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Emerging Contaminant Defined

- Synthetic or naturally-occurring chemical or microbe
- Not commonly monitored
- Potential to enter the environment and cause known or suspected adverse environmental or health effects
- Sometimes heretofore undetectable
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Current Research on Emerging Contaminants

- Perchlorate
- NDMA
- 1,4-Dioxane
- PFCs
Perchlorate Issue

- Broad Use & Occurrence
  - DoD
    - Rocket propellant
    - Insensitive munitions
  - Pyrotechnics and flares
  - Agricultural
  - Natural deposition
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Eco-Toxicology

- SERDP initiated studies in 1998
- A comprehensive program
  - amphibians
  - fish
  - invertebrates
  - birds
  - small mammals
- Laboratory and field studies
- Work is the basis for EPA eco-risk assessment
- Investment Completed
- Comprehensive book being written
Vadose Zone Treatment

- Blower
- Vaporizer
- Electron Donor
- Perchlorate Source
- Extraction Well
- Injection Well
Ex Situ Treatment

- 1998 drinking water treatment R&D was initiated by an industry consortium (AWWARF)
  - Completed in 2004
- Successful ESTCP waste water bio-treatment transitioned in 2000
- Only ion-exchange currently used for drinking water
- FY2005 initiatives
  - ESTCP Congressional program to dem/val new approaches (ion exchange, biotreatment, tailored GAC)
  - SERDP develop program for next generation treatment
In Situ Treatment

- SERDP initiated bioremediation R&D in 1998
  - Fundamental and applied studies
  - Showed potential and method for cost effective treatment
  - Investment completed

- Dozens of field demonstrations ongoing across DoD

- Fully commercialized
  - Two full-scale applications

![Microbial Biodegradation of Perchlorate](image-url)

*Influence of Different Electron Donors on Perchlorate Biodegradation in Aquifer Microcosms from Site 16*
Treatment Approaches

- **Active Treatment**
  - Soluble Electron Donor
  - Continuous pumping

- **Semi-Passive Treatment**
  - Soluble Electron Donor
  - Intermittent Pumping

- **Passive Treatment**
  - Slow Release Electron Donor
  - No Pumping

**Considerations:**
Mixing, O&M Costs, Biofouling, Secondary Groundwater impacts
Perchlorate Sources

- DoD Sources
  - Manufacturing
  - Demilitarization
  - Test and Training Ranges

- Natural Sources (FY05 Start)
  - Cause
  - Distribution
  - Fate
  - Identification

- Non Military Sources (FY05 Start)
  - Magnitude
  - Extent
  - Identification

Isotopic Identification of Perchlorate Sources
Road Flares

- **Background**
  - 20-40 million flares sold annually

- **Laboratory**
  - Lab studies showed 5-6% potassium perchlorate in unburned flares (10g for a 15 min flare)
  - Complete burning reduced perchlorate by 99% - still have up to 66 mg perchlorate in flare residue

- **Field**
  - Monitoring of background levels of perchlorate in highway runoff
  - Monitored highway run-off near a road flare deployed by State Police at an accident scene (I-95 MA)
  - Max ClO$_4^-$ concentration leaving highway: ~ 314,000 PPB
  - Peak load of ClO$_4^-$ leaving highway : 32.4 mg/min.
  - Total ClO$_4^-$ load to receiving waters : 1.3 g
  - Flares can be a significant point source of perchlorate
Fireworks

- **Background**
  - 221 million pounds consumed in U.S. in 2003
  - May contain up to 70 wt% potassium perchlorate
  - Case studies discussing contamination at display sites are limited

- **Field Study**
  - Concentration of perchlorate increased from ND to 5 mg/kg after firework display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter (mg/kg)</th>
<th>Charge 1</th>
<th>Charge 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perchlorate</td>
<td>389,000,000</td>
<td>355,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antimony</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barium</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strontium</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Perchlorate concentration in fireworks charge was 389 g/kg. Aluminum, magnesium and potassium were also present at high concentrations.
Natural Sources: Where it all started

Chilean NO$_3^-$ Deposits (Atacama Desert)

- Desert for at least last 1 MY
- ClO$_4^-$ (>1%) identified over 100 years ago
- Deposits also contain IO$_3^-$, CrO$_7$ (mg/kg in some strata)
Does Natural Perchlorate Impact other Areas?

Concentration (ppb)
Distribution of Perchlorate in Surface Soils
ClO₄⁻ Concentration Distribution in Groundwater from Selected Areas

[Graph showing concentration distribution with labels for Amargosa Mountains, NHP, CHP*, SHP*, Alb, Big Bend*, Edwards, UAE, African, and their respective N values.]
Proposed Perchlorate Accumulation Mechanisms

- Atmospheric Production and Deposition
- Partial Transport in Undisturbed Arid Areas
- Accumulation over long Periods
- Flushing Possible from Irrigation or Climate Shifts
- Not Stable in Anaerobic Environments and Some Plant Uptake
What’s the Overall Significance?

- **Exposure**
  - Plants?
  - Milk?
  - GW?

