

US Patent & Trademark Office

Patent Public Search | Text View

United States Patent Application Publication

20250263310

Kind Code

A1

Publication Date

August 21, 2025

Inventor(s)

Townsend; Timothy G. et al.

TREATING PER- AND POLY-FLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES IN LANDFILL LEACHATE

Abstract

The present disclosure provides for devices, systems, and methods of separating PFAS compounds from wastewater leachate. After separation, the PFAS compounds can be rendered less harmful. The present disclosure provides for devices, systems, and methods that uses aeration-induced foaming to isolate PFAS from landfill leachate into a concentrated, volume reduced liquid (coalesced foam), which can be separated and treated.

Inventors: Townsend; Timothy G. (Gainesville, FL), Bowden; John Alfred (Gainesville, FL), Annable; Michael D. (Gainesville, FL), Robey; Nicole (Gainesville, FL)

Applicant: University of Florida Research Foundation, Inc. (Gainesville, FL)

Family ID: 1000008575055

Appl. No.: 19/189663

Filed: April 25, 2025

Related U.S. Application Data

parent US division 17911903 20220915 parent-grant-document US 12312255 US division
PCT/US2021/022492 20210316 child US 19189663
us-provisional-application US 63027450 20200520
us-provisional-application US 62990156 20200316

Publication Classification

Int. Cl.: C02F1/24 (20230101); B01D21/00 (20060101); B01D21/24 (20060101); C02F1/40 (20230101); C02F101/36 (20060101); C02F103/06 (20060101)

U.S. Cl.:

Background/Summary

CLAIM OF PRIORITY TO RELATED APPLICATION [0001] This application is a divisional of U.S. patent application Ser. No. 17/911,903, filed Sep. 15, 2022, which is the 35 U.S.C. § 371 national stage of PCT application having serial number PCT/US 2021/022492, filed on Mar. 16, 2021. PCT/US 2021/022492 claims priority to U.S. provisional application entitled “TREATING PER-AND POLY-FLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES IN LANDFILL LEACHATE,” having Ser. No. 63/027,450 filed on May 20, 2020, and to U.S. provisional application entitled “TREATING PER-AND POLY-FLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES IN LANDFILL LEACHATE,” having Ser. No. 62/990,156 filed on Mar. 16, 2020, each of which are entirely incorporated herein by reference.

BACKGROUND

[0003] Large volumes of per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl-contaminated substances (PFAS-contaminated substances) wastewaters, such as municipal solid waste landfill leachates, pose a challenge for P FAS treatment technologies in practice today. While various techniques have been used, each of them possesses their own unique challenges as it pertains to wastewater leachate. Thus, there is a need to find alternative approaches.

SUMMARY

[0004] The present disclosure provides for devices, systems, and methods of separating PFAS compounds from wastewater leachate. After separation, the PFAS compounds can be rendered less harmful. The present disclosure provides for devices, systems, and methods that uses aeration-induced foaming to isolate PFAS from landfill leachate into a concentrated, volume reduced liquid (coalesced foam). The foam can then be separated and treated.

[0005] An aspect of the present disclosure provides for a method of separating per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl compounds (PFAS compounds) from a wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds, comprising: foaming the wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds for a period of time to form a foam layer on top of the wastewater leachate and a de-foamed wastewater leachate, wherein the foam layer comprises a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the wastewater leachate, wherein the de-foamed wastewater leachate has a lower concentration of total PFAS compounds than the wastewater leachate; and separating the foam layer from the de-foamed wastewater leachate; and optionally processing the foam layer. The foaming can include bubble aeration of the wastewater leachate that can include artificial bubble aeration introduced using a bubble aeration system. The bubble aeration system can produce bubbles within the wastewater leachate for a period of time sufficient to form the foam layer. The bubbles have a sufficient bubble size and air-to-liquid volume, and contact time with the wastewater leachate to form the foam layer. The PFAS compounds can include perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS), or a combination thereof. The processing can include processing using an electron beam, processing using a plasma, processing by incineration, processing by oxidation, or a combination thereof. After processing any residual water can be returned, reclaimed, or recycled.

[0006] The present disclosure provides for a system for removing per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl compounds (P FAS compounds) from wastewater leachate contaminated with P FAS compounds, comprising: a bubble aeration system comprising an air flow device in communication with a bubble aeration device, wherein the bubble aeration device is within pre-foamed wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds, wherein the bubble aeration device is configured to

produce bubbles from the air flow from the air flow device, wherein the bubbles form a foam layer on top of the wastewater leachate, wherein the foam layer comprises a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the pre-foamed wastewater; a separating system configured to remove a portion of the foam layer from the surface of the wastewater leachate; and optionally a processing system includes a device that renders the PFAS compounds less hazardous relative to before processing than PFAS compound. The air flow device can be an air generator or pump and wherein the bubble aeration device is a structure that is configured to form bubbles as air is flowed through the bubble aeration device. The separating system can include a structure that is configured to skim the foam layer off of the surface of the wastewater leachate, optionally wherein the structure is a skimmer or a baffle. The processing system can include: an electron beam device, a plasma device, an incineration device, an oxidation device, or a combination thereof.

[0007] The present disclosure provides for a device for removing per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl compounds (PFAS compounds) from wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds, comprising: an air flow device in communication with a bubble aeration device, wherein the bubble aeration device is within pre-foamed wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds, wherein the bubble aeration device is configured to produce bubbles from the air flow from the air flow device, wherein the bubbles form a foam layer on top of the wastewater leachate, wherein the foam layer comprises a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the pre-foamed wastewater; a separating device that is configured to remove a portion of the foam layer from the surface of the wastewater leachate; and optionally a processing system includes a device that renders the PFAS compounds less hazardous relative to before processing than PFAS compound. The air flow device can be an air generator or pump and wherein the bubble aeration device is a structure that is configured to form bubbles as air is flowed through the bubble aeration device. The separating device can include a structure (e.g., skimmer, baffle, and the like) that is configured to skim the foam layer off of the surface of the wastewater leachate, optionally wherein the structure is a skimmer or a baffle. The processing system can include: an electron beam device, a plasma device, an incineration device, an oxidation device, or a combination thereof.

Description

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

[0008] Further aspects of the present disclosure will be more readily appreciated upon review of the detailed description of its various embodiments, described below, when taken in conjunction with the accompanying drawings.

[0009] FIG. 1 illustrates landfill leachate PFAS extraction efficiency experiment flow diagram. The ratio between average peak area for aliquots spiked in step 2 and step 4 is the solid phase extraction efficiency, and the ratio between average peak area for aliquots spiked in step 2 and step 6 is the total preparation efficiency.

[0010] FIG. 2 illustrates graphs describing mean removal percentages for PFAS. Error bars represent standard deviation. In all ten foaming experiments, the mass-labeled tracer of PFHxS (*) was not found in defoamed leachate, therefore the removal percentage was assumed to be 100% (0% standard deviation). Σ PFOS and Σ PFHxS are shown as the sum of their respective isomers.

[0011] FIG. 3 illustrates graphs describing mean removal percentages for the remaining PFAS (a category which includes fluorotelomers and sulfonamides). Error bars represent standard deviation. In all ten foaming experiments, the labeled standard of PFECBS (*) was not found in defoamed leachate, therefore the removal percentage was assumed to be 100% (0% standard deviation). Compounds are displayed from top to bottom in increasing order of MS retention time.

[0012] FIG. 4 illustrates graphs describing sequential foam experiment results for select PFAS compounds: all detected sulfonates and carboxylates and the nine most prevalent (by peak area)

“other” PFAS compounds. Peak area ratios were calculated using the mean peak areas of native and mass-labeled PFAS compounds in leachate, in 50-mL aliquots (approximately 14% of the initial leachate volume) of coalesced foam and in defoamed leachate from three experiments. The values reported in the figure are the peak area of the sample divided by the peak area of the defoamed leachate (the end point of PFAS reduction for this experiment). Σ PFOS and Σ PFHxS are shown as the sum of their respective isomers.

[0013] FIG. 5 illustrates graphs describing average foam: defoam peak area ratio among perfluoroalkyl acids (P FAA) relative to carbon chain length.

[0014] FIG. 6 illustrates graphs describing extraction efficiency comparison for solid phase extraction and total extraction (i.e., after nitrogen evaporation) for leachate and foam. Σ PFOS and Σ PFHxS are shown as the sum of their respective isomers. Compounds are shown in increasing order of retention time.

[0015] FIG. 7 illustrates extraction efficiency experiment details.

[0016] FIG. 8 is an aerial (top diagram) and elevation (bottom diagram) view of a device or system of the present disclosure that is a field scale P FAS removal treatment train.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION

[0017] This disclosure is not limited to particular embodiments described, and as such may, of course, vary. The terminology used herein serves the purpose of describing particular embodiments only, and is not intended to be limiting, since the scope of the present disclosure will be limited only by the appended claims.

[0018] Where a range of values is provided, each intervening value, to the tenth of the unit of the lower limit unless the context clearly dictates otherwise, between the upper and lower limit of that range and any other stated or intervening value in that stated range, is encompassed within the disclosure. The upper and lower limits of these smaller ranges may independently be included in the smaller ranges and are also encompassed within the disclosure, subject to any specifically excluded limit in the stated range. Where the stated range includes one or both of the limits, ranges excluding either or both of those included limits are also included in the disclosure.

[0019] As will be apparent to those of skill in the art upon reading this disclosure, each of the individual embodiments described and illustrated herein has discrete components and features which may be readily separated from or combined with the features of any of the other several embodiments without departing from the scope or spirit of the present disclosure. Any recited method may be carried out in the order of events recited or in any other order that is logically possible.

[0020] Embodiments of the present disclosure will employ, unless otherwise indicated, techniques of chemistry, polymer chemistry, material science, and the like, which are within the skill of the art. Such techniques are explained fully in the literature.

[0021] Prior to describing the various embodiments, the following definitions are provided and should be used unless otherwise indicated.

[0022] Unless otherwise defined, all technical and scientific terms used herein have the same meaning as commonly understood by one of ordinary skill in the art of microbiology, molecular biology, medicinal chemistry, and/or organic chemistry. Although methods and materials similar or equivalent to those described herein can be used in the practice or testing of the present disclosure, suitable methods and materials are described herein.

[0023] As used in the specification and the appended claims, the singular forms “a,” “an,” and “the” may include plural referents unless the context clearly dictates otherwise. Thus, for example, reference to “a support” includes a plurality of supports. In this specification and in the claims that follow, reference will be made to a number of terms that shall be defined to have the following meanings unless a contrary intention is apparent.

DISCUSSION

[0024] Aspects of the present disclosure provide for devices, systems, and methods of separating

PFAS compounds from wastewater leachate. After separation, the PFAS compounds can be rendered less harmful. The present disclosure provides for devices, systems, and methods that uses aeration-induced foaming to isolate P FAS from landfill leachate into a concentrated, volume reduced liquid (coalesced foam). Dilute waste streams are usually poor candidates for high energy destructive P FAS treatment methods (e.g., sonication, chemical oxidation, electron beam, plasma). Landfill leachate is a more concentrated waste stream, which can be further concentrated using this technique.

[0025] The surfactant properties of P FAS are exploited to concentrate the PFAS compounds in a foam layer that can be produced via the bubble aeration of landfill wastewater leachate. Initial testing shows that the effectiveness of the foaming technique for concentrating PFAS varied by compound, with a mean removal percentage (the percent difference between PFAS in leachate before and after foam removal) of about 69% and a median removal percentage of about 92% among the ten replicate foaming experiments. The effectiveness can vary depending upon various factors such as the wastewater leachate contents, pH, presence of other materials in the leachate, and the like. An advantage of this technique is that it appears to be similarly effective at sequestering sulfonates and carboxylate PFAS compounds. The results suggest that for the pretreatment or preconcentration of landfill leachates, foaming to sequester PFAS is a practical approach that optionally could be strategically coupled to high energy PFAS-destructive treatment technologies. The process described herein is simple and could feasibly be applied at a relatively low cost at most landfills.

