Starting Soon: Characterization and Remediation of Fractured Rock

Poll Question

- Characterization and Remediation of Fractured Rock (FracRx-1) http://fracturedRX-1.itrcweb.org
- Download PowerPoint file
  - Clu-in training page at http://www.clu-in.org/conf/itrc/FracRx/
  - Under "Download Training Materials"
- Download flowcharts for reference during the training class
  - https://clu-in.org/conf/itrc/FracRx/ITRC_TrainingHandout_FracRx-Figure1-1.pdf
- Using Adobe Connect
  - Related Links (on right)
    - Select name of link
    - Click "Browse To"
  - Full Screen button near top of page
- Follow ITRC

Associated Poll Questions:

Tell us about your site(s): [check all that apply]

Existing fractured rock site, meeting remedial objectives

Existing fractured rock site, prior characterization, struggling to meet remedial goals

New fractured rock site, not yet characterized

2

Welcome – Thanks for joining this ITRC Training Class

Characterization and Remediation of Fractured Rock



ITRC Guidance: Characterization and Remediation of Fractured Rock (FracRx-1)

Sponsored by: Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (www.itrcweb.org)
Hosted by: US EPA Clean Up Information Network (www.cluin.org)

Training Course Overview:

Characterization and remediation of contaminated groundwater in fractured rock has not been conducted or studied as broadly as groundwater at unconsolidated porous media sites. This unfamiliarity and lack of experience can make fractured rock sites perplexing. This situation is especially true in portions of the U.S. where bedrock aquifers are a primary source of drinking and process water, and demands on water are increasing. As a result, remedial activities often default to containment of contaminant plumes, point of use treatment and long-term monitoring rather than active reduction of risk. However, this attitude does not incorporate recent advances in the science and technology of fractured rock site characterization and remediation.
The basis for this training course is the ITRC guidance: Characterization and Remediation of Fractured Rock. The purpose of this guidance is to dispel the belief that fractured rock sites are too complex to characterize and remediate. The physical, chemical and contaminant transport concepts in fractured rock have similarities to unconsolidated porous media, yet there are important differences. These differences are the focus of this guidance.

By participating in this training class, you should learn to:

Use ITRCs Fractured Rock Document to guide your decision making so you can:

Develop quality Conceptual Site Models (CSMs) for fractured rock sites

Set realistic remedial objectives

Select the best remedial options

Monitor remedial progress and assess results

Value an interdisciplinary site team approach to bring collective expertise to improve decision making and to have confidence when going beyond containment and monitoring - - to actually remediating fractured rock sites.

Case studies of successful fractured rock remediation are presented to provide examples of how fractured rock sites can be evaluated and available tools applied to characterization and remediation.
Training participants are encouraged to view the associated ITRC guidance, Characterization and Remediation of Fractured Rock prior to attending the class.

ITRC (Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council) www.itrcweb.org

Training Co-Sponsored by: US EPA Technology Innovation and Field Services Division (TIFSD) (www.clu-in.org)

ITRC Training Program: training@itrcweb.org; Phone: 402-201-2419

3

Housekeeping

- Course time is 2 ¼ hours
- This event is being recorded
- Trainers control slides
  - **Want to control your own slides?** You can download presentation file on Clu-in training page
- Questions and feedback
  - **Throughout training:** type in the “Q & A” box
  - **At Q&A breaks:** unmute your phone with #6 to ask out loud
  - **At end of class:** Feedback form available from last slide
    - **Need confirmation of your participation today?** Fill out the feedback form and check box for confirmation email and certificate

We have started the seminar with all phone lines muted to prevent background noise. Please keep your phone lines muted during the seminar to minimize disruption and background noise. During the question and answer break, press #6 to unmute your lines to ask a question (note: *6 to mute again). Also, please do NOT put this call on hold as this may bring unwanted background music over the lines and interrupt the seminar.

Use the “Q&A” box to ask questions, make comments, or report technical problems any time. For questions and comments provided out loud, please hold until the designated Q&A breaks.

Everyone – please complete the feedback form before you leave the training website. Link to feedback form is available on last slide.

4

ITRC (www.itrcweb.org) – Shaping the Future of Regulatory Acceptance

- Host organization
- Network
  - State regulators
    - All 50 states, PR, DC
  - Federal partners

ECOS

DOE DOD EPA

  - ITRC Industry Affiliates Program

IAP

  - Academia
  - Community stakeholders
- Follow ITRC

- Disclaimer
  - Full version in "Notes" section
  - Partially funded by the U.S. government
    - ITRC nor US government warranty material
    - ITRC nor US government endorse specific products
- ITRC materials available for your use – see usage policy
- Available from www.itrcweb.org
  - Technical and regulatory guidance documents
  - Online and classroom training schedule
  - More…

The Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC) is a state-led coalition of regulators, industry experts, citizen stakeholders, academia and federal partners that work to achieve regulatory acceptance of environmental technologies and innovative approaches. ITRC consists of all 50 states (and Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia) that work to break down barriers and reduce compliance costs, making it easier to use new technologies and helping states maximize resources. ITRC brings together a diverse mix of environmental experts and stakeholders from both the public and private sectors to broaden and deepen technical knowledge and advance the regulatory acceptance of environmental technologies. Together, we're building the environmental community's ability to expedite quality decision making while protecting human health and the environment. With our network of organizations and individuals throughout the environmental community, ITRC is a unique catalyst for dialogue between regulators and the regulated community.

For a state to be a member of ITRC their environmental agency must designate a State Point of Contact. To find out who your State POC is check out the "contacts" section at www.itrcweb.org. Also, click on "membership" to learn how you can become a member of an ITRC Technical Team.

Disclaimer: This material was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof and no official endorsement should be inferred.

The information provided in documents, training curricula, and other print or electronic materials created by the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council ("ITRC" and such materials are referred to as "ITRC Materials") is intended as a general reference to help regulators and others develop a consistent approach to their evaluation, regulatory approval, and deployment of environmental technologies. The information in ITRC Materials was formulated to be reliable and accurate. However, the information is provided "as is" and use of this information is at the users' own risk.

ITRC Materials do not necessarily address all applicable health and safety risks and precautions with respect to particular materials, conditions, or procedures in specific applications of any technology. Consequently, ITRC recommends consulting applicable standards, laws, regulations, suppliers of materials, and material safety data sheets for information concerning safety and health risks and precautions and compliance with then-applicable laws and regulations. ITRC, ERIS and ECOS shall not be liable in the event of any conflict between information in ITRC Materials and such laws, regulations, and/or other ordinances. The content in ITRC Materials may be revised or withdrawn at any time without prior notice.

ITRC, ERIS, and ECOS make no representations or warranties, express or implied, with respect to information in ITRC Materials and specifically disclaim all warranties to the fullest extent permitted by law (including, but not limited to, merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose). ITRC, ERIS, and ECOS will not accept liability for damages of any kind that result from acting upon or using this information.

ITRC, ERIS, and ECOS do not endorse or recommend the use of specific technology or technology provider through ITRC Materials. Reference to technologies, products, or services offered by other parties does not constitute a guarantee by ITRC, ERIS, and ECOS of the quality or value of those technologies, products, or services. Information in ITRC Materials is for general reference only; it should not be construed as definitive guidance for any specific site and is not a substitute for consultation with qualified professional advisors.

5

Meet the ITRC Trainers

Kristopher McCandless
Virginia DEQ
Woodbridge, VA
703-583-3833
kristopher.mccandless @deq.virginia.gov

Melissa Boysun
ERM
Zurich Switzerland
+41 078 300 22 34
melissa.boysun@erm.com

Jeff Hale
Parsons
Pittsburgh, PA
412-848-8072
jeffrey.hale@parsons.com

Ted Tyler
Kleinfelder,
Phoenix AZ
480-688-7647
etyler@kleinfelder.com

Read trainer bios at https://clu-in.org/conf/itrc/FracRx/

Kristopher (Kris) McCandless has worked for the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in Woodbridge, Virginia since 2015. As an Environmental Geologist in the petroleum storage tank remediation division, he manages the characterization and remediation of numerous leaking petroleum storage tank sites, as well as assists the Land Protection Program with chlorinated solvent sites. Kris has spent most of his career as a project manager and hydrogeologist in the environmental consulting field. In the past two decades, his projects were focused on investigating and managing petroleum and chlorinated solvent sites in the Mid-Atlantic Piedmont states. Kris spearheaded investigations for Alternate Water Supplies for the DEQ Petroleum Program for State Lead sites as a contractor for DEQ, including locating new supply well locations, tracking groundwater flow through fractured media, performing packer testing to sample and isolate impacted zones within a supply well, performing pump tests in fractured rock, and assessing bedrock sites for remediation of chlorinated solvents. While reaping the benefits of many ITRC webinars during his consulting career, Kris joined the Fractured Bedrock team soon after employment with DEQ. Kris is actively engaged as a chapter lead for the ITRC Optimization of In situ Remediation team beginning in 2018. Kris earned his Bachelor of Science degree in Geology from George Mason University in 1988 in Fairfax, Virginia and is a Certified Professional Geologist (CPG) in Virginia.