- **Future GW impacts**
  - Desert Urbanization
  - Climate Change
  - Irrigation

- **Site Assessment**
  - Establish Background
  - Isotopic Differentiation
Natural vs. Anthropogenic Perchlorate

Key Question: Can You Distinguish Natural from Man-Made Perchlorate?
Isotope Ratio Analysis to Differentiate Perchlorate Sources

- Objectives
  - Analyze Isotope Ratios in Commercial, Military, and Natural Perchlorate Sources.
    - Develop broad database quantifying difference between natural and anthropogenic perchlorate.
  - Analyze Isotope Ratios of Perchlorate in Groundwater Plumes with Anthropogenic Origin and Suspected Natural Sources.
    - Demonstrate/validate isotopic procedure for forensic analysis.

- Elements in a compound can have widely different isotopic ratios based on mode of formation (e.g., $^{18}$O in NO$_3$ from nitrification vs. atmospheric).

- Stable isotope ratios provide a unique “fingerprint” of a chemical compound, another dimension of information invisible from dissolved concentrations.
First Objective: Analyze Isotope Ratios in Commercial, Military, & Natural Perchlorate Sources

- **Military sources**
  - Propellant-grade perchlorate
  - Demilitarization activities
- **Commercial sources**
  - Reagent grade perchlorate
  - Fireworks
  - Emergency flares
  - Cotton defoliants
  - Bleach
- **Natural sources**
  - Chilean caliche
  - Natural fertilizers with Chilean nitrate
  - Southwest US: Evaporites
  - Potash salt
Results: Forensic Isotopic Analysis of Perchlorate $\delta^{37}\text{Cl}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$

Chlorine markedly "heavier" in anthropogenic Perchlorate (n = 25).

$\delta^{37}\text{Cl}: 0.6 \pm 0.9$
Range: -3.1 to 1.6

$\delta^{18}\text{O}: -17.2 \pm 2.8$
Range: -24.8 to -12.5

Oxygen consistently "heavier" in natural Perchlorate (n = 7).

$\delta^{37}\text{Cl}: -12.8 \pm 2.0$
Range: -14.5 to -9.2

$\delta^{18}\text{O}: -6.3 \pm 2.5$
Range: -9.3 to -2.2
NDMA

- **Toxicology**
  - NDMA is a potent mutagen, teratogen, & carcinogen.
  - EPA $10^{-6}$ Lifetime Cancer Risk = 0.7 ng/L.
  - California DHS; 10 ng/L Action Level; California OEEHA 3 ng/L PHG (12/2006)

- **Sources**
  - 1,1-Dimethylhydrazine Rocket Fuel\([(CH_3)_2NNH_2]\]
  - Aerozine 50 (Mixture of Hydrazine and 1,1DMH)
  - Disinfection Byproduct (Chloramine)
  - Industrial, Agricultural and Food Sources.

- **Treatment**
  - Pump-and-Treat with UV Irradiation
  - 1000 mj/cm^2 for 10-fold reduction
  - (10X for Cryptosporidium)
Biological Degradation of NDMA

- Summary of Previous Research:
  - Mammalian Metabolism
    - Cytochrome P-450 System
  - Biological Degradation
    - Several Papers 1970’s – 1980’s
    - Biodegradation Observed in Soils and Lake Water, Intestinal Bacteria
    - Persistent in Groundwater
  - No Environmental Isolates Capable of Growth on NDMA
  - One Isolate Capable of Cometabolism
    - Methylosinus trichosporium OB3b
Potential Remedial Applications

Ex Situ

In Situ
NDMA Summary

- Treatable by UV Oxidation
- *In Situ* and *Ex Situ* Biotreatment Possible
  - May require propane biostimulation to reach low levels
- *Ex Situ* Metal Catalyst Treatment Showing Promise (*Data not shown*)
I,4-Dioxane

1,4-Dioxane

1,1,1-Trichloroethane
The 1,4-Dioxane Problem

- Used extensively as a stabilizer in chlorinated solvents
  - Primarily used with 1,1,1-TCA
  - 1,1,1-TCA found at 809 NPL sites (www.atsdr.gov; 2004)
- 1,4-Dioxane has recently emerged as a contaminant of concern
  - Low action levels in several states: California (3 ppb); Florida (5 ppb); Maine (70 ppb); Massachusetts (50 ppb); Michigan (1 ppb); North Carolina (7 ppb)
  - Risk of closed sites being re-opened
- Little detailed information on the fate of 1,4-dioxane in groundwater
  - Few biodegradation studies
Current Treatment Options for 1,4-Dioxane

- *In situ* oxidation
  - Reported to work in some cases
- Advanced Oxidation (HiPOx)
  - Some full-scale systems in place
- Biological Treatment
  - Co-metabolic process (propane/THF)
  - Biological treatment has proven to be challenging
- No universal solution yet available
Perfluoroalkyl Contaminated Groundwater

- FY11 SON: In Situ Remediation of Perfluoroalkyl Contaminated Groundwater
- Objectives:
  - Improve understanding of mechanisms involved in F&T processes in groundwater under varying natural & engineered conditions.
  - Determine impact of co-contaminants on F&T processes.
  - Improve understanding of behavior of perfluoroalkyl contaminants under typical remedial technologies for co-contaminants.
  - Develop remedial strategies for perfluoroalkyl contaminants, including consideration of the necessity for treatment train approaches to facilitate treatment of co-contaminants.
What Are Perfluorochemicals (PFCs)?

