

Vertex Environmental Inc.

Treating PFAS: Current In-Situ Remediation Approaches

September 27, 2023 SABCS Workshop Bruce Tunnicliffe, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.



Outline

- Remediating PFAS
 - Why is PFAS remediation difficult?
 - Review of current State of Affairs
- In-Situ Remediation of PFAS
 - Comparison of 2 Amendments
- Closing



Background



Bruce Tunnicliffe, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.

- Masters U of Waterloo. Remediation
- Founder Vertex Environmental Inc.
- Founder SMART Remediation

Vertex Environmental Inc.

- Started July 2003
- Environmental Contractor



VERTE

The Characteristics of PFAS, As They Relate to Remediation



PFAS: Why is it hard to Remediate?

PFAS is a Group of Chemicals

- Some say more than 4,500
- Laboratories report ~40 PFAS
- PFAS = Dark Matter?
 - you don't know what you have
- Long chain can degrade to short chain
- Generally short chains are more toxic and mobile than long chains
- Documented water treatment issues
 - e.g. hydrogen peroxide is added during water treatment, the short chained PFAS effluent concentration is higher than influent conc.



VERTE

A Take Away Be careful with PFAS destruction approaches, you have to consider precursors

PFAS: Why is it hard to Remediate?

How They Are Made

- Human made
- A fossil fuel derivative
- To make PFAS, replace the hydrogen with fluorine
- Carbon-Fluorine (C-F) bond:
 - strongest covalent bond in organic chemistry
- Low to no degradation under natural conditions
- PFAS thermally degrades at >800°C

A Take Away Traditional remediation approaches will be very difficult to apply due to PFAS characteristics



Aliphatic Compound



Perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS)



Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)



Remediating PFAS The Current State of Affairs



Remediating PFAS, The Current State of Affairs

Treatment Technologies and Methods for Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)

- Treatment technologies for PFAS are the focus of intense research and are evolving
- The nature of PFAS make many conventional treatment technologies ineffective, including those that rely on:
 - <u>contaminant volatilization</u> at ambient temperature (air stripping, soil vapor extraction)
 - <u>bioremediation</u> (biosparging, biostimulation, bioaugmentation)
- Even aggressive technologies require extreme conditions beyond typical practices:
 - thermal treatment and chemical oxidation
- "...innovative combinations of...technologies are required"



ITRC, July 2022 "Treatment Technologies and Methods for Per- and Polyfluoralkyl Substances (PFAS)"

Remediating PFAS Interesting leading-edge technologies



Remediating PFAS, Foam Fractionation



VERTEX

Remediating PFAS, Foam Fractionation

PFAS in an Aqueous Solution







Remediating PFAS, eBeam



Radiation Physics and Chemistry

Volume 189, December 2021, 109705



Degradation of PFOS and PFOA in soil and groundwater samples by high dose <u>Electron</u> Beam Technology

John Lassalle^a, Ruilian Gao^a, Robert Rodi^a, Corinne Kowald^b, Mingbao Feng^c, Virender K. Sharma^c, Thomas Hoelen^d, Paul Bireta^d, Erika F. Houtz^e, David Staack^a A 🖾, Suresh D. Pillai^b A 🖾



Remediating PFAS, eBeam

 Electron beam (eBeam) technology utilizes compact electron accelerators to generate large numbers of highly energetic electrons from electricity. The technology is commonplace in the medical device sterilization industry, wire and cable polymer crosslinking and food pasteurization industries.







Remediating PFAS, eBeam



Remediating PFAS, some Innovative Destruction Technologies

TECHNOLOGY	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES Widescale application. Inefficient for short-chain PFASs. Electrodes are expensive. Reduced electrode lifetime. High energy consumption. Toxic by-products. Forms short-chain PFAS	
ELECTROCHEMICAL OXIDATION	 Effective for long-chain PFASs. Efficient for highly concentrated PFASs. Effective for low-volume PFASs. Low environmental impact. Does not require pretreatment. 		
PLASMA	 Effective for long-chain PFASs. Effective for short-chain PFASs. Low energy consumption. No chemical additives are needed. Short treatment time. Effective for highly concentrated PFASs. Effective against Co-contaminants. 	 Affects water's pH, making it acidic. Forms short-chain PFASs. Its mechanism is not well understood. Longer time for short-chain treatment. The addition of chemicals is required. Nontargeted reactions can result in longer treatment time 	
PHOTOCATALYSIS	 Low energy consumption. Performed at ambient temperatures. Sustainable technology. It can be recycled. 	 Low degradation efficiency. Inefficient for sulfonic groups. Toxic intermediate products. Additional treatment is needed. Affected by co-contaminants. 	
SONOLYSIS	 Effective for long-chain PFASs. Effective for short-chain PFASs. Effective in soils and liquids. Effective for highly concentrated PFASs. Effective against co-contaminants. No chemical additives are needed. Does not require pretreatment. Efficient for highly concentrated PFASs. 	 Widescale application. High energy consumption. Its mechanism is not well understood. Optimization of ultrasonic and geometric parameters are needed to scaling up of technology 	
SUPERCRITICAL WATER OXIDATION	 Effective for long-chain PFASs. Effective for short-chain PFASs Low environmental impact. Relatively quick treatment time 	 Not economically viable for large volumes. Affects water's pH, making it acidic. Corrosion of the reactor. Precipitation of salts. Toxic intermediate products. 	
THERMAL DEGRA DATION/ INCINERATION	 Widescale application. Reduced capital cost. Effective for long-chain PFASs. 	 Toxic intermediate and final products. High environmental impact. Air and soil contamination. Toxic emission. Toxic by-products. 	

VERTE

"A Review of PFAS Destruction Technologies", Dec 2022, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health

Remediating PFAS In-situ

What Can We Do Right Now?



Remediating PFAS, in-situ

- In-situ PFAS destruction
 - In general, <u>not feasible</u> for full-scale application at this time
- In-situ: adsorption and stabilization
 - It is **feasible** to immobilize PFAS in-situ at this time



Treatment Technologies and Methods for Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)

- "It might be reasonable and necessary to implement interim remedial actions...
 - ...to mitigate completed exposure pathways...
 - ... with the intent of applying more robust and permanent solutions as they are developed."
- Now: Adsorption in-situ approaches
- Years, decades later: Apply new technology to destroy PFAS



Remediating PFAS, in-situ

Adsorption / Stabilization:

Amendments exist that can be injected into the subsurface:

- Activated Carbon
 - PlumeStop
- Modified Clay
 - Fluoro-Sorb®

These amendments are proven to effectively adsorb PFAS



Remediating PFAS, in-situ using Activated Carbon

- Regarding Activated Carbon, one product has been applied numerous times for PFAS
- Colloidal Activated Carbon (PlumeStop)



Plumestop Data from the Manufacturer



Remediating PFAS, in-situ with AC

Colloidal Activated Carbon (PlumeStop) Published Case Study

/ERTEX



G.Niarchos et al., 2023 – "In-situ application of colloidal activated carbon for PFAS-contaminated soil and groundwater: A Swedish case study"

Remediating PFAS, in-situ with AC

Activated Carbon



Activated Carbon – Roll Over, or Competitive Adsorption

- PFAS >4,500 compounds
- Long Chain PFAS
 - Preferentially adsorbed
- Short Chain PFAS
 - Get "kicked off" the carbon



Remediating PFAS, in-situ with Modified Clay

- Activated carbon has a Competitive Adsorption mechanism
- Modified clay (FluoroSorb®) does not
- The modified clay adsorption is ion exchange as well as hydrophobic attraction
- PFAS is surfactant-like, thus partially hydrophobic



Remediating PFAS, in-situ with Modified Clay

• Modified Clay Sorption Mechanism

Modified Clay: Platelet-like structure



How PFAS is Sorbed



Increasing PFAS Adsorption



VERTE)



Remediating PFAS, in-situ with Modified Clay



Lead Reactive Cells (First 90 days)					
	2.5% MC	5% MC	7.5% MC		
Vol. of Treated Water (L)	~9,700 L	~9,200 L	~9,050 L		
Flux ∑PFAS (µg)	~160,300	~152,900	~149,700		
Adsorbed ∑PFAS (µg)	~90,800	~148,200	~149,400		
Removal Efficiency (%)	57%	97%	99.8%		
	(Second 90 days)				
	2.5% MC	5% MC	7.5% MC		
Vol. of Treated Water (L)	~9,100 L	~8,250 L	~8,500 L		
Flux ∑PFAS (µg)	~236,600	~215,250	~220,040		
Adsorbed ∑PFAS (µg)	~235,600	~215,070	~220,020		
Removal Efficiency (%)	99.6%	99.9%	100%		



Credit: SNC-Lavalin

Remediating PFAS, in-situ – Activated Carbon vs Modified Clay

Groundwater has Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC) naturally present



VERTE)

Remediating PFAS, in-situ – Activated Carbon vs Modified Clay

• Capacity of PFAS adsorption (How long will it hold onto the PFAS?)





Orange County Water District (2021). PFAS Phase 1 Pilot Scale Treatment Study Final Report. March 24, 2021.

Remediating PFAS, in-situ – Using Injectable Modified Clay (Fluoro-Sorb®)

- Modified Clay, specifically Fluoro-Sorb[®], has some advantages
- Create a suspension with potable water and inject into all geologies
- Will not swell or block formation
- Stays put where placed (non-soluble, non-mobile)
- QA/QC testing





VERTE

Closing Thoughts



In-Situ Remediation of PFAS

- PFAS remediation is in a development stage
 - Research, experimentation, pilot tests
 - Very exciting times
- PFAS Destruction is difficult
 - We have to be careful with precursors
- Interim remedial measures are necessary right now
- Two proven in-situ injectable approaches, using:
 - Activated Carbon (specifically, colloidal activated carbon)
 - Modified Clay (specifically, Fluoro-Sorb[®])
- Current Assessment:
 - Activated Carbon In-Situ PFAS Remediation Approach 1.0
 - Modified Clay In-Situ PFAS Remediation Approach 2.0





Questions?

Thank You for Your Time

Bruce Tunnicliffe Vertex Environmental Inc. (519) 249-9184 mobile brucet@vertexenvironmental.ca

www.vertexenvironmental.ca

