compositions?



Modified from Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86510_88079-476131--,00.html

Same data, but classified by sources known to be discharging to WWTFs

Industrial Discharge (with IPP)	Landfill Leachate (>1%)	Residential/Commercial/ Food Prep Only
Barre	Montpelier	Burlington- North
Brattleboro	Newport	Shelburne
Burlington- Main		South Burlington- Bartlett Bay
Essex		St. Johnsbury
Milton		Williamstown
Randolph		Northfield
Rutland		
Saint Albans		
Springfield		
Swanton		

Sidenote: concentration differences observed by source



ΣPFAS higher for WWTFs accepting >1% landfill leachate

Trend similar in both influent and effluent

Mean total PFAS concentration categorized by influent characteristic (A) for influent and (B) for effluent (Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA and Tukey-Kramer Test; alpha=0.05)

Applied NMDS with analysis of similarity (AOSIM) to W&S data

Landfill leachateaccepting influent samples distinct in signature



Adams et. al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of influent PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont WWTFs (AOSIM, Figure S1, p<0.001, R=0.1952, Pairwise ADONIS: ID & LL p<0.001, ID & RES p=0.035, LL & RES p<0.001).

Applied NMDS with analysis of similarity (AOSIM) to W&S data

Landfill leachateaccepting influent samples distinct in signature

Industrial discharge (IPP) too broad to cluster from residential/commercial



Adams et. al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of influent PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont WWTFs (AOSIM, Figure S1, p<0.001, R=0.1952, Pairwise ADONIS: ID & LL p<0.001, ID & RES p=0.035, LL & RES p<0.001).

Indicator analysis revealed FT and short chain PFAS drive differences in samples containing landfill leachate







Adams et. al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of influent PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont WWTFs (AOSIM, Figure S1, p<0.001, R=0.1952, Pairwise ADONIS: ID & LL p<0.001, ID & RES p=0.035, LL & RES p<0.001).

Differences in source composition are less pronounced after treatment



Venn diagram illustrating indicator species analysis results



Adams et. al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of effluent PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont WWTFs (AOSIM, Figure S1, p<0.001, R=0.1396, Pairwise ADONIS: ID & LL p<0.001, ID & RES p=0.012, LL & RES p<0.001).

2. Are known upstream sources associated with certain PFAS compositions?



Modified from Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86510_88079-476131--,00.html

Summary/key points

- Leachate signatures evident in influent and effluent
- Further source characterization would improve clustering in influent and effluent

RESULTS

25

3. Does sludge handling influence PFAS signature?



Modified from Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86510_88079-476131--,00.html

Applied NMDS with analysis of similarity (AOSIM) to NH and VT biosolids data



Adams et al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of sludges and biosolids PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont and 26 New Hampshire WW or biosolid facilities (AOSIM, Figure S1, p=0.002, R=0.3463; Pairwise ADONIS, AD & CP p=0.006, AD & LS p=0.430, AD & NPSRP p=0.363, CP & LS p=0.009, CP & NPSRP p=0.002, LS & NPSRP p=0.066).

Applied NMDS with analysis of similarity (AOSIM) to NH and VT biosolids data

Stabilization treatment significantly alters PFAS signature



Adams et al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of sludges and biosolids PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont and 26 New Hampshire WW or biosolid facilities (AOSIM, Figure S1, p=0.002, R=0.3463; Pairwise ADONIS, AD & CP p=0.006, AD & LS p=0.430, AD & NPSRP p=0.363, CP & LS p=0.009, CP & NPSRP p=0.002, LS & NPSRP p=0.066).

Compost handling had distinct signature of short chain and PFCA compounds



Venn diagram illustrating indicator species analysis results



Adams et al, in preparation. Non-multidimensional scaling of sludges and biosolids PFAS measurements for 18 Vermont and 26 New Hampshire WW or biosolid facilities (AOSIM, Figure S1, p=0.002, R=0.3463; Pairwise ADONIS, AD & CP p=0.006, AD & LS p=0.430, AD & NPSRP p=0.363, CP & LS p=0.009, CP & NPSRP p=0.002, LS & NPSRP p=0.066).

RESULTS 29

3. Does sludge handling influence PFAS signature?

Summary/key points

- Stabilization processes alters PFAS signatures
- Composted sample signatures are distinct, dominated by shorter chain PFAS, possibly due to incorporated media or handling differences.



Modified from Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy https://www.michigan.gov/pfasresponse/0,9038,7-365-86510_88079-476131--,00.html



Looking upstream, applying P2 approach...



Characterizing municipal and industrial sources in upstream VT sewer sheds

Improved knowledge of signatures will help municipalities predict, reduce, eliminate upstream sources



DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION





Thank you to those who made this possible!

Technical Support and Data Availability:

Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation-Eamon Twohig and Nick Giannetti

New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services-Anthony Drouin and Tracy Wood

Funding Support:

Sea Grant New Hampshire

- 2021 Graduate Research Fellowship
- NHSG Program Biannual Funding

Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation

References

• Barisci, S., & Suri, R. (2021). Occurrence and removal of poly/perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in municipal and industrial wastewater treatment plants. *Water Science and Technology*, *84*(12), 3442–3468. https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2021.484

• Bogdan, D., Kammer, S., Russell, J., Person, M., Ruhala, S., Campbell, S., Davidson, C., Tavalire, A., Hill, C., Sneller, C., & Berdinski, T. (n.d.). Evaluation of PFAS in Influent, Effluent, and Residuals of Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs) in Michigan. *Great Lakes*, 119.

• Gallen, C., Eaglesham, G., Drage, D., Nguyen, T. H., & Mueller, J. F. (2018). A mass estimate of perfluoroalkyl substance (PFAS) release from Australian wastewater treatment plants. *Chemosphere*, *208*, 975–983. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.06.024

• Lenka, S. P., Kah, M., & Padhye, L. P. (2021). A review of the occurrence, transformation, and removal of poly- and perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in wastewater treatment plants. *Water Research*, *199*, 117187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117187

• Tavasoli, E., Luek, J. L., Malley, J. P., & Mouser, P. J. (2021). Distribution and fate of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in wastewater treatment facilities. *Environmental Science. Processes & Impacts*, *23*(6), 903–913. https://doi.org/10.1039/d1em00032b

• Zhang, X., Lohmann, R., Dassuncao, C., Hu, X. C., Weber, A. K., Vecitis, C. D., & Sunderland, E. M. (2016). Source Attribution of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) in Surface Waters from Rhode Island and the New York Metropolitan Area. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, *3*(9), 316–321. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.6b00255

• East, A., Anderson, R. H., & Salice, C. J. (2021). Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) in Surface Water Near US Air Force Bases: Prioritizing Individual Chemicals and Mixtures for Toxicity Testing and Risk Assessment. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 40(3), 859–870. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4893

• Ruyle, B. J., Pickard, H. M., LeBlanc, D. R., Tokranov, A. K., Thackray, C. P., Hu, X. C., Vecitis, C. D., & Sunderland, E. M. (2021). Isolating the AFFF Signature in Coastal Watersheds Using Oxidizable PFAS Precursors and Unexplained Organofluorine. Environmental Science & Technology, 55(6), 3686–3695. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c07296

Thank you! Questions?



Dr. Paula J. Mouser University of New Hampshire Associate Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering Paula.Mouser@unh.edu



Sydney Adams

University of New Hampshire

Masters Student in Civil and Environmental Engineering

Sydney.Adams@unh.edu