Jeffrey Hale is a Senior Technical Consultant with Parsons, located in Pittsburgh, PA. He provides consultation for challenging environmental and natural resources issues internationally with emphasis on fractured rock & complex sites, emerging issues, remediation, liability management, and environmental forensics. Jeff has presented at many conferences on the topic of fractured rock characterization and remediation and served as an invited panelist at the NGWA Focus Conference on Fractured Rock and Eastern Groundwater Regional Issues. He has been involved with ITRC since 2014 as a principal contributor to the Characterization and Remediation in Fractured Rock document, and he serves as a section leader for the ITRC PFAS team. Jeff received a B.S. in Earth Sciences from Penn State in 1993, an M.S. in Geology from the University of Akron in 1995, and an M.S. in Engineering Management from Point Park University in 2008. He is licensed as a Professional Geologist in Pennsylvania.

Melissa Boysun is a Project Geologist for Environmental Resources Management in Zurich Switzerland. Melissa has worked as a geologist and consultant for ERM since 2012, and prior to that with Tetra Tech and AECOM from 2005 to 2012. Her work currently involves site investigation and remediation at midstream and downstream oil and gas facilities, wood preserving sites, and landfills. Prior to 2012, Melissa worked as a consultant on Department of Defense facilities, which included multiple investigations and pilot studies at fractured rock sites. She presented results from site investigations at fractured rock sites at the Battelle Conference in California and at AquaconSoil in Belgium. Melissa has contributed to ITRC as a team member for the Remediation of Fractured Bedrock Team and the LNAPL Update Team. She earned a bachelor's degree in Geology from Montana State University in 1999 and a master's degree in Geology from the University of Southern California in 2004. Melissa is also a certified PG with the California Board for Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors.

Ted Tyler is a Principal Engineer with Kleinfelder located in Phoenix, Arizona. Since 2002; Ted has worked at Kleinfelder as a project manager and environmental remediation design engineer specializing in biological and chemical treatment technologies, holding a patent on an innovative in-situ bioremediation process. Ted has provided engineering design bringing solutions to treat federal, industrial and commercial sites impacted by a wide array of contaminants (e.g.; chlorinated solvents; heavy metals; perchlorate; 1,4-dioxane; fuel hydrocarbons; etc.), and has provided solutions at sites with widely varying often challenging site geology such as sites underlain by deep vadose zones, heterogeneous soils, and fractured bedrock. He has contributed to ITRC as a team member on multiple ITRC teams including the most recent Fractured Bedrock Characterization and Remediation team. Prior to Kleinfelder he worked for 10 years at Groundwater Technology. Ted received his Bachelors and Masters and degree in Civil/Environmental Engineering from University of California in Los Angeles in 1990 and 1992, respectively, and is a registered professional engineer.

6

Meet the ITRC Trainers

Ryan A. Wymore
CDM Smith
Denver, CO
303-550-2738
wymorera@cdmsmith.com

John Dougherty
CDM Smith
Edison, NJ
732-590-4652
Doughertyjn @cdmsmith.com

Tamzen Macbeth
CDM Smith
Helena, Montana
802-249-5826
macbethtw@cdmsmith.com

Read trainer bios at https://clu-in.org/conf/itrc/FracRx/

Ryan A. Wymore, P.E., rejoined CDM Smith in Denver, CO in 2015. He serves as a national resource for evaluation, selection, and implementation of remediation strategies and solutions. Ryan has specialized in innovative groundwater remediation technologies, particularly bioremediation, monitored natural attenuation and chemical oxidation. Previously, he work at Geosyntec Consultants in 2014-2015, CDM Smith from 2005-2013, at North Wind Inc. from 2001-2005, and at the Idaho National Laboratory from 1998-2001. He has given over eighty presentations at various local, regional, national, and international symposia and meetings. Since 2002, he has worked with various ITRC teams that addressed DNAPLs, bioremediation, enhanced attenuation, and Environmental Molecular Diagnostics. He was an instructor on the ITRC Internet-based training courses: DNAPL Performance Assessment, Bioremediation of DNAPLs, and Integrated DNAPL Site Strategy. Ryan earned a bachelor's degree in Biological Systems Engineering from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in 1997 and a master's degree in Civil/Environmental Engineering from the University of Idaho in Moscow, Idaho in 2003. He is a registered Professional Engineer in the state of Idaho and Colorado in the environmental discipline.

Tamzen Macbeth is a Vice President at CDM Smith out of Helena, Montana. She has worked for CDM since 2009. Previously, she worked for 7 years at North Wind Inc. Tamzen is an environmental engineer with an interdisciplinary academic and research background in microbiology and engineering. She specializes in the development, demonstration and application of innovative, cost-effective technologies for contaminated groundwater. Specifically, she is experienced in all aspects of remedies from characterization to remediation for DNAPLs, dissolved organic, inorganic, and radioactive contaminants under CERCLA and RCRA regulatory processes. She has expertise in a variety of chemical, biological, thermal, extraction and solidification/stabilization remediation techniques as well as natural attenuation. Her current work focuses developing combined technology approaches, and innovative characterization techniques such as mass flux and mass discharge metrics. Since 2004, Tamzen has contributed to the ITRC as a team member and instructor for the ITRC's Bioremediation of DNAPLs, Integrated DNAPL Site Strategy, Molecular Diagnostics and DNAPL Characterization teams. Tamzen earned a bachelor's degree in Microbiology in 2000 and a master's degree in Environmental Engineering in 2002 both from Idaho State University in Pocatello, Idaho, and a doctoral degree from in Civil and Environmental Engineering in 2008 from the University of Idaho in Moscow, Idaho.

John N. Dougherty is a senior hydrogeologist at CDM Smith in Edison, New Jersey. Since joining CDM Smith in 1999, John has developed extensive experience applying a range of site characterization tools and drilling methods to the hydrogeologic characterization of groundwater contamination at fractured bedrock sites in New York, New Jersey, Kansas, Puerto Rico, and Massachusetts. At these sites, John applies site characterization tools including borehole geophysical logs (e.g. caliper, natural gamma, formation resistivity, fluid temperature and conductivity, and heat pulse flow meter), FLUTe transmissivity profiling, matrix diffusion sampling, and passive flux meters. John uses software to analyze geophysical logs, develop cross sections, and prepare stereo nets, to develop a conceptual groundwater flow model and design monitoring wells. In 2015 John worked with the US EPA Office of Research and Development and the University of Florida to test the Fractured Rock Passive Flux Meter (FRPFM), which is a new tool for characterizing mass flux/mass discharge in fractured rock, and was the principal author of the project report. John has also worked on water supply projects in Tanzania and Saudi Arabia which also utilized borehole geophysical tools. Since 2014 John has been a member of the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council "Characterization and Remediation in Fractured Rock" team currently developing guidance and training for fractured rock site characterization and remediation. John earned a bachelor's degree in geosciences from The Pennsylvania State University in State College, PA in 1983. John is a Professional Geologist in Arkansas, Florida, and Pennsylvania.

7

Dispelling the Fractured Rock Site Myth Can These Sites Really Be Cleaned Up?

Difficult, But Not Impossible



ITRC FracRx-1 Figure D-6

No associated notes.

8

The Problems and Site Challenges with Fractured Rock Remediation



No associated notes.

9

Challenge: Rock Sites are Complex



ITRC FracRx-1 Figure 11-3

No associated notes.

The Problems and Site Challenges with Fractured Rock Remediation



RAO - remedial action objective

No associated notes.

11

The Nature of the Solution
Solutions and Remedies



RAO - remedial action objective
CSM - conceptual site model

No associated notes.

