Welcome to ITRC's Advanced Permeable Reactive Barrier Internet-Based Training

Advanced Techniques on Installation of Iron Based Permeable Reactive Barriers and Non-iron Based Barrier Treatment Material

Developed by:
ITRC's Permeable Reactive Barrier Team

Sponsored by ITRC, RTDF and the EPA Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation

www.itrcweb.org

1

This is the second training on Permeable Reactive Barrier Walls from the ITRC. It responds to student requests to provide additional detail and describe advancements in the science and engineering to design, install, maintain and monitor reactive barrier systems. This curriculum will train students using case studies to describe long-term performance of iron-based systems and design them according to the heterogeneities of the subsurface. Construction techniques for excavation and barrier wall emplacement have improved dramatically and careful attention to barrier design & construction is critical to long term performance monitoring. This training is designed for State and Federal regulators and the practicing consultants. Site owners and community stakeholders will find this new information interesting as well. The training does not focus on the basic science and engineering of barrier systems but does present information from industry and State regulators using up to date case studies to document the data.

This training also describes non-iron barrier systems, the material most commonly used and the mechanisms encouraging a reduction in contaminant concentrations with in the systems. Three documents created by the ITRC's Permeable Reactive Barrier Walls Technical Team and the Remediation Technologies Development Forum (RTDF) support the training materials: *"Regulatory Guidance for Permeable Barrier Walls Designed to Remediate Chlorinated Solvents", "Regulatory Guidance for Permeable Reactive Barriers Designed to Remediate Inorganic and Radionuclide Contamination" & "Design Guidance for Application of Permeable Barriers to Remediate Dissolved Chlorinated Solvents".* This presentation can be accessed at: http://www.clu-in.org/conf/itrc/advprb

Three ITRC PRB documents are available as supportive materials for this course at www.itrcweb.org and at: http://www.clu-in.org/conf/itrc/advprb/resource.htm

****

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

ITRC Course Moderator: Mary Yelken (myelken@earthlink.net)

EPA-OSRTI - Environmental Protection Agency - Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (www.clu-in.org)



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 more than 40 states (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 approaching 7,500 people from all aspects of 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.



Supporting ITRC documents (available at www.itrcweb.org or http://www.clu-in.org/conf/itrc/advprb/resource.htm)

*** "Design Guidance for Application of Permeable Barriers to Remediate Dissolved Chlorinated Solvents"

*** "Regulatory Guidance for Permeable Barrier Walls Designed to Remediate Chlorinated Solvents"

*** "Regulatory Guidance For Permeable Reactive Barriers Designed to Remediate Inorganic and Radionuclide Contamination"

Matthew Turner has a B.S. in Biology and a M.S. in Environmental Science. With 15 years experience in the environmental field, he is currently employed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection as a Case Manager in the Site Remediation Program. He is a member of the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Cooperation Workgroup where he has served as the leader of the Permeable Barrier Wall Subgroup since 1997. He is also a participant in the Remediation Technology Development Forum's Action Team on Permeable Reactive Barriers.

Arun Gavaskar is a Research Leader/Group Leader in the Environmental Restoration Department at Battelle, Columbus, Ohio. He has a background in chemical engineering and environmental technology, and has worked for thirteen years in the remediation and industrial pollution prevention areas. His current research interests include the remediation of a variety of groundwater, soil, and sediment contaminants, namely, DNAPL and dissolved-phase chlorinated solvents, heavy metals, and PCBs/dioxins. He also co-chaired the Second International Conference on Remediation of Chlorinated and Recalcitrant Compounds at Monterey, California in May 2000.

Scott D. Warner joined Geomatrix in August 1991 and currently serves as the Practice Area Leader for the Environmental Sciences and Engineering Practice of the Firm's Oakland, California office; he also serves on the Firm's Board of Directors. Mr. Warner has been practicing as a professional hydrogeologist and environmental consultant since January 1987.