- General formula: $F(CF_2)_n-R$
  - Hydrophobic alkyl chain of varying length (typically C$_4$ to C$_{16}$)
  - Hydrophilic end group
- Man-made compounds with unique chemical properties
  - Very stable and persistent in the environment
  - Ionic form of PFCs – highly soluble, non-volatile, and poorly sorb to soil
- Primary PFCs of interest
  - Perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS)
  - Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)
What Are PFCs Used For?

- Used to make:
  - Fluoropolymer coatings and products that resist heat, oil, stains, and grease.
    - Clothing
    - Furniture
    - Food packaging
    - Heat resistant non-stick cooking surfaces
    - Electrical wire insulation
  - Fluorosurfactants
    - Aqueous film forming foam (AFFF)
    - Chromium plating mist suppressants
    - Stain repellants
    - Photolithographic chemicals
Aqueous Film Forming Foam

- AFFF
  - Developed in 1960s by 3M and U.S. Navy for use on Class B fires (flammable liquids)
  - Contains fluorosurfactants other compounds as required) per MILSPEC MIL-F-24385F(SH)
  - Low surface tension and positive spreading coefficient enable film formation on top of lighter

- PFCs in AFFF
  - Historically, AFFF contained PFOS and small percentage of PFO (disassociated form of PFOA)
  - 3M, sole producer of PFOS in the U.S., discontinued production of PFOS in 2001
  - Continued use of stockpiled PFOS-based AFFF not currently restricted under U.S. regulations
  - AFFF now produced using smaller chain PFCs (<C₆) fuels
Growing Regulatory Interest in PFCs

- Interest driven by findings of PFCs in:
  - Occurrence in biological organisms and environmental media
  - Groundwater near PFC manufacturing and disposal facilities
    - DuPont Washington Works Facility, West Virginia
    - 3M Cottage Grove Facility, Minnesota
    - Numerous landfills and disposal sites in Minnesota
  - Soil and groundwater near fire training facilities in Minnesota
  - Soil and compost at north Georgia wastewater treatment facility
  - Sewage sludge and agricultural soils in Alabama
  - Public water supply systems in New Jersey
Federal Regulation Related to Cleanup

- CERCLA - not a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant
- Not RCRA regulated waste (listed or characteristic)
- PFOA/PFOS not currently regulated under the USEPA Safe Drinking Water Act
  - Recently included on the USEPA Drinking Water Contaminant Candidate List (CCL3)
- USEPA Provisional Health Advisory Values
  - PFOA – 0.4 µg/L
  - PFOS – 0.2 µg/L
- Developed in response to contaminated agricultural sites in Alabama but values can be used to assess exposure at other sites
- Based on
  - 10-kg child consuming 1 L drinking water per day.
  - Default relative source contribution (RSC) – 20%
# State Environmental Guidelines/Action Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline / Action Level</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>PFOA</th>
<th>PFOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Health Risk Limit</td>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>0.3 µg/L</td>
<td>0.3 µg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Interim Maximum Allowable Concentration</td>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>2 µg/L</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Preliminary Guidance Value</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>0.04 µg/L</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California – under review for possible Prop. 65 listing</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Persistent Bioaccumulative Toxins Rule</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental release of PFCs

- Historical testing or emergency activation of fire suppression systems in hangars
-Leaks from storage tanks and pipelines
- Historical fire fighter training exercises
Scope

- Scope of potential impact difficult to define
- Site investigations have not typically included analysis for PFCs, given their emerging status
- Scope of potential problem can be estimated using the number of “Fire/ Crash/Training” sites as a surrogate for actual site data
  - May underestimate problem by not including AFFF spills, pipeline leaks, or testing/emergency activation of aircraft hangar fire suppression systems
## Potential Impacts to DoD Restoration Program

### DoD Fire/ Crash/ Training Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total Sites</th>
<th>Remedy in Place (RIP)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Response Complete (RC)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Force</strong></td>
<td>353</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Army</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navy</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DLA</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUDS</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>594</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data obtained from the DoD Knowledge Based Corporate Reporting System (KBCRS), 2008
Cleanup Challenges

- Many conventional treatment approaches are not effective for PFCs in water (e.g., direct oxidation, air stripping, vapor extraction)

- Technologies currently available to treat PFCs in water include
  - Granular activated carbon (GAC) is most effective method
    - Drinking water treatment (municipal and private wells)
    - Landfill water treatment
  - Reverse osmosis is effective for higher concentration industrial waste streams

- Bench-scale research to develop alternative treatment approaches continues
Home Pages