12

Solution: Understand Fractured Rock Characteristics

Figure B-4. Inclined sandstone bedding

Figure B-7 Foliated schist in outcrop.

No associated notes.

13

The Nature of the Solution
Solutions and Remedies



RAO - remedial action objective
CSM - conceptual site model

No associated notes.

14

Solution: The Tool Table

Tool	Data Quality	Sub surface		Zone	
		Bedrock	Unconsolidated	Unsaturated	Saturated
Geophysics					
Surface Geophysics					
Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR)	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
High Resolution Seismic Reflection (2D or 3D)	QL - Q	✓	✓		✓
Seismic Refraction	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Multi-Channel Analyses of Surface Waves (MASW)	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT)	QL - SQ	✓	✓	✓	✓
Very Low Frequency (VLF)	QL	✓	✓	✓	✓
ElectroMagnetic (EM) Conductivity	QL	✓	✓	✓	✓
Downhole Testing					
Magnetometric Resistivity	QL	✓	✓		✓
Induction Resistivity (Conductivity Logging)	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Resistivity (Elog)	QL - SQ	✓			✓
GPR Cross-Well Tomography	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Optical Televiewer	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Acoustic Televiewer	QL - Q	✓			✓
Natural Gamma Log	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Neutron (porosity) Logging	QL - Q	✓	✓		✓
Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Logging	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Video Log	QL - SQ	✓	✓	✓	✓
Caliper Log	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Temperature Profiling	QL - Q	✓	✓		✓
Full Wave Form Seismic	Q - QL	✓			✓

The tools matrix is a downloadable excel spreadsheet located in Appendix A

No associated notes.

15

The Nature of the Solution
Solutions and Remedies



RAO - remedial action objective
CSM - conceptual site model

No associated notes.

16

A Better Way….. Based on the Latest Research Specific to Fractured Rock



ITRC Technical and Regulatory Guidance:

Characterization and Remediation of Fractured Rock

http://fracturedRX-1.itrcweb.org

This guidance completes a succession of ITRC documents produced in the last 10 years that builds on ITRC's 2010 Mass Flux and Mass Discharge document, their 2011 Integrated DNAPL Site Strategy and their 2015 Integrated Site Characterization document

17

Building a Quality Conceptual Site Model – You Need the Right Pieces



Fate & Transport

- Key to your success - a team with broad expertise: hydrogeology, structural geology, geophysics, geochemistry, and engineering

No associated notes.

18

What You Need to Know About Fractured Rock

See Training Handout



ITRC FracRx-1 Figure 1-1

No associated notes.

19



Similarities and Differences Bedrock vs. Unconsolidated



See Training Handout

ITRC FracRx-1 Figure 1-1

No associated notes.

20

Geologic Characteristics that Affect Flow



ITRC FracRx-1
Figure 1-1

No associated notes.

21

Today's Road Map – Connects to ITRC Guidance

- Identify similarities and differences between characterizing fractured rock and unconsolidated media sites (**Chapters 2 - 4**)
- Recognize the skills, approaches, and tools available to characterize fractured rock sites and develop CSMs (**Chapter 5**)
- Apply improved approaches to develop Remedial Action Objective (RAOs) and select remedies (**Chapter 6**)
- Describe development of a monitoring strategy for fractured rock sites (**Chapter 7**)



No associated notes.

Terrane Analysis – Regional Setting



Note NE-SW trend in landscape and arrangement of physiographic provinces: initial clue to bedrock and groundwater flow characteristics.

No associated notes.

23

Terrane Analysis – Lithology, Structure, Anisotropy, Hydrology



Rock type, layering, and structure impart directional component to hydrology and groundwater flow.

Courtesy Jeff Hale

No associated notes.

24

Terrane Analysis – Initial CSM



Assemble source, hydraulic gradient, bedrock influence, hydrology, and receptors for initial CSM.



Source Jeff Hale, prepared for ITRC

No associated notes.

25

Terrane Analysis – Complete Example



No associated notes.

26

Terrane Analysis – Elements

- Receptors
- Regional Setting
- Lithology
- Structure
- Anisotropy
- Heterogeneity
- Hydrology



The Terrane Analysis Matrix (Appendix B) is a tool that breaks down terrane analysis into its basic elements with helpful tips.

ITRC FracRx-1 Appendix B

No associated notes

27

Terrane Analysis – The Challenge of Karst

Karst landscapes develop when fractured, soluble bedrock interacts with surface water or groundwater to develop macroscale secondary porosity features such as voids, conduits, sinkholes, and caves.

Source USGS

- Appendix A in the document discusses Karst issues in detail

ITRC FracRx-1, Appendix A

No associated notes.

28

Hydrology of Fractured Rock – The Basic Questions

Poll Question

Hydrology

- ▶ Where is the fluid?
- ▶ Are there multiple phases?
- ▶ How does it move?



ITRC FracRx-1 Figure 1-1

Poll Question: Which of these is the most important for determining flow in a fractured rock setting?

1.Where is the fluid?

2.Are there multiple phases?

3.How does it move?

29

What Bedrock Characteristics Control Fluid Flow?



ITRC FracRx-1 Figure 3-2

No associated notes.

30

Primary Considerations for Flow in Sedimentary vs Crystalline Rock

Hydrology

- Influence of fractures
- Bedding or layering
- Fracture systems
- Mechanical and chemical weathering

Courtesy Melissa Boysun

No associated notes.

31

Flow in Bedrock Drives the Approach to the Investigation

Hydrology

- Matrix flow
- Discrete fracture flow
- Interconnected fracture network flow

Matrix Porosity



From PGA Ltd.



No associated notes.

Fluid Dynamics

Hydrology

- Pressure and density gradients
- Laminar vs turbulent
  - Darcy vs non-darcy flow
  - Scale dependence
- Multi-fluid systems
  - Wetting vs non-wetting phases
  - Effects of density contrast



Courtesy Dan Bryant

No associated notes.

33

Intersection of Scale and Fracture Flow Properties

- Macroscopic
- Mesoscopic
- Microscopic



ITRC FracRx-1 Figure 3-1

No associated notes.

Macroscopic Flow: The Big Picture

- Occurs at regional or site-wide scale
- Regional factors beyond the site that could influence flow
  - Faults
  - Rivers
  - Tides
  - Changes in lithology
- Remote Sensing and Terrane Analysis to evaluate interaction of multiple structures
  - Orientation, length, connectivity
  - Karst is considered as a whole
  - Overall flow behaving as continuous Darcian flow system
- Knowing how structures interact helps direct investigation at smaller scales

No associated notes.

35

Mesoscopic Flow: Where We Learn the Most

Hydrology

Poll Question

- Plume delineation, flow between multiple wells/boreholes
  - Orientation, aperture, density, length, and connectivity
  - Influence of matrix characteristics
- Boreholes and Outcrops
  - Fracture analysis
  - Hydraulic testing
- Flow in fracture sets
  - Advection, entrainment, dispersion
- Primary scale of investigation
  - Majority of investigation and characterization techniques

Poll question: Which of these is a general representative range of in-situ fracture apertures in the upper few hundred feet of rock (mm)?"

A. 0.005-0.05
B. 0.05-0.5
C. 1.0-5
D. 5-50
E. Impossible to tell

36

Microscopic Flow: Tools for Fine-Tuning your Site Understanding

- Individual fracture, to matrix interaction
- Microscopic and individual fracture analysis
  - Investigate individual fracture characteristics
  - Core samples
  - Aperture increases by dissolution, or decreases by infilling
- Flow between fractures and matrix
- Interface between fracture and matrix and matrix storage effects F&T

Courtesy Jeff Hale

We may not get down to this scale very often

No associated notes.

37

How to Integrate this with your CSM



- Better understanding of where the fluid is and where it's going
- Started to look at how multiple phases interact
- Incorporated flow and fracture data from multiple scales

- Fate and Transport - last piece of puzzle before creating initial CSM
- Understanding fate and transport in fractured rock
  - Unique properties of the contaminant
  - Characteristics of the rock
- Consider fate and transport mechanisms involved

No associated notes.

38

Contaminant Fate and Transport in Saturated Fractured Rock

- ▶ Common fate and transport mechanisms
  - Density driven vertical migration
  - Dissolution and advection
  - Matrix diffusion/back diffusion
  - Sorption/retardation
  - Degradation
    - Example: abiotic and biotic transformation

Fate & Transport



Freeze and Cherry 1979

No associated notes.

Identification of Contaminant Properties

Chemical	Liquid Density	Vapor Pressure	Solubility	Henry's Constant	Koc	Reactivity
	g/cm^3 (water = 1 g/cm^3)	mm HG (volatile >= 1 mm HG)	mg/L	atm-m^3/mole	L/kg	
trichloroethene (TCE)	1.46	58 @ 20 C	1100	0.0103 (EPA)	166	abiotic biogeochemical transformation

- Identify properties of contaminant (example, TCE)
- Consider how these properties affect flow in bedrock:
  - Flow through bedding planes
  - Flow through vertical fractures
  - Flow through primary (matrix) porosity



ITRC FracRx-1Table 4-1

No associated notes.

Identification of Potential Fate and Transport Mechanisms

Chemical	Liquid Density	Vapor Pressure	Solubility	Henry's Constant	Koc	Reactivity
	g/cm^3 (water = 1 g/cm^3)	mm HG (volatile >= 1 mm HG)	mg/L	atm-m^3/mole	L/kg	
-						
trichloroethene (TCE)	1.46	58 @ 20 C	1100	0.0103 (EPA)	166	abiotic biogeochemical transformation

Fate and Transport Mechanisms Likely

- Based on density, likely to sink in saturated zone
- Potential for partitioning to vapor phase
- Potential for dissolved plume and matrix diffusion
- Potential retardation along fracture walls and/or within rock matrix
- Abiotic transformation potential

ITRC FracRx-1 Table 4-1

No associated notes.

Contaminant Fate and Transport in Saturated Fractured Rock

- Example dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) release
- Vertical migration into saturated zone
- Dissolution and advection within fractures
- Matrix diffusion/back diffusion, and potential sorption
- Consider potential for abiotic and/or biotic transformation

Early Time

Intermediate Time

Late Time



Parker et al. 2012

No associated notes.

42

LNAPL in Fractured Rock

- Light non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL) migration in vertical fracture
  - Down dip in unsaturated zone
  - Along strike in saturated zone
- Dip of fracture can also affect difficulty of identifying LNAPL
  - Steeper fractures are less likely for a well to intersect
- In a horizontal fracture, hydraulic gradient could influence migration



Courtesy Ted Tyler



Courtesy Alex Wardle

Fate & Transport

No associated notes.

43

DNAPL in Fractured Rock

- DNAPL migration in vertical fracture
  - Down dip in unsaturated zone
  - Down dip and potentially along strike in saturated zone
- Shallow well away from source area likely to miss DNAPL and highest dissolved concentrations
- Fracture dip can increase difficulty of identifying DNAPL but may help in locating the dissolved plume (see document for additional detail)
- In a horizontal fracture, hydraulic gradient could influence migration



Courtesy Ted Tyler



Courtesy Alex Wardle

Fate & Transport

No associated notes.

Introduction – 21 Compartment Model

	SOURCE ZONE			DOWNGRADIENT EXTENT		
	Matrix Storage	Matrix Flow	Fracture Flow	Fracture Flow	Matrix Flow	Matrix Storage
Vapor*						
NAPL*				NA	NA	NA
Dissolved						
Sorbed						

Fate & Transport

ITRC FracRx-1 Table D-1

No associated notes.

21 Compartment Model – Sandstone

	SOURCE ZONE			DOWNGRADIENT EXTENT		
	Matrix Storage	Matrix Flow	Fracture Flow	Fracture Flow	Matrix Flow	Matrix Storage
Vapor	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
NAPL	Low	Low	High	NA	NA	NA
Dissolved	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
Sorbed	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low

DNAPL spill site underlain by fractured uncemented sandstone

Key:
- Orange = high concentration
- Yellow = moderate concentration
- Green = low concentration

ITRC FracRx-1 Table D-3a

No associated notes.

21 Compartment Model – Shale Bedrock

	SOURCE ZONE			DOWNGRADIENT EXTENT		
	Matrix Storage	Matrix Flow	Fracture Flow	Fracture Flow	Matrix Flow	Matrix Storage
Vapor	Low	NA	Medium	Medium	NA	Low
NAPL	Low	NA	High	NA	NA	NA
Dissolved	Low	NA	Medium	Medium	NA	Low
Sorbed	Low	NA	Medium	Medium	NA	Low

DNAPL spill site underlain by fractured shale bedrock

Key:
- Orange = high concentration
- Yellow = moderate concentration
- Green = low concentration

Fate & Transport

ITRC FracRx-1 Table D-5a

No associated notes.

21 Compartment Model – Granite

	SOURCE ZONE			DOWNGRADIENT EXTENT		
	Matrix Storage	Matrix Flow	Fracture Flow	Fracture Flow	Matrix Flow	Matrix Storage
Vapor	Negligible	NA	Medium	Medium	NA	Negligible
NAPL	Negligible	NA	High	NA	NA	NA
Dissolved	Negligible	NA	Medium	Medium	NA	Negligible
Sorbed	Negligible	NA	Medium	Medium	NA	Negligible

DNAPL spill site underlain by **fractured granite bedrock**

Key:
- Orange = high concentration
- Yellow = moderate concentration
- Green = low concentration

Fate & Transport

ITRC FracRx-1 Table D-5b

No associated notes.

Combined 21 Compartment Model and Conceptual Hydrogeologic Model



	Source Zone			DOWNGRADIENT EXTENT		
	Matrix Storage	Matrix Flow	Fracture Flow	Fracture Flow	Matrix Flow	Matrix Storage
Vapor		low			low	
NAPL		low		NA	NA	NA
Dissolved		low			low	
Sorbed		low			low	

CSM Source: Jim Studer, InfraSUR

Fate & Transport

ITRC FracRx-1 Figure D-6

No associated notes.

49

Q&A Break

Follow ITRC





No associated notes.

50

Today's Road Map – Connects to ITRC Guidance

- Identify similarities and differences between characterizing fractured rock and unconsolidated media sites. (Chapters 2 - 4)
- Recognize the skills, approaches, and tools available to characterize fractured rock sites and develop CSMs (Chapter 5)
- Apply improved approaches to develop Remedial Action Objective (RAOs) and select remedies (Chapter 6)
- Describe development of a monitoring strategy for fractured rock sites (Chapter 7)



No associated notes.

51

Developing a Fractured Rock CSM (Conceptual Site Model)

- Not a comprehensive start-to-finish “cookbook” for building a fractured rock CSM
- Discusses key elements unique to those sites
- Follows Integrated Site Characterization process developed in 2015 ITRC Guidance



Figure 4-1 Integrated Site Characterization

ITRC ISC-1, 2015, Figure 4-1

No associated notes

52

Developing a Fractured Rock CSM – Key Elements

- Iteratively develop and assess the CSM (Section 5.1)
- Clearly define the problem statement (Section 5.2)
- Identify significant data gaps and needs, and resolution requirement (Section 5.3)
- Establish data quality objectives (Section 5.4)
- Select tools and techniques (Section 5.5)
- Carefully interpret, manage and present the data (Section 5.7)

No associated notes

53

Developing a Fractured Rock CSM – Process Summary



"Significant" Data Gaps

- Missing or incomplete information, which limits the formulation of a scientifically defensible interpretation of environmental conditions and/or potential risks in a bedrock hydrogeologic system.
- Likely to exist if more than one CSM can be supported by the data
- Reference: http://www.ct.gov/deep/lib/deep/site_clean_up/guidance/Site_Characterization/Final_SCGD.pdf

No associated notes.

54

Examples of Objectives

- **Characterization Objective:** Determine the lateral and vertical extent of dissolved phase VOCs
- **Data Gap:** Vertical and lateral extent of dissolved phase VOCs is unknown
- **Data Collection Objective:** In areas beneath the source, and between the source and receptor(s), gather data:
  - Fracture locations
  - Fracture orientations
  - VOC concentrations

No associated notes

55

Tools Matrix Format and Location

- The tools matrix is a downloadable excel spreadsheet



Tool
Geophysics
Surface Geophysics
Downhole Testing
Hydraulic Testing
Single well tests
Cross Borehole Testing
Vapor and Soil Gas Sampling
Solid Media Sampling and Analysis Methods
Solid Media Sampling Methods
Solid Media Evaluation and Testing Methods
Direct Push Logging (In-Situ)
Discrete Groundwater Sampling & Profiling
Multilevel sampling
DNAPL Presence
Chemical Screening
Environmental Molecular Diagnostics
Microbial Diagnostics
Stable Isotope and Environmental Tracers
On-site Analytical

- Tools segregated into categories and subcategories

Tools Table can be downloaded on the opening page of ITRC FracRx-1

The tool is downloadable by click on the Select Tools on the opening page of the Web document. There are also a number of links to the tools throughout the Characterization section of the document.