Mr. Warner is an experienced hydrogeologist and environmental consultant whose practice has evolved from designing and performing highly quantitative hydrogeological characterization and analysis work for several radioactive waste repository assessment programs (including those in the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Sweden), to designing, implementing, and consulting on innovative *in situ* groundwater remediation technologies. Mr. Warner also has provided expert witness and litigation support services to the legal community and has been qualified in court as an expert in hydrogeology and groundwater remediation. Mr. Warner has developed a wide range of experience in assessing the fate and transport of key environmental contaminants including methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), perchlorate, arsenic and other metals, industrial solvents (including trichloroethylene and vinyl chloride) and a variety of xenobiotic compounds.

Mr. Warner has published widely (selected references are provided on the reverse) and has presented to professional, academic, government, and international audiences on innovative groundwater remediation methods. He served on both the Remediation Technologies Development Forum and Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (Permeable Reactive Barrier [PRB] subcommittees) and was a co-developer and instructor for EPA-supported national short courses on PRB technology.

Mr. Warner is the co-editor for the American Chemical Society Book *Chlorinated Solvent and DNAPL Remediation* which was published by Oxford University Press in January 2003.

Mike Duchene is a senior engineer at EnviroMetal Technologies Inc. (ETI) with more than 10 years consulting engineering experience in the environmental field. He received both his Bachelors of Applied Science and Masters of Applied Science in Civil Engineering from the University of Waterloo. He joined ETI in October 1999. Prior to joining ETI, Mike worked primarily as a design engineer and designed and operated several groundwater remediation systems. At ETI, his responsibilities include managing various engineering aspects of the design and installation of PRBs. Mike is primarily involved in assisting clients in the detailed design of PRBs including detailed assessments of groundwater hydraulics, assessment and specification of potential construction techniques, and construction QA/QC protocols. He is also involved in the development and evaluation of innovative construction methods and the interpretation of chemical and hydrogeological performance data for completed PRBs.



It is important that you know that this is a follow-on course to the first ITRC Permeable Reactive Barrier course.

We pointed out in the introduction to this course that you could and should access and review the archived version of the 1st course before taking this course. We hope to limit our questions to those relative to this advanced training.

Hydraulic Performance of Field PRBs "Lessons learned for future applications"

- Groundwater capture zone
  - **Ensuring that the barrier captures sufficient water**
  - **Ensuring that the barrier captures the targeted water**
- Residence time
  - **Ensuring that groundwater flowing through the barrier gets sufficient residence time for contaminant removal to target levels**

6

No Associated Notes

Variety of Hydrogeologic Characteristics of PRB Sites

Site	NAS Alameda	Dover AFB	Lowry AFB	Moffett Field	Seneca Army D
Aquifer Type	Unconfined	Unconfined	Unconfined	Semi-confined	Unconfined
Aquifer Material	Artificial Fill	Silty Sand	Silty Sand, Sand, Gravel	Sand Channel	Glacial Till
Aquitard Depth (ft)	20	40	17	25	10
Aquifer Conductivity (ft/d)	221	7.4	6.0	30	25
Aquifer Gradient (ft/ft)	0.007	0.0018	0.035	0.0007	0.01
Groundwater velocity (ft/d)	4.4	0.04	0.7	0.7	1.4

No Associated Notes

PRB at Lowry AFB (Denver, CO)
"Determining groundwater capture zone"

- **Funnel & gate design pilot-scale system**
- **Constructed in Nov. 1995**
- **Master Builders iron (45 tons)**
- **Funnel walls keyed into bedrock at 17 ft bgs**
- **Stream flowing on east side of barrier**

8

No Associated Notes



No Associated Notes

NAS Moffett Field

"Effect of aquifer heterogeneity on capture"



10

No Associated Notes

Asymmetric Capture Zone

"Aquifer with very low gradients"



No Associated Notes

Continuous Reactive Barrier at Seneca Army Depot

“Determining flow divide”



12

No Associated Notes

Dover AFB "Accounting for Seasonal Fluctuations in Groundwater Flow Direction"



13

No Associated Notes



14

PRB at NAS Moffett Field – Tracer Test

Residence time distribution and preferential pathways in the barrier medium

No Associated Notes

Optimizing the Hydraulic Performance of a PRB

- Conduct sufficient site characterization, especially on the local scale of the PRB location
  - Characterize and map geologic and plume heterogeneities
  - Model the whole range of hydraulic parameters at the site, not just the average values
  - Determine a range of groundwater flow velocities and directions
  - Determine a suitable location, orientation, and dimensions of the PRB
- Incorporate appropriate safety factors
  - For thickness and width of the PRB
- Use construction techniques that minimize smearing
  - E.g., Continuous trencher or biodegradable slurry

15

Water levels

Still the best method

Look at seasonal and historical water level maps

Selectively use groundwater probes, if unusually heterogeneous flow system

In-situ Hydrotechnics™ sensor

Down-hole heat pulse sensor

Colloidal borescope

Hydraulic Assessment Tools for Site Characterization and Design

- Water levels
  - **Still the best method**
  - **Look at seasonal and historical water level maps**
- Selectively use groundwater probes, if unusually heterogeneous flow system
  - **In-situ Hydrotechnics™ sensor**
  - **Down-hole heat pulse sensor**
  - **Colloidal borescope**
- Tracer Tests (good tool, but may be more expensive)

16

No Associated Notes



Field Investigation

- Groundwater analysis (influent and effluent)
- Geochemical modeling
- Iron core analysis
- Hydraulic monitoring (tracer test, flow sensors, hydraulic modeling)

Laboratory Investigation

- Long-term field performance simulation in columns
- Monitor change in degradation rates as iron ages
- Detailed analysis of corrosion compounds

Geochemical Modeling “Moffett Field





18

No Associated Notes

Change in Groundwater Species Concentrations within Moffett Field Barrier (mg/L)

	Na	K	Mg	Ca	HCO_3	Cl	NO_3	SO_4
Influent	35.5	2.1	66.9	165	412	42.2	2.0	333
Effluent	29.1	1.4	1.0	10.4	62	39.1	0.0	18.0
Change	6.4	0.7	65.9	155	350	3.1	2.0	315
% Change	18%	34%	98%	94%	85%	7%	100%	95%

19

No Associated Notes

Iron Core Sampling from NAS Moffett Field Barrier (looking for long-term changes that may affect iron performance)

20

No Associated Notes

SEM Image of Silt from Monitoring Wells in the Iron at Moffett Field (illustrates the types of precipitates that deposit in the barrier)

EDS Analysis

Element	Atom %
Ca	23.3
Mg	3.5
Al	1.9
Si	15.3
Fe	18.7
Ti	0.5
Mn	1.7
S	2.1
O	32.0

21

No Associated Notes



No Associated Notes



No Associated Notes

Geochemistry of a PRB
- *Implications for Longevity and Economics*

- PRBs have a finite reactive life. The iron may become dormant sometime in the future, unless rejuvenated or replaced in some way
- Predicting the longevity of a PRB depends partly on the accuracy of flow estimates (hydraulics)
- Colloidal flow and deposition in monitoring wells may be factors that mitigate precipitate buildup in reactive medium.
- Economic issue – will payback on the capital invested in the PRB occur before its reactivity is exhausted
  - Indications from several sites are that it will

24

No Associated Notes

Economic Analysis of PRB versus P&T System - Present Value (PV) is a method of discounting future costs to the present

Fairfield, NJ Site (See links @ end of seminar)		Dover AFB Site (Analysis done by Battelle)	
Discount Rate = 7%	PV (30 yrs)	Discount Rate = 3%	PV (30 yrs)
P&T System	$1.6 M	P&T System	$4.9 M
7 year PRB life	$1.3 M	5 year PRB life	$5.5 M
10 year PRB life	$1.2 M	10 year PRB life	$4.6 M
30 year PRB life	$1.1 M	20 year PRB life	$4.1 M
		30 year PRB life	$4.1 M

25

No Associated Notes



Excavation refers to methods where aquifer material is removed and replaced with the reactive material.

Injection methods involve the placement of the reactive media directly into the subsurface with no or minimal removal of aquifer material.

All construction methods have advantages and disadvantages. These are the primary factors to consider when evaluating the technical feasibility of the available construction methods.

Target zone refers to the depth interval where the PRB is to be installed (e.g. 50 to 80 ft bgs).

Excavation Methods for PRB Installation

Method	Depth	Installation Thickness	Number of Installations
Unsupported Excavation	< 25 ft	> 1 ft	3
Supported Excavation	< 25 ft	> 2 ft	5
Biopolymer Slurry Excavation	< 120 ft	> 1.5 ft	18
Continuous Trenching	< 25 ft	1-2 ft	12
Cofferdam (Sheet Pile)	< 30 ft	> 3 ft	14

* Iron PRB for VOC treatment only

27

Unsupported excavation can be used where formation will remain open without collapsing for long enough to place reactive media (e.g. dense tills, highly weathered bedrock). Unsupported excavation is the least expensive method.

Supported excavation uses some type of shoring system such as trench boxes or hydraulic shores to temporarily support the trench until the reactive material is placed.

Biopolymer slurry is used to temporarily support the excavation until the reactive material is placed.

Continuous trenching simultaneously excavates the soil and places the reactive material in one pass.

Cofferdam or sheet pile involves driving sheet pile around the perimeter of the PRB and excavating the material from within.

Biodegradable Slurry Construction

- Historically used as a drilling fluid and to support excavations for collection drains since 1980’s
- Most recent full-scale installations of iron for VOC treatment have involved the use of a biodegradable slurry



28

Biopolymer uses biodegradable slurry for excavation support

Vertical hydrofracturing and jetting use biodegradable slurry to suspend the iron to allow it to be pumped.

“Supported” is excavation using either a trench box or hydraulic shoring for support.

Biodegradable Slurry For Excavation Support

- Guar Gum (Galactomannan)
  - Most commonly used biodegradable slurry
  - Powder milled from specially grown beans
  - Long chain carbohydrate
  - Forms a viscous solution in water
- Biodegradable Slurry Preparation for Excavation Support
  - Guar gum powder
  - Biostat preservative
  - pH Adjustment (soda ash)
- Procedure
  - Slurry is pumped into trench as excavation proceeds
  - Granular iron placed through slurry
  - Enzyme breaker added after backfill

29

No Associated Notes



Results from column tests. Residence time is residence time in bench-scale column. "Iron and BP" is an iron column that was saturated with biodegradable slurry then broken with enzyme breaker. "Iron" is an iron column without biodegradable slurry. "Iron from pilot" is iron collected in cores from a pilot installation completed with biodegradable slurry and packed into a laboratory column. All tests were completed at 10 deg. C.

Conclusion: Short-term negative effects of biodegradable slurry on VOC degradation rates observed in original laboratory test were not observed in the column test of material from the field core.

See: Focht. R.M., Vogan, J.L. and Krug, T.A. "Biopolymer Construction Techniques for Installation of Permeable Reactive Barriers Containing Granular Iron for Groundwater Remediation" presented at the Division of Environmental Chemistry, American Chemical Society, San Diego, CA April 1-5, 2001

Somersworth Pilot Test Monitoring Results - 3 Months

Parameter	Upgradient	Distance into Iron-Sand Zone		Downgradient
		25 cm	50 cm	
PCE (µg/L)	130	<5	<5	7
TCE (µg/L)	220	<5	<5	44
cDCE (µg/L)	120	<5	<5	170
VC (µg/L)	27	<5	<2	<2
ORP (mV)	-143	-457	-522	-185
pH	6.4	9.0	9.7	6.5
TOC (mg/L)	7	59	63	12
PLFA (cells/mL)	$10^{4.8}$	$10^{5.7}$	$10^{5.1}$	$10^{4.9}$

Source: GeoSyntec Consultants

31

Complete degradation of VOCs in PRB

Increase in pH and decrease in ORP as expected

Increase in TOC attributed to broken down guar gum remaining within PRB

Biodegradable Slurry Use for Excavation Support

Date	Site	Contaminant	Media
May 1997	Vancouver, BC (pilot)	Heavy Metals	Compost
Nov 1997	Y12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN (pilot)	Metals	Granular Iron
Aug 1999	Pease AFB, NH	VOCs	Granular Iron
Oct 1999	Industrial Site, Seattle, WA	VOCs	Granular Iron
Nov 1999	Somersworth Landfill, NH (pilot)	VOCs	Granular Iron
Jun 2000	Pease AFB, NH	VOCs	Granular Iron
Jul 2000	Somersworth Landfill, NH	VOCs	Granular Iron
Aug 2000	Lake City AAP, MO	VOCs	Granular Iron
Dec 2000	Industrial Facility, Los Angeles, CA	VOCs	Granular Iron
Mar 2001	Vancouver, BC	Heavy Metals	Compost/Iron
2001 -2003	11 sites	VOCs	Granular Iron

32

No Associated Notes



Guar gum in powered form is mixed with water in a slurry mixer.

Soda ash is added to adjust pH to between 9 and 10 and a biostat is added to slow the natural biodegradation of the guar gum.

Viscosity of the guar gum is measured with a Marsh Funnel.

Guar gum is pumped into the trench as excavation proceeds to maintain a hydraulic head on the trench.

Excavation with Biodegradable Slurry Support

Excavation

Modified Tremie

34

Biodegradable slurry level is maintained above groundwater table to provide hydraulic head on trench.

Biodegradable slurry in trench spoils is allowed to drain back into excavation.

Granular iron or iron sand mixture will not “flow” through tremie into backfill.

Tremie pipe is maintained a short distance above the backfilled material to minimize drop through biodegradable slurry.



Enzyme breaker is added to trench surface, into extraction wells, and/or through injection points or other wells.

Water is extracted and discharged to trench surface or re-injected through wells.

QA/QC for Excavated PRBs

- Construction
  - **Depth, length, flow-through thickness**
  - **Backfill composition**
  - **Amount of backfill placed**
- Development/Breaking
  - **Viscosity of recirc water**
  - **TOC in PRB**
- Long-Term
  - **Gradient across PRB**
  - **Permeability**

36

•depth measured with weighted tape

•Confining unit confirmed with borehole information, excavator effort, samples from unit and/or geophysical methods

•Minimum width set by width of excavator bucket

•Bulk weight of sand and iron mixed in a batch used to determine percent iron. Magnetic separation test used to confirm uniform mixture.

•Samples collected in situ tested with magnetic separation test

•Viscosity of water extracted during bioslurry breaking decreases as guar gum breaks

•TOC indicates presence of guar gum but not how much it has broken

•Hydraulic gradient will indicate if the permeability of the PRB is reduced

•Permeability of backfill can be assessed with slug tests.

Excavation Methods for PRB Installation

- Advantages
  - **Good QA/QC on placement**
  - **Ability to install well in PRB**
- Disadvantages
  - **Soil disposal**
  - **Disruption to site**
  - **Depth limitation**
  - **Minimum flow-through thickness**

37

Good QA/QC on placement location (e.g. depth, length, width)

Able to QA/QC backfill (reactive media)

Able to monitor groundwater in PRB due to flow-through thickness of PRB

Disadvantages

Excavated soil requires disposal

Disruption to site activities

Depth limitation

Large flow-through thickness may not be required at some sites

Example of Construction Costs

	Construction	Iron	Total
Backhoe Construction, OH 1999 • 8 ppm TCE • 20 ft deep, 200 ft long • v = 0.01 ft/day	$36,000	$28,000	$64,000
BioPolymer Trench, NH 1999 • 10 ppm cDCE; 5 ppm TCE; 1 ppm VC • 33 ft deep, 150 ft long • v = 0.3 ft/day	$200,000	$130,000	$330,000
Trench Box, WY 1999 • 21 ppm TCE; <1 ppm cDCE, < 1 ppm VC • 23 ft deep, 565 ft long • v = 1.3 ft/day	$1,400,000	$600,000	$2,000,000

38

No Associated Notes

Injection Methods for PRB Installation

Method	Depth	Installation Thickness	Number of Installations
Vertical Hydrofracturing	30 – 200 ft	< 0.5 ft	7
Jetting - Columnar	> 200 ft	< 0.5 ft	2
Jetting – Panels, Diaphragms	> 200 ft	< 0.25 ft	1

Installation of Iron PRBs for VOC Treatment Only

39

Biodegradable Slurry for Jetting Applications

Biodegradable Slurry for Jetting

- Guar Gum
- Enzyme Breaker
- Granular Iron (typically finer grained)

Slurry for jetting (prior to adding iron)

Biodegradable Slurry for Vertical Hydrofracturing

- Proprietary Mixture
  (HPG, Cross-Linker,
  Enzyme Breaker,
  Fine grained granular iron)

Cross linked guar with iron

40

For jetting applications, the biodegradable slurry is used to suspend the granular iron to allow it to be pumped. The enzyme breaker is added prior to injection as the slurry only needs to be viscous for a short time until the granular iron is jetted into place.

For vertical hydrofracturing, the guar gum is cross-linked to form a very viscous gel which allows the fracture to propagate.



-boreholes installed along PRB alignment

-Specialized frac casing is grouted into borehole

-Controlled vertical fracture is initiated at the required azimuth orientation and depth

-Iron is blended with hydroxypropylguar (HPG)

-Injection at multiple well heads to form continuous PRB

QA/QC for Injected PRBs

- Depths, length
- Mass of media injected
- Spoils volume and composition
- Induced earth tilts
- Geophysics
- Hydraulic gradient
- Hydraulic pulse interference test
- Cores from angle drilling



Hydraulic Pulse Interference Test
Source: GeoSierra

42

•Confining unit confirmed with borehole information (before or during placement), injection tool advancement, and/or geophysical methods

•Density of injection mixture and flow rate are used to determine mass of granular iron injected.

•Alternatively the reactive material is injected in batches to track quantity injected.

•Columnar jetting results in some spoils at the ground surface. These spoils will contain some fraction of granular iron.

•Geophysical methods include active resistively monitoring

•Hydraulic gradient will indicate if the permeability of the PRB is reduced

•Permeability of PRB can be assessed with hydraulic pulse interference testing

Injection Methods for PRB Installation

- Advantages
  - **Depth**
  - **Target Vertical Zones**
  - **Thinner PRBs**
  - **No or minimal soil disposal**
  - **Smaller equipment**
- Disadvantages
  - **Difficult to QA/QC on placement**
  - **Potential for mixing reactive material**

43

No Associated Notes

Question & Answers



Oregon Graduate Institute and New Mexico Tech

44

No Associated Notes

Performance Monitoring

- Focus on the PRB system rather than the entire site
- Ensure operation of wall as designed
- Detect changes in performance
- Evaluation of physical, chemical and geochemical parameters over time
- Sampling frequency typically quarterly for the routine parameters
- Contingency sampling program necessary for unexpected conditions

45

No Associated Notes

Performance Monitoring Issues

- Contaminant degradation and byproduct formation
- Hydraulic capture of the system
- Geochemistry and precipitate formation
- Loss of reactivity

46

Sampling Procedures

Passive sampling method for collection of groundwater samples

Collection of representative samples where the retention time within the reactive media is not altered

Smaller diameter wells are preferred (3/4 in.) with short screens

Passive Sampling Methods

Low Flow Sampling

Diffusion Sampler (ITRCweb.org)

In-situ Probes

Performance Indicator Parameters

- Can provide some measure of system performance
  - pH
  - DO
  - Eh/Redox
  - Alkalinity
  - Ferrous iron
  - Hydrogen

47

No Associated Notes

Inorganic Analysis

- Parameters which decrease through PRB indicating mineral precipitation
  - Alkalinity
  - Ca
  - Mg
  - Si
  - SO_4
  - NO_3
- Relatively Conservative Parameters
  - Na
  - K
  - Cl

48

No Associated Notes

Typical Inorganic Geochemistry
"New Jersey Site Data"

Source: Rockwell Automation/TRC Vectre, 2000 Diagram

Parameter (mg/L)	Upgradient	Iron PRB
Iron	32	0.8
Calcium	61	10
Magnesium	18	13
Sulphate	23	5
Alkalinity	197	77
TDS	336	184
pH	7.4	9.2
Eh (mV)	-205	-377

enviro**metal** technologies inc.

49

No Associated Notes

Hydraulic Evaluation

- Head Measurements
- Velocity Probes
- Tracer Tests
- Pump Tests

50

No Associated Notes

Velocity Probes

- HydroTechniques
  - Thermal perturbation technique
  - Measures the 3-D groundwater flow
- Colloidal Borescope
  - Visual means of observing colloids

51

No Associated Notes

PRB Cored

Lowry, Moffet, Elizabeth City ORNL, New York & Australia Sites

- Carbonates observed in cores predominate @ upgradient interface
- Porosity loss estimated from carbonate content, thickness of surface coatings
- Maximum porosity loss measured in the field is 12% of original (i.e., a drop from 0.55 to 0.5) in two years
- Usually only a few percent porosity loss reported

52

Since recent data suggests this carbonate precipitation will move as a front through the iron as opposed to the initial concept that the carbonate precipitates will continue to form on the upgradient face until the PRB was plugged

ORNL has abundant Fe Oxide at the interface (High Nitrate & dissolved oxygen in the groundwater,

Analysis Methods for Cores

Scanning Electron Microscope

FTIR Spectroscopy

X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy

Raman Spectroscopy

Optical Microscope

Wet Chemistry Extractions

Total Carbon Analysis

Long Term Performance Data

- Organic
  - consistent performance with respect to VOC degradation rates
  - no evidence of microbial fouling under flowing conditions
- Inorganic
  - carbonate precipitation initially occurs at upgradient interface
  - accumulation of precipitates over time may cause loss of porosity / permeability losses
  - no evidence of hydraulic fouling due to precipitates

Longevity issues must be evaluated on a site specific basis

53

No Associated Notes



No Associated Notes

Monitoring Program - Commercial Site

- Sunnyvale PRB - Installed Nov. 1994
  - 1995-1997 Quarterly Monitoring - WL and Analytes
    - Low-flow sampling, flow-cell for DO, Redox, pH
    - 1997 - Inorganic analyses, gases, cell counts
  - 1998-2001 - Quarterly WL, Semi-annual Analytes
    - 1999 Inorganic analyses, down-hole probe (pH, redox)
  - 2000 - 5 Year Performance Evaluation
    - Hydrogen sampling, Passive Bag sampling pilot test
  - 2001 - Passive Bag sampling approved for full-time use

55

No Associated Notes

Alternative Treatment Materials for PRBs:
"Treatment Mechanisms"

- Chemical dehalogenation
- pH control
- Reduction-oxidation reactions (Redox)
- Sorption reactions (including ion exchange)
- Biological enhancement
- Sequential treatment

56

No Associated Notes

Reactive Media Selection Guidance

Treatment Material and Treatable Contaminants		
Treatment Material	**Target Contaminants**	**Status**
Zero-Valent Iron	Halocarbons, Reducible metals	In Practice
Reduced Metals	Halocarbons, Reducible Metals	Field Demonstration
Metals Couples	Halocarbons	Field Demonstration
Limestone	Metals, Acid Water	In Practice
Soptive Agents	Metals, Organics	Field Demonstration, In Practice
Reducing Agents	Reducible Metals, Organics	Field Demonstration, In Practice
Biological Electron Acceptors	Petroleum Hydrocarbons	In Practice, Field Demo

57

No Associated Notes

Non-metallic Treatment Materials

- pH control
  - **limestone, compost, organic material**
- Precipitation Agents
  - **gypsum, hydroxyapatite, organic compost, limestone**
- Sorptive agents
  - **GAC, bone char, phosphatics, zeolites, coal, peat, synthetic resins, organic compost**
- Reducing agents
  - **organic compost, sodium dithionite, hydrogen sulfide, bacterial agents, acetate, carbohydrates, molasses**
- Biological enhancements
  - **oxygen source, hydrogen source, carbon source, nitrate**

58

No Associated Notes

Chemical Precipitation—pH Control

- Metal solubility as a function of pH



59

No Associated Notes



No Associated Notes

Sorption Reactions

- Three types of reactions
  - **Hydrophobic**
  - **Hydrophilic**
  - **Ion Exchange**
- Chemicals sorb by:
  - **diffusion, adhesion, electrical attraction**
- Chemicals desorb by:
  - **diffusion, displacement by molecular affinity**

61

No Associated Notes

Sorption Reactions

- Sorption of Organics - good for:
  - **low water solubility compounds**
  - **hydrophobic compounds**
  - **not readily biodegraded compounds**
- Example materials
  - **GAC, peat, coal, organic-shale, zeolites**

62

No Associated Notes

Sorption Reactions

- Sorption of Inorganics - good for:
  - **metals**
    - **affinity on carbon Pb>Cu>Ni>Zn=Mn=Cd=Co**
  - **hydrophilic and ion exchange reactions**
- Example materials
  - **organic carbon, zeolites, clays, oxyