



**Environmental  
Science**  
Processes & Impacts

**Constructed Wetlands for Polishing Oil and Gas Produced  
Water Releases**

Journal:	<i>Environmental Science: Processes &amp; Impacts</i>
Manuscript ID	EM-ART-07-2021-000311.R1
Article Type:	Paper

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Constructed Wetlands for Polishing Oil and Gas Produced Water Releases

Molly C. McLaughlin<sup>1,2</sup>, Bonnie McDevitt<sup>3</sup>, Hannah Miller<sup>4</sup>, Kaela K. Amundson<sup>4</sup>, Michael J. Wilkins<sup>4</sup>, Nathaniel R. Warner<sup>3</sup>, Jens Blotvogel<sup>1</sup>, Thomas Borch<sup>1,4,5,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Colorado State University, 1320 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, CO, 80523, USA

<sup>2</sup> Present address: Abt Associates Inc., 2755 Canyon Blvd., Boulder, CO, 80301

<sup>3</sup> Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University, 212 Sackett Building, University Park, PA 16801, USA

<sup>4</sup> Department of Soil and Crop Sciences, Colorado State University, 1170 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Chemistry, Colorado State University, 1872 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, Colorado, 80523, USA

\*Corresponding author: [thomas.borch@colostate.edu](mailto:thomas.borch@colostate.edu)

### Abstract

Produced water (PW) is the largest waste stream associated with oil and gas (O&G) operations and contains petroleum hydrocarbons, heavy metals, salts, naturally occurring radioactive materials and any remaining chemical additives. In some areas in Wyoming, constructed wetlands (CWs) are used to polish PW downstream of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) PW release points. In recent years, there has been increased interest in finding lower cost options, such as CWs, for PW treatment. The goal of this study was to understand the efficacy of removal and environmental fate of O&G organic chemical additives in CW systems used to treat PW released for agricultural beneficial reuse. To achieve this goal, we analyzed water and sediment samples for organic O&G chemical additives and conducted 16S rRNA gene sequencing for microbial community characterization on three such systems in Wyoming, USA. Three surfactants (polyethylene glycols, polypropylene glycols, and nonylphenol ethoxylates) and one biocide (alkyldimethylammonium chloride) were detected in

1  
2  
3 all three PW discharges and >94% removal of all species from PW was achieved after treatment  
4 in two CWs in series. These O&G extraction additives were detected in all sediment samples  
5  
6 collected downstream of PW discharges. Chemical and microbial analyses indicated that sorption  
7  
8 and biodegradation were the main attenuation mechanisms for these species. Additionally, all  
9  
10 three discharges showed a trend of increasingly diverse, but similar, microbial communities with  
11  
12 greater distance from NPDES PW discharge points. Results of this study can be used to inform  
13  
14 design and management of constructed wetlands for produced water treatment.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **Environmental Significance Statement**

22  
23  
24 Use of constructed wetlands (CWs) for treatment of oil and gas (O&G) produced water  
25  
26 (PW) is expected to increase in the future, due to the relatively low cost associated with this  
27  
28 treatment approach. Prior to widespread implementation of this practice, it is important to  
29  
30 understand if CWs are effective at PW treatment. In this study we focused on three CW systems  
31  
32 downstream of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) PW discharges in  
33  
34 Wyoming and found greater than 94% removal of all detected O&G chemical additives. In  
35  
36 contrast, our companion study showed that concentrations of inorganic species were not  
37  
38 decreased. Results and recommendations provided in these studies can be used to inform design  
39  
40 and management of CWs for PW treatment.  
41  
42  
43

## 44 **Introduction**

45  
46 Produced water (PW) is one of the largest waste streams associated with oil and gas  
47  
48 (O&G), resulting in over three trillion liters of PW generated each year in the United States.<sup>1</sup>  
49  
50 Due to conflicts over water scarcity and issues associated with common PW management  
51  
52 strategies (e.g., earthquakes caused by high rates of underground PW injection), operators and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 governments are increasingly interested in finding ways to reuse PW, either in the oilfield or  
4  
5 outside.<sup>2-9</sup> One example of PW reuse occurs in the United States where west of the 98<sup>th</sup> meridian,  
6  
7 the federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulation permits  
8  
9 operators to release PW for agricultural beneficial reuse.<sup>2-4, 10</sup>  
10  
11

12 In most cases, PW must be treated prior to reuse.<sup>11, 12</sup> Many approaches for PW treatment  
13  
14 have been studied including membrane separation and distillation, forward osmosis,  
15  
16 electrocoagulation, advanced oxidation processes, adsorption, and biological treatment.<sup>13-15</sup>  
17  
18 Treatment costs range from \$0.25/m<sup>3</sup> - \$20/m<sup>3</sup> depending on treatment type, location, quality of  
19  
20 the inlet water and more.<sup>6</sup> Treatment facilities often require skilled staff, high start-up and  
21  
22 maintenance costs and external power.<sup>16</sup> These factors can make treatment and reuse financially  
23  
24 prohibitive, which may result in temporary or permanent closure of a well.<sup>17</sup>  
25  
26  
27

28 Constructed wetlands (CWs) have been used for decades to treat domestic, agricultural,  
29  
30 and industrial wastewaters. In comparison to other treatment systems, CWs can have relatively  
31  
32 low start-up and maintenance costs. Biodegradation, sorption, photo-degradation and plant  
33  
34 uptake are the main attenuation mechanisms in these systems and CWs can be designed to  
35  
36 enhance one or more removal mechanisms, depending on the contaminant(s) of concern.<sup>18</sup> In  
37  
38 some parts of the U.S., natural or constructed wetlands are used to polish PW after treatment  
39  
40 with separators and chemical additives.<sup>16, 19, 20</sup> This practice has been occurring since the 1980s,  
41  
42 however, it remains relatively uncommon. PW composition varies throughout the U.S. (e.g.,  
43  
44 TDS: 100 – 400,000 mg/L) and only lower salinity PWs are suitable for treatment via CWs.<sup>21, 22</sup>  
45  
46  
47 Wetlands are currently used for PW polishing in both Wyoming and California, where PW  
48  
49 salinity is relatively low (< 5,000 mg/L). Even though these CWs have been in operation for  
50  
51 decades, minimal analysis has been conducted on the efficacy of PW treatment at these sites.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 PW is a complex waste stream containing organic chemicals (both geogenic and  
4 anthropogenic), metals, naturally occurring radioactive materials (NORMs), and salts. Previous  
5 studies, many of which were conducted in the lab, have shown that CWs are effective at reducing  
6 a range of bulk contaminant parameters including chemical oxygen demand (COD), biological  
7 oxygen demand (BOD), oil, trace organics, and in some cases, total dissolved solids (TDS).<sup>19, 23-</sup>  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<sup>25</sup> Additional studies have reported attenuation of metals, including cadmium, copper, nickel and zinc.<sup>23, 24</sup> Finally, one study showed decreased acute toxicity in *Daphnia magna* after treatment of PW with reverse osmosis followed by CWs.<sup>23</sup>

This study was conducted at an undisclosed location in Wyoming, where surface flow CW systems are used to polish PW downstream of NPDES PW release points. Previous analysis at one release point showed that volatile organic contaminants (e.g., gasoline range organics (GRO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs)) were removed prior to the first CW. Less volatile species, including diesel range organics (DRO) and organic O&G chemical additives (e.g., surfactants) persisted through this wetland and preliminary results indicated that attenuation of O&G chemical additives increased within the CW. To date, no studies have investigated the fate of organic O&G chemical additives in PW treated via CWs. Similarly, no studies have examined the efficacy of CWs for O&G chemical additive removal.

Many O&G chemical additives are biodegradable, can be taken up by plants, and readily sorb to sediment (e.g., nonylphenol ethoxylates) and therefore are ideal candidates for attenuation via CWs.<sup>26, 27</sup> Some well-maintenance additives are volatile (e.g., toluene) and will be removed from PW via volatilization.<sup>3</sup> The environmental fate and impact of other compounds, however, is less certain. For example, biocides are commonly used in the O&G industry to suppress unwanted microbial activity. Biodegradation is a major attenuation mechanism in CWs

1  
2  
3 and thus biocides may negatively impact biodegradation rates in CWs. Additionally, because PW  
4 is complex, a chemical analysis alone is insufficient for understanding treatment efficacy and  
5  
6 downstream impacts of PW treated in CW systems.<sup>2</sup> Due to the sensitivity of microbial  
7  
8 communities to changes in the environment, the characterization of microbial communities may  
9  
10 offer additional insights into treatment efficacy, especially in complex water samples such as  
11  
12 PW, where the exact chemical composition is unknown.<sup>2, 3, 28</sup> Microbial community analyses  
13  
14 may also provide insight into contaminant removal mechanisms. The composition of PW is  
15  
16 unique to other wastewaters that have been managed by CWs. Thus, further investigation into the  
17  
18 viability of CWs for PW management is warranted.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24         The goals of this study are to 1) determine the efficacy of CWs downstream of NPDES  
25 releases for O&G chemical additive removal, 2) explore the key mechanisms controlling the fate  
26 of organic O&G chemical additives in CWs, and 3) analyze the microbial communities in water  
27 and sediment to identify major metabolic processes involved in contaminant fate. To achieve  
28 these goals, this study will focus on three surface flow CW systems in Wyoming used to polish  
29 PW downstream of three different NPDES PW release points where salt concentrations are  
30 relatively low (TDS: 1,000 - 3,500 mg/L). Fate of both organic and inorganic species must be  
31 considered to fully understand treatment efficacy and thus a companion study, which focused on  
32 radium and TDS components, was also conducted at this site.<sup>4</sup> By determining the environmental  
33 fate of organic O&G chemical additives in these systems, this study will provide valuable  
34 information for the design and management of additional CWs for PW treatment.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

## 51 **Materials and Methods**


52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

### *Site description*

This study was conducted at an undisclosed field site in Wyoming where over 10 NPDES PW discharges are located and has been studied in detail previously.<sup>2-4, 9, 10</sup> At this site, O&G operations occur in a relatively remote location and there are few other sources of contamination. Analysis focused on three NPDES PW discharges, the wetland(s) used to polish the PW downstream (Figure 1) and a control site wetland. For the remainder of this study, the NPDES discharges will be referred to as Discharge A (DA), Discharge B (DB), and Discharge C (DC). Treatment of PW prior to release at the NPDES point is relatively similar at all three sites. Multiple wells (10+) are in operation at each site. After extraction from the wells, the oil-gas-PW mixture is combined and sent to the on-site treatment system. Treatment includes a three-phase separator (oil, gas, water) which uses heat, gravity, and emulsion-breaking chemicals. Once separated, a portion of the PW is reinjected underground either for enhanced oil recovery or for disposal in cases where TDS exceeds effluent limits. Permits for DB provided detailed information on well maintenance chemicals used onsite including scale inhibitors, corrosion inhibitors, and a water clarifier. The permit stated that hydraulic fracturing occurs every other year at this site. Details regarding well maintenance chemicals and stimulation schedule were not available for the other two discharges.

On average, 1.5 million liters of PW are released each day at DA. At DB and DC, an average of 4.0 and 4.5 million liters are released per day, respectively. At the time of sampling, multiple wells at DB were shut-in due to low oil prices. This resulted in a lower-than-average discharge rate at this site. At all sites, minimally treated PW is polished by wetlands after release. Downstream of DA and DB, the wetlands are natural depressions that are now filled with PW and vegetation. At DC, wetlands were constructed for the purpose of PW treatment. At all three

1  
2  
3 sites, cattle, birds, horses, and other wildlife use the streams and wetlands as a drinking water  
4 source. There is little precipitation in the region (average 230 mm/year)<sup>29</sup> and no additional  
5  
6 tributaries to the wetlands and streams discussed at these sites. As a result, the wetlands and  
7  
8 streams downstream of all three discharges are composed entirely of O&G PW unless there has  
9  
10 been a recent precipitation event. Additional site description, along with details on permit  
11  
12 effluent limits, are provided in the Supporting Information (Table S1).  
13  
14  
15



16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Figure 1.** Map of sampling locations at three undisclosed NPDES PW discharges in Wyoming, Discharge A (DA), Discharge B (DB) and Discharge C (DC). Surface water and sediment grab samples were collected in November 2018. Sites DA-D, DB-D and DC-D were collected directly from the discharge culvert. All other sites were collected upstream (US), downstream (DS) or within the wetlands (W). The first wetland on each discharge is indicated by W1 and the second by W2. When large enough, wetlands are indicated on the map in dark blue. In some instances (DB-W1 and DC-W1) the wetlands are smaller and hidden beneath the sampling site indicators. Site DC-100m was collected 100 m downstream of DC-D.

### Site Sampling



Surface water and sediment grab samples were collected at all three field sites in November 2018. Samples DA-D, DB-D and DC-D were collected directly from the NPDES discharge point (D), immediately before the water entered the streams. All other sampling sites were located immediately upstream, downstream or within a wetland. The naming conventions for these sites indicates their location. For example, DC-USW1 is located upstream (US) of the first wetland (W1). DC-W1 is located within the first wetland (W1) and DC-DSW1 is located downstream (DS) of the first wetland (W1). DC-100m, which is located 100 m downstream of DC-D, is one exception to this naming and sampling convention. In addition, a control site wetland (CSW) that was unimpacted by PW releases was also sampled. A complete list of site names, site descriptions and distances from the discharge are provided in Table 1. Our companion study on radium and TDS components sampled the same locations and used the same site names.<sup>4</sup>

**Table 1.** Sampling site names, descriptions, distance from discharge point and field parameters.

Site Name	Distance from Discharge (km)	Site Description	Temperature (°C)	pH	Conductivity (µS/cm)	Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)
CSW	-	Control Site Wetland	4.9	8.80	900	1.6
<b>Discharge A (DA)</b>						
DA-D	0.00	NPDES Discharge Point	35.4	7.07	6400	0.4
DA-W1	0.33	Wetland 1	1.9	8.41	5790	1.7
DA-DSW1	0.53	Downstream of Wetland 1	3.6	8.05	6330	2.3
DA-W2	1.41	Wetland 2	2.1	8.30	7830	3.7
DA-DSW2	2.06	Downstream of Wetland 2	2.4	8.56	11400	3.5
<b>Discharge B (DB)</b>						
DB-D	0.00	NPDES Discharge Point	10.6	7.40	5080	1.2
DB-USW1	0.79	Upstream of Wetland 1				
DB-W1	0.82	Wetland 1	1.0	7.62	6420	3.2
DB-DSW1	0.84	Downstream of Wetland 1	1.9	7.77	6430	4.5
<b>Discharge C (DC)</b>						
DC-D	0.00	NPDES Discharge Point	40.4	7.90	2270	0.5
DC-100m	0.10	100 m downstream of discharge	41.1	8.11	2290	0.6
DC-USW1	1.79	Upstream of Wetland 1	29.8	8.40	2090	1.7
DC-W1	1.85	Wetland 1	27.1	8.50	2080	2.0
DC-DSW1	1.90	Downstream of Wetland 1	24.4	8.36	2010	1.9
DC-USW2	5.24	Upstream of Wetland 2	16.5	7.73	2000	1.6
DC-W2	5.40	Wetland 2	15.7	7.76	1910	1.4

DC-DSW2	6.00	Downstream of Wetland 2	2.4	7.81	1990	3.2
---------	------	-------------------------	-----	------	------	-----

Water samples were collected in the center of the streams and as close to the center of the wetlands as possible. Water samples for microbial analysis were collected using Sterivex filters (0.22  $\mu\text{m}$ , polyethersulfone, Millipore). Between 40 and 1000 mL of fluid was passed through these filters to collect planktonic biomass for DNA extraction. Sediment samples in the streams were collected near the shore typically in an area on the inner shore of a meander. In the wetlands, sediment samples were collected as close to the water sample as possible, also in an area of sediment accumulation. Except for water samples collected for NPOC analysis, samples for organic analysis were collected in glass bottles with Teflon-lined caps. Water samples for NPOC analysis were collected in plastic bottles and acidified in the field. Prior to collection, all glassware was cleaned with Milli-Q water and methanol and baked in a muffle furnace for 6 hours at 450°C. Sediment samples for microbial analysis were collected in sterile plastic bags. Field and lab blanks were also collected and processed alongside each analysis. At each site, a Hanna HI98194 probe was used to measure temperature, pH, conductivity, and dissolved oxygen of the water.

#### *Volatile Organic Compounds, Carbon and Nitrogen Analyses*

Water samples were analyzed for non-purgeable organic carbon (NPOC), total nitrogen (TN), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). NPOC and TN of water samples was analyzed using a Shimadzu TOC-L equipped with a platinum catalyst. For VOC analysis, water samples were prepared following EPA Method 5021A using a Tekmar 7000 Headspace Autosampler and analyzed for volatile organics following EPA Method 8015 using an Agilent 6890N Network Gas Chromatography (GC) System with a Flame Ionization Detector (FID).

1  
2  
3 Additional details on water sample collection and analysis can be found in the Supporting  
4  
5 Information.  
6

7  
8 Sediment samples were analyzed for total carbon, total nitrogen, and inorganic carbon.  
9  
10 Total carbon and total nitrogen of sediments were analyzed using a LECO TruSpec CN.  
11  
12 Inorganic carbon (i.e., carbonate) content of sediments was analyzed using a calcimeter, pressure  
13  
14 transducer and voltage meter following methods in Sherrod, 2002.<sup>30</sup> Additional details on  
15  
16 sediment sample collection and analysis can be found in the Supporting Information.  
17  
18

### 19 *Non-Volatile Organic Compounds Analyses*

20

21  
22 Water and sediment samples were analyzed for non-volatile organic compounds  
23  
24 (NVOCs). Water samples were collected without headspace, stored on ice in the field and stored  
25  
26 at 4°C in the lab until analysis. Sediment samples were stored on ice in the field and at -20°C in  
27  
28 the lab. Water sample extracts were prepared following methods in McLaughlin et al., 2020a.  
29  
30 Sediment extracts were prepared following methods described in Lara-Martin et al., 2011.<sup>31</sup>  
31  
32 Details for both methods are provided in the Supporting Information.  
33  
34

35  
36 Water and sediment methanol extracts were analyzed for NVOCs using a Quadrupole  
37  
38 Time-of-Flight mass spectrometer (Q-ToF-MS). Details of this method are provided in the  
39  
40 Supporting Information. An exact concentration of each surfactant series could not be  
41  
42 determined due to a lack of commercial standards with known ethoxymer distribution. Instead,  
43  
44 an estimated concentration was determined at the discharge using polyethylene glycol 400,  
45  
46 polypropylene glycol (Alfa Aesar, Haverhill, MA), and 4-nonylphenol-polyethylene glycol  
47  
48 (Sigma Aldrich, Saint Louis, MO) standards. For alkyldimethylbenzylammonium chloride  
49  
50 (ADBAC), three different alkyl lengths (C10, C12, C14) were detected and a dodecyldimethyl-*n*-  
51  
52 benzylammonium chloride (Alfa Aesar, Haverhill, MA) standard was used to estimate  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 concentration. Relative concentrations ( $C/C_0$ ) were determined for samples downstream since all  
4 samples were stored in the same manner and extracted and analyzed at the same time. Relative  
5  
6 concentration was calculated by dividing the estimated concentration at each sampling location  
7  
8  
9  
10 by the estimated concentration at the effluent.  
11

#### 12 13 14 *Microbial Analysis (16S rRNA gene sequence)*

15  
16  
17 Sterivex filters and sediments for microbial analysis were stored in sterile plastic bags on  
18  
19 dry ice in the field and at  $-70^{\circ}\text{C}$  in the lab until analysis. Total nucleic acids were extracted from  
20  
21 0.4 g of sediment using the DNeasy PowerSoil Ki (Qiagen) and eluted with 10  $\mu\text{L}$  of elution  
22  
23 buffer, then stored at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Extracted DNA purity and quantity were measured on a Qubit  
24  
25 Fluorometer (ThermoFisher Scientific). DNA was sequenced at the Colorado State University  
26  
27 next-generation sequencing facility. Bacterial 16S rRNA gene libraries were prepared according  
28  
29 to the two-step PCR workflow in the *Illumina 16S Metagenomic Sequencing Library*  
30  
31 *Preparation Protocol (Part 15044223 Revision B)*. Round one primers were modified to include  
32  
33  $n=0$  to  $n=3$  base pair heterogeneity spacers according to Galan et al., 2018. Round two primers  
34  
35 included two eight base pair barcodes for sample multiplexing.<sup>32</sup> HiFi HotStart ReadyMix  
36  
37 (Roche Ltd.) was used to amplify libraries. Individual libraries were pooled at approximately  
38  
39 equimolar ratios and library QC included visualization on with TapeStation HS D1000 reagents  
40  
41 (Agilent, Inc.) and qPCR using Library Quantification Master Mix and Standards  
42  
43 (Roche Ltd.). The pooled libraries were sequenced at 10pM on a MiSeq instrument (Illumina  
44  
45 Inc.) using the 500 cycle (2 x 250 base pair) V2 Reagent Kit with 15% PhiX spike-in to increase  
46  
47 base-call heterogeneity during the run. All raw reads for 16S rRNA gene sequencing were  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 submitted to NCBI under BioProject PRJNA722032.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Data processing was conducted with QIIME2 following the protocol of Borton et al.  
4  
5 2017.<sup>33</sup> Samples with less than 5000 reads were discarded due to low data quality. Statistical  
6  
7 analysis was performed primarily using the R statistical package “vegan” (v2.5.7). Alpha  
8  
9 diversity was calculated with the diversity function to investigate species richness, Shannon’s  
10  
11 diversity and Simpson evenness. Beta diversity was calculated by analyzing Bray-Curtis  
12  
13 dissimilarities of the resulting 16S rRNA amplicon features by first converting feature counts to  
14  
15 relative abundances, and then plotting these values with nonmetric multidimensional scaling  
16  
17 (NMDS) ordinations in R. Both a multi response permutation procedure and mean dissimilarity  
18  
19 matrix (MRPP) function and an analysis of similarities (ANOSIM) function were calculated to  
20  
21 determine the significance of differences between sample groups. Finally, linear discriminant  
22  
23 analysis effect size (LEfSe) was performed on water and sediment samples to determine  
24  
25 significantly discriminate microbial features between these two groups.<sup>34</sup>  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