Orientation to the Tools Matrix

- Contains over **100** tools
- Sorted by:
  - Characterization objective
    - Geology
    - Hydrogeology
    - Chemistry
  - Effectiveness in media
    - Unconsolidated/Bedrock
    - Unsaturated/Saturated
- Ranked by data quality
  - Quantitative
  - Semi-quantitative
  - Qualitative

Tool	Data Quality	Sub surface		Zone	
		Bedrock	Unconsolidated	Unsaturated	Saturated
Geophysics					
Surface Geophysics					
Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR)	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
High Resolution Seismic Reflection (2D or 3D)	QL - Q	✓	✓		✓
Seismic Refraction	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Multi-Channel Analyses of Surface Waves (MASW)	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT)	QL - SQ	✓	✓	✓	✓
Very Low Frequency (VLF)	QL	✓	✓	✓	✓
ElectroMagnetic (EM) Conductivity	QL	✓	✓	✓	✓
Downhole Testing					
Magnetometric Resistivity	QL	✓	✓		✓
Induction Resistivity (Conductivity Logging)	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Resistivity (Elog)	QL - SQ	✓			✓
GPR Cross-Well Tomography	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Optical Televiewer	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Acoustic Televiewer	QL - Q	✓			✓
Natural Gamma Log	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Neutron (porosity) Logging	QL - Q	✓	✓		✓
Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Logging	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Video Log	QL - SQ	✓	✓	✓	✓
Caliper Log	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓
Temperature Profiling	QL - Q	✓	✓		✓
Full Wave Form Seismic	Q - QL	✓			✓

Tools Table can be downloaded on the opening page of ITRC FracRx-1

No associated notes.

57

Tools Matrix Functionality

Click any box for a description or definition

Click

E.3 Geology

Geologic data provide a means to describe the physical matrix and structure of the subsurface and to classify the sedimentary, igneous, or metamorphic environment. Data related to lithology and distribution of strata and facies changes are generated through a variety of qualitative and quantitative collection tools and methods.

Initial methods and tools used to characterize site geology include site walkovers to help gain a preliminary understanding of the site prior to a major field mobilization, which can involve the use of both intrusive and nonintrusive tools. Outcroppings offer insight into structural features of the bedrock, and much information can be obtained through basic geologic mapping techniques (for example, measuring strike and dip of planar features and plotting on a stereonet).

Following a surface investigation, the next step in site characterization commonly involves collecting a continuous core of sediments and bedrock. Data provided by this core sampling may include lithology, grain size and sorting, crystalinity, geologic contacts, bedding planes, fractures and faults, depositional environment, porosity, and permeability. Generally, numerous boreholes are drilled to determine the vertical and horizontal variability of the site-specific geology. The depositional environment and facies changes should also be mapped as much as possible, and these data may be combined with surface and borehole geophysical data to interpolate conditions between the holes. Downhole geophysical tools and direct-push tools – for example, membrane interface probe (MIP), hydraulic profiling tool (HPT), and Waterloo profiler – can provide detailed information on the geology and contaminant distribution at a site.

Effective site geology characterization requires that personnel are trained and experienced in field geology and are able to accurately assess the collected data. It is also important that the team use consistent investigative methods – for example, characterizing soil or rock type using the same, agreed upon classification system. The team must determine the level of data resolution necessary to adequately characterize a specific site and whether surface and borehole geophysical data are of sufficient resolution.

Unfortunately, collection efforts at contaminated sites often yield insufficient geologic data, leading to a high degree of uncertainty in subsurface interpretation. Historically, there has been a tendency to oversimplify conceptual site models (CSMs), which has led to the misperception that physical (geologic) conditions of the site can be engineered around – that is, limitations in site characterization data can be compensated by overdesigning remediation systems. However, remedy performance success rates have been poor under such circumstances, whereas investing in adequately detailed site characterization has provided a positive return on investigation in terms of improved remedy success rates and reduced life cycle costs.

Oversimplification of CSMs is particularly relevant to glaciated regions with complex depositional environments. In the northeast and Midwest, many glaciated sites contain both bedrock and glacial aquifers that have DNAPL issues. Under such conditions, hydrogeological and geological expertise specific to glacial environments and their depositional characteristics is required for developing an accurate and complete CSM, and is key to the success of a DNAPL remedy.

No associated notes.

Detailed Tool Descriptions

Click on any tool

- Additional reference material
- Description
- Applicability
- Limitations

Click

Tool	Data Quality	Sub surface		Zone	
		Bedrock	consolidated	nsaturated	Saturated

Tool/References	Description	Data Quality and Applicability/Advantages	Limitations/Difficulty
Ground Penetrating Radar • Annan 2005 • Bayer et al. 2011 • Beres et al. 1999 • Bradford 2006 • Bradford and Deeds 2006 • Bradford, Dickins. and Brandvik 2010 • Bradford and Babcock 2013 • Clement, Barrash, and Knoll 2006 • Guerin 2005 • USEPA 2004	Ground penetrating radar (GPR) creates a cross-sectional imaging of the ground based on the reflection of an electromagnetic (EM) pulse from boundaries between layers of different dielectric properties. The quality depends on soil and water conditions as penetration is reduced by clay, water, and salinity. GPR is useful in resolving stratigraphic layers; however, independent confirmation of lithology is required. GPR generates a 2D profile, but it can be run with multiple lines in a grid pattern to generate a pseudo-3D image. Penetration and resolution of features depend on antenna frequency and material conductivity and interferences, and are generally limited to 20 meters (m) deep. GPR can identify internal structures between material-bounding reflectors (e.g., cross-bedding) in some cases. GPR can be used to locate geologic material or property contacts associated with dielectric property contrasts (e.g., proxy for porosity in some water-saturated clastic sediments) as well as subsurface infrastructure (e.g., pipes, tanks, cavities).	Data Quality • varies with antennas and subsurface EC • relatively sharp boundaries • qualitative to quantitative depending on field conditions, prior knowledge/subsurface calibration, experimental quality, appropriate modeling Applicability/Advantages • relatively fast to acquire, and processing methodology well established • primarily used in materials with low EC (sand, gravel, or rock except shales) • can be run repeatedly in time-lapse mode to track changes in moisture (above water table) or EC or dielectric properties (plume or spill bodies, including several experiments tracking presence and changes in dense nonaqueous phase liquid [DNAPL] in sandy aquifers)	• minimal penetration in electrically conductive (silts and clay-rich or conductive pore water) units • interpretation of features and depths semiquantitative without independent reference (well or cone penetrometer [CPT])

ITRC FracRx-1

No associated notes.

59

Shaded Boxes Denote Tool Meets Objective

Tools collect these types of information

Tool	Data Quality	Sub surface		Zone		Geology										
		Bedrock	Unconsolidated	Unsaturated	Saturated	Lithology	Lithology Contacts	Porosity	Permeability	Dual Permeability	Faults	Fractures	Fracture Density	Fracture sets	Rock Competence	Mineralogy
Geophysics																
Surface Geophysics																
Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR)	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓											
High Resolution Seismic Reflection (2D or 3D)	QL - Q	✓	✓		✓											
Seismic Refraction	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓											
Multi-Channel Analyses of Surface Waves (MASW)	QL - Q	✓	✓	✓	✓											
Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT)	QL - SQ	✓	✓	✓	✓											
Very Low Frequency (VLF)	QL	✓	✓	✓	✓											
ElectroMagnetic (EM) Conductivity	QL	✓	✓	✓	✓											
Downhole Testing																

Green shading indicates that tool is applicable to characterization objective

ITRC FracRx-1

No associated notes.

60

Integrated Borehole Log - Example



Courtesy John Dougherty

No associated notes

61

Plan View - Example



ITRC FracRx-1
Figure 5-5

No associated notes

62

Cross Section – Example



FracRx-1 Figure 5-6

No associated notes

Characterization of Fractured Rock Generic Flow Path

ITRC ISC-1, 2015

Develop and Implement Work Plan

- Select tools
- Drill bedrock boreholes
- Collect rock cores as necessary
- Test boreholes for hydrologic characteristics and contaminant distribution (packer testing/packer sampling, heat pulse flow meter, multi-well aquifer pump testing, etc.)
- Sample and analyze groundwater

No associated notes.

Develop a Workplan

A typical fractured rock characterization work plan should:

- Emphasize characterization and data collection objectives
- Present a data collection process
- Include the tools selected
- Be forward-looking to discuss what procedures/software/models may be used for data evaluation and interpretation
- Include data evaluation process

No associated notes.

Develop a Workplan

ITRC endorses a dynamic field approach to site characterization to the extent practical at fractured rock sites

A dynamic work plan can involve

- Real time data assessment
- Frequent (up to daily) calls or data uploads between the field team and project stakeholders to review field activities and data, to make decisions next steps for efficiently completing the characterization.
- Continuously or frequently updating the CSM

No associated notes.

Implement a Site Investigation

- If real time or near-real time data are being generated during the investigation, these results can be evaluated as they are generated to help guide further data collection activities

We stress that characterization activities must be designed to not spread contamination!

- **Do not leave open holes where flow can occur between previously unconnected fractures**.

No associated notes.

67

Site Characterization
SRSNE Case Study Learning Objectives

Using this case study site as an example…

- See how regional (“macroscopic) structure influences site-scale (“mesoscopic”) structure
- Recognize the usefulness of measuring and analyzing in-situ bedrock fracture orientation data
- Understand how fracture orientations affect
  - Modeled groundwater flow directions (anisotropy)
  - Observed plume geometry
  - DNAPL migration
- See the hydraulic and fate-and-transport parameters that were quantified to understand the fracture system and the matrix

No associated notes.

68

Site Characterization - Case Study

Regional Setting - Connecticut Rift Valley

Solvents Recovery Service of New England, Inc. (SRSNE) Superfund Site



Courtesy Michael Gefell

Source: Basemap from Connecticut Geological and Natural History Survey, 1990. White-colored map area = sedimentary rocks ("red beds")

No associated notes.

69

Bedrock Conceptual Model

Cross Section Perpendicular to Inferred Strike of Fractures (Primary Groundwater Flow Direction)



Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

70

In Situ Fracture Orientation Data

Dip Vectors



"Raw" data - not corrected for magnetic declination.

True orientations are 14˚ counterclockwise of these.

most dip vectors oriented toward ESE

Dip Directions



note wide variety of secondary dip directions (minor cross-cutting fractures)

primary fracture set

Dip Angles



consistent fracture dip for primary fracture set

Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

71

Plan View Hydraulic Gradient in Bedrock



Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

72

Modeled Anisotropy - Calibrated to Plume in Bedrock

Regional MODFLOW/MODPATH Model – 1:20 Anisotropy



★ = DNAPL/Sheen Encountered in Bedrock

Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

73

3-D Model of DNAPL Observations in Bedrock

Looking North-Northeast Along Strike of Fractures



Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

74

Fracture Hydraulic Aperture vs. Depth below top of Bedrock



Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

75

Site Specific Average Data for Fate and Transport Evaluation

- Bulk permeability = 10^{-4} cm/s
- Matrix porosity = 8%
- Fraction organic carbon = 0.5%
- Fracture aperture = 97 microns
- Fracture spacing = 155 cm
- Fracture porosity = 0.006%

Courtesy Michael Gefell



Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

76

Today's Road Map – Connects to ITRC Guidance

- Identify similarities and differences between characterizing fractured rock and unconsolidated media sites. (Chapters 2 - 4)
- Recognize the skills, approaches, and tools available to characterize fractured rock sites and develop CSMs (Chapter 5)
- Apply improved approaches to develop Remedial Action Objective (RAOs) and select remedies (Chapter 6)
- Describe development of a monitoring strategy for fractured rock sites (Chapter 7)



No associated notes.

Section 6: Remedy Selection



- Attaining prescriptive levels (e.g., MCLs) generally more challenging than in overburden
- Focus on “SMART” RAOs and risk reduction
- Consider remedies that have reasonable timeframes and costs, and that:
  - Address most critical risks
  - Foster partial cleanups
  - Address community concerns
  - Progress towards complete restoration

SMART
Specific
Measureable
Applicable
Relevant
Time Bound

No associated notes.

78

Establish Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs)

- "SMART" RAOs and risk reduction may consider:
  - Groundwater discharge to surface water
  - Vapor discharge
  - Mass flux zones
  - Source zones
- Acknowledge uncertainty
- Develop contingency plan

SMART
Specific
Measureable
Applicable
Relevant
Time Bound

Remediation Objectives, Section 3 of ITRC Guidance:
Integrated DNAPL Site Strategy (IDSS-1, 2011)

Remediation Objectives, Section 3 of ITRC Guidance: Integrated DNAPL Site Strategy (IDSS-1, 2011) at http://www.itrcweb.org/GuidanceDocuments/IntegratedDNAPLStrategy_IDSSDoc/IDSS-1.pdf

Online training at https://clu-in.org/conf/itrc/IDSS/

79

Special Considerations in Bedrock

Properties	Difference at Fractured Rock sites	Impact
Hydraulic conductivity/ mass storage	Wider range of hydraulic conductivity and contaminant mass storage domains	Injection and extraction based remedies can be more difficult to implement successfully
NAPL	NAPL distribution may be even more complex than in porous media	NAPL more difficult to remove/contact
Groundwater flow direction/flux	Groundwater flow is more complex, especially on local scales	Preferential flow can complicate amendment distribution; passive remedies (e.g. barriers) can be more difficult to install
Abiotic/biotic reactions	Wide range of biotic and abiotic interaction with fracture surfaces and rock matrix	Need to understand rock types and whether matrix degrades or immobilizes contaminants; can enhance MNA at some sites

ITRC FracRx-1, Summary of Section 6.2

No associated notes

80

Rock Type Influences Remedy Selection

- Begin technology screening with consideration of general rock types
  - Rock type affects fate, transport, storage, geochemistry characteristics, and therefore remediation
    - Differences in hydraulic characteristics
    - Differences in organic carbon content
    - Abiotic transformation reactions

No associated notes

81

Contaminant Characteristic Considerations

- Highly soluble contaminants may exhibit strong matrix diffusion
  - Subsequent back diffusion following remediation of contamination within fractures
- NAPLs may be transported great distances
  - Horizontal and/or vertical transport in fracture network
- Water-contaminant-rock interactions very different on fracture surfaces than in rock matrix

No associated notes

Technology Screening Matrix

Table 6-2. Remediation Technology Screening Matrix for Fractured Bedrock Environments

Representative Rock Types / Origin				Hydrogeology			Physical						Containment		Chemical / Biological						
				Transmissivity (Flow)		Matrix Storage	Removal	Thermal	Air Sparge	Vapor & Multiphase Extraction	Surfactant Flushing[1]	LNAPL Recovery	Pump & Treat	Permeable Reactive Barrier	In-Situ Chemical Oxidation		In-Situ Chemical Reduction		In-Situ Bioremediation		MNA
				Matrix	Fracture										Short-lived oxidant	Long-lived oxidant	Short-lived reductant	Long-lived reductant	Short-lived carbon substrate	Long-lived carbon substrate	
Sedimentary Rocks	Chemical	Coal	Bituminous	H	L	H	Y	U	U	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
			Anthracite	L	L	L	Y	U	U	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
		Carbonates	Limestone (including Karst)	H	L or H	H	Y	Y	U	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
			Dolomite & Recrystallized Limestone	L	L or H	L	Y	Y	U	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Clastics		Cemented Sandstone, Conglomerate, & Other Coarse-Grained Rocks	L	H	L	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
			Uncemented Sandstone, Conglomerate, & Other Coarse-Grained Rocks	H	L	H	Y	Y	U	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
			Shale & Mudstone	H	H	H	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Igneous & Metamorphic Rocks	Extrusives		Tuff / Scoria / Pumice	H	L	H	U	U	U	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
			Basalt / Rhyolite	L	H	L	U	U	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Intrusives		Granites & Other Crystalline Intrusives	L	H	L	U	U	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Metamorphics		Foliated Metamorphsics (e.g., Gneiss & Schist)	L	H	L	U	U	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
			Unfoliated Metamorphics (e.g., Quartzite, Amphibolite)	L	L	L	U	U	U	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Treatment Zone and Phase Considerations	Vadose Zone		NAPL				Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
			Matrix Storage (sorbed mass)				Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
			Vapor phase				Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
	Saturated Zone		NAPL				U	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
			Matrix Storage (sorbed mass)				U	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
			Dissolved phase				U	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
			Vapor phase (dissolved gas)				U	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

* This table is for general technology screening only. Technology selection must be based upon careful review of site-specific conditions.

1. Surfactant use in bedrock presents a high degree of uncertainty and was not recommended as a fractured bedrock remediation technology in previous ITRC guidance (ITRC, 2003). However, some case studies have demonstrated success with fractured bedrock sites in some scenarios.

H = High
L = Low

Y = Yes, generally applicable remediation technology
U = Unlikely to be applicable remediation technology
N = No, generally not applicable remediation technology

ITRC FracRx-1, Table 6-2

No associated notes

83

Technology Screening Matrix

21-Compartment Model Elements by Rock Type

Representative Rock Types/Origin				Transmissivity (Flow) Matrix	Transmissivity (Flow) Fracture	Matrix Storage
Sedimentary Rocks	Chemical	Coal	Bituminous	H	L	H
			Anthracite	L	L	L
		Carbonates	Limestone (including Karst)	H	L or H	H
			Dolomite & Recrystallized Limestone	L	L or H	L
	Clastics		Cemented Sandstone, Conglomerate, & Other Coarse-Grained Rocks	L	H	L
			Uncemented Sandstone, Conglomerate, & Other Coarse-Grained Rocks	H	L	H
			Shale & Mudstone	H	H	H
Igneous & Metamorphic Rocks	Extrusives		Tuff/Scoria/Pumice	H	L	H
			Basalt/Rhyolite	L	H	L
	Intrusives		Granites & Other Crystalline Intrusives	L	H	L
	Metamorphics		Foliated Metamorphsics (such as Gneiss & Schist)	L	H	L
			Unfoliated Metamorphics (such as Quartzite, Amphibolite)	L	L	L

"H" = "High"
"L" = "Low"

ITRC FracRx-1, Table 6-2

No associated notes

Range of Technologies

Physical					Contaminant		Chemical / Biological					
Removal	Thermal	Air Sparge	Vapor & Multiphase Extraction	Surfactant Flushing	Pump & Treat	Permeable Reactive Barrier	In-situ Chemical Oxidation		In-situ Chemical Reduction		In-situ Bioremediation	
							Short-lived oxidant	Long-lived oxidant	Short-lived reductant	Long-lived reductant	Short-lived carbon substrate	Long-lived carbon substrate



ITRC FracRx-1, Table 6-2

No associated notes

General Technology Applicability

Example: Physical Removal
Y = Generally applicable
N = Not generally applicable
U = Unlikely applicable

Physical				
Removal	Thermal	Air Sparge	Vapor & Multiphase Extraction	Surfactant Flushing
Y	U	U	Y	U
Y	U	U	Y	U
Y	Y	U	Y	U
Y	Y	U	Y	U
Y	Y	U	Y	Y
Y	Y	U	Y	N
Y	Y	U	Y	Y
U	U	U	Y	N
U	U	U	Y	Y
U	U	U	Y	Y
U	U	U	Y	Y
U	U	U	Y	N



ITRC FracRx-1, Table 6-2

No associated notes

86

Physical Technologies

- Removal
  - Limited to unsaturated, “soft” or weathered rock
  - Good for high matrix storage and primary porosity
- Thermal methods
  - Different methods have individual advantages and disadvantages for different types of rock
- Air sparge
  - Distribution pathways likely to be very limited compared to those in porous media

No associated notes

87

Physical Technologies
Vapor and Multiphase Extraction

- Both commonly applied in bedrock
- Design more challenging due to discrete fracture control of vapor and fluid migration in bedrock
- Commonly coupled with other technologies
  - Usually component of thermal methods
  - Commonly coupled with peroxide ISCO for off gas control

No associated notes

88

Physical Technologies
Surfactant / Cosolvent Flushing

- Challenging due to heterogeneous fluid flow
  - Preferential migration through transmissive, large-aperture fractures
  - Little or no contact with NAPL in less-transmissive fracture zones, primary porosity, or matrix storage
- ITRC (2003) recommended against application of surfactants/cosolvents in fractured rock aquifers

No associated notes

89

Containment Technologies
Pump and Treat

- Widely applied, but special rock considerations
  - Communication with overburden or weathered bedrock
  - Fracture orientations and anisotropy
  - Multiple intersecting fracture sets
  - Capture-zone geometry more complex than in porous media, estimate using:
    - Modeling
    - Hydraulic head measurements
    - Groundwater contaminant concentrations

No associated notes

90

Containment Technologies

Permeable Reactive Barrier Zones

- Accurate fracture identification and depth resolution are critical
  - Target transmissive, water-bearing fractures
  - Careful coring and logging to identify depths
  - May be ineffective if a transmissive fracture is missed
- Injected media may affect fluid flow
- PRBZ technologies most applicable to sites with significant secondary porosity

No associated notes

91

Chemical and Biological Technologies

In-Situ Chemical Oxidation & Reduction

In-Situ Chemical Oxidation (ITRC ISCO-2, 2005) & Reduction (ISCR) (ITRC IDSS-1, 2011)

- Reagent distribution is critical consideration
  - Distribution through transmissive secondary porosity rather than primary porosity or matrix storage domains
- Fracture orientation and density-driven flow
- Oxidant demand generally low (fracture surfaces)
- Long-lived oxidants diffusively penetrate rock
- NAPLs have much less interfacial surface area or trapped in less-transmissive fractures
- ZVI for permeable reactive barrier applications

No associated notes

92

Chemical and Biological Technologies Bioremediation and Monitored Natural Attenuation

- Also widely applied
- Reagent distribution challenges like ISCO & ISCR
- Consideration of microbial distribution between groundwater and primary porosity, and biofilms
- Ability of microbes to migrate into and survive within primary porosity is not well known

No associated notes

93

Combined Remedies

- Remedial paradigm has shifted to accept that combined remedies are almost always necessary
  - Emphasize strengths, minimize weaknesses
- Rock often requires development and/or modification of standard overburden approaches
- Spatial and/or temporal separation
- Requires careful designs to consider both positive and negative interactions between technologies
- The 21-Compartment Model may help develop and communicate combined remedy strategies

No associated notes

94

Bench and Field Pilot Test Considerations

- Bench and field pilot tests provide relevant data
  - Treatability, rock-chemistry interaction, reagent distribution, and overall effectiveness
- Relevant differences from overburden include:
  - Rock surface area exposed to groundwater, contaminants, and reagents is very different
    - Generally don't use crushed rock for bench tests.
  - Fracture-controlled groundwater flow can be much faster than in granular overburden

No associated notes

95

Remedy Selection
SRSNE Case Study Learning Objectives

Using this case study site as an example…

- See how hydraulic containment was modeled to support the remedial design for VOC-affected bedrock groundwater
- Understand the multiple lines of evidence that are used to confirm that the existing remedy is protective

96 **SRSNE Case Study - Remedy Selection**

Bedrock GW Remedy: 1 - Plume Containment

- Regional, 3-D flow model
- 20:1 bedrock anisotropy in plan view
- Capture zone confirmed by:
  - Hydraulic heads
  - Groundwater sampling results



Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

97

SRSNE Case Study Remedy Selection

Bedrock GW Remedy: 2 – Monitored Natural Attenuation

- MNA parameters monitored every 2 years at select wells inside and outside of capture zone
- VOC, 1,4-dioxane and tetrahydrofuran (THF) concentration trends and attenuation half-lives updated in annual MNA reports
  - Concentrations decreasing, even downgradient of bedrock DNAPL zone
- Quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) analysis demonstrated degraders present for CVOCs, BTEX, 1,4-dioxane and THF

No associated notes.

98

Today's Road Map – Connects to ITRC Guidance

- Identify similarities and differences between characterizing fractured rock and unconsolidated media sites. (Chapters 2 - 4)
- Recognize the skills, approaches, and tools available to characterize fractured rock sites and develop CSMs (Chapter 5)
- Apply improved approaches to develop Remedial Action Objective (RAOs) and select remedies (Chapter 6)
- **Describe development of a monitoring strategy for fractured rock sites (Chapter 7)**



No associated notes.

99

Monitoring: Objective

- Develop a groundwater monitoring strategy for your fractured rock site taking into account:
  - Results of the site characterization
  - Information needed to ensure that the selected remedial strategy attaining site-specific cleanup goals

No associated notes.

100

Monitoring: Types

- Compliance monitoring
  - Assess compliance with regulatory requirements and protection of human health and the environment
- Operational monitoring
  - Assess whether a remediation system is meeting or approaching its functional objectives
- Progress/Performance monitoring
  - Assess the effectiveness of a remedial in achieving functional objectives

No associated notes.

101

Media to Monitor

- Subsurface gas
  - Monitory migration and/or degradation of contaminants in the fractured rock
- Groundwater
  - Monitor concentrations of dissolved contaminants and water level elevation data are needed to monitor groundwater flow
- Surface water
  - Monitor groundwater discharge, surface water quality and impact to groundwater
- Aquifer matrix materials
  - Groundwater or subsurface vapor monitoring data are indicators of conditions in the aquifer matrix materials

No associated notes.

102

Monitoring: Network Design

- Characteristics of the rock type(s) at the site
  - Igneous, sedimentary, metamorphic
- Fracture network and bedding orientation and lateral extent
  - Need data from multiple wells
- Role of hydrogeochemical zoning
  - Minerals may release metals into solution and low pH
- Location of potential sensitive receptors
  - Monitoring must evaluate the potential for exposure to receptors
- Characteristics of other media
  - May provide insight into extent of fracture network

No associated notes.

103

Monitoring: Locations

Selection of monitoring locations is based on:

- Fracture network
  - Where are the most transmissive features and what is there orientation?
- Groundwater gradient and flow direction
  - Where is groundwater, and hence contaminants, flowing?
  - Is flow being refracted by the fracture network or is an equivalent porous media model acceptable?
- Geochemistry
  - Focus monitoring on fracture zones with site related contaminants.

No associated notes.

Monitoring: Locations

- Source zone wells
- Impacted zone wells
- Distal portions and boundaries of the area of impact
- Up gradient and cross gradient wells
- Sentinel wells

No associated notes.

105

Monitoring: Well Design Considerations



Courtesy John Dougherty

No associated notes.

106

Monitoring: Evaluating the Remedy

- USEPA guidance "Groundwater Remedy Completion Strategy. Moving Forward with an End in Mind" suggests four elements to an effective remedy evaluation
  1. Remedy operation
  2. Remedy progress toward groundwater RAOs and associated clean up levels
  3. Remedy attainment of RAOs and cleanup levels
  4. Other site factors

No associated notes.

107

Monitoring Strategy: Greenville Case Study

- Former Industrial Site in Greenville, South Carolina illustrates development of a remediation monitoring strategy
- Media to monitor
  - Groundwater and surface water
- Monitoring network design
  - Weathered rock zone grades into competent bedrock consisting of metamorphic gneiss with little matrix porosity
  - Fractures in the bedrock were predominantly sub-horizontal
  - Water-bearing fracture zones could be readily identified

No associated notes.

108

Monitoring Strategy: Greenville Case Study (Continued)

- Monitoring network design (cont'd)
  - 15 monitoring wells in the source area and 37 monitoring wells in the impacted zone and adjacent areas in saprolite and bedrock
  - Included upgradient, cross gradient, and sentinel wells
  - Wells installed upgradient and down gradient of ZVI barriers to monitor remedy progress
  - Additional cross gradient wells were installed to confirm the treatment area boundaries
  - Periodic surface water sampling is conducted down gradient \ of the impacted zone

No associated notes.

109

Monitoring Approach
SRSNE Case Study Learning Objectives

Using this case study site as an example…

- See how the monitoring network for this site was designed
- Recognize methods that can be used to reduce monitoring cost, while remaining protective
- Appreciate how historical data can be used to support reducing the monitoring frequency

No associated notes.

110

SRSNE Case Study Groundwater Monitoring Approach

- Bedrock monitoring wells installed in two general depth zones – screen depths based on core inspection, packer tests, and/or geophysical logs:
  - Shallow bedrock – top 30 feet of bedrock
  - Deep bedrock – 60 to 125 feet below top of rock
- Annual, sampling for VOCs (biennial for MNA parameters) at subset of monitoring wells
  - No-purge sampling at wells with higher concentrations reduced sampling cost by half relative to low-flow
- Comprehensive network sampled by low-flow every 5 years for VOCs and 1,4-dioxane
- Long-term sampling frequency is based on historical trend statistics, and frequency-scenario testing

No associated notes.

111

Historical TVOC Concentration Trends Example for 6 Wells



Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

112

Frequency Scenario Testing
Example for Same 6 Wells



Courtesy Michael Gefell

No associated notes.

113

Reducing Sampling Frequency

- Mann-Kendall, Sen's Slope and Linear Regression Trend Test Results (number of wells with trend at 90% C.I.)

Frequency	Decreasing	No Trend	Increasing
Semi-Annual	18-19	6-7	0
Biennial	15	10	0

- Regulator approved reduced sampling during RD/RA
  - 23% no sampling, water levels only
  - 52% every 5 years
  - 16% of wells annual
  - 3% biennial
  - 6% variable (in source zone – remediation monitoring)

No associated notes.

114

Overall Course Summary

Courtesy Dan Bryant

Dispelling the Fractured Rock Site Myth These Sites Really Can Be Cleaned Up!

No associated notes.

115

Today’s Road Map – Connects to ITRC Guidance

- Identify similarities and differences between characterizing fractured rock and unconsolidated media sites (**Chapters 2 - 4**)
- Recognize the skills, approaches, and tools available to characterize fractured rock sites and develop CSMs (**Chapter 5**)
- Apply improved approaches to develop Remedial Action Objective (RAOs) and select remedies (**Chapter 6**)
- Describe development of a monitoring strategy for fractured rock sites (**Chapter 7**)



No associated notes.

116

Use Tools Matrix for Characterization and Remedy Selection

- The tools matrix is a downloadable excel spreadsheet located in Appendix A
- Tools segregated into categories and subcategories, selected by subject matter experts
- A living resource intended to be updated periodically

Tool
Geophysics
Surface Geophysics
Downhole Testing
Hydraulic Testing
Single well tests
Cross Borehole Testing
Vapor and Soil Gas Sampling
Solid Media Sampling and Analysis Methods
Solid Media Sampling Methods
Solid Media Evaluation and Testing Methods
Direct Push Logging (In-Situ)
Discrete Groundwater Sampling & Profiling
Multilevel sampling
DNAPL Presence
Chemical Screening
Environmental Molecular Diagnostics
Microbial Diagnostics
Stable Isotope and Environmental Tracers
On-site Analytical

No associated notes.

117

Our Goal is to Grow Your Skills and Knowledge to:

- Use ITRC's Fractured Rock Document to guide your decision making so you can:
  - Develop quality Conceptual Site Models (CSMs) for fractured rock sites (based on the state of the science)
  - Set realistic remedial objectives
  - Select the best remedial options
  - Monitor remedial progress and assess results
- So your site teams can make confident and effective decisions ……going beyond containment and monitoring - - to actually remediating sites

No associated notes.

118

Thank You

Follow ITRC

- **2nd question and answer break**
- **Links to additional resources**
  - https://clu-in.org/conf/itrc/FracRx/resource.cfm
- **Feedback form – *please* complete**
  - https://clu-in.org/conf/itrc/FracRx/feedback.cfm

Poll Question

Need confirmation of your participation today?

Fill out the feedback form and check box for confirmation email and certificate.

Links to additional resources:
https://clu-in.org/conf/itrc/FracRx/resource.cfm

Your feedback is important – please fill out the form at:
https://clu-in.org/conf/itrc/FracRx/feedback.cfm

The benefits that ITRC offers to state regulators and technology developers, vendors, and consultants include:

✓Helping regulators build their knowledge base and raise their confidence about new environmental technologies

✓Helping regulators save time and money when evaluating environmental technologies

✓Guiding technology developers in the collection of performance data to satisfy the requirements of multiple states

✓Helping technology vendors avoid the time and expense of conducting duplicative and costly demonstrations

✓Providing a reliable network among members of the environmental community to focus on innovative environmental technologies

How you can get involved with ITRC:

✓Join an ITRC Team – with just 10% of your time you can have a positive impact on the regulatory process and acceptance of innovative technologies and approaches

✓Sponsor ITRC's technical team and other activities

✓Use ITRC products and attend training courses

✓Submit proposals for new technical teams and projects