[0026] Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are man-made compounds that have been used to manufacture consumer products and industrial chemicals such as aqueous film forming foams (AFFFs). PFAS substances and related compounds such as PFAS precursors can be referred to as PFAS compounds. PFAS compounds can include perfluorobutyric acid (PFBA), perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPA), perfluorobutane sulfonate (PFBS), perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA), perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA), perfluorohexane sulfonate (PFHxS), 6:2 fluorotelomer sulfonate (6:2 FTS), perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), perfluoroheptane sulfonate (PFHpS), perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS), perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA), and 8:2 fluorotelomer sulfonate (8:2 FTS), as well other compounds and precursor materials used to make these compounds. The PFAS compounds can include perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS), or a combination thereof.

[0027] The present disclosure provides for devices, systems, and methods of separating PFAS compounds from wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds and processing the separated P FAS. The wastewater leachate prior to foaming can be referred to as “pre-foamed wastewater leachate” or “wastewater leachate” while after foaming it is referred to as de-foamed wastewater leachate. It should be stated that the same volume of wastewater leachate can be subjected to the foaming process multiple separate times and/or continuously. The foaming process includes aerating the wastewater leachate that may be contaminated with PFAS compounds. In one instance, the wastewater leachate may be known to be contaminated while in another it may be suspected to be contaminated. The foaming process includes operating a bubble aeration device (e.g., fine bubble diffusers or microbubble diffusers) in contact (e.g., disposed within) with wastewater leachate using specified bubble size, air-to-liquid volume, and contact time, followed by physical separation of the foam from the leachate using a separating device or system that can include baffles or skimmers (e.g., industrial baffles or skimmers to process large volumes of wastewater). In an aspect, the wastewater leachate is flowed in a straight or serpentine, curving, winding, or sinuous path (e.g., see FIG. 8), where the wastewater leachate is subjected to the foaming process (e.g., exposed the bubble from the bubble aeration device) along portions or the entire path or at the end of the path. The separating device or system can be configured to separate the foam at various positions along the path and/or at the end of the path. The characteristics, volumes and manner of collection of landfill leachate differs from domestic water or groundwater.

Foam separation units can be placed at individual leachate collection points (pump station, sumps), at storage facilities, or inline with other treatment unit operations. Foam separation units can be fixed or can be mobile, where in some instances the unit can float on the surface of the wastewater leachate in a pond or other body of water.

[0028] During the foaming process, after a period of time (e.g., minutes to an hour or more), a foam layer is formed on top of the wastewater leachate (now referred to as de-foamed wastewater leachate). The foam layer comprises a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the pre-foamed wastewater. The de-foamed wastewater leachate has a lower concentration (e.g., a reduction of about 10-90%, about 10-70%, about 10-50, or about 10-30%) of total P FAS compounds than the pre-foamed wastewater leachate. The reduction in the concentration can be obtained by measuring before and after foaming. Also, those measurements can be compared to what is found in the foam layer. The path which the wastewater leachate follows can be made longer to reduce the P FAS compounds and/or the wastewater leachate can be processed multiple times to reduce the PFAS compounds.

[0029] After foaming or even during the foaming process, the foam layer can be separated from the de-foamed wastewater leachate. The foaming process can be continuous or for set periods of time and the wastewater leachate can be foamed multiple times to reduce the amount of PFAS compounds down to the desired levels. The separation can be conducted by skimming off the foam layer manually or in an automated manner during the foaming process or after the foaming process is stopped.

[0030] Once the foam layer is separated, the foam layer (which may revert back to a liquid form after sufficient time) can be further processed on site or separately. Processing the foam layer renders the PFAS compounds less hazardous relative to before processing than PFAS compounds. The processing can include processing using an electron beam, processing using a plasma, processing by incineration, processing by oxidation, or a combination thereof.

[0031] Having described the present disclosure, additional details are provided below. The present disclosure provides for methods of separating per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl compounds (PFAS compounds) from a wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds. The method can include the following steps. The first step is foaming the wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds for a period of time (e.g., minutes to hours or more (e.g., 10 min to 24 hours)) to form a foam layer on top of the wastewater leachate and a de-foamed wastewater leachate. The foam layer includes a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the wastewater leachate. In particular, the foam layer can include 10 to 90% of the PFAS compounds that were present in the wastewater leachate prior to treatment. The de-foamed wastewater leachate has a lower concentration of total P FAS compounds than the wastewater leachate. In other words, as the foam is made, the foam removes PFAS compounds from the wastewater leachate. The foam layer can be separated from the de-foamed wastewater leachate and optionally further processed.

[0032] The foaming step includes bubble aeration of the wastewater leachate. The bubble aeration includes artificial bubble aeration using a bubble aeration system. In other words, the foam is not formed using natural processes caused by the natural flow of the wastewater leachate, where foam that might be generated is soon converted based to a fluid, so that an equilibrium naturally exists, whereas the foam layer described herein is formed using bubble aeration. The bubble aeration system includes producing bubbles within the wastewater leachate for a period of time sufficient (e.g., minutes to hours to a day or more) to form the foam layer. In particular, the bubbles formed have a sufficient bubble size (e.g., about 50 to 150 μm , or about 75 to 125 μm , or about 100 μm) and air-to-liquid volume (e.g., approximately about 10:1, about 7:1, or about 4:1), and contact time (e.g., about 1 to 10 minutes, or about 1 to 7 minutes, or about 2 to 5 minutes) with the wastewater leachate to form the foam layer.

[0033] The foaming step and the separating step can occur concurrently in that as soon as foam is formed the foam layer can be separated. Alternatively, the foaming step and separating step occurs

sequentially, where in one aspect, the method includes alternating between forming and separation for a period of (e.g., time hour to days to weeks).

[0034] The separating step includes separating the foam layer from the wastewater leachate using devices such as baffles or skimmers such as those used in industrial processes. The baffle or skimmer can be positioned just above or just below the wastewater leachate to remove the foam layer, where the baffle or skimmer is moving across the wastewater leachate and/or the wastewater leachate is flowing past the baffle or skimmer.

[0035] Once the foam layer is separated from the wastewater leachate, the foam layer can be processed. In general, the foam quickly converts back into fluid. The foam (or fluid) can be subjected to processing to breakdown the PFAS compounds into less hazardous compounds. The processing that can be used to breakdown the PFAS compounds can include processing using an electron beam, processing using a plasma, processing by incineration, processing by oxidation, or a combination thereof.

[0036] The present disclosure also provides for systems for removing per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl compounds (PFAS compounds) from wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds. The system can include a bubble aeration system, a separating system, and optionally a processing system. Each component of the overall system can be in communication (e.g., via a computer or otherwise) with one another so that the foam layer is formed, separated, and optionally processed. The bubble aeration system can include an air flow device (e.g., air generator or pump) in gaseous communication with a bubble aeration device (e.g., fine bubble diffusers or microbubble diffusers). The bubble aeration device is within wastewater leachate that is contaminated with PFAS compounds and is configured to produce bubbles from the air flow from the air flow device. The bubbles cause the formation of a foam layer on top of the wastewater leachate, where the foam layer comprises a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the pre-foamed wastewater.

[0037] The separating system is configured to remove a portion of the foam layer from the surface of the wastewater leachate using a device such as a baffle or skimmer. The separating system collects the foam layer, which can then be processed. The separating system can be in communication with the bubble aeration system so that the device can separate the foam layer at the appropriate time or can be operated in a continuous manner if the bubble aeration system is continuously producing bubbles. The separating system can be in communication electronically or mechanically with the processing system so that the foam layer (or fluid therefrom) can be moved to an appropriate area to be processed.

[0038] The processing system includes a device(s) that renders the PFAS compounds less hazardous relative to before processing than PFAS compound. The processing system can include an electron beam device, a plasma device, an incineration device, an oxidation device, or a combination thereof, where each can decompose the PFAS compounds to less hazardous compounds.

[0039] The present disclosure also provides for devices for removing per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl compounds (PFAS compounds) from wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds. The device can include a bubble aeration device, a separating device, and optionally a processing device. Each component of the overall device can be in communication (e.g., via a computer or otherwise) with one another so that the foam layer is formed, separated, and optionally processed. The bubble aeration device can include an air flow device (e.g., air generator or pump) in gaseous communication with a bubble aeration device (e.g., fine bubble diffusers or microbubble diffusers). The bubble aeration device is within wastewater leachate that is contaminated with PFAS compounds and is configured to produce bubbles from the air flow from the air flow device. The bubbles cause the formation of a foam layer on top of the wastewater leachate, where the foam layer comprises a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the pre-foamed wastewater.

[0040] The separating device is configured to remove a portion of the foam layer from the surface of the wastewater leachate using a device such as a baffle or skimmer. The separating device collects the foam layer, which can then be processed. The separating device can be in communication with the bubble aeration system so that the device can separate the foam layer at the appropriate time or can be operated in a continuous manner if the bubble aeration device is continuously producing bubbles. The separating device can be in communication electronically or mechanically with the processing device so that the foam layer (or fluid therefrom) can be moved to an appropriate area to be processed.

[0041] The processing device includes a device(s) that renders the PFAS compounds less hazardous relative to before processing than PFAS compound. The processing device can include an electron beam device, a plasma device, an incineration device, an oxidation device, or a combination thereof, where each can decompose the PFAS compounds to less hazardous compounds.

[0042] In an aspect, the bubble aeration device or system and the separating device or system are within a single structure. The single structure can include a straight flow path or can have a serpentine, curving, winding, or sinuous path flow path having an entrance for the wastewater leachate and an exit for defoamed water. The bubble aeration system (e.g., bubble aeration device) can produce bubbles along portions or all along the flow path. The separating system or device can be designed to skim the foam layer off of the surface of the wastewater leachate along the flow path or at or near the exit of the flow path. The single structure is configured to float in a body of wastewater leachate. In an aspect, the single structure including the bubble aeration system or device and the separating system or device can be part of a single unit that is configured to float on a body of water and positioned within the body of water. The processing system or device can be part of the single unit or can be positioned on land, where when positioned on land, the processing system or device can be in fluidic communication with the separating system of the single unit so that the separated foam can be flowed from the single unit to the processing system or device and residual treated water can be flowed back to original body of water, for example, or otherwise processed. This configuration allows the single unit to be moved between bodies of water. In other aspects, the system or device for removing PFAS compounds can be constructed as a stationary unit and wastewater leachate is flowed into the system.

EXAMPLE 1

[0043] Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are an expansive family of manmade compounds used in many commercial and industrial applications. Concern regarding environmental and human exposure to PFAS has become the subject of extensive research 1-4, and the case has been consistently made regarding the value of continued PFAS research in numerous works detailing their presence (5-7), persistence (8-10), and fate and transport (11-14). Because they typically discharge to the environment, municipal wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) have been the subject of scrutiny over PFAS levels in their effluent (15-20). As a result, facilities increasingly refuse to accept high strength industrial wastewaters rather than attempt to treat or remove the PFAS and other contaminants from large volumes of comparatively dilute sewage. Landfill leachate—the liquid formed when moisture comes into contact with waste in a landfill—is one such industrial wastewater.