## 33 **Results & Discussion**

### 34 *Field Parameters*

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Field parameters for the sampling sites are shown in Table 1. For all three discharges,  
41  
42 temperature was highest at the discharge point and decreased with distance downstream. At  
43  
44 Discharge A and Discharge B, pH was lowest at the discharge (DA-D: 7.07; DB-D: 7.40),  
45  
46 trended upward in the wetlands and with distance downstream. At Discharge C, pH was 7.90 at  
47  
48 the discharge, increased slightly through the first wetland and then decreased through the second  
49  
50 wetland. Previous studies have observed increases in pH downstream of both O&G and coalbed  
51  
52 methane (CBM) PW discharges in Wyoming and attributed the increases to evaporation and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 carbonate precipitation.<sup>10, 35</sup> All sampling sites were within the range of the pH permitted at the  
4  
5 effluent (pH 6.5-9).  
6

7  
8 At both Discharge A and Discharge B, conductivity was lowest at the discharge (DA-D:  
9  
10 6,400  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ; DB-D: 5,080  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) and increased with distance downstream. Previous studies  
11  
12 conducted in the area showed that increases in conductivity downstream of O&G PW discharges  
13  
14 were due to evaporation and oxidation of sulfide to sulfate ( $\text{SO}_4$ ).<sup>10</sup> In Discharge A, conductivity  
15  
16 was above the permit effluent limits (7,500  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) at site DA-W2 (7,830  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ) and DA-  
17  
18 DSW2 (11,400  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ). Conductivity at Discharge C was lower than observed at Discharge A  
19  
20 and Discharge B and remained relatively steady at all sampling sites, ranging between 1910 and  
21  
22 2290  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ . At all three discharges, dissolved oxygen was lowest at the discharge and generally  
23  
24 increased with distance downstream. In the control site wetland (CSW), temperature was 4.9°C,  
25  
26 pH was slightly higher than in the impacted wetlands (8.80), and conductivity was substantially  
27  
28 lower than in the impacted wetlands (900  $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ). Dissolved oxygen in the CSW was 1.6 mg/L,  
29  
30 which is comparable to dissolved oxygen in the two wetlands at Discharge C (DC-W1, DC-W2).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 *Chemical Composition of Water Samples*

39

40 The chemical composition at all three discharges reflected that of PW previously reported  
41  
42 in the area, with relatively low salt concentrations as compared to PWs in other regions of the  
43  
44 U.S. (TDS: 1,000 – 4,000 mg/L).<sup>2-4, 10</sup> The PW discharge samples also contained O&G chemical  
45  
46 additives, including some that were reported as well-maintenance chemicals in the Discharge B  
47  
48 NPDES permit (Table 2). At Discharge B and Discharge C, non-purgeable organic carbon  
49  
50 (NPOC) was highest at the discharge and generally decreased with distance downstream. At  
51  
52 Discharge A, NPOC was lowest at the discharge and increased downstream, more than doubling  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 by the last sample (DA-DSW2, ~2km downstream) (Figure S1). At all three discharges, total  
4  
5 nitrogen in water samples generally decreased with distance (Figure S1).  
6  
7

### 8 9 10 *VOC Analysis*

11  
12 Gas chromatography analysis revealed that volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were  
13  
14 present at all three discharges (Table 2). VOCs detected at the discharges included benzene,  
15  
16 toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes (BTEX) and acetone. Except for acetone, these compounds are  
17  
18 naturally present in PW.<sup>36,37</sup> All five chemicals are commonly used O&G chemical additives and  
19  
20 three of these VOCs (toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene) were reported as well-maintenance  
21  
22 chemicals in the Discharge B NPDES permit. In addition, acetone is a known by-product of  
23  
24 polypropylene glycol (PPG) biodegradation, another O&G chemical additive detected in all three  
25  
26 discharges.<sup>38</sup>  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 VOC concentrations were highest at DB-D, with benzene and toluene being the most  
32  
33 prominent VOCs in the sample (Table 2). Total BTEX released at this site was 2,640 µg/L.  
34  
35 Concentrations of toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes at this site exceeded the surface water acute  
36  
37 toxicity values for aquatic species (Table 2)<sup>39</sup> and this discharge reported failed acute toxicity  
38  
39 (*Daphnia magna* and *Pimephales promelas*) tests in 2019. Concentrations of BTEX were lower  
40  
41 at DA-D (BTEX: 880 µg/L) and were lowest at DC-D by another order of magnitude (BTEX:  
42  
43 70.0 µg/L). Toluene was detected downstream of the discharge point at Discharge A (DA-  
44  
45 DSW1, DA-DSW2) and Discharge B (DB-W1, DB-DSW1) but was below the limit of  
46  
47 quantification (LOQ). All other BTEX chemicals were below the detection limit in downstream  
48  
49 samples. Previous studies have shown that BTEX removal in both wetlands and streams is  
50  
51 dominated by volatilization, as evidenced by the Henry's constants ( $5.2\text{--}6.6 \times 10^{-3}$  atm-  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

m<sup>3</sup>/mol).<sup>3, 40</sup> Additionally, at all three discharges, produced water is released from a pipe and falls 1 – 2 m before entering the stream. Thus, these species are expected to partition quickly from water to the air and are generally removed prior to reaching the wetlands. All BTEX chemicals were below detection limit in the CSW.

Acetone concentrations were highest at DB-D (560 µg/L) and relatively similar at DA-D and DC-D (96 – 99 µg/L). Acetone was below detection limit downstream of DA-D and DB-D. Downstream of DC-D, where acetone was the most prominent VOC, this species was detected at DC-UPW1 (60 µg/L) and DC-DSW1 (55 µg/L). PPG concentrations are highest at DC-D and degradation of PPG was observed in the first wetland (see section on NVOCs analysis) and thus PPG biodegradation may contribute to acetone concentrations at these sites.<sup>38</sup> Acetone also has natural sources including animals, plants, and trees.<sup>3, 41</sup> Concentrations of acetone were below detection limit in the CSW.

**Table 2.** Concentrations of BTEX and four chemical additives (Polyethylene Glycols (PEGs); Polypropylene Glycols (PPGs); Nonylphenol Ethoxylates (NPEOs); and Alkyl Dimethyl Benzyl Alkonium Chloride (ADBAC) at the three NPDES PW discharges.

	Discharge			Surface Water Acute Tox. <sup>a</sup>	Chemical Type		
	DA-D	DB-D	DC-D		DB-D Well-Maintenance <sup>b</sup>	O&G Chemical Additive <sup>c</sup>	Geogenic Component of PW <sup>c</sup>
Benzene (µg/L)	308	848	22	2,300	N	Y	Y
Toluene (µg/L)	252	1067	10	120	Y	Y	Y
Ethylbenzene (µg/L)	88	210	10	130	Y	Y	Y
Xylenes (µg/L)	232	513	27	230	Y	Y	Y
Acetone (µg/L)	96	560	99	28,000	N	Y	N
PEGs (µg/L) <sup>d</sup>	4.4	7.0	2.5	<sup>e</sup>	N <sup>f</sup>	Y	N
PPGs (µg/L) <sup>d</sup>	2.1	4.2	6.4	<sup>e</sup>	N <sup>f</sup>	Y	N
NPEOs (µg/L) <sup>d</sup>	2.7	1.7	3.8	<sup>e</sup>	N <sup>f</sup>	Y	N
ADBAC (µg/L) <sup>d</sup>	347	62	0.1	<sup>e</sup>	Y	Y	N

<sup>a</sup> Data from NOAA Screening Quick Reference Tables unless noted. If multiple values available, lowest value was selected.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>b</sup> Well-maintenance chemical listed in the Discharge B NPDES permit. Chemicals may also be used for other purposes on-site, such as hydraulic fracturing. Chemical additives were not reported in the NPDES permits for Discharge A and Discharge C.

<sup>c</sup> Elliot, 2016.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>d</sup> Estimated concentrations. See Methods section.

<sup>e</sup> Acute toxicity values not available.



1  
2  
3 <sup>f</sup> Monomer is listed in Discharge NPDES permit.  
4  
5  
6

### 7 *NVOCs Analysis*

8

9 Water samples were analyzed for non-volatile organic compounds (NVOCs) using liquid  
10 chromatography. Polyethylene glycols (PEGs), polypropylene glycols (PPGs), nonylphenol  
11 ethoxylates (NPEOs), and alkyldimethylbenzylammonium chlorides (ADBACs) were present in  
12 all three discharges (Table 2; Figure 2). PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs are non-ionic surfactants  
13 commonly used by the O&G industry as emulsifiers, wetting agents and corrosion inhibitors.<sup>38</sup>  
14 Ethylene glycol and propylene glycol, the monomer of PEGs and PPGs, respectively, are both  
15 reported in the DB-D NPDES permit, although the polymers are not (Table 2). ADBACs, a  
16 cationic surfactant and quaternary ammonium compound mixture commonly used as a biocide in  
17 the O&G industry, are also reported in the Discharge B NPDES permit.<sup>44</sup>  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 ADBACs were the most prominent chemical additive detected at both DA-D (347 µg/L)  
31 and DB-D (62 µg/L), however, concentrations were much lower in DC-D (0.1 µg/L). At both  
32 Discharge A and Discharge B, ADBAC concentrations exceeded the LC50 values to fish and  
33 aquatic invertebrates (280 µg/L and 5.9 µg/L, respectively), and thus ADBAC may also have  
34 contributed to the failed acute toxicity tests reported at Discharge A.<sup>45</sup> Concentrations of PEGs,  
35 PPGs, and NPEOs were relatively steady between the discharges, ranging between 1.7 and 7.0  
36 µg/L. These concentrations are lower than concentrations reported in PW collected from a  
37 wellhead in Colorado (PEGs and PPGs ~1,000 µg/L), which was expected since the Colorado  
38 wells were recently hydraulically fractured and PW at our site is partially treated prior to release  
39 at the NPDES point.<sup>46</sup> To our knowledge, ADBACs have not previously been quantified in PW.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 PEGs, PPGs, NPEOs and ADBACs were detected downstream of both DA-D and DC-D.  
54 At Discharge B, all NVOCs were below LOQ at sampling sites downstream of the discharge.  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 This is likely due to the lower-than-average discharge rate at Discharge B, resulting in generally  
4 stagnant water and increased hydraulic retention times in both the stream and wetland.  
5

