US EPA's Research on PFAS and Small Systems

Thomas F. Speth, PhD, PE
US EPA ORD National Risk Management Research Laboratory

Region 9 States and Tribes Environment and Health Leadership Meeting
September 4, 2019

Presentation Overview

Topic
PFAS
• Analytics • Drinking Water Treatment • End of Life Disposal • Wastewater • Incineration
Small Systems
• Arsenic • Nitrate and Perchlorate • Outreach / Communication



Drinking Water Sample Methods

Method 537.1

- Covers 18 PFAS analytes
- Posted November 2018
- https://www.epa.gov/water-research/epa-drinking-water-research-methods

Method 533

- Covers 25 PFAS analytes: 14 of the 537.1 analytes and 11 unique to this method
- Second laboratory review in progress
- Expected publishing date: October 2019

Non-Drinking Water Sample Methods

SW-846 Draft Method 8327—Direct Injection

- 24 PFAS (including all 18 target analytes in EPA Method 537.1)
- EPA is currently reviewing public comments along with Prep Method 3512
- https://www.epa.gov/hw-sw846/validated-test-method-8327-and-polyfluoroalkyl-substances-pfas-using-external-standard



CWA 1600 Draft Method
SW-846 Draft Method 8328—Isotope Dilution

- Same 24 PFAS as 8327 plus Gen-X
- Undergoing single lab validation
- Multi-lab validation and public comment to follow



Drinking Water Treatment

Problem: Utilities lack treatment technology cost data for PFAS removal

Action:

- Gather performance and cost data from available sources (DOD, utilities, industry etc.)
- Conduct EPA research on performance of treatment technologies including home treatment systems
- Update EPA’s Treatability Database and Unit Cost Models
- Connect EPA’s Treatability Database to Unit Cost Models for ease of operation
- Model performance and cost, and then extrapolate to other scenarios
    - Variable source waters
    - Variable PFAS concentrations in source water
    - Different reactivation/disposal options
    - Document secondary benefits
    - Address treatment impact on corrosion
- Evaluate reactivation of granular activated carbon (GAC)

Impact: Enable utilities to make informed decisions about cost-effective treatment strategies for removing PFAS from drinking water

Drinking Water Treatment

Publically Available Drinking Water Treatability Database

Interactive literature review database that contains over 65 regulated and unregulated contaminants and covers 34 treatment processes commonly employed or known to be effective (thousands of sources assembled on one site)

Currently available:

- Nitrate
- Perchlorate
- Microcystins
- All PFAS found in the literature including PFOA, PFOS, Gen-X

http://iaspub.epa.gov/tdb/pages/general/home.do

Future Work: Activated Carbon Reactivation

Problem: There is a liability concern regarding the reactivation of spent granular activated carbon (GAC)

- What percentage of the adsorbed PFAS is released from the carbon and how much remains after reactivation?
- What conditions are optimal for reactivation (temperature, time, reactor configuration)?
- What impact does reactivation have on the performance of off-gas incineration treatment?
- Are PFAS released after reactivation with incineration off-gas treatment?

Action: Conduct bench- and full-scale research on reactivation processes

- Impact of time and temperature
- PFAS reactions during reactivation
- Impact of post incineration
- Post GAC evaluations to determine PFAS remaining on carbon (fate)

End of Life Disposal

Problem: Lack of knowledge regarding end-of-life management of PFAS-containing consumer and industrial products

Action:

- Characterize end-of-life PFAS disposal streams (e.g. municipal, industrial, manufacturing, recycled waste streams)
- Evaluate efficacy of materials management technologies (e.g. land application, landfilling, incineration) to manage end-of-life disposal
- Evaluate performance and cost data with collaborators to manage these materials and avoid environmental PFAS releases

Results: Provide technologies, data and tools to manage end-of-life streams

Impact: Responsible officials will be able to manage effectively end-of-life disposal of PFAS-containing products

RCRA Waste Facilities

Problem: Landfills receive large amounts of PFAS containing waste, and there is a general lack of understanding of fate and transport in landfill environments

Action: Collect and analyze PFAS in leachate from more than 20 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) landfill sites in Florida. The sites include:

- Municipal solid waste landfills (leachate, gas condensate)
    - Examine the impact of onsite leachate treatment on PFAS concentration in landfill leachate
- Ash monofills (leachate)
- Construction and demolition debris landfills
- Groundwater and surface water around landfills



Future Work: RCRA Waste

- Leachate sampling to across the US
  - In discussion with Waste Management Inc. and the Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA) to provide site access for sample collection
  - Include total oxidizable precursors analysis
- Fate, transport and transformation of PFAS in simulated landfill environments
- PFAS transport through earthen and man-made liners
- PFAS concentration in municipal solid waste (MSW) ash
- PFAS flow and concentrations through the MSW recycling processes including composting

Future Work: Wastewater Treatment

Problem: Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs) are a source of PFAS

Action: Develop research to support:

- Analytical methods for the compounds of interest
- Bioassays to better understand if treatments are effective and to identify risks
- Evaluation of WWTP conventional and advanced unit operations to manage PFAS
- Evaluate air emissions from:
    - Activated sludge processes
    - Biosolids heat drying operations
    - Incineration processes
- Evaluate wastewater biosolids treatment.
- Evaluate pretreatment technologies to address “sources”



Future Research: Land Application of Biosolids

Evaluation of land application of biosolids

- Comparisons of biosolids application method (e.g. wet cake, dried solids, liquid, surface or subsurface injection)
- Changing industry and pre-regulation applications
- Operations of the land application sites
  - History of biosolids loading to the land application site
  - Agricultural practice vs. land reclamation sites (high rates of application to fractured soils)
  - Drain tile discharge
  - Plant uptake
- Operational history of facility
- Soil type and depth to groundwater
- Land use changes (e.g. many farm fields have been converted into residential areas as cities grow)



Future Research: Incineration

Problem: There are many sources of materials that may need to be incinerated:

- Manufacturing wastes
- Biosolid sludges
- Municipal waste
- Obsolete flame retardants
- Spent water treatment sorbents - in conjunction with reactivation

What minimum conditions (temperature, time) are needed to adequately destroy PFAS and what are the products of incomplete combustion?

Action: Conduct bench- and full-scale incineration studies and modeling to evaluate:

- Impact of source material
- Impact of temperature on degree of destruction
- Impact of calcium
- PFAS releases from incineration systems

PFAS Technical Support

ORD is a resource for regions, states and tribes for the analyses and treatment of PFAS in different media.

Examples:

National Sludge Survey and PFAS – Research needs to prepare for the next survey include:

- Improved analytical methods for biosolids and sludges
- Preliminary research to evaluate critical variables: facility size, treatment type, biosolids product methods, wastewater sources – domestic, commercial, industrial, potential PFAS sources

Workshops for Biosolids coordinators from EPA regions, states and tribes. Common questions asked about how PFAS should be handled under CWA include:

- How are PFAS managed during wastewater treatment?
- What technologies are effective for pretreatment of wastewater containing PFAS?
- What levels of PFAS are safe for human and ecological receptors?

ORD Groundwater and Engineering Technical Support Centers – provide technical input to a variety of Superfund sites regarding PFAS issues



EPA PFAS Data and Tools

EPA PFAS Data and Tools including the Drinking Water Treatability Database and the CompTox Chemicals Dashboard are currently available on our website:

https://www.epa.gov/pfas

https://www.epa.gov/pfas/epa-pfas-data-and-tools



The EPA PFAS Chemical Library is now available for state partners. The Library is a collection of 430 PFAS, listed here: https://comptox.epa.gov/dashboard/chemical_lists/epapfasinv



Small Water Systems

Research → Outreach →Solutions

- Pilot- and Full-Scale Technology Demonstration and Evaluation
- Technical Assistance
- Monthly Webinar Series
- Annual Workshop
- Communications Workgroup




Arsenic Demonstration Program

Funded 50 small, full-scale arsenic removal systems in 26 different states, impacting over 60,000 consumers. The performance and cost information developed is considered the most comprehensive set of research data that has ever been collected on drinking water treatment technologies design for a specific problem.

State/Community
Arizona
Rimrock Sells Valley Vista
California
Lake Isabella Susanville Tehehapi
Nevada
Reno - STMBID



Demonstration Sites with Multiple Contaminants

Sites	Well Flow gpm	Contaminants Arsenic ug/L	Contaminants Other
Homedale, ID	10 Homes	52	Uranium, Nitrate
Lake Isabella, CA	38	35	Uranium
Fruitland, ID	250	50	Nitrate
Vale, ID	525	17	Nitrate
STMGID Reno, NV	350	88	Antimony
Greenville, WI	375	34	Radium
Carmel, ME	30	21	Antimony
Lyman, NE	250	20	Uranium
North Smithfield, RI	18	20	Radium



Nitrate and Perchlorate

Problem: Treating nitrate and perchlorate are not simple for small communities

Action: Evaluate the cost of point of use (POU) (membranes) and anaerobic biological treatment against ion exchange treatment

Results: Costs were developed for various system sizes

- Anerobic biological treatment for drinking water scenarios are only cost-effective of larger systems for nitrate
- POU treatment is cost-effective for extremely small systems <100 people
- Ion exchange remains the most cost-effective option for the other scenarios

Impact: Helps states and communities ballpark potential treatment costs





Small Systems Monthly Webinar Series

January 2015 to June 2019

Has provided over ***28,000 continuing education credits***

Affiliation Percentages

13%	Federal Gov't
43%	State Gov't
13%	Local Gov't
1%	Tribal Gov't/Nation
8%	Utility (Public/Private)
1%	Military
10%	Consultant/Tech Assist
4%	Private Sector
3%	Academia/Education
2%	NGO/Association
1%	Other



Schedule and Registration:

epa.gov/water-research/small-systems-monthly-webinar-series

16th Annual EPA Drinking Water Workshop: Small Systems Challenges and Solutions

September 24-26, 2019 in Cincinnati, Ohio

Earn up to 15 Continuing Education Contact Hours

epa.gov/water-research/16th-annual-epa-drinking-water-workshop-small-systems-challenges-and-solutions

- Focus on drinking water distribution monitoring and treatment topics
- Discussion groups and ask the experts
- Technical talks and demos
- Hands-on training options
- Great networking opportunity

Contacts

Thomas Speth, PhD, PE
Acting Associate Director
National Risk Management Research Laboratory
US EPA Office of Research and Development
speth.thomas@epa.gov
513-569-7208

ORD PFAS Team:
Andrew Gillespie – *ORD Executive Lead for PFAS R&D*
Chris Impellitteri – *Analytical methods, biosolids*
Marc Mills – *Remediation, analytical methods*
Thabet Tolaymat – *Landfills, materials management*
Carolyn Acheson – *Biosolids*
Bill Linak – *Incineration, thermal treatment*
Darren Lytle – *Arsenic treatment*
Michelle Latham – *Small system communication*



The views expressed in this presentation are those of the individual author and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the US EPA.