[0044] Modern, sanitary municipal solid waste (MSW) landfills are engineered to use space efficiently and to prevent excessive rainwater intrusion into the waste mass (21). To protect groundwater and the surrounding environment, water which does migrate into the landfill, now leachate, is collected on a low permeability liner system and removed for disposal or treatment. Often the leachate is sent to a WWTP, though in some cases it is treated and discharged on site, or disposed of using deep well injection (22). Landfill leachate is a complex matrix (23) containing the products of anaerobic decomposition and leaching from a wide variety of waste materials. Broadly speaking, landfill leachate from a mature MSW landfill contains high concentrations of ammonia, chemical oxygen demand (COD) and salts, with trace levels of many metals and

metalloids such as arsenic and antimony (24). Leachates can also contain measurable levels of other contaminants of concern, such as pesticides (25), pharmaceuticals (26), and, of immediate interest, PFAS (27-29); if it is found in the waste, it is likely to be found in the leachate (30-32). [0045] Due to their widespread use and resistance to degradation, several PFAS compounds have been found at elevated concentrations in leachates (33,34). Of the more than 5,000 individual compounds referred to as P FAS, only two—perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)—have been sufficiently evaluated to receive risk-based exposure guidance by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (35,36), and some state agencies, including the State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), have released provisional risk-based thresholds for non-drinking water, such as groundwater cleanup target levels (GCTLs) (37) based on the EPA guidance. Despite being phased out of use decades ago, both compounds are still routinely found in MSW landfill leachates at concentrations orders of magnitude higher than the 70 ng L⁻¹ (combined concentration of PFOA and PFOS) EPA Lifetime Drinking Water Health Advisory and FDEP provisional GCTL (34,38). While the implications of these elevated concentrations in leachate have yet to be determined, the need for treatment and/or pretreatment technologies is clear. Due to the high concentrations of PFAS and relatively low volume, which is typically a fraction of the flow rates for WWTPs serving the same population, landfill leachates can play an important role with respect to PFAS fate and transport from consumer products to the environment. Additionally, high concentrations of PFAS in leachate provide opportunities to implement advanced treatment technologies which may not be feasible for the larger volumes and lower concentrations typically observed in a WWTP or contaminated waterbodies (39). Wei et al. (40) reviewed the current understanding of P FAS in landfill leachate and the most common PFAS treatment technologies in terms of effectiveness and feasibility. Treatment methods can be categorized as either separation (e.g., reverse osmosis (RO), activated carbon adsorption) or destructive technologies (e.g., electron beam, plasma, incineration, oxidation, sonication). PFAS destruction is usually an energy- or chemical-intense process and may require large capital investments and operational costs, making them impractical for many landfill- or WWTP-scale applications. The most effective separation technologies described in the literature come with their own disadvantages—e.g., the complexity and chemical nature of landfill leachate can cause RO membrane fouling, and all separation methods produce a contaminated residual (such as highly concentrated RO retentate or spent activated carbon) which must then be further treated or disposed. Wei et al.'s review briefly describes an in-situ foam fractionation application-similar in principal to the work described in this manuscript—for extracting P FAS from groundwater in wells. The review describes the technology as infeasible for groundwater due to the limited access to P FAS-contaminated water in wells and uncertainty about the cost versus removal efficiency. Foam separation of PFAS has been described elsewhere in the literature. Meng et al. (41) reported removal of select P FAS (PFBS, PFHxS, PFOS, PFOA and OBS) from AFFF-contaminated water and a synthetic PFOS solution using bubble aeration, and Ebersbach et al. (42) investigated the role of foam partitioning and aerosolization as removal mechanisms for 6:2 FTS (as well as select PFAAs) in electroplating wastewaters.

[0046] Here, we explore a treatment approach that takes advantage of the surfactant properties of several PFAS compounds to remove PFAS from MSW landfill leachate and explore PFAS characteristics associated with the phenomenon. Many species of PFAS tend to partition to the interface between air and water, oil and water and water and solids (43,44) and the surfactant properties of a few select PFAS species have been described in the literature (45-48). Surfactants, such as PFAS, are often used to generate foam for applications such as fire-fighting, sometimes referred to as aqueous film-forming foams, or AFFFs, a frequent source of PFAS contamination (49-51). Landfill leachates, like many wastewaters, are known to have foaming issues. By inducing leachate foaming (i.e., generating a high air-water interfacial area) and separating the foam from the “defoamed” leachate, PFAS may then be concentrated in the foam, which subsequently

coalesces back into a liquid form. Pretreatment methods common in landfill leachate collection systems include aeration, which has proven ineffective by itself for the treatment of PFAS (52). Previous studies and our findings suggest that existing treatment technologies such as dissolved air floatation (DAF) might be an effective component of a treatment train for PFAS in leachate, producing a low volume, high concentration residual which could be further subjected to stabilization or possible thermal treatment (similar to concentrated residuals from membrane technologies).

[0047] The primary objectives of this study were to (1) investigate the partitioning of mass-labeled PFAS “tracers” from leachate into foam in ten replicate experiments (reported as percent removed from leachate); (2) describe the partitioning rate of PFAS into the foam by assessing sequential foam fractions; (3) relate the partitioning results to structural characteristics of both the native and mass-labeled PFAS (e.g., implication of chain length, functional groups); (4) examine the extraction efficiency (and quantified levels for a triplicate set) of both landfill leachate and foam; and (5) and provide context regarding the implications of how foam sequestration of PFAS from leachate may lead to better overall PFAS removal solutions.

Materials and Methods

Mass-Labeled PFAS Tracer Experiment

[0048] Ten replicate experiments were designed to promote the foaming of landfill leachate, followed by the systematic removal and collection of the foam for subsequent PFAS analysis. The pre-foamed leachate, as well as defoamed leachate were also analyzed for PFAS. The leachate was collected from a 20-year old cell of an active MSW landfill in central Florida, U.S.A., via leachate lift station in a 20-L HDPE carboy and homogenized gently, with care taken not to agitate and induce foaming, before aliquots were collected for this experiment. In brief, the setup included 1,000-mL glass beakers with 750 mL of leachate added, in addition to a 750 μ L spike of a mass-labeled PFAS mixture (see Supplemental Table S1 for more information; ~20 ng/g in methanol; derived from Wellington Laboratories using two retail mixtures-MPAC-C-ES and MFTA-MXA and several individually purchased compounds). The mass-labeled PFAS spike served as a “tracer”, providing a means to follow the fate of each PFAS during the foaming process. The spike was gently added and stirred into the leachate for 60 s. Prior to the initiation of the experiment, one 50-mL aliquot of the spiked leachate was collected from each beaker as the untreated leachate sample and was saved for later analysis via ultra-high performance liquid chromatograph-tandem mass spectrometry (UHPLC-MS/MS). One sintered glass aquarium air stone, spherical and approximately 4 cm in diameter with a pore size of 100 μ m, connected to an 8 watt, four-outlet air pump using methanol-rinsed polypropylene tubing, was submerged into each leachate beaker. The air stones were used to bubble air and, subsequently, induce substantial foaming in the landfill leachate. All materials were washed using laboratory cleaner and decontaminated with HPLC grade methanol prior to use.

[0049] When the air pump was turned on, air was bubbled through the leachate at approximately 2.6 L min⁻¹ and foam began to form immediately. A stainless-steel mesh skimmer was used to collect foam as necessary to prevent foam from overflowing from the beaker, approximately every 10-15 seconds, and was transferred to an HDPE funnel mounted on a pre-weighed 250 mL HDPE bottle. Foam quickly coalesced back into a liquid form and once foam generation slowed, the air pump was turned off, the sintered glass stone was removed and a “defoamed” 50-mL aliquot of leachate was collected from the beaker and saved for later analysis. The bottles were weighed after collection to determine the mass of foam collected from each beaker. This process was repeated for ten beakers-seven as described, and three modified to collect the foam sequentially in 50-mL aliquots to compare PFAS in the first foam collected versus subsequent 50-mL fractions.

Extraction and LC-MS/MS Analysis

[0050] Leachate, foam, “defoamed” leachate samples and blanks underwent solid phase extraction developed specifically for landfill leachate samples. One 50-mL aliquot of leachate, “defoamed

leachate” and foam (subsampled from the 250-mL bottles of coalesced foam) was extracted for each replicate experiment. Each full 50-mL sample bottle was weighed before and after extraction to normalize concentration and/or peak areas during data processing. Before extraction, sample pH was adjusted to 4-5 using glacial acetic acid (Fisher Scientific) and samples were centrifuged to remove/isolate suspended solids. Samples were extracted using Phenomenex solid phase extraction cartridges (Strata-X-AW 100 μ m Polymeric Weak Anion 500 mg/6 mL). The cartridges were conditioned with 4 mL of 0.3% ammonium hydroxide in methanol, 3 mL of methanol and 4 mL of an ammonium acetate buffer before samples were loaded using a 60 mL reservoir attachment. The loaded cartridges were rinsed with 4 mL of ammonium acetate buffer, then eluted into 15-mL HDPE tubes using 4 mL each of methanol and 0.3% ammonium hydroxide in methanol. Eluted extracts were evaporated from approximately 8 mL to 4 mL using a Biotage TurboVap nitrogen evaporator at 28° C.

[0051] To monitor potential sources of contamination in this process, one quality control sample was collected in the field (field blank), and the foaming procedure was repeated in triplicate using 750 mL of reagent grade water (no mass-labeled PFAS tracer added). For these three control experiments, a 50 mL aliquot was collected from the beaker, then air was bubbled using identical air stones for a period of 15 min. No foam was generated in any of the control tests, and 50 mL “after” aliquots were collected at the end of the 15 min process. Additional blanks were included throughout the extraction and analytical process.

[0052] The analyses of the samples were conducted using a Thermo Scientific Vanquish ultra-high-pressure liquid chromatography coupled to a TSQ Quantis triple quadrupole mass spectrometer (UHPLC-MS). Chromatographic separation was achieved using a Gemini C18 (100 \times 2 mm; 3 μ m) column from Phenomenex. Water [A] and methanol [B] both containing 5 mM of ammonium acetate were used as the mobile phase. Optima grade water, methanol and ammonium acetate used in this study were purchased from Fisher Scientific. The gradient elution was set as 0-3 min 10% B, 3-4.5 min 10-35% B, 4.5-12.5 min 35-95% B, 12.5-12.51 min 95-99% B, 12.51-19 min 99% and then equilibrated to initial conditions in 30 min. The autosampler temperature was 4° C., the flow rate and injection volume were 0.5 mL min⁻¹ and 10 μ L, respectively. Each PFAS (native and/or mass-labeled) was detected using scheduled selected reaction monitoring scan (SRM) mode (monitoring two transitions, if possible). Additional LC-MS/MS analytical conditions are detailed in Table S2 (SI) and the scan parameters for all target analytes are found in Table S3 (SI).

PFAS Extraction Efficiency and Quantification Experiment

[0053] Because mass-labeled internal standards were added as “tracers” in the foam treatment study, quantification of PFAS compounds in those samples was not possible. Thus, nine additional 50-mL samples of leachate were collected from the 20-L carboy for a quantification and extraction efficiency experiment where mass-labeled PFAS internal standards (IS) were added to three 50-mL leachate samples before solid phase extraction (samples 1-3), three samples where IS was added after extraction but before evaporation (samples 4-6) and three samples where IS was added after evaporation down to 4 mL (samples 7-9). Approximately 3,000 mL of leachate was then added to a 5,000-mL glass beaker and aerated to produce approximately 500 mL of coalesced foam, which was then divided into nine 50 mL HDPE bottles for a similar foam concentration and extraction efficiency experiment (as described above for leachate). FIG. 1 describes the extraction efficiency experiment and details of the solid phase extraction and evaporation protocol are included in the “Extraction and LC-MS/MS Analysis” section. A more detailed diagram of the extraction efficiency experiment is included in FIG. 7. PFAS concentrations were calculated for three leachate and three foam aliquots (samples 1-3). For extraction efficiency calculations, the ratios between the mass-adjusted peak areas (peak area per gram of leachate) of the mass-labeled PFAS compounds were compared between the samples where IS was added before any extraction (samples 1-3), after solid phase extraction (samples 4-6) and after evaporation (samples 7-9). Results were compared between foam and leachate aliquots using a paired two-sample t-test to determine if there is a

statistically significant difference in extraction efficiency.

[0054] For quantification, a calibration curve (14 levels, spanning from 10 ng/L to 100,000 ng/L) was developed for all 51 PFAS compounds (listed in Supplemental Table S4) through serial gravimetrically-weighed dilutions of primary standard solutions. Calibration information for each PFAS was derived and tailored using the prepared calibration levels. Each calibration level also contained a mixture of 24 mass-labeled P FAS internal standards (see Supplemental Table S1) at a concentration of ~ 1000 ng/L). The mass of all reagents and standards was recorded to report the most precise concentration. All mass-labeled P FAS compounds found in the mixtures and their respective gravimetric concentrations are detailed in Table S1 (SI). All PFAS standards were purchased from Wellington Laboratories Inc. (Guelph, ON, Canada).

Data Analysis

[0055] Scheduled selected-reaction monitoring (SRM) transitions were used to detect and quantify P FAS in a total of 56 samples and seven controls. The most intense transition was used to quantify PFAS while the second transition was used to confirm identification (if possible). Acquisition and peak integration were performed using Xcalibur v.4.1 (Thermo Fisher Scientific). P FAS were quantified in three leachate and three foam samples following integration of the peak area for the most intense transition of each analyte. A linear regression model was used to build the calibration curves, with intercept, slope and correlation coefficient values calculated over the linear dynamic range for each PFAS species. Instrument detection and quantification limits (LOD and LOQ, respectively) were calculated for each compound using calibration curve and visual signal-to-noise (S/N) determination (S/N of 3 and 10 for LOD and LOQ, respectively). Detection limits were also calculated using the method described by U.S. EPA 53, however, for most compounds, the visual method produced a higher (i.e., more conservative) LOD, and 7-replicates of each limit showed higher reproducibility (RSD<15%) than the EPA approach, so the visual method was employed in this study. LOD and LOQ for all 51 compounds are included in the supplemental Table S4. For the foam experiment, we examined the intra-sample variations between leachate before and after foaming and the coalesced foam for individual replicates. Each native and mass-labeled PFAS had a percent removed calculation (i.e., percent difference between the peak area of the “prefoam” leachate aliquot and the “defoamed” leachate aliquot) as well as a concentration factor calculation (i.e., the ratio of the foam peak area to the defoamed leachate peak area). All peak areas were normalized to the mass of sample extracted e.g., peak area g⁻¹.

Results and Discussion

Leachate Foaming Experiment

[0056] The results of this study suggest that foam sequestration is an effective technique for concentrating several P FAS compounds in landfill leachate. The average amount of foam produced among the ten replicate experiments was 153 mL of foam from 700 ml of leachate, approximately 22% of the initial volume. The percent removal was calculated for 21 mass-labeled and 37 native compounds measured above detection limits. The effectiveness of the foaming technique for concentrating P FAS varied by compound, with a mean removal percentage of 69% and a median removal percentage of 92% among the ten foaming experiments (FIGS. 2 and 3). These removal rates, in a matrix which is likely more organically complex than the wastewaters used in other studies (23), are comparable to other foam removal studies, such as Meng et al. (41) and Ebersbach et al. (42). Results for native analytes and their corresponding mass-labeled compound were similar in most cases. The mean and median difference between the percent removal of native and mass-labeled compounds were 3.8% and 2.4%, respectively, and the difference was greater than 10% for only one compound, 6:2 FTS (FIGS. 2 and 3).

[0057] The percent of each compound removed can be found in FIGS. 2 (carboxylate and sulfonate PFAS compounds) and 3 (all other PFAS compounds measured above LOD, including fluorotelomers, sulfonamides and others). In several cases, a compound was detected in the leachate and foam but not in the defoamed leachate. When this happened (for native compounds

PFHxS, FHEA, FHxSA, FOUEA, FOSAA, 8:2 FTS, FDEA and EtFOSA, and mass-labeled tracers 4:2 FTS, PFHpA, PFOS, FOEA, 8:2 FTS and FOSA), the average peak area of the other replicates was used instead. This results in a more conservative estimate than using a value of zero which would result in 100% compound removal for those replicates. Two compounds, PFECHS and the mass-labeled PFHxS tracer, were not found in any of the defoamed leachate samples, although they were found in all leachate and foam samples, so the percent removal was designated as 100%. PFHpS and 6:2 diPAP were not found in several leachate and defoamed samples but were found in the foam for all replicates, so the measured peak areas for leachate and defoamed samples for the remaining replicates were averaged to provide a substitute value and allow for an estimation of percent removal.

[0058] Two compounds, PFBA (a PFCA with carbon chain length of three) and 6:2 diP AP (a high molecular weight phosphate ester) were found, on average, in slightly higher concentrations in the defoamed leachate than in leachate, resulting in negative percent removal. However, in all of these cases, the value was close to zero with high variability (i.e., positive removal percentage was within one standard deviation). These compounds, as well as others with low, positive removal percentages (e.g., low molecular weight PFPeA (n=4) and PFPrS (n=3), and high molecular weight diS AmPAP) represented the lowest and highest molecular weight compounds, and showed some of the highest variability in removal percentage among all compounds. These compounds should be prioritized in future optimization studies; for example, Ebersbach et al. were able to increase removal of PFBS using lower air flow rates and longer treatment times (up to 120 min) 42 and Meng et al. reported improved removal of PFOS at higher ionic strengths and higher and lower adjusted pH (41).

Partitioning Behavior of PFAS into Foam

[0059] For three of the ten foaming experiments, the collection of foam was modified to collect the foam sequentially into separate 50-mL aliquots to compare PFAS concentrations in the first foam collected versus subsequent 50-mL fractions. Thus, when foam was collected in these 50-mL aliquots, percent removal for each aliquot could not be determined in the same manner. The ratio between the defoamed leachate (i.e., the endpoint of these experiments) and each aliquot can illustrate the partitioning behavior as a function of foam removed and point towards an optimum fraction of leachate to remove as foam for PFAS removal and volume reduction. In this portion of the experiment, we derived the ratio between the peak areas for each compound found in the leachate (before foaming), then in each aliquot of coalesced foam, to the defoamed leachate. As shown in FIG. 4, the peak area ratio (a proxy for relative concentration) for some compounds is significantly higher in the first and second aliquots than in the third and fourth. These highest concentration aliquots combined account for approximately the first 100 ml of coalesced foam, or 14% of the initial leachate volume (100 ml of coalesced foam divided into 700 mL initial leachate volume). Compounds with low or negative removal percentages (e.g., PFBS, PFPrS, PFBA, PFPeA, 6:2 diPAP and diS AmPAP) in FIGS. 2 and 3 showed little or no change across any of the aliquots. These compounds partition to the foam to some extent, but not preferentially compared to water (leachate) partitioning.

Foam Sequestration Effectiveness as a Function of PFAS Structure

[0060] Goss et al. (47) and Campbell et al. (45) compared air-water interface partitioning coefficients for select PFAS compounds (fluorotelomer alcohols/olefins and perfluoroalkyl acids (PFAA), respectively) and in both cases, found a positive relationship between the number of carbons in the compounds' carbon-fluorine chains and interfacial partitioning. Using foam removal of PFAAs, Ebersbach et al. also reported an increase in elimination rate as the carbon chain length increased (42). The results of this experiment suggest a similar trend for short-chain P FAS, which reverses among longer chain species. Sequestration peaks for the carboxylates at PFHpA (carbon chain=6) and for the sulfonates at PFOS (carbon chain=8), and the ratio declines for all longer-chain compounds, although the shortest chain species (PFBA, PFPrS, n=3; and PFPeA and PFBS,

n=4) remain the lowest in terms of relative concentration in the foam. FIG. 5 compares the foam: defoam peak area ratio for PFAS of different carbon chain lengths, and the same trend is demonstrated in FIGS. 2, 3 and 4—more effective foam sequestration, whether measured as the percent removed from leachate or the relative abundance in foam, as molecular weight increases within each PFAS class, to a point, then less effective among the largest compounds. Variability, measured as standard deviation among ten replicated experiments, was highest among the lowest and highest molecular weight compounds as well. This could suggest instability of the compound or a matrix interference, and this experiment was not performed to account for P FAS transformations within the leachate (e.g., due to aeration) or transportation of aerosols outside of the experimental setup (14,42).

PFAS Extraction Efficiency and Quantification Experiment

[0061] Solid phase (comparing samples 1-3 to samples 4-6) and total preparation (comparing samples 1-3 to samples 7-9, as described in Methods) efficiencies for the 22 mass-labeled PFAS are presented in FIG. 6. Mass-labeled PFAS standards of the 22 compounds listed in Table S1 (SI) were used, although one, 4:2 FTS (a fluorotelomer), was unable to be detected at the concentrations used in the standard. Total preparation efficiency was between 70% and 130% for 11 and 12 of the 21 compounds for leachate and foam, respectively. Extraction efficiency was lowest for the largest molecular weight compounds, particularly PFTeDA at less than 20% for both matrices and both extraction endpoints. Where SPE efficiency of PFTeDA in landfill leachate has been reported elsewhere, results ranged between 8% 54 and 155% 55. Additional comparison between these extraction efficiency results and selections from the literature can be found in Table S6 (SI). The paired sample t-test results suggest a significant difference between extraction efficiencies (for both solid phase extraction and total extraction) between leachate and foam ($\alpha=0.05$). On average across all 21 compounds, foam extraction efficiency was 8% higher than leachate extraction efficiency for both solid phase and total extraction. Perhaps, constituents found in the leachate matrix which interfere with PFAS extraction do not partition to the foam, making coalesced foam a “cleaner” matrix for extraction; this hypothesis would necessitate a follow-up study to confirm. The average loss during evaporation (i.e., the difference between extraction efficiency of solid phase extraction and total extraction efficiency) is 18% for both leachate and foam. Despite these losses, the nitrogen evaporation process is an important part of extraction in order to concentrate the sample and improve quantification of trace species. A thorough evaluation of PFAS loss during evaporation versus improved mass spectrometric response for low-concentration compounds has yet to be published. The differences between leachate and foam extraction efficiencies and evaporation loss for individual compounds is included in Table S5 (SI).

[0062] Of the 51 native PFAS measured in the quantification experiment, 32 and 36 were present in leachate and foam, respectively, at levels above the detection limit. Landfill leachate is notoriously heterogeneous, with a diversity of PFAS, wide concentration ranges and high standard deviations of concentrations reported in the literature (29,34). Based on what has been published previously, the PFAS concentrations determined from the leachate samples used in this study align with what is typical for MSW landfill leachate. Mean concentrations and standard deviations for each P FAS detected at concentrations above the detection limits, in both the foam and leachate are included in Table 1. Two compounds, 6:2 FTS and 6:2 diPAP, were measured in every field and control blank, so the average peak area of the blanks was subtracted from the samples.

TABLE-US-00001 TABLE 1 Mean PFAS concentrations and standard deviation in leachate and coalesced foam. A complete list of the compounds included in this study, as well as full names and classification details is found in Table S4 of the Supplemental Information. Mean Concentration (Standard Deviation) Leachate (ng/L) Foam (ng/L) Compound n = 3 n = 3 PFBA +1,021.4 (437.6) 660.5 (200.2) PFPeA 837.1 (118.5) 930.2 (111.4) PFHxA +2,178.6 (16.2) +7987.7 (259.5) PFHpA 454.1 (13.1) +3034.3 (112.1) PFOA 950.9 (58.1) +5,659.4 (151.9) PFNA 63.8 (2.1) 272.3 (7.5) PFDA 86.9 (4.2) 249.7 (40.7) PFUnDA 11.5 (0.9) 28.2 (5.0) PFDoDA 11.2 (1.5) 29.4 (1.9)

PFTrDA BDL 2.4 (0.2) PFTeDA *0.9 (0.2) *1.5 (0.2) PFPrS 10.8 (1.7) 12 (3.3) PFBS +752.6 (119.7) +1,806.1 (116.6) PFPeS 24.6 (4.5) +62.5 (1.4) Σ PFHxS 2,058.9 (280) +10,630.3 (583.9) PFHpS BDL *2.9 (0.7) Σ PFOS 103.9 (13.6) 199.7 (5.6) PFDS BDL *2.6 (0.5) 4:2 FTS BDL 4.3 (0.8) 6:2 FTS +134.7 (29.1) +820.7 (146.3) 8:2 FTS 22.8 (2.1) +32.4 (11.8) 10:2 FTS 6.2 (0.1) 31.6 (2.2) FHEA 329.4 (8.5) +1,799.5 (72.3) FOEA 131.9 (10.7) 377.6 (71.4) FDEA *11.5 (0.8) 57.3 (14.4) FOUEA 5.9 (0.9) +16.1 (3.6) PFECHS *0.4 (0.1) 3.1 (0.4) FHxSA *2.1 (0.7) 5.8 (0.3) FOSA 7.6 (0.9) 17.4 (2.6) FOSAA 3.4 (0.2) 5.5 (0.4) MeFOSAA 111.5 (16.1) 269.9 (45.9) EtFOSAA 85.5 (4.2) 180.1 (35.3) MeFOSA *0.7 (0) *1.3 (0.1) EtFOSA 6.2 (0.7) 11.9 (2.6) 6:2 diPAP 4.2 (0.3) 3.6 (0.3) diSAmpAP 4.3 (1.8) +8.5 (3.9) BDL indicates compounds for which the peak area was below the instrument detection limits *compounds found above detection limits but below the limit of quantification (LOQ) in at least one of the three samples +denotes concentrations above the highest point of the calibration curve.