6  
7 Downstream of DA-D and DC-D, concentrations of ADBACs, PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs  
8 decreased with distance from the discharge (Figure 2). In the second sample downstream of DA-  
9 D (DA-DSW1), ADBACs were below LOQ. Downstream of the second and final wetland (DA-  
10 DSW2), a 95% reduction in PEGs, 94% reduction in PPGs, and a 99% reduction in NPEOs was  
11 observed, as compared to the discharge. This corresponds to estimated concentrations of 0.20  
12  $\mu\text{g/L}$  (PEGs), 0.12  $\mu\text{g/L}$  (PPGs), and 0.02  $\mu\text{g/L}$  (NPEOs). At Discharge C, ADBACs were below  
13 detection downstream of the first wetland (Figure 2). Both PEGs and NPEOs were below  
14 detection downstream of the second wetland (DC-DSW2), while a 96% reduction in PPGs was  
15 observed at this site (0.27  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ), as compared to the discharge. Concentrations of all surfactant  
16 classes were below detection limit in water samples collected from the CSW.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29


30  
31 ADBACs were the first chemical species removed from the water column downstream of  
32 DA-D and DC-D. Aqueous biodegradation of ADBACs have been reported in some instances;  
33 however, due to their high soil sorption coefficient ( $\log K_{oc} = 5.5-7$ ), previous studies have  
34 shown that sorption is the dominant removal mechanism for these species.<sup>44, 45, 47</sup> ADBACs were  
35 detected in sediments downstream of all three discharges, as discussed further in the sediments  
36 section, providing further evidence to show that this species was removed via sorption. Previous  
37 studies have shown that biodegradation and sorption are the two main attenuation mechanisms  
38 for PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs.<sup>26, 38, 47-49</sup> These species are known to biodegrade via sequential  
39 ethoxylate chain shortening, which leads to changes (increase or decrease) in homolog  
40 distribution depending on microbial preferences in ethoxymer chain length.<sup>38, 48</sup> NPEOs also  
41 potentially degrade via central cleavage.<sup>50</sup> Decreases in average ethoxymer length can also be an  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 indication of sorption since larger ethoxymers are more hydrophobic and therefore more likely to  
4 sorb to sediments.<sup>47, 49</sup> Changes in average ethoxymer length were observed for all three non-  
5  
6 ionic surfactant species with distance downstream at both Discharge A and Discharge C (dashed  
7  
8 lines, Figure 2) indicating that changes in concentration were due to transformation and not  
9  
10 dilution. Downstream of DC-D, the average ethoxymer length of the surfactants generally  
11  
12 decreased with distance, providing evidence for both biodegradation and sorption. In DA-W2,  
13  
14 decreases in PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs concentrations were similarly accompanied by decreases  
15  
16 in ethoxymer length. The increase in PPGs average ethoxymer length within DA-W1 and DC-  
17  
18 W2 may be due to preferential biodegradation of shorter ethoxymer lengths, which has been  
19  
20 observed in some studies for PEGs.<sup>48</sup> A combination of removal processes (e.g., biodegradation  
21  
22 and sorption) with preferences for different EO lengths could be the reason that the average  
23  
24 PEGs EO chain length remains relatively steady in DA-W1, while the relative concentration  
25  
26 decreases by nearly 90%.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 While concentrations of surfactants generally decreased with distance downstream, a  
34  
35 slight increase in PEGs was observed in the first wetland downstream of Discharge C. Initially,  
36  
37 the concentration of PEGs decreased with distance and 96% remained upstream of the first  
38  
39 wetland. Within the first wetland, however, relative concentration of PEGs increased to 102%.  
40  
41 This is mostly likely due to variability in the discharge composition; however, the increase may  
42  
43 also be due to other mechanisms such as NPEO biodegradation. Previous studies have provided  
44  
45 evidence for a central cleavage mechanism for NPEO degradation, which would generate PEGs  
46  
47 and nonylphenol.<sup>50</sup>  
48  
49  
50

51 In addition to biodegradation and sorption, evaporation and photodegradation have the  
52  
53 potential to impact the fate of the O&G chemical additives in these systems. Our previous study  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

had documented substantial evaporation at this site, causing increases in concentrations of inorganic solutes along the flow path.<sup>10</sup> Likewise, this process would lead to an increase in concentration of non-volatile organic chemicals, underestimating the removal rates calculated below. Photodegradation may also be occurring at the site, however, studies show that photodegradation of PEGs, NPEOs, and ADBACs is minimal in the absence of a catalyst.<sup>45, 51, 52</sup>



**Figure 2.** Relative concentration of polyethylene glycols (PEGs), polypropylene glycols (PPGs), nonylphenol ethoxylates (NPEOs), and alkyl dimethyl benzyl ammonium chlorides (ADBACs) and average ethoxymer (EO) length for PEGs, PPGs, and NPEOs versus distance from the NPDES discharge (km) at Discharge A (top) and Discharge C (bottom). Grey boxes indicate locations of wetlands. Initial concentrations of these species are shown in Table 2.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 *Removal of PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs downstream of Discharge C*

7  
8         Downstream of DC-D, water samples were collected immediately upstream and  
9  
10 downstream of both wetlands, allowing for a comparison between the stream and wetlands  
11 sections. In contrast to Discharge A and Discharge B, where the wetlands are ephemeral  
12 wetlands that have been filled in with PW, the wetlands downstream of DC-D were constructed  
13 wetlands that have been filled in with PW, the wetlands downstream of DC-D were constructed  
14 for the purpose of treating PW. Thus, this site is more similar to PW CWs that may be built  
15 downstream of other NPDES PW discharges.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21         The amount of mass removed in each of the two stream and wetlands “segments” was  
22 calculated for ADBACs, PEGs, PPGs, and NPEOs. These calculations were conducted using the  
23 average flow rate of the discharge stream (0.036 cms; Figure S8) and assumptions for average  
24 depth and width of the stream segments, based on what was observed at the site (Table S3 and  
25 S4). These results are presented in Table 3 and show the estimated mass per unit width of stream,  
26 the removal of mass in each segment and the percent removal in each segment. For both  
27 ADBACs and NPEOs, the majority of removal occurred in one of the stream segments. The vast  
28 majority (82%) of ADBACs were removed in the first stream segment while the majority of  
29 NPEOs (59%) were removed in the second stream segment. In contrast, the majority of PEGs  
30 and PPGs removal did not occur in a stream segment but instead within the second wetland  
31 segment (56% and 58% of removal, respectively). For all species, when change in mass is  
32 normalized over distance, the greatest change in mass occurs in one of the wetlands segments.  
33 For ADBACs and NPEOs, this is observed in the first wetland (W1), while for PEGs and PPGs,  
34 this is observed in the second wetland (W2). These results show that both wetlands and streams  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 are effective at removing these well-maintenance NVOCs from PW. The wetlands, however, are  
4  
5 more effective than streams when normalized by distance.  
6

7  
8 In addition to these calculations, pseudo-first order rates of removal were calculated for  
9  
10 PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs. While removal processes in these systems may follow different kinetic  
11  
12 orders and the exact and possibly mixed order is unknown, previous studies have shown that  
13  
14 most removal processes that occur in CWs can be estimated with first order kinetics.<sup>53</sup> Results of  
15  
16 the kinetic analysis are shown in Figure 3. This calculation was not conducted for ABDACs  
17  
18 since only two data points were available. It should also be noted that interpretation of these  
19  
20 results is limited due to the few data points and the flow rate assumptions. PPGs were the only  
21  
22 species detected downstream of the second wetland and removal of this species generally follows  
23  
24 the pseudo-first order rate of removal throughout the stream and wetland system. When  
25  
26 combined with the results in Table 3, this indicates that the increased removal of PPGs within the  
27  
28 second wetland is most likely due to the increased retention time in the wetland and not because  
29  
30 the rates of major removal mechanisms (i.e., biodegradation, sorption) are enhanced in the  
31  
32 wetlands versus the stream segments. Studies have shown that an increase in hydraulic retention  
33  
34 time (HRT) results in increased removal efficiency in CWs.<sup>54</sup> Larger HRTs generally require  
35  
36 larger volume systems, however, and thus enhancing removal rates within CWs is desirable to  
37  
38 reduce the space required for CWs.<sup>18, 54</sup>  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Observations that can be made about PEGs and NPEOs are limited due to the fact that  
46  
47 these species are below detection limit downstream of the second wetland. Linear trendlines  
48  
49 were added to Figure 3 to indicate when removal is faster or slower than average. It is clear from  
50  
51 these trendlines that the rate of removal for PPGs and NPEOs was slower within the first wetland  
52  
53 as compared to the average removal rate of these species throughout the system (dotted black  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 line). The removal rate of PEGs and NPEOs was also slower within the first stream segment, as  
4 compared to average. These observations indicate that there may be an initial lag period in  
5 removal mechanisms (e.g., biodegradation and sorption) for these two species. Many factors  
6 could be contributing to this lag phase. In the case of PEGs, previous studies have shown that  
7 biodegradation is faster under aerobic conditions and that biocides, when present at high enough  
8 concentration, inhibit PEG degradation.<sup>38, 48</sup> Dissolved oxygen increased and ADBAC  
9 concentrations decreased with distance downstream and thus could result in increased PEG  
10 biodegradation with distance. In the case of NPEOs, changes in sediment composition may result  
11 in increased sorption downstream. A study on NPEO absorption partition coefficients ( $K_d$ ) found  
12 that the average  $K_d$  value for a NPEO mixture increases with increasing organic carbon (OC)  
13 content in sediment.<sup>49</sup> The OC content at DS-USW2, which is the last sampling point shown for  
14 NPEOs in Figure 3, is approximately twice that of upstream samples (3.6% vs. 0.37 – 1.96%)  
15 (Figure S9). If OC values increase throughout this segment, it would result in increased sorption.  
16 Finally, a slight increase in PEG concentration was observed within the first wetland, as noted in  
17 the previous section.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


**Table 3.** Estimated removal of ADBAC, PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs mass in each stream and wetland segment downstream of DC-D. Values in bold indicate segments in which the greatest % Removal or greatest Removal/Distance occurred for each species.

Segment	Distance (km)	Hydraulic retention time (days)	Estimated mass ( $\mu\text{g}$ ) per unit width of stream	Removal of mass in each zone ( $\Delta \mu\text{g}$ )	% Removal (of mass present at discharge)	Removal/Distance ( $\Delta \mu\text{g}/\text{km}$ )
<b>ADBAC</b>						
Discharge <sup>a</sup>	0.0		0.03			
Stream 1	1.8	0.19	0.01	0.02	<b>82%</b>	0.013
Wetland 1	1.9	0.44	0.00	0.01	18%	<b>0.047</b>
Stream 2	5.2	0.36	0.00	0.00	0%	0.000
Wetland 2	6.0	4.1	0.00	0.00	0%	0.000
<b>PEGs</b>						
Discharge <sup>a</sup>	0.0		0.84			
Stream 1	1.8	0.19	0.81	0.03	4%	0.018
Wetland 1	1.9	0.44	0.85	-0.05 <sup>b</sup>	-6% <sup>b</sup>	-0.427 <sup>b</sup>
Stream 2	5.2	0.36	0.47	0.38	46%	0.114
Wetland 2	6.0	4.1	0.00	0.47	<b>56%</b>	<b>0.619</b>
<b>PPGs</b>						
Discharge <sup>a</sup>	0.0		2.13			
Stream 1	1.8	0.19	1.88	0.25	12%	0.139
Wetland 1	1.9	0.44	1.71	0.16	8%	1.448
Stream 2	5.2	0.36	1.27	0.44	22%	0.132
Wetland 2	6.0	4.1	0.09	1.18	<b>58%</b>	<b>1.549</b>
<b>NPEOs</b>						
Discharge <sup>a</sup>	0.0		1.25			
Stream 1	1.8	0.19	1.04	0.21	17%	0.119
Wetland 1	1.9	0.44	0.82	0.22	18%	<b>1.984</b>
Stream 2	5.2	0.36	0.08	0.74	<b>59%</b>	0.222
Wetland 2	6.0	4.1	0.00	0.08	6%	0.100

<sup>a</sup> Discharge is not a segment. Provided to show mass present at NPDES discharge point.

<sup>b</sup> Negative values indicate an increase in PEGs concentration which is either due to central cleavage of NPEOs or variability in the discharge composition.





**Figure 3.** Pseudo-first order removal rates of PPGs, PEGs and NPEOs downstream of Discharge C. PEGs and NPEOs were below detection limit in sample DC-DSW2 and thus only four data points are presented. Grey boxes indicate locations of wetlands. The dotted black line is a trendline, indicating average rate of removal.

### *Chemical Composition of Sediments*

Sediment sample extracts were analyzed for non-volatile organic compounds (NVOCs) using liquid chromatography. PEGs, PPGs, NPEOs and ADBACs were detected at all sites

1  
2  
3 downstream of the three discharges (Table 4). PEGs and PPGs were also detected in the control  
4 site wetland (CSW: PEGs: 6.9  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ; PPGs: 2.0  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ) at concentrations lower than in the PW  
5 impacted samples. NPEOs and ADBACs were below detection limit in the control site wetland  
6 (CSW).  
7  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 In samples collected downstream of the NPDES PW discharges, concentrations of PEGs  
13 ranged between 14.0 and 202  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ . Concentrations of NPEOs spanned a similar range (11.0 and  
14 194  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ) while the range in PPGs was greater, spanning four orders of magnitude (3.4 – 1150  
15  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ). The range in ADBACs sediment concentration was greatest, spanning seven orders of  
16 magnitude (0.7 – 455,000  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ ). Previous studies have shown that sediments are sinks for  
17 surfactants and that concentrations of cationic surfactants in sediments are generally greater than  
18 concentrations of non-ionic surfactants as a result of the greater sorption coefficients for cationic  
19 species.<sup>26, 47</sup>  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 In sediments collected from all three discharges, ADBAC concentrations were highest  
32 near the discharge, corresponding with the sharp decrease in aqueous ADBAC concentrations at  
33 these sites. ADBACs are commonly used in the United States as pesticides and disinfectants and  
34 have been widely observed in sediments downstream of wastewater treatment plants (WWTP),  
35 as well as other areas.<sup>55</sup> Sorption of ADBAC to sediment occurs because the positive charge on  
36 this species sorbs strongly to negatively charged sediments (i.e., clay minerals). Sorption is  
37 further enhanced because of the large hydrophobic moieties in ADBAC and their affinity to soil  
38 organic matter.<sup>44, 45, 56</sup> Three different alkyl lengths of ADBAC were detected in water samples  
39 including decyl, dodecyl and tetradecyl. At DA-D and DC-D, sediments were enriched in  
40 dodecyl- and tetradecyl-ADBACs, as compared to the water samples collected from the  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 discharge, indicating that preferential sorption of the longer ADBACs occurred due to increasing  
4 hydrophobic interactions with increasing chain length.<sup>56</sup>  
5  
6

7  
8 The elevated concentration of ADBACs is most striking at site DA-W1 where the  
9 sediment concentration was 455 mg/kg. Similar concentrations have been observed in sediments  
10 downstream of WWTPs.<sup>47, 57</sup> The environmental impact of such high ADBAC concentrations in  
11 sediments is unknown. Microbial analysis, which is discussed further in the next section,  
12 revealed that the alpha diversity metrics at this site (i.e., richness, Shannon's H) were  
13 insignificantly lower than in most other samples. No other notable differences between this  
14 sample and others were observed in the microbial community analysis. Previous studies have  
15 shown that ADBACs can retain their biocidal properties on surfaces and can also sorb beyond  
16 their cation exchange capacity, leading to clay aggregation and decreased sorption capacity<sup>44, 56,</sup>  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

58. If occurring within the wetland, these outcomes have the potential to negatively impact major attenuation mechanisms (i.e., biodegradation and sorption). Concentrations of PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs were also elevated at this site (DA-W1) relative to other sediment samples collected from this discharge. Biodegradation is a dominant removal mechanism for all four NVOCs in sediment and thus removal rates would be influenced by a decrease in microbial activity.<sup>59</sup> In samples collected downstream of site DA-W1, ADBAC concentrations decreased substantially and concentrations of all non-ionic surfactants trended downward as well.

For PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs, there were no clear trends in sediment concentrations versus distance. NPEOs have previously been detected in lake sediments impacted by a WWTP treating O&G PW. PEGs and PPGs were not detected in this sediment.<sup>26</sup> The exact composition of the WWTP PW influent was not reported, however, based on an analysis of O&G chemical additives conducted in the area, it is likely that PEGs and PPGs were presented in the water

influent.<sup>60</sup> This provides evidence for preferential sorption of NPEOs to sediments, as compared to PEGs and PPGs. PEGs are the most hydrophilic of the surfactants detected at these sites and therefore the least likely to sorb to sediments. Concentrations of PEGs in sediment may be due to sorption or could be the result of in-situ degradation of other non-ionic surfactants.<sup>47</sup>

Results show that all four surfactant classes are accumulating in sediments downstream of the NPDES PW discharges, even though concentrations are below detection limit in some of the water samples. Degradation of all four surfactants has been observed in sediments and thus additional research is needed to determine if sediment concentrations are changing with time.<sup>47</sup> Finally, it should be noted that a principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the sediment samples and revealed no correlation between soil properties (organic carbon, inorganic carbon and total nitrogen) and surfactant concentrations. This finding was not unexpected because sediment surfactant concentrations are influenced by multiple factors including sediment composition, composition of the influent, and distance from the discharge.

**Table 4.** Concentration of polyethylene glycols (PEGs), polypropylene glycols (PPGs), nonylphenol ethoxylates (NPEOs) and alkyldimethylbenzylammonium chlorides (ADBACs) in sediment grab samples collected from the three discharges and the control site wetland (CSW).

Site Name	PEGs ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	PPGs ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	NPEOs ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )	ADBACs ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ )
CSW	6.9	2.0	Below LOD	Below LOD
Discharge A				
DA-D	15.5	19.2	30.9	1430
DA-W1	196	22.8	70.0	455000
DA-DSW1	202	10.2	29.2	154
DA-W2	85.1	7.8	43.1	45.0
DA-DSW2	15.7	5.4	23.6	5.7
Discharge B				
DB-D	66.8	1150	132	6110
DB-USW1	33.9	16.1	11.6	1.4
DB-W1	24.8	28.3	44.5	1.8
DB-DSW1	50.0	38.0	28.0	2.8
Discharge C				
DC-D	59.3	76.5	122	83.5
DC-100m	44.7	38.7	11.6	11.3
DC-USW1	25.8	35.7	138	6.4
DC-W1	18.9	11.8	23.3	3.5

DC-DSW1	14.0	7.3	14.6	1.4
DC-USW2	47.8	184	167	3.7
DC-W2	44.4	382	194	0.7
DC-DSW2	28.6	3.4	11.0	3.9
DC-PLAYA	17.7	76.9	136	1.9

### *Microbial (16S rRNA gene analysis)*

The composition of microbial communities in sediment and water samples was profiled using 16S rRNA gene analyses to identify major metabolic processes involved in contaminant fate and to further understand changes in water and sediment composition with distance downstream (Figures S9 and S10). Samples with less than 5000 reads (DA-D and DC-DSW1 sediment samples) are not presented in the results. A series of alpha diversity metrics highlighted greater microbial richness and diversity in sediments, relative to water samples (Figure S13). While this observation is likely driven by greater habitat heterogeneity in sediments, the influence of produced water chemistry (e.g., elevated salinity) on constraining microbial diversity may also play a role.<sup>61</sup> In general, communities displayed greater dissimilarity nearer discharge points, and began to converge with increasing distance downstream (Figure 4A). This effect was observed in both water and sediment samples and suggests a weakening of the environmental factors (e.g., water temperature, inorganic and organic chemistry) that constrain community composition with distance. Further highlighting the role of environmental factors in influencing microbial community assembly, we observed a positive correlation between distance from the discharge point and microbial community richness in water samples (Figure 4B). Together, these results suggest a trend of increasingly diverse, but similar, microbial communities with greater distance from produced water discharge points.

16S rRNA gene sequencing data revealed strong evidence for sulfur cycling in both sediments and the overlying water impacted by water discharge. In general, water samples were

1  
2  
3 dominated by putative sulfur oxidizing chemolithoautotrophic microorganisms (i.e., *Thiovirga*<sup>62</sup>  
4 and *Thiofaba*<sup>63</sup>) that were also likely able to tolerate elevated salinity. These enrichments were  
5  
6 typically greatest at the discharge points, with a single *Thiofaba* OTU accounting for 38% and  
7  
8 57% of the community at DC-D and DA-D, respectively and a *Sulfurospirillum* OTU accounting  
9  
10 for ~50% of the microbial community at DB-D. Highlighting the dominance of these taxa in the  
11  
12 majority of water samples, OTUs associated with *Thiovirga* and *Thiofaba* were discriminant  
13  
14 features for water samples (Figure 4C). Previous studies have shown that halotolerant microbial  
15  
16 communities such as these are capable of degrading commonly used oil and gas surfactants,  
17  
18 including PEGs and PPGs, as well as some biocides.<sup>28, 64, 65</sup>  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Water samples also contained putative signatures of microorganisms that may have  
25  
26 derived from produced water itself. *Arcobacter* is commonly detected in produced water from  
27  
28 hydraulic fracturing operations<sup>66, 67</sup> and two OTUs affiliated with this genus were discriminant  
29  
30 features for water samples. Given that these heterotrophic microorganisms are thought to utilize  
31  
32 organic substrates within the well environment, they may also play a role in surfactant  
33  
34 biodegradation within the wetland discharge system.  
35  
36


37 Putative sulfate reducing bacteria affiliated with the Order Desulfobacterales were  
38  
39 frequently some of the most abundant OTUs in sediment samples collected downstream of the  
40  
41 PW discharges (e.g., DC-W1, DA-W2, DA-W1, and DC-USW2) and were discriminant features  
42  
43 between water and sediment sample groups (Figure 4C). A previous study observed that bacteria  
44  
45 within this group (e.g., *Desulfovibrio*) were enriched in sediments from anaerobic microcosms  
46  
47 during degradation of O&G organic chemical additives.<sup>68</sup> However, degradation of PEGs, PPGs  
48  
49 and NPEOs is slower under anaerobic conditions and thus, these chemical species may be  
50  
51 accumulating in sediments due to the reducing/anaerobic conditions.<sup>38</sup> At the control site wetland  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (i.e., CSW) and sites less impacted by produced water (i.e., DC-DSW2, DB-USW1, and DB-  
4 W1), abundant OTUs affiliated with *Thiobacillus* were also detected in the sediments. Given that  
5  
6 *Thiobacillus* microorganisms are frequently implicated in sulfur oxidation<sup>69</sup>, these data suggest  
7  
8 that oxidative and reductive portions of the sulfur cycle may be tightly coupled in some near-  
9  
10 surface sediments and that the oxidative conditions are generally observed at sites less impacted  
11  
12 by PW.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 OTUs affiliated with the family Anaerolineaceae were also abundant (1-11% relative  
18  
19 abundance in sediments) and strong discriminant features between water and sediment samples  
20  
21 (Figure 4C). Although little is known of metabolisms within this family, the few studies  
22  
23 published to date have implicated these microorganisms in processes including hydrocarbon  
24  
25 degradation<sup>70</sup> and primary fermentation.<sup>71, 72</sup> Therefore, microorganisms affiliated with this  
26  
27 family could potentially play key roles in degrading complex polymers, such as surfactants, and  
28  
29 hydrocarbons within wetland sediments. Finally, two OTUs affiliated with the Bacteroidetes  
30  
31 VadinHA17 group were discriminant features between sediment and water samples (Figure 4C).  
32  
33 These OTUs have previously been identified in sulfidic bioreactors where they were implicated  
34  
35 in the degradation of complex organic matter.<sup>73</sup>  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 In two locations (DC-D, DC-100m), surface waters were found to be over 40 °C and  
41  
42 contained elevated concentrations of H<sub>2</sub>S (>20 ppm observed on personal H<sub>2</sub>S meters).  
43  
44 Furthermore, filamentous algal mats were clearly visible associated with near surface sediments.  
45  
46 Here, OTUs affiliated with a green filamentous anoxygenic phototrophic (FAP) bacterium,  
47  
48 *Candidatus Chlorothrix*, accounted for 18% and 35% of all OTUs in sediment samples at DC-D  
49  
50 and DC-100M, respectively. Given prior laboratory studies indicating that these microorganisms  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

perform sulfide dependent anoxygenic photosynthesis, the specific environmental conditions at these locations likely selected for enrichment of this microorganism.<sup>74, 75</sup>



**Figure 4.** Microbial community dynamics across wetland samples. In parts A and B, samples from Discharge A (DA) are shown in red, samples from Discharge B (DB) are shown in yellow and samples from Discharge C (DC) are shown in blue. Additionally, water samples are shown as circles and sediment samples are shown as triangles. (A) Multivariate ordination showing spatial dynamics of microbiome profiles. Arrows indicate direction of flow in the CW systems, and the final sample is indicated with a larger data point and a distance (e.g., 0.82 km for Discharge B water). The clustering of water and sediment samples with increasing distance from discharge points indicates a diminishing impact of produced water on community composition. (B) Alpha diversity (Shannon's  $H'$ ) in water samples increases with increasing distance downstream from discharge point. (C) Microbial taxa generating the largest Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) scores that are discriminant features between water and sediment samples.

## Conclusions



1  
2  
3 In some arid locations in the western U.S., CWs are used to treat and polish PW  
4  
5 downstream of NPDES PW release points. Because of the relatively high costs associated with  
6  
7 PW treatment and the relatively low costs associated with CWs for treatment, we predict that PW  
8  
9 treatment with CWs will become increasingly popular in the future. Results of this study showed  
10  
11 that CW systems at the study site were effective at removing organic O&G chemical additives  
12  
13 from PW. Chemical and microbial analyses provided evidence to indicate that biodegradation  
14  
15 and sorption are major removal mechanisms of non-volatile O&G organic chemical additives at  
16  
17 these sites. Kinetic calculations, however, showed that the rate of removal did not increase  
18  
19 within the CWs as compared to the stream segments. This indicates that the rate of removal for  
20  
21 the major removal mechanisms was not optimized within the CWs, as compared to the stream  
22  
23 segments, and there is likely potential for increased attenuation in these systems.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Treatment optimization within the CWs at these sites can occur by increasing aeration,  
29  
30 which could increase biodegradation rates of all three surfactants.<sup>38</sup> As noted in our companion  
31  
32 study, a small baffle, which would allow for aeration through a waterfall, would achieve this  
33  
34 goal, as would additional cattail vegetation maintaining oxic redox conditions and thereby  
35  
36 increasing degradation of these species within the sediments. Aeration of these systems would  
37  
38 also enhance removal of any remaining VOCs in these systems. While the VOCs at this site were  
39  
40 removed relatively quickly, some VOCs (e.g., benzene) are highly toxic to microbes, livestock  
41  
42 and humans, and thus removal of these species is highly important to CW design and  
43  
44 performance. To enhance adsorption of ADBAC, clay minerals could be added to the stream  
45  
46 segment prior to the wetland. Removing the biocide prior to the first wetland has the potential to  
47  
48 increase biodegradation rates of other species within that wetland.<sup>48</sup> Because biocides are one of  
49  
50 the most commonly used O&G chemical additives, removal of biocides, based on the  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 physiochemical parameters, should be one of the first considerations in CW design for PW  
4  
5 treatment. NPEO sorption could be enhanced by adding additional organic soils to the sediments  
6  
7 in the wetlands.<sup>49</sup> Finally, a pilot scale study showed that more shallow water depths (15 cm vs.  
8  
9 56 cm) resulted in increased removal rates for organic PW chemicals. The opposite trend was  
10  
11 observed for inorganic species. Thus, shallower water in one or more of the CWs would increase  
12  
13 removal of the organic chemicals; however, sequential wetlands, with varying depths (and likely  
14  
15 other design parameters) are needed to fully treat this complex waste stream.<sup>24</sup>  
16  
17  
18

19 Sediment analyses showed that despite the relatively low concentrations of O&G  
20  
21 chemical additives in the NPDES PW discharge, all four NVOC O&G chemical additives had  
22  
23 accumulated in the sediment. This is especially true for ADBACs, which were found at  
24  
25 concentrations of 455 mg/kg in one sample. The environmental implications of such high  
26  
27 concentrations of ADBACs, however, remain unknown. Because ADBACs are a component of  
28  
29 hand-sanitizers, production, use and release of these compounds has increased substantially in  
30  
31 the past year due to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.<sup>57</sup> As a result, there is increased attention from  
32  
33 the scientific community towards understanding the environmental implications of these  
34  
35 commonly used biocides. The concentrations of PEGs, PPGs and NPEOs in all sediments were  
36  
37 relatively low, as compared to concentrations previously reported in sediments impacted by  
38  
39 WWTP discharges, and thus are not as high priority for additional research as ADBACs.<sup>47, 76</sup>  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 In conclusion, this study shows that CW systems are effective at removing O&G  
45  
46 chemical additives from PW. However, the systems at this site could be further optimized to  
47  
48 increase removal rates. Additional research is needed to understand the potential impact of  
49  
50 cationic surfactants and biocides, such as ADBACs, on benthic organisms, sediment sorption  
51  
52 capacity, plant uptake, and the implications for contaminant removal and CW management.<sup>77</sup>  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Finally, in addition to chemical analysis, analysis of both chronic and acute toxicity is necessary  
4  
5 at these sites to fully understand treatment efficacy and determine if the treated water can be  
6  
7 safely reused for agriculture.<sup>2, 11, 78</sup> Results of this study and future studies can be used to inform  
8  
9 design and management of CWs for PW treatment.  
10  
11  
12  
13

## 14 **Acknowledgements**

15  
16 This research was funded by the University Consortium for Field-Focused Groundwater  
17  
18 Research. This work was also supported by the Colorado State University Water Center, and the  
19  
20 Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI) grant no. 2021-67019-33726 from the USDA  
21  
22 National Institute of Food and Agriculture. Additional support by NSF:AIR 1640634, NSF:AIR-  
23  
24 REU Supplement, and NSF Wastewater Sediment grant 1703412. We would also like to  
25  
26 acknowledge our oil and gas collaborators who assisted with this research and without whom this  
27  
28 study would not have been possible. Additionally, we would like to thank Kayla Borton and Reb  
29  
30 Daly at Colorado State University for their assistance and guidance with laboratory and data  
31  
32 processing procedures relating to microbial community analyses.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 **References**

- 39  
40 1. C. E. Clark, R. M. Horner and C. B. Harto, Life Cycle Water Consumption for Shale Gas  
41 and Conventional Natural Gas, *Environmental science & technology*, 2013, **47**, 11829-  
42 11836.  
43 2. M. C. McLaughlin, J. Blotvogel, R. A. Watson, B. Schell, T. A. Blewett, E. J. Folkerts,  
44 G. G. Goss, L. Truong, R. L. Tanguay, J. L. Argueso and T. Borch, Mutagenicity  
45 assessment downstream of oil and gas produced water discharges intended for  
46 agricultural beneficial reuse, *The Science of the total environment*, 2020, **715**, 136944.  
47 3. M. C. McLaughlin, T. Borch, B. McDevitt, N. R. Warner and J. Blotvogel, Water  
48 quality assessment downstream of oil and gas produced water discharges intended for  
49 beneficial reuse in arid regions, *The Science of the total environment*, 2020, **713**, 136607.  
50 4. B. McDevitt, M. C. McLaughlin, J. Blotvogel, T. Borch and N. R. Warner, Oil & gas  
51 produced water retention ponds as potential passive treatment for radium removal and  
52 beneficial reuse, *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*, 2021, **23**, 501-518.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9
  - 10
  - 11
  - 12
  - 13
  - 14
  - 15
  - 16
  - 17
  - 18
  - 19
  - 20
  - 21
  - 22
  - 23
  - 24
  - 25
  - 26
  - 27
  - 28
  - 29
  - 30
  - 31
  - 32
  - 33
  - 34
  - 35
  - 36
  - 37
  - 38
  - 39
  - 40
  - 41
  - 42
  - 43
  - 44
  - 45
  - 46
  - 47
  - 48
  - 49
  - 50
  - 51
  - 52
  - 53
  - 54
  - 55
  - 56
  - 57
  - 58
  - 59
  - 60
5. M. Weingarten, S. Ge, J. W. Godt, B. A. Bekins and J. L. Rubinstein, High-rate injection is associated with the increase in U.S. mid-continent seismicity, *Science*, 2015, **348**, 1336-1340.
6. F. C. Dolan, T. Y. Cath and T. S. Hogue, Assessing the feasibility of using produced water for irrigation in Colorado, *Science of The Total Environment*, 2018, **640-641**, 619-628.
7. United States Department of Energy, Water Security Grand Challenge, <https://www.energy.gov/eere/water-security-grand-challenge>, (accessed July 22, 2019).
8. C. Zhong, A. Zolfaghari, D. Hou, G. G. Goss, B. D. Lanoil, J. Gehman, D. C. W. Tsang, Y. He and D. S. Alessi, Comparison of the Hydraulic Fracturing Water Cycle in China and North America: A Critical Review, *Environmental science & technology*, 2021, **55**, 7167-7185.
9. B. McDevitt, M. C. McLaughlin, D. S. Vinson, T. J. Geeza, J. Blotevogel, T. Borch and N. R. Warner, Isotopic and element ratios fingerprint salinization impact from beneficial use of oil and gas produced water in the Western U.S, *Science of The Total Environment*, 2020, **716**, 137006.
10. B. McDevitt, M. McLaughlin, C. A. Cravotta, M. A. Ajemigbitse, K. J. Van Sice, J. Blotevogel, T. Borch and N. R. Warner, Emerging investigator series: radium accumulation in carbonate river sediments at oil and gas produced water discharges: implications for beneficial use as disposal management, *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*, 2019, **21**, 324-338.
11. T. Borch, D. Dionysiou, L. Katz, P. Xu, R. Breckenridge, K. Ellison, J. Fox, J. Macknick, D. Sedlak and J. Stokes-Draut, *National Alliance for Water Innovation (NAWI) Technology Roadmap: Agriculture Sector*, National Renewable Energy Lab. (NREL), Golden, CO (United States), 2021.
12. T. Y. Cath, S. Chellam, L. E. Katz, R. Breckenridge, K. Ellison, J. Macknick, J. Monnell, N. Rao, D. Sedlak and J. Stokes-Draut, *National Alliance for Water Innovation (NAWI) Resource Extraction Sector Technology Roadmap 2021*, United States, 2021.
13. Y. Sun, D. Wang, D. C. W. Tsang, L. Wang, Y. S. Ok and Y. Feng, A critical review of risks, characteristics, and treatment strategies for potentially toxic elements in wastewater from shale gas extraction, *Environment International*, 2019, **125**, 452-469.
14. B. Akyon, M. McLaughlin, F. Hernández, J. Blotevogel and K. Bibby, Characterization and biological removal of organic compounds from hydraulic fracturing produced water, *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*, 2019, **21**, 279-290.
15. D. E. Freedman, S. M. Riley, Z. L. Jones, J. S. Rosenblum, J. O. Sharp, J. R. Spear and T. Y. Cath, Biologically active filtration for fracturing flowback and produced water treatment, *Journal of Water Process Engineering*, 2017, **18**, 29-40.
16. A. I. Stefanakis, in *Phytoremediation: Management of Environmental Contaminants, Volume 6*, eds. A. A. Ansari, S. S. Gill, R. Gill, G. R. Lanza and L. Newman, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2018, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-99651-6\_6, pp. 151-167.
17. C. E. Clark and J. A. Veil, *Produced water volumes and management practices in the United States*, Report ANL/EVS/R-09/1, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL, 2009.
18. T. V. Wagner, J. R. Parsons, H. H. M. Rijnaarts, P. de Voogt and A. A. M. Langenhoff, A review on the removal of conditioning chemicals from cooling tower water in

- constructed wetlands, *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology*, 2019, DOI: 10.1080/10643389.2018.1512289, 1-32.
19. G. D. Ji, T. H. Sun and J. R. Ni, Surface flow constructed wetland for heavy oil-produced water treatment, *Bioresource Technology*, 2007, **98**, 436-441.
20. P. Ramirez, Jr., Oil field-produced water discharges into wetlands: Benefits and risks to wildlife, *Environmental Geosciences*, 2005, **12**, 65-72.
21. G. A. Kahrilas, J. Blotvogel, E. R. Corrin and T. Borch, Downhole Transformation of the Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid Biocide Glutaraldehyde: Implications for Flowback and Produced Water Quality, *Environ Sci Technol*, 2016, **50**, 11414–11423.
22. K. L. Benko and J. E. Drewes, Produced Water in the Western United States: Geographical Distribution, Occurrence, and Composition, *Environmental Engineering Science*, 2008, **25**, 239-246.
23. R. L. Knight, R. H. Kadlec and H. M. Ohlendorf, The Use of Treatment Wetlands for Petroleum Industry Effluents, *Environmental science & technology*, 1999, **33**, 973-980.
24. B. L. Alley, B. Willis, J. Rodgers and J. W. Castle, Water depths and treatment performance of pilot-scale free water surface constructed wetland treatment systems for simulated fresh oilfield produced water, *Ecological Engineering*, 2019, **61**, 190-199.
25. B. L. Alley, B. Willis, J. Rodgers and J. W. Castle, Seasonal Performance of a Hybrid Pilot-Scale Constructed Wetland Treatment System for Simulated Fresh Oil Field-Produced Water, *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*, 2013, **224**, 1639.
26. W. D. Burgos, L. Castillo-Meza, T. L. Tasker, T. J. Geeza, P. J. Drohan, X. Liu, J. D. Landis, J. Blotvogel, M. McLaughlin, T. Borch and N. R. Warner, Watershed-Scale Impacts from Surface Water Disposal of Oil and Gas Wastewater in Western Pennsylvania, *Environmental science & technology*, 2017, **51**, 8851-8860.
27. L. Shariq, Uncertainties Associated with the Reuse of Treated Hydraulic Fracturing Wastewater for Crop Irrigation, *Environmental science & technology*, 2013, **47**, 2435-2436.
28. M. F. Campa, S. M. Techtmann, C. M. Gibson, X. Zhu, M. Patterson, A. Garcia de Matos Amaral, N. Ulrich, S. R. Campagna, C. J. Grant, R. Lamendella and T. C. Hazen, Impacts of Glutaraldehyde on Microbial Community Structure and Degradation Potential in Streams Impacted by Hydraulic Fracturing, *Environmental science & technology*, 2018, DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.8b00239.
29. NOAA, Past Weather by Zip Code - Data Table, <https://www.climate.gov/>, (accessed Sept. 22, 2018).
30. L. A. Sherrod, G. Dunn, G. Peterson and R. Kolberg, *Inorganic Carbon Analysis by Modified Pressure-Calcimeter Method*, 2002.
31. P. A. Lara-Martín, E. González-Mazo and B. J. Brownawell, Multi-residue method for the analysis of synthetic surfactants and their degradation metabolites in aquatic systems by liquid chromatography–time-of-flight-mass spectrometry, *Journal of Chromatography A*, 2011, **1218**, 4799-4807.
32. D. N. Frank, BARCRAWL and BARTAB: software tools for the design and implementation of barcoded primers for highly multiplexed DNA sequencing, *BMC Bioinformatics*, 2009, **10**, 362.
33. M. A. Borton, A. Sabag-Daigle, J. Wu, L. M. Solden, B. S. O'Banion, R. A. Daly, R. A. Wolfe, J. F. Gonzalez, V. H. Wycsocki, B. M. M. Ahmer and K. C. Wrighton, Chemical

- 1  
2  
3 and pathogen-induced inflammation disrupt the murine intestinal microbiome,  
4 *Microbiome*, 2017, **5**, 47-47.
- 5 34. N. Segata, J. Izard, L. Waldron, D. Gevers, L. Miropolsky, W. S. Garrett and C.  
6 Huttenhower, Metagenomic biomarker discovery and explanation, *Genome Biology*,  
7 2011, **12**, R60.
- 8 35. I. H. McBeth, K. J. Reddy and Q. D. Skinner, COALBED METHANE PRODUCT  
9 WATER CHEMISTRY IN THREE WYOMING WATERSHEDS1, *JAWRA Journal of*  
10 *the American Water Resources Association*, 2003, **39**, 575-585.
- 11 36. B. D. Drollette, K. Hoelzer, N. R. Warner, T. H. Darrah, O. Karatum, M. P. O'Connor, R.  
12 K. Nelson, L. A. Fernandez, C. M. Reddy, A. Vengosh, R. B. Jackson, M. Elsner and D.  
13 L. Plata, Elevated levels of diesel range organic compounds in groundwater near  
14 Marcellus gas operations are derived from surface activities, *Proceedings of the National*  
15 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 2015, **112**, 13184-13189.
- 16 37. W. Orem, C. Tatu, M. Varonka, H. Lerch, A. Bates, M. Engle, L. Crosby and J.  
17 McIntosh, Organic substances in produced and formation water from unconventional  
18 natural gas extraction in coal and shale, *International Journal of Coal Geology*, 2014,  
19 **126**, 20-31.
- 20 38. K. M. Heyob, J. Blotevogel, M. Brooker, M. V. Evans, J. J. Lenhart, J. Wright, R.  
21 Lamendella, T. Borch and P. J. Mouser, Natural Attenuation of Nonionic Surfactants  
22 Used in Hydraulic Fracturing Fluids: Degradation Rates, Pathways, and Mechanisms,  
23 *Environmental science & technology*, 2017, **51**, 13985-13994.
- 24 39. M. C. McLaughlin, T. Borch, B. McDevitt, N. R. Warner and J. Blotevogel, Water  
25 quality assessment downstream of oil and gas produced water discharges intended for  
26 beneficial reuse in arid regions, *Science of The Total Environment*, 2020, **713**, 136607.
- 27 40. P. E. Eke and M. Scholz, Benzene removal with vertical-flow constructed treatment  
28 wetlands, *Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology*, 2008, **83**, 55-63.
- 29 41. ATSDR, *Toxicological profile for acetone*, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease  
30 Registry, Atlanta, GA, 1994.
- 31 42. M. F. Buchman, *Screening Quick Reference Tables (SQuiRTs)*, United States, National  
32 Ocean Service, Office of Response and Restoration; United States, National Ocean  
33 Service, United States, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration., 2008.
- 34 43. E. G. Elliott, A. S. Ettinger, B. P. Leaderer, M. B. Bracken and N. C. Deziel, A  
35 systematic evaluation of chemicals in hydraulic-fracturing fluids and wastewater for  
36 reproductive and developmental toxicity, *J Expos Sci Environ Epidemiol*, 2016, DOI:  
37 10.1038/jes.2015.81.
- 38 44. G. A. Kahrilas, J. Blotevogel, P. S. Stewart and T. Borch, Biocides in Hydraulic  
39 Fracturing Fluids: A Critical Review of Their Usage, Mobility, Degradation, and  
40 Toxicity, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2015, **49**, 16-32.
- 41 45. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Reregistration Eligibility Decision for  
42 Alkyl Dimethyl Benzyl Ammonium Chloride (ADBAC), 2006.
- 43 46. E. M. Thurman, I. Ferrer, J. Rosenblum, K. Linden and J. N. Ryan, Identification of  
44 Polypropylene Glycols and Polyethylene Glycol Carboxylates in Flowback and Produced  
45 Water from Hydraulic Fracturing, *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 2017, DOI:  
46 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2016.02.041>.
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
47. X. Li, A. C. Doherty, B. Brownawell and P. A. Lara-Martin, Distribution and diagenetic fate of synthetic surfactants and their metabolites in sewage-impacted estuarine sediments, *Environmental Pollution*, 2018, **242**, 209-218.
48. M. C. McLaughlin, T. Borch and J. Blotvogel, Spills of Hydraulic Fracturing Chemicals on Agricultural Topsoil: Biodegradation, Sorption, and Co-contaminant Interactions, *Environ Sci Technol*, 2016, **50**, 6071–6078.
49. D. M. John, W. A. House and G. F. White, Environmental fate of nonylphenol ethoxylates: Differential adsorption of homologs to components of river sediment, *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 2000, **19**, 293-300.
50. M. Franska, R. Franski, A. Szymanski and Z. Lukaszewski, A central fission pathway in alkylphenol ethoxylate biodegradation, *Water Research*, 2003, **37**, 1005-1014.
51. H. Hidaka, S. Yamada, S. Suenaga, H. Kubota, N. Serpone, E. Pelizzetti and M. Grätzel, Photodegradation of surfactants. V. Photocatalytic degradation of surfactants in the presence of semiconductor particles by solar exposure, *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A: Chemistry*, 1989, **47**, 103-112.
52. J. A. Giroto, A. C. S. C. Teixeira, C. A. O. Nascimento and R. Guardani, Degradation of Poly(ethylene glycol) in Aqueous Solution by Photo-Fenton and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/UV Processes, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 2010, **49**, 3200-3206.
53. M. Gajewska, K. Skrzypiec, K. Józwiakowski, Z. Mucha, W. Wójcik, A. Karczmarczyk and P. Bugajski, Kinetics of pollutants removal in vertical and horizontal flow constructed wetlands in temperate climate, *Science of The Total Environment*, 2020, **718**, 137371.
54. D. Ghosh and B. Gopal, Effect of hydraulic retention time on the treatment of secondary effluent in a subsurface flow constructed wetland, *Ecological Engineering*, 2010, **36**, 1044-1051.
55. P. C. DeLeo, C. Huynh, M. Pattanayek, K. C. Schmid and N. Pechacek, Assessment of ecological hazards and environmental fate of disinfectant quaternary ammonium compounds, *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*, 2020, **206**, 111116.
56. T. Kwolek, M. Hodorowicz, K. Stadnicka and J. Czapkiewicz, Adsorption isotherms of homologous alkyldimethylbenzylammonium bromides on sodium montmorillonite, *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, 2003, **264**, 14-19.
57. P. I. Hora, S. G. Pati, P. J. McNamara and W. A. Arnold, Increased Use of Quaternary Ammonium Compounds during the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic and Beyond: Consideration of Environmental Implications, *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 2020, **7**, 622-631.
58. M. B. Harney, R. R. Pant, P. A. Fulmer and J. H. Wynne, Surface Self-Concentrating Amphiphilic Quaternary Ammonium Biocides as Coating Additives, *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces*, 2009, **1**, 39-41.
59. B. J. Brownawell, H. Chen, W. Zhang and J. C. Westall, Sorption of Nonionic Surfactants on Sediment Materials, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 1997, **31**, 1735-1741.
60. G. J. Getzinger, M. P. O'Connor, K. Hoelzer, B. D. Drollette, O. Karatum, M. A. Deshusses, P. L. Ferguson, M. Elsner and D. L. Plata, Natural Gas Residual Fluids: Sources, Endpoints, and Organic Chemical Composition after Centralized Waste Treatment in Pennsylvania, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2015, **49**, 8347–8355.
61. R. A. Daly, M. A. Borton, M. J. Wilkins, D. W. Hoyt, D. J. Kountz, R. A. Wolfe, S. A. Welch, D. N. Marcus, R. V. Trexler, J. D. MacRae, J. A. Krzycki, D. R. Cole, P. J.

- 1  
2  
3 Mouser and K. C. Wrighton, Microbial metabolisms in a 2.5-km-deep ecosystem created  
4 by hydraulic fracturing in shales, *Nature Microbiology*, 2016, **1**, 16146.
- 5 62. T. Ito, K. Sugita, I. Yumoto, Y. Nodasaka and S. Okabe, Thiovirga sulfuroxydans gen.  
6 nov., sp. nov., a chemolithoautotrophic sulfur-oxidizing bacterium isolated from a  
7 microaerobic waste-water biofilm, *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary*  
8 *Microbiology*, 2005, **55**, 1059-1064.
- 9 63. K. Mori and K. Suzuki, Thiofaba tepidiphila gen. nov., sp. nov., a novel obligately  
10 chemolithoautotrophic, sulfur-oxidizing bacterium of the Gammaproteobacteria isolated  
11 from a hot spring, *International journal of systematic and evolutionary microbiology*,  
12 2008, **58**, 1885-1891.
- 13 64. M. V. Evans, G. Getzinger, J. L. Luek, A. J. Hanson, M. C. McLaughlin, J. Blotevogel,  
14 S. A. Welch, C. D. Nicora, S. O. Purvine, C. Xu, D. R. Cole, T. H. Darrah, D. W. Hoyt,  
15 T. O. Metz, P. Lee Ferguson, M. S. Lipton, M. J. Wilkins and P. J. Mouser, In situ  
16 transformation of ethoxylate and glycol surfactants by shale-colonizing microorganisms  
17 during hydraulic fracturing, *The ISME Journal*, 2019, DOI: 10.1038/s41396-019-0466-0.
- 18 65. A. J. Hanson, J. L. Luek, S. S. Tummings, M. C. McLaughlin, J. Blotevogel and P. J.  
19 Mouser, High total dissolved solids in shale gas wastewater inhibit biodegradation of  
20 alkyl and nonylphenol ethoxylate surfactants, *Science of The Total Environment*, 2019,  
21 **668**, 1094-1103.
- 22 66. Y. Zhang, Z. Yu, H. Zhang and I. P. Thompson, Microbial distribution and variation in  
23 produced water from separators to storage tanks of shale gas wells in Sichuan Basin,  
24 China, *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology*, 2017, **3**, 340-351.
- 25 67. M. V. Evans, J. Panescu, A. J. Hanson, S. A. Welch, J. M. Sheets, N. Nastasi, R. A. Daly,  
26 D. R. Cole, T. H. Darrah, M. J. Wilkins, K. C. Wrighton and P. J. Mouser, Members of  
27 Marinobacter and Arcobacter Influence System Biogeochemistry During Early  
28 Production of Hydraulically Fractured Natural Gas Wells in the Appalachian Basin,  
29 *Front Microbiol*, 2018, **9**, 2646-2646.
- 30 68. P. J. Mouser, M. Borton, T. H. Darrah, A. Hartsock and K. C. Wrighton, Hydraulic  
31 fracturing offers view of microbial life in the deep terrestrial subsurface, *FEMS*  
32 *Microbiology Ecology*, 2016, **92**, fiw166-fiw166.
- 33 69. Z.-H. Yang, K. StÖVen, S. Haneklaus, B. R. Singh and E. Schnug, Elemental Sulfur  
34 Oxidation by Thiobacillus spp. and Aerobic Heterotrophic Sulfur-Oxidizing Bacteria,  
35 *Pedosphere*, 2010, **20**, 71-79.
- 36 70. B. Liang, L. Y. Wang, S. M. Mbadinga, J. F. Liu, S. Z. Yang, J. D. Gu and B. Z. Mu,  
37 Anaerolineaceae and Methanosaeta turned to be the dominant microorganisms in alkanes-  
38 dependent methanogenic culture after long-term of incubation, *AMB Express*, 2015, **5**,  
39 117.
- 40 71. S. J. Mellroy, R. H. Kirkegaard, M. S. Dueholm, E. Fernando, S. M. Karst, M. Albertsen  
41 and P. H. Nielsen, Culture-Independent Analyses Reveal Novel Anaerolineaceae as  
42 Abundant Primary Fermenters in Anaerobic Digesters Treating Waste Activated Sludge,  
43 *Frontiers in microbiology*, 2017, **8**, 1134.
- 44 72. Y. Xia, Y. Wang, Y. Wang, F. Y. L. Chin and T. Zhang, Cellular adhesiveness and  
45 cellulolytic capacity in Anaerolineae revealed by omics-based genome interpretation,  
46 *Biotechnology for Biofuels*, 2016, **9**, 111.
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 73. S. A. Baldwin, M. Khoshnoodi, M. Rezadehbashi, M. Taupp, S. Hallam, A. Mattes and  
4 H. Sanei, The microbial community of a passive biochemical reactor treating arsenic,  
5 zinc, and sulfate-rich seepage, *Front Bioeng Biotechnol*, 2015, **3**, 27-27.  
6  
7 74. J. A. Klappenbach and B. K. Pierson, Phylogenetic and physiological characterization of  
8 a filamentous anoxygenic photoautotrophic bacterium ‘Candidatus Chlorothrix halophila’  
9 gen. nov., sp. nov., recovered from hypersaline microbial mats, *Archives of*  
10 *Microbiology*, 2004, **181**, 17-25.  
11  
12 75. T. L. Olson, A. M. L. van de Meene, J. N. Francis, B. K. Pierson and R. E. Blankenship,  
13 Pigment Analysis of “Candidatus Chlorothrix halophila,” a Green Filamentous  
14 Anoxygenic Phototrophic Bacterium, *Journal of Bacteriology*, 2007, **189**, 4187-4195.  
15  
16 76. P. A. Lara-Martín, A. Gómez-Parra and E. González-Mazo, Sources, transport and  
17 reactivity of anionic and non-ionic surfactants in several aquatic ecosystems in SW  
18 Spain: a comparative study, *Environmental pollution (Barking, Essex : 1987)*, 2008, **156**,  
19 36-45.  
20  
21 77. L. Shariq, M. C. McLaughlin, R. A. Rehberg, H. Miller, J. Blotevogel and T. Borch,  
22 Irrigation of wheat with select hydraulic fracturing chemicals: Evaluating plant uptake  
23 and growth impacts, *Environmental Pollution*, 2021, **273**, 116402.  
24  
25 78. C. Danforth, J. McPartland, J. Blotevogel, N. Coleman, D. Devlin, M. Olsgard, T.  
26 Parkerton and N. Saunders, Alternative Management of Oil and Gas Produced Water  
27 Requires More Research on its Hazards and Risks, *Integrated Environmental Assessment*  
28 *and Management*, 2019, **0**.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60