Implications

[0063] The experimental results presented here have implications for the analysis of PFAS in water as well as wastewater treatment applications. This foam generation and collection technique can be used to concentrate several PFAS within a matrix (in this case, landfill leachate), which can enhance PFAS measurement in complex matrices, particularly species of interest which occur in low concentrations. With respect to engineering applications, the results suggest that the separation of PFAS chemicals into a volume-reduced, highly concentrated, coalesced foam may prove a valuable addition to leachate treatment strategies at MSW landfills. A common practice at landfill sites is aeration of leachate in lagoons or similar storage units, typically using surface aerators. Occasionally, operators will include a dissolved air flotation unit, which by their nature include removal of a foam fraction. The process described herein is simple and could feasibly be applied at a relatively low cost at most landfills, even in discrete locations within a landfill site, optimized to address specific leachate streams.

[0064] A majority of the dominant PFAS species detected in a typical active MSW landfill leachate were removed at levels well over 80%. This includes the two PFAS species with EPA-recommended exposure guidances, PFOS and PFOA. If we apply the mean percent removal from the foam experiment to the initial concentrations of these compounds, the defoamed leachates would contain 26.3 ng L⁻¹ PFOA and 3.4 ng L⁻¹ PFOS, well below the EPA drinking water guidance and FDEP GCTL threshold of 70 ng L⁻¹ combined. Low molecular weight compound PFBA was one of the most highly concentrated compounds in this leachate and did not respond to foam separation. This low response has been reported for other sequestration methods, such as granular activated carbon³⁹. It is possible that a modification of this experiment, for instance pH adjustment, may change the partitioning behavior of highly mobile species.

[0065] Additional research is required to optimize foaming strategies that both maximize PFAS concentration (particularly for PFAS which did not partition to the foam under the conditions of this study) and minimize foam volume (as sequential foam collection found that the highest rate of removal occurs in the initial generation of foam, approximately the first 14% of leachate removed). While PFTeDA exhibited the lowest extraction efficiency and poor foam partitioning, other PFAS with low recoveries (e.g., FOSA, MeFOSA, PFDODA, EtFOSA) had high foam partitioning and thus would be good candidates for foam-augmented analysis. Partitioning tendencies of most precursor species and some of the less common PFAAs are not well understood, and more research may shed light on the behavior of these compounds in this experiment. Strategies for managing concentrated leachate streams (to align with the foaming approach) require further investigation, whether they be destructive technologies such as plasma, sonication, or chemical oxidation, or stabilization techniques that will allow the material to be disposed of in the landfill in a manner such that PFAS is not released back into the leachate.

REFERENCES

[0066] (1) Daly, E. R.; Chan, B. P.; Talbot, E. A.; Nassif, J.; Bean, C.; Cavallo, S. J.; Metcalf, E.;

Simone, K.; Woolf, A. D. Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Exposure Assessment in a Community Exposed to Contaminated Drinking Water, New Hampshire, 2015. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* 2018, 221 (3), 569-577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2018.02.007>. [0067] (2) Hogue, C. Short-chain and long-chain P FAS show similar toxicity, US National Toxicology Program says [https://cen.acs.org/environment/persistent-pollutants/Short-chain-long-chain-P FAS/97/i33](https://cen.acs.org/environment/persistent-pollutants/Short-chain-long-chain-P-FAS/97/i33) (accessed Sep. 28, 2019). [0068] (3) McCarthy, C.; Kappelleman, W.; DiGuisseppi, W. Ecological Considerations of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS). *Curr Pollution Rep* 2017, 3 (4), 289-301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40726-017-0070-8>. [0069] (4) Wang, Z.; Cousins, I. T.; Scheringer, M.; Hungerbuehler, K. Hazard Assessment of Fluorinated Alternatives to Long-Chain Perfluoroalkyl Acids (PFAAs) and Their Precursors: Status Quo, Ongoing Challenges and Possible Solutions. *Environment International* 2015, 75, 172-179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2014.11.013>. [0070] (5) Calafat, A. M.; Wong, L.-Y.; Kuklenyik, Z.; Reidy, J. A.; Needham, L. L. Polyfluoroalkyl Chemicals in the U.S. Population: Data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 2003-2004 and Comparisons with NHANES 1999-2000. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2007, 115 (11), 1596-1602. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.10598>. [0071] (6) Munoz, G.; Labadie, P.; Botta, F.; Lestremiau, F.; Lopez, B.; Geneste, E.; Pardon, P.; Dévier, M.-H.; Budzinski, H. Occurrence Survey and Spatial Distribution of Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Surfactants in Groundwater, Surface Water, and Sediments from Tropical Environments. *Science of The Total Environment* 2017, 607-608, 243-252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.06.146>. [0072] (7) Pan, C.-G.; Ying, G.-G.; Liu, Y.-S.; Zhang, Q.-Q.; Chen, Z.-F.; Peng, F.-J.; Huang, G.-Y. Contamination Profiles of Perfluoroalkyl Substances in Five Typical Rivers of the Pearl River Delta Region, South China. *Chemosphere* 2014, 114, 16-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.04.005>. [0073] (8) Houtz, E. F.; Higgins, C. P.; Field, J. A.; Sedlak, D. L. Persistence of Perfluoroalkyl Acid Precursors in AFFF-Impacted Groundwater and Soil. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2013, 47 (15), 8187-8195. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es4018877>. [0074] (9) Sáez, M.; de Voogt, P.; Parsons, J. R. Persistence of Perfluoroalkylated Substances in Closed Bottle Tests with Municipal Sewage Sludge. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 2008, 15 (6), 472-477. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-008-0020-5>. [0075] (10) Washington, J. W.; Yoo, H.; Ellington, J. J.; Jenkins, T. M.; Libelo, E. L. Concentrations, Distribution, and Persistence of Perfluoroalkylates in Sludge-Applied Soils near Decatur, Alabama, USA. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2010, 44 (22), 8390-8396. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es1003846>. [0076] (11) Hamid, H.; Li, L. Y.; Grace, J. R. Review of the Fate and Transformation of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) in Landfills. *Environmental Pollution* 2018, 235, 74-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.12.030>. [0077] (12) Kwok, K. Y.; Yamazaki, E.; Yamashita, N.; Taniyasu, S.; Murphy, M. B.; Horii, Y.; Petrick, G.; Kallerborn, R.; Kannan, K.; Murano, K.; Lam, P. K. S. Transport of Perfluoroalkyl Substances (P FAS) from an Arctic Glacier to Downstream Locations: Implications for Sources. *Science of The Total Environment* 2013, 447, 46-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.10.091>. [0078] (13) Möller, A.; Ahrens, L.; Surm, R.; Westerveld, J.; van der Wielen, F.; Ebinghaus, R.; de Voogt, P. Distribution and Sources of Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (P FAS) in the River Rhine Watershed. *Environmental Pollution* 2010, 158 (10), 3243-3250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2010.07.019>. [0079] (14) H. Johansson, J.; Shi, Y.; Salter, M.; T. Cousins, I. Spatial Variation in the Atmospheric Deposition of Perfluoroalkyl Acids: Source Elucidation through Analysis of Isomer Patterns. *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts* 2018, 20 (7), 997-1006. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C8EM00102B>. [0080] (15) Ahrens, L.; Shoeib, M.; Harner, T.; Lee, S. C.; Guo, R.; Reiner, E. J. Wastewater Treatment Plant and Landfills as Sources of Polyfluoroalkyl Compounds to the Atmosphere. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2011, 45 (19), 8098-8105. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es1036173>. [0081] (16) Gallen, C.; Eaglesham, G.; Drage, D.; Nguyen, T. H.; Mueller, J. F. A Mass Estimate of Perfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Release from Australian Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Chemosphere* 2018, 208, 975-983.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.06.024>. [0082] (17) Hamid, H.; Li, L. Role of Wastewater Treatment Plant in Environmental Cycling of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances. *Ecocycles* 2016, 2 (2), 43-53. <https://doi.org/10.19040/ecocycles.v2i2.62>. [0083] (18) Loganathan, B. G.; Sajwan, K. S.; Sinclair, E.; Senthil Kumar, K.; Kannan, K. Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonates and Perfluorocarboxylates in Two Wastewater Treatment Facilities in Kentucky and Georgia. *Water Research* 2007, 41 (20), 4611-4620. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2007.06.045>. [0084] (19) Schultz, M. M.; Higgins, C. P.; Huset, C. A.; Luthy, R. G.; Barofsky, D. F.; Field, J. A. Fluorochemical Mass Flows in a Municipal Wastewater Treatment Facility. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2006, 40 (23), 7350-7357. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es061025m>. [0085] (20) Sinclair, E.; Kannan, K. Mass Loading and Fate of Perfluoroalkyl Surfactants in Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2006, 40 (5), 1408-1414. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es051798v>. [0086] (21) U.S. EPA. RCRA Subtitle D (40 CFR § 258.40) Criteria for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills: Design Criteria; 2012. [0087] (22) Maliva, R. G.; Walker, C. W. Hydrogeology of Deep-Well Disposal of Liquid Wastes in Southwestern Florida, USA. *Hydrogeology Journal* 1998, 6 (4), 538-548. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s100400050174>. [0088] (23) Martin, K.; Cooper, W. J.; Heyes, A.; Ma, S.; Powers, L.; Robey, N. M.; Schmitt-Kopplin, P.; Townsend, T. G.; Gonsior, M. A Characterization of Landfill Leachate Molecular Composition Using Ultrahigh Resolution Mass Spectrometry. *Environmental Science and Technology In Review*. [0089] (24) Moody, C. M.; Townsend, T. G. A Comparison of Landfill Leachates Based on Waste Composition. *Waste Management* 2017, 63 (Journal Article), 267-274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2016.09.020>. [0090] (25) Haarstad, K.; Borch, H. Halogenated Compounds, PCB and Pesticides in Landfill Leachate, Downstream Lake Sediments and Fish. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health, Part A* 2008, 43 (12), 1346-1352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10934520802231966>. [0091] (26) Musson, S. E.; Townsend, T. G. Pharmaceutical Compound Content of Municipal Solid Waste. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 2009, 162 (2-3), 730-735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2008.05.089>. [0092] (27) Benskin, J. P.; Li, B.; Ikononou, M. G.; Grace, J. R.; Li, L. Y. Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances in Landfill Leachate: Patterns, Time Trends, and Sources. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2012, 46 (21), 11532-11540. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es302471n>. [0093] (28) Fuertes, I.; Gómez-Lavín, S.; Elizalde, M. P.; Urtiaga, A. Perfluorinated Alkyl Substances (PFASs) in Northern Spain Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Leachates. *Chemosphere* 2017, 168, 399-407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.10.072>. [0094] (29) Lang, J. R.; Allred, B. M.; Field, J. A.; Levis, J. W.; Barlaz, M. A. National Estimate of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Release to U.S. Municipal Landfill Leachate. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2017, 51 (4), 2197-2205. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b05005>. [0095] (30) Eggen, T.; Moeder, M.; Arukwe, A. Municipal Landfill Leachates: A Significant Source for New and Emerging Pollutants. *Science of The Total Environment* 2010, 408 (21), 5147-5157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.07.049>. [0096] (31) Masoner, J. R.; Kolpin, D. W.; Furlong, E. T.; Cozzarelli, I. M.; Gray, J. L. Landfill Leachate as a Mirror of Today's Disposable Society: Pharmaceuticals and Other Contaminants of Emerging Concern in Final Leachate from Landfills in the Conterminous United States: CECs in Final Leachate from Landfills in the USA. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 2016, 35 (4), 906-918. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3219>. [0097] (32) Slack, R. J.; Gronow, J. R.; Voulvoulis, N. Household Hazardous Waste in Municipal Landfills: Contaminants in Leachate. *Science of The Total Environment* 2005, 337 (1), 119-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2004.07.002>. [0098] (33) Busch, J.; Ahrens, L.; Sturm, R.; Ebinghaus, R. Polyfluoroalkyl Compounds in Landfill Leachates. *Environmental Pollution* 2010, 158 (5), 1467-1471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2009.12.031>. [0099] (34) Gallen, C.; Drage, D.; Eaglesham, G.; Grant, S.; Bowman, M.; Mueller, J. F. Australia-Wide Assessment of Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) in Landfill Leachates. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 2017, 331, 132-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2017.02.006>. [0100] (35) U.S. EPA. Interim Recommendations to Address Groundwater Contaminated with Perfluorooctanoic Acid and Perfluorooctanesulfonate. OLEM Directive No. 9283.1-47, 2019.

[0101] (36) U.S. EPA. Drinking Water Health Advisories for PFOA and PFOS. FACT SHEET 2016, 5. [0102] (37) Stuchal, L.; Roberts, S. PFAS-Provisional Cleanup Target Levels and Screening Levels, 2019. [0103] (38) Solo-Gabriele, H. M.; Jones, A. S.; Lindstrom, A. B.; Lang, J. R. Waste Type, Incineration, and Aeration Are Associated with per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Levels in Landfill Leachates. *Waste Management* 2020, 107, 191-200. [0104] (39) Ross, I.; McDonough, J.; Miles, J.; Storch, P.; Thelakkat Kochunarayanan, P.; Kalve, E.; Hurst, J.; S. Dasgupta, S.; Burdick, J. A Review of Emerging Technologies for Remediation of PFASs. *Remediation* 2018, 28 (2), 101-126. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rem.21553>. [0105] (40) Wei, Z.; Xu, T.; Zhao, D. Treatment of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances in Landfill Leachate: Status, Chemistry and Prospects. *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology* 2019, 5 (11), 1814-1835. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C9EW00645A>. [0106] (41) Meng, P.; Deng, S.; Maimaiti, A.; Wang, B.; Huang, J.; Wang, Y.; Cousins, I. T.; Yu, G. Efficient Removal of Perfluorooctane Sulfonate from Aqueous Film-Forming Foam Solution by Aeration-Foam Collection. *Chemosphere* 2018, 203, 263-270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.03.183>. [0107] (42) Ebersbach, I.; Ludwig, S. M.; Constapel, M.; Kling, H.-W. An Alternative Treatment Method for Fluorosurfactant-Containing Wastewater by Aerosol-Mediated Separation. *Water Research* 2016, 101, 333-340. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2016.05.063>. [0108] (43) Brusseau, M. L. Assessing the Potential Contributions of Additional Retention Processes to PFAS Retardation in the Subsurface. *Science of The Total Environment* 2018, 613-614, 176-185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.09.065>. [0109] (44) Brusseau, M. L.; Yan, N.; Van Glubt, S.; Wang, Y.; Chen, W.; Lyu, Y.; Dungan, B.; Carroll, K. C.; Holguin, F. O. Comprehensive Retention Model for PFAS Transport in Subsurface Systems. *Water Research* 2019, 148, 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.10.035>. [0110] (45) Campbell, T. Y.; Vecitis, C. D.; Mader, B. T.; Hoffmann, M. R. Perfluorinated Surfactant Chain-Length Effects on Sonochemical Kinetics. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2009, 113 (36), 9834-9842. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp903003w>. [0111] (46) P sillakis, E.; Cheng, J.; Hoffmann, M. R.; Colussi, A. J. Enrichment Factors of Perfluoroalkyl Oxoanions at the Air/Water Interface. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* 2009, No. 113, 8826-8829. [0112] (47) Goss, K.-U.; Bronner, G.; Harner, T.; Hertel, M.; Schmidt, T. C. The Partition Behavior of Fluorotelomer Alcohols and Olefins. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2006, 40 (11), 3572-3577. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es060004p>. [0113] (48) Wang, F.; Liu, C.; Shih, K. Adsorption Behavior of Perfluorooctanesulfonate (PFOS) and Perfluorooctanoate (PFOA) on Boehmite. *Chemosphere* 2012, 89 (8), 1009-1014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2012.06.071>. [0114] (49) Anderson, H. R.; Adamson, D. T.; Stroo, H. F. Partitioning of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances from Soil to Groundwater within Aqueous Film-Forming Foam Source Zones. *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology* 2019, 220, 59-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconhyd.2018.11.011>. [0115] (50) Barzen-Hanson, K. A.; Roberts, S. C.; Choyke, S.; Oetjen, K.; McAlees, A.; Riddell, N.; McCrindle, R.; Ferguson, P. L.; Higgins, C. P.; Field, J. A. Discovery of 40 Classes of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances in Historical Aqueous Film-Forming Foams (AFFFs) and AFFF-Impacted Groundwater. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2017, 51 (4), 2047-2057. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b05843>. [0116] (51) Moody, C. A.; Hebert, G. N.; Strauss, S. H.; Field, J. A. Occurrence and Persistence of Perfluorooctanesulfonate and Other Perfluorinated Surfactants in Groundwater at a Fire-Training Area at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, USA. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 2003, 5 (2), 341-345. <https://doi.org/10.1039/B212497A>. [0117] (52) Appleman, T. D.; Higgins, C. P.; Quiñones, O.; Vanderford, B. J.; Kolstad, C.; Zeigler-Holady, J. C.; Dickenson, E. R. V. Treatment of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances in U.S. Full-Scale Water Treatment Systems. *Water Research* 2014, 51, 246-255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2013.10.067>. [0118] (53) U.S. EPA. Definition and Procedure for the Determination of the MEthod Detection Limit, Revision 2-EPA 821-R-16-006. Office of Water, Washington, D.C. December 2016. [0119] (54) Huset, C. A.; Barlaz, M. A.; Barofsky, D. F.; Field, J. A. Quantitative Determination of Fluorochemicals in Municipal Landfill Leachates. *Chemosphere* 2011, 82 (10), 1380-1386.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2010.11.072> [0120] (55) Benskin, J. P.; Ikononou, M. G.; Woudneh, M. B.; Cosgrove, J. R. Rapid Characterization of Perfluoralkyl Carboxylate, Sulfonate, and Sulfonamide Isomers by High-Performance Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry. *Journal of Chromatography A* 2012, 1247, 165-170.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2012.05.077>.

Supplemental Information

TABLE-US-00002 TABLE S1 Mass-labeled PFAS tracer compounds. The molecular formula includes deuterated/^{sup}.¹³C information from the manufacturer (Wellington Laboratories).
Molecular Concentration Abbreviation Compound Formula PFAS Type (ng/g) M4PFBA perfluorobutanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.4HF._{sub}.7O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 M5PFPeA perfluoropentanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.5HF._{sub}.9O._{sub}.3 carboxylate 22.118 M5PFHxA perfluorohexanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.5.^{sup}.¹²CHF._{sub}.11O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 M4PFHpA perfluoroheptanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.4.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.3HF._{sub}.13O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 M8PFOA perfluorooctanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.8HF._{sub}.15O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 M9PFNA perfluorononanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.9HF._{sub}.17O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 M6PFDA perfluorodecanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.6.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.4HF._{sub}.19O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 M7PFUdA perfluoroundecanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.7.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.4HF._{sub}.21O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 MPFDoA perfluorododecanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.2.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.10HF._{sub}.23O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 M2PFTeDA perfluorododecanoic acid ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.2.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.12HF._{sub}.27O._{sub}.2 carboxylate 22.118 M8FOSA perfluorooctane ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.8H._{sub}.2F._{sub}.17NO._{sub}.2S sulfonamide 22.118 sulfonamide d3-N- n-methylperfluoro-1- C._{sub}.11D._{sub}.3H._{sub}.3F._{sub}.17NO._{sub}.4S sulfonamidoacetic 22.118 MeFOSAA octanesulfonamidoacetic acid acid d5-N- n-ethylperfluoro-1- C._{sub}.12D._{sub}.5H._{sub}.3F._{sub}.17NO._{sub}.4S sulfonamidoacetic 22.118 EfFOSAA octanesulfonamidoacetic acid acid M3PFBS perfluorobutyl sulfonate ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.3.^{sup}.¹²CHF._{sub}.9O._{sub}.3S sulfonate 20.547 M3PFHxS perfluorohexyl sulfonate ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.3.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.3HF._{sub}.13O._{sub}.3S sulfonate 20.923 M8PFOS perfluorooctyl sulfonate ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.8HF._{sub}.17O._{sub}.3S sulfonate 21.167 M2-4:2FTS 4:2 fluorotelomer ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.2.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.4H._{sub}.4F._{sub}.9O._{sub}.3SNa fluorotelomer 20.680 sulfonate M2-6:2FTS 6:2 fluorotelomer ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.2.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.6H._{sub}.4F._{sub}.13O._{sub}.3SNa fluorotelomer 20.990 sulfonate M2-8:2FTS 8:2 fluorotelomer ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.2.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.8H._{sub}.4F._{sub}.17O._{sub}.3SNa fluorotelomer 21.189 sulfonate MFHEA 6:2 fluorotelomer ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.2.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.6H._{sub}.3F._{sub}.13O._{sub}.2 telomer acid 23.002 carboxylic acid MFOEA n-2-perfluorooctyl ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.2.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.8H._{sub}.3F._{sub}.17O._{sub}.2 telomer acid 23.002 ethanoic acid MFDEA n-2-perfluorodecyl ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.2.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.10H._{sub}.3F._{sub}.21O._{sub}.2 sulfonamidoacetic 23.002 ethanoic acid acid M3HFPO-DA hexafluoropropylene oxide ^{sup}.¹³C._{sub}.3.^{sup}.¹²C._{sub}.3HF._{sub}.11O._{sub}.3 n/a 111.026 dimer acid (Gen-X) d3-N- n-methylperfluorooctane- C._{sub}.9D._{sub}.3HF._{sub}.17NO._{sub}.2S sulfonamide 118.144 MeFOSA-M 1-sulfonamide d5-N- n-ethylperfluorooctane-1- C._{sub}.10D._{sub}.5HF._{sub}.17NO._{sub}.2S sulfonamide 111.379 EtFOSA-M sulfonamide

TABLE-US-00003 TABLE S2 LC-MS/MS Analytical Conditions Chromatography Conditions - Thermo Scientific Vanquish UHPLC LC conditions Column: Gemini Phenomenex 100 × 2 mm 3 μm Gradient elution using Water and methanol both containing 5 mM of ammonium acetate Oven temperature 40° C. Flow rate: 0.5 mLmin.^{sup}.-1 Injection volume: 10 μL Mass Spectrometry Analysis - Thermo Quantis Ion Source Electrospray - negative mode parameters: Ion Spray: 1500 V Sheath Gas: 50 Arb Auxilliary Gas: 10 Arb Ion Transfer tube Temperature: 250° C. Vaporizer temperature: 550° C.

TABLE-US-00004 TABLE S3 Target PFAS Analytes SRM experiment - Scan parameters Analytes Precursor Fragment Collision RF (abbreviation) Ion (m/z) Ion (m/z) Energy (V) Lens (V) PFBA 213 168.9 11 75 M3PFBA 216 172 11 75 M4PFBA 217 172 11 75 L-PFPrS-1 249.05 79.9 28.84

138 L-PFPrS-2 249.05 98.9 25.68 138 PFPeA 263 219 11 64 M5PFPeA 268 223 11 64 FBSA-1
 297.95 77.9 24.8 144 FBSA-2 297.95 118.9 17.97 144 L-PFBS-1 298.975 79.9 32 152 L-PFBS-2
 298.975 98.9 28.46 152 M3PFBS 302 99 29 152 PFHxA 312.9 269 10 73 M5PFHxA 318 273 10
 73 4:2FTS-2 326.962 81 28.5 138 4:2FTS-1 326.962 306.8 17.97 138 M2-4:2FTS 329 81 17.97
 138 HFPO-DA 329 285 7 65 PFPeS-1 348.975 79.9 34.28 174 PFPeS-2 348.975 98.9 31.45 174
 PFHpA-1 362.9 169 17 81 PFHpA-2 362.9 318.9 11 81 M4PFHpA 367 322 11 81 FHEA 376.9 293
 20 100 NaDONA 377 251 10 280 FHxSA-1 397.96 77.9 28.42 185 FHxSA-2 397.96 377.9 20.33
 185 L-PFHxS-2 398.975 79.9 37.48 174 L-PFHxS-1 398.975 98.9 34.95 174 M3PFHxS 402 99 35
 151 PFOA-1 413 169.0 19 94 PFOA-2 413 368.9 11 94 M2PFOA 415 370 11 94 M8PFOA 421
 376 11 94 6:2FTS-2 426.962 80.9 29.94 166 6:2FTS-1 426.962 406.9 21.39 166 M2-6:2FTS-2 429
 81 21.39 166 M2-6:2FTS-1 429 376 21.39 166 PFHpS-1 448.925 79.9 39.2 223 PFHpS-2 448.925
 98.9 37.56 223 FOUEA 456.9 392.9 12 100 PFECHS-2 460.925 98.9 28.76 171 PFECHS-1
 460.925 380.9 26.15 171 PFNA-1 463 218.9 16 101 PFNA-2 463 418.9 12 101 M9PFNA 472 427
 12 101 FOEA 476.9 393 18 100 MFOEA-1 479.01 394 11 107 N-AP-FHxSA-1 483.05 168.9 26.57
 244 N-AP-FHxSA-2 483.05 318.9 21.55 244 FOSA-I-1 497.962 77.9 30.44 206 FOSA-I-2 497.962
 477.9 23.16 206 L-PFOS-1 498.925 79.9 40.26 214 L-PFOS-2 498.925 98.9 40.55 214 MPFOS-2
 502.925 79.9 41.86 266 MPFOS-1 502.925 98.8 41.86 266 M8FOSA-I-2 505.95 77.9 30.4 196
 M8FOSA-I-1 505.95 485.9 22.94 196 M8PFOS-1 507 80 44 259 M8PFOS-2 507 99 44 259 N-
 MeFOSA-M-2 511.962 168.9 26.23 187 N-MeFOSA-M-1 511.962 219 23.62 187 PFDA 513 469
 11 94 8Cl-PFOS-1 514.925 79.9 41.44 273 8Cl-PFOS-2 514.925 98.9 40.3 273 d-N-MeFOSA-M-2
 514.995 168.9 26.23 194 d-N-MeFOSA-M-1 514.995 218.9 23.74 194 MPFDA 515 470 11 94
 M6PFDA 519 474 11 94 N-EtFOSA-M-2 525.962 168.9 26.69 209 N-EtFOSA-M-1 525.962 219
 24.04 209 8:2FTS-2 526.988 486.8 30.57 179 8:2FTS-1 526.988 506.8 24.76 179 M2-8:2FTS 529
 81 24.76 179 9Cl-PF3ONS-1 530.838 350.9 24.71 155 d-N-EtFOSA-M-3 530.925 169 26.69 203
 d-N-EtFOSA-M-2 530.925 219 24.76 203 L-PFNS-1 548.975 80 42.99 280 L-PFNS-2 548.975
 98.9 42.78 280 FOSAA-2 555.95 418.9 23.45 210 FOSAA-1 555.95 497.8 26.06 210 FDUEA 557
 493 21 280 PFUnDA 563 518.9 11 116 N-MeFOSAA-1 569.975 418.8 18.18 178 N-MeFOSAA-2
 569.975 482.8 14.39 178 M7PFUnDA-2 570 525 11 116 d3-N-MeFOSAA-1 572.962 418.9 18.56
 174 d3-N-MeFOSAA-2 572.962 482.8 14.06 174 FDEA 576.8 493 8 100 N-EtFOSAA-2 583.962
 418.9 18.52 179 N-EtFOSAA-1 583.962 525.9 18.1 179 d5-N-EtFOSAA-2 589.012 418.9 19.15
 176 d5-N-EtFOSAA-1 589.012 530.9 19.36 176 L-PFDS-1 598.925 79.9 44.51 280 L-PFDS-2
 598.925 98.9 46.87 280 PFDODA-2 612.925 318.9 17.51 129 PFDODA-1 612.925 568.9 9.8 129
 MPFDODA 615 570 9.8 129 10:2FTS-2 626.95 80.9 34.19 280 10:2FTS-1 626.95 606.8 29.01 280
 HCl-PF3OUdS 630.95 450.8 27.2 225 SAmPAP-1 650 526 25 280 PFTrDA-2 662.812 318.9 18.98
 136 PFTrDA-1 662.812 618.9 10.73 136 L-PFDOS-1 698.925 80 55 280 L-PFDOS-3 698.925 99 55
 280 6:6PFPI 700.9 400.9 55 188 PFTeDA 713 669 12 107 M2PFTeDA 715 670 12 107 6:2diPAP-2
 788.925 96.9 29.3 216 6:2diPAP-1 788.925 442.9 17.05 216 6:8PFPI-2 800.9 400.9 55 188
 6:8PFPI-1 800.9 500.8 55 188 PFHxDA-2 812.875 418.9 20.42 167 PFHxDA-1 812.875 768.8
 11.95 167 6:2/8:2diPAP 889 443 20 280 PFODA-2 912.888 318.8 25.05 188 PFODA-1 912.888
 868.8 13.3 188 8:2diPAP-2 988.888 522.9 27.11 280 8:2diPAP 989 543 20 280 diSAmPAP 1202.95
 525.9 25 280 *-1 and -2 means first and second transition of the analyte—first transition used for
 quantitation and second transition for confirmation.

TABLE-US-00005 TABLE S4 PFAS standard compounds and corresponding mass-labeled
 compounds used to develop calibration curves. Correlative Labeled LOD LOQ Abbreviation
 Compound PFAS Type Compound (ng/L) (ng/L) PFBA perfluorobutanoic acid carboxylate
 M4PFBA 4.18 8.09 PFPrS perfluoropropane sulfonate sulfonate M5PFPeA 1.66 6.42 PFPeA
 perfluoropentanoic acid carboxylate M5PFPeA 20.92 182.15 PFBS perfluorobutyl sulfonate
 sulfonate M3PFBS 3.70 18.52 FBSA perfluorobutane sulfonamide sulfonamide M3PFBS 80.74
 398.28 4:2FTS 4:2 fluorotelomer sulfonate telomer sulfonate M24:2FTS 3.91 19.56 PFHxA
 perfluorohexanoic acid carboxylate M5PFHxA 4.18 20.92 PFPeS perfluoropentane sulfonate

sulfonate M3HFPO-DA 3.93 19.67 PFHxS perfluorohexyl sulfonate M3PFHxS 19.08
 35.46 PFHpA perfluoroheptanoic acid carboxylate M4PFHpA 4.18 20.92 NaDONA dodecafluoro-
 3H-4,8- other M4PFHpA 76.85 379.09 dioxanonanoate FHEA 6:2 fluorotelomer carboxylic
 telomer acid M4PFHpA 35.40 165.86 acid AP-FHxSA M26:2FTS 32.48 362.66 PFECHS n-
 decafluoro-4 cyclic M26:2FTS 3.32 16.59 ethylcyclohexanesulfonate FHxSA perfluorohexane
 sulfonamide sulfonamide M3PFHxS 9.76 36.26 6:2FTS 6:2 fluorotelomer sulfonate telomer
 sulfonate M26:2FTS 3.97 19.87 PFHpS perfluoroheptane sulfonate sulfonate M26:2FTS 9.94
 36.93 PFOA perfluorooctanoic acid carboxylate M8PFOA 10.46 38.88 PFOS perfluorooctyl
 sulfonate sulfonate M8PFOS 19.36 81.44 PFNA perfluorononanoic acid carboxylate M9PFNA
 4.18 20.92 Cl-PFOS 8-chlorohexadecafluoro-3- other M8PFOS 17.06 71.76 oxaoctane-1-sulfonate
 FOEA n-2-perfluorooctyl ethanoic telomer acid MFOEA 35.92 168.30 acid FOUEA 2H-perfluoro-
 2-decanoic acid unsaturated telomer MFOEA 3.18 6.14 acid Cl-PF3ONS 9-chlorohexadecafluoro-
 3- other M28:2FTS 3.30 6.38 oxanonane-1-sulfonate FOSAA 2-perfluorooctanesulfonamido
 sulfonamidoacetic M28:2FTS 8.83 17.65 acetic acid acid PFNS perfluorononane sulfonate
 sulfonate M28:2FTS 10.04 84.48 8:2FTS 8:2 fluorotelomer sulfonate telomer sulfonate M28:2FTS
 20.08 37.32 FOSA perfluoro-1- sulfonamide M8FOSA 8.09 38.88 octanesulfonamide PFDA
 Perfluorodecanoic acid carboxylate M6PFDA 1.62 8.09 N-MeFOSAA N-methylperfluoro-1-
 sulfonamidoacetic d3-N- 8.09 88.00 octanesulfonamidoacetic acid acid MeFOSAA PFDS
 perfluorodecane sulfonate sulfonate d5-N- 20.19 84.92 EtFOSAA PFUnDA perfluoroundecanoic
 acid carboxylate M7PFUnDA 4.18 20.92 N-EtFOSAA N-ethylperfluoro-1- sulfonamidoacetic d5-
 N- 20.92 88.00 octanesulfonamidoacetic acid acid EtFOSAA FDUEA n-2-perfluorodecyl ethanoic
 unsaturated telomer M7PFUnDA 1711.28 13092.94 acid acid FDEA n-2-perfluorodecyl ethanoic
 saturated telomer M7PFUnDA 35.67 167.14 acid acid Cl-PF3OUdS 11-chloroeicosafluoro-3- other
 d5-N- 3.39 6.55 oxaundecane-1-sulfonate EtFOSAA N-MeFOSA N-methylperfluorooctane
 sulfonamide d-N- 3.58 33.29 sulfonamide MeFOSA PFDoDA perfluorododecanoic acid
 carboxylate MPFDoDA 4.18 8.09 10:2FTS 10:2 fluorotelomer sulfonate telomer sulfonate
 MPFDoDA 8.68 32.24 6:6PFPi sodium perfluoroalkyl- MPFDoDA 3.45 17.23
 bis(perfluorohexyl)phosphinate phosphinate N-EtFOSA N-ethylperfluorooctane sulfonamide d-N-
 EtFOSA 17.43 32.39 sulfonamide PFDoDS perfluorododecane sulfonate sulfonate MPFDoDA
 17.13 31.83 PFTriDA perfluorotridecanoic acid carboxylate d-N-EtFOSA 6.97 8.09 6:2diPAP 6:2
 fluorotelomer phosphate phosphate ester M2PFTeDA 3.66 18.29 diester PFTreDA
 perfluorotetradecanoic acid carboxylate M2PFTeDA 4.18 20.92 6:8PFPi sodium perfluoroalkyl-
 M2PFTeDA 1.78 8.89 perfluorohexylperfluoro- phosphinate octylphosphinate 6:2/8:2diPAP
 M2PFTeDA 6.94 33.34 PFHxDA perfluorohexadecanoic acid carboxylate M2PFTeDA 3.16 6.12
 8:2diPAP 6:2 fluorotelomer phosphate phosphate ester M2PFTeDA 9.00 33.46 diester PFODA
 perfluorooctadecanoic acid carboxylate M2PFTeDA 3.51 6.80 diSAmPAP sodium bis-(2-N-
 phosphate ester M2PFTeDA 15.68 29.13 ethylperfluorooctane-1- sulfonamido)ethyl When the
 same compound was not available as mass-labeled, the closest retention time labeled compound
 was selected. Detection and quantification limits (LOD and LOQ) reflect concentrations in the 4-
 mL solvent-eluted samples. In order to compare these values to leachate concentrations, multiply
 the instrument detection limit by the ratio between volumes, in this case, 4 mL divided by the
 extracted volume of each leachate sample (approximately 50 mL).

TABLE-US-00006 TABLE S5 Extraction efficiency experiment result details. Compounds are
 listed in increasing order of retention time. Extraction Efficiency Total Extraction Efficiency
 Evaporation Loss (%) (%) (%) Compound Leachate Foam Δ Leachate Foam Δ Leachate Foam
 PFBA 114 147 34 107 95 -12 6 52 PFPeA 104 115 11 88 84 -4 16 31 PFBS 84 131 47 73 100 27
 11 31 PFHxA 93 106 14 79 91 11 14 16 PFHxS 106 128 21 80 92 12 26 36 PFHpA 102 113 11 82
 93 11 21 20 6:2 FTS 84 99 16 70 85 15 13 14 PFOA 101 108 6 80 88 7 21 20 PFOS 104 108 5 73
 104 31 31 4 PFNA 100 110 10 77 88 11 22 22 FOE A 85 90 5 71 73 2 14 16 8:2 FTS 75 93 18 51
 86 35 24 7 FOSA 64 59 -4 46 46 0 17 13 PFDA 85 84 -1 61 69 8 24 14 N-MeFOSAA 73 79 6 55

64.18 15 N-Et-FOSAA 72.66 -7.53 54.1 20.12 PFUnDA 65.64 -1.45 51.6 20.13 N-MeFOSA
57.54 -3.38 42.5 20.12 PFDoDA 44.43 -1.31 34.3 13.9 N-EtFOSA 54.42 -12.37 35.2 16.7
PFTeDA 19.17 -2.14 14.0 6.3 MEAN 80.1 88.3 8.2 62.4 70.8 8.4 17.7 17.5

TABLE-US-00007 TABLE S6 Comparison of landfill leachate extraction efficiency results from previous reports, values are in %. The comparison was made for PFAS evaluated in common with this study, most of these studies included additional compounds not listed here. Current solid phase extraction methods for PFAS in leachate vary between researchers. The procedure used in this study features commonly employed materials, such as WAX cartridges^{sup.1,2}, methanolic ammonium hydroxide^{sup.1,2} (however, the concentration varies), and methanol, which was used in some portion of all SPE approaches referenced. Other efficiency experiment results in the literature, which were not included in this table, such as Li et al.^{sup.5}, which reported a range of recoveries (20% to 120%) for all compounds and no individual PFAS, and Gonzalez-Barreiro et al.^{sup.6}, which also reported similar recoveries for two SPE methods (ranging from 11% to 96% for Method A and 8% to 102% for Method B) using wastewater effluent, had comparable results. Optimization of PFAS extraction protocols for multiple compounds with a wide variety of extraction behaviors is a challenge, and thus, solid phase extraction efficiency for different compounds varies widely (i.e., from 8% to 160%) among these studies; this method resulted in a comparable range (19% to 114%). Community-wide efforts aimed at harmonizing/standardizing PFAS measurement in leachate (e.g., development of a Standard Reference Material) would provide a means to better evaluate these workflows. Benskin Busch Huset Allred This et al. et al. et al. study (2010).^{sup.1} (2010).^{sup.2} (2011).^{sup.3} (2014).^{sup.4} Extraction Type SPE SPE SPE SPE LLE PFBA 114 54 53 ± 21 25 ± 5 11 PFPeA 104 68* 39 ± 8 41 PFBS 84 68* 54 ± 2 PFHxA 93 121 47 ± 17 64 ± 9 92 PFHxS 106 102* 49 ± 19 80 ± 3 100 PFHpA 102 137* 110 ± 12 6:2 FTS 84 74 ± 2 100 PFOA 101 136 50 ± 19 72 ± 16 100 PFOS 104 96 60 ± 24 69 ± 1 110 PFNA 100 139 54 ± 23 120 ± 18 100 FOEA 85 103 45 ± 22 110 8:2 FTS 75 94 ± 7 FOSA 64 132* 110 ± 8 PFDA 85 146* 48 ± 22 73 ± 7 110 MeFOSAA 73 123* 71 ± 4 100 EtFOSAA 72 116* 65 ± 3 110 PFUnDA 65 160* 47 ± 20 44 ± 3 100 MeFOSA 57 60 ± 23 PFDoA 44 144* 45 ± 20 34 ± 6 100 EtFOSA 54 54 ± 18 PFTeDA 19 155* 8 ± 3

*Results for these compounds are for non-mass-labeled standards, the remaining extraction efficiencies are for mass-labeled. References for supplemental information .^{sup.1}Benskin, J. P.; Ikonou, M. G.; Woudneh, M. B.; Cosgrove, J. R. Rapid Characterization of Perfluoroalkyl Carboxylate, Sulfonate, and Sulfonamide Isomers by High-Performance Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr. A* 2012, 1247, 165-170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2012.05.077>. .^{sup.2}Busch, J.; Ahrens, L.; Sturm, R.; Ebinghaus, R. Polyfluoroalkyl Compounds in Landfill Leachates. *Environ. Pollut.* 2010, 758(5), 1467-1471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2009.12.031>. .^{sup.3}Huset, C. A.; Barlaz, M. A.; Barofsky, D. F.; Field, J. A. Quantitative Determination of Fluorochemicals in Municipal Landfill Leachates. *Chemosphere* 2011, 82 (10), 1380-1386.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2010.11.072>. .^{sup.4}Allred, B. M.; Lang, J. R.; Barlaz, M. A.; Field, J. A. Orthogonal Zirconium Diol/C18 Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry Analysis of Poly and Perfluoroalkyl Substances in Landfill Leachate. *J. Chromatogr. A* 2014, 1359, 202-211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2014.07.056>. .^{sup.5}Li, B.; Danon-Schaffer, M. N.; Li, L. Y.; Ikonou, M. G.; Grace, J. R. Occurrence of PFCs and PBDEs in Landfill Leachates from Across Canada. *Water. Air. Soil Pollut.* 2012, 223 (6), 3365-3372. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11270-012-1115-7>. .^{sup.6}González-Barreiro, C.; Martínez-Carballo, E.; Sitka, A.; Scharf, S.; Gans, O. Method Optimization for Determination of Selected Perfluorinated Alkylated Substances in Water Samples. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 2006, 386 (7), 2123-2132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-006-0902-7>.

EXAMPLE 2

[0121] The laboratory experiment described in Example 1 was used to design a field application of foam separation of PFAS in landfill leachate. The field unit includes a simple, portable, two-stage

PFAS separation unit which will use foam flotation followed by either membrane or sorbent separation to concentrate PFAS in a low volume waste stream. Additional laboratory studies will be used to optimize (based on site-specific matrix characteristics and PFAS contamination) the design and construction of a deployable unit which uses bubble aeration to produce and separate a P FAS-rich foam, which will be separated and undergo additional separation, stabilization and/or destructive treatment. In the field unit, PFAS concentrations in the treated water as well as air effluent will be monitored. The schematic included in FIG. 8 includes an additional apparatus similar to that described in EPA OTM-45, a method in development for the measurement of volatile and semi-volatile PFAS in gases.

[0122] It should be noted that ratios, concentrations, amounts, and other numerical data may be expressed herein in a range format. It is to be understood that such a range format is used for convenience and brevity, and thus, should be interpreted in a flexible manner to include not only the numerical values explicitly recited as the limits of the range, but also to include all the individual numerical values or sub-ranges encompassed within that range as if each numerical value and sub-range is explicitly recited. To illustrate, a concentration range of “about 0.1% to about 5%” should be interpreted to include not only the explicitly recited concentration of about 0.1 wt % to about 5 wt %, but also include individual concentrations (e.g., 1%, 2%, 3%, and 4%) and the sub-ranges (e.g., 0.5%, 1.1%, 2.2%, 3.3%, and 4.4%) within the indicated range. In an embodiment, the term “about” can include traditional rounding according to significant figures of the numerical value. In addition, the phrase “about ‘x’ to ‘y’” includes “about ‘x’ to about ‘y’”.

[0123] It should be emphasized that the above-described embodiments of the present disclosure are merely possible examples of implementations, and are set forth only for a clear understanding of the principles of the disclosure. Many variations and modifications may be made to the above-described embodiments of the disclosure without departing substantially from the spirit and principles of the disclosure. All such modifications and variations are intended to be included herein within the scope of this disclosure.

Claims

1. A system for removing per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl compounds (P FAS compounds) from wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds, comprising: a bubble aeration system comprising an air flow device in communication with a bubble aeration device, wherein the bubble aeration device is within pre-foamed wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds, wherein the bubble aeration device is configured to produce bubbles from the air flow from the air flow device, wherein the bubbles form a foam layer on top of the wastewater leachate, wherein the foam layer comprises a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the pre-foamed wastewater; and a separating system configured to remove a portion of the foam layer from the surface of the wastewater leachate to form defoamed water.
2. The system of claim 1, wherein the air flow device is an air generator or pump and wherein the bubble aeration device is a structure that is configured to form bubbles as air is flowed through the bubble aeration device.
3. The system of claim 1, wherein the separating system comprising a structure that is configured to skim the foam layer off of the surface of the wastewater leachate.
4. The system of claim 2, wherein a single structure includes has a winding flow path having an entrance for the wastewater leachate and an exit for defoamed water, wherein along the winding flow path the bubble aeration device produces bubbles
5. The system of claim 4, wherein along the winding flow path the separating system is skimming the foam layer off of the surface of the wastewater leachate or wherein the separating system skims the foam layer off at the exit of the winding flow path.
6. The system of claim 5, wherein the single structure is configured to float in a body of wastewater

leachate.

7. The system of claim 6, wherein bubble aeration system and the separating system of in a single unit that is configured to float on a body of water and positioned within the body of water.

8. The system of claim 1, wherein the bubble aeration system includes a path configured to flow the wastewater leachate, wherein the path is a serpentine path, a curving path, a winding path, or a sinuous path.

9. The system of claim 1, wherein the separating system configured to remove a portion of the foam layer from the surface of the wastewater leachate at multiple points along the path.

10. The system of claim 1, wherein the separating system includes a skimmer, a baffle, or both, wherein the separating occurs as the de-foamed wastewater leachate flows past the skimmer or baffle along the path.

11. The system of claim 1, further comprising a processing system includes a device that renders the PFAS compounds less hazardous relative to before processing than PFAS compound.

12. The system of claim 1, wherein processing system includes: an electron beam device, a plasma device, an incineration device, an oxidation device, or a combination thereof.

13. A device for removing per- and/or polyfluoroalkyl compounds (PFAS compounds) from wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds, comprising: an air flow device in communication with a bubble aeration device, wherein the bubble aeration device is within pre-foamed wastewater leachate contaminated with PFAS compounds, wherein the bubble aeration device is configured to produce bubbles from the air flow from the air flow device, wherein the bubbles form a foam layer on top of the wastewater leachate, wherein the foam layer comprises a concentrated amount of PFAS compounds relative to that present in the pre-foamed wastewater; and a separating device configured to remove a portion of the foam layer from the surface of the wastewater leachate to form defoamed water.

14. The system of claim 13, wherein the bubble aeration system includes a path configured to flow the wastewater leachate, wherein the path is a serpentine path, a curving path, a winding path, or a sinuous path.

15. The system of claim 13, wherein the separating system configured to remove a portion of the foam layer from the surface of the wastewater leachate at multiple points along the path.

16. The system of claim 13, wherein the separating system includes a skimmer, a baffle, or both, wherein the separating occurs as the de-foamed wastewater leachate flows past the skimmer or baffle along the path.

17. The system of claim 13, further comprising a processing system includes a device that renders the P FAS compounds less hazardous relative to before processing than PFAS compound.

18. The system of claim 13, wherein the air flow device is an air generator or pump and wherein the bubble aeration device is a structure that is configured to form bubbles as air is flowed through the bubble aeration device.

19. The system of claim 13, wherein the separating system comprising a structure that is configured to skim the foam layer off of the surface of the wastewater leachate.

20. The system of claim 13, further comprising a processing system includes a device that renders the PFAS compounds less hazardous relative to before processing than PFAS compound, wherein processing system includes: an electron beam device, a plasma device, an incineration device, an oxidation device, or a combination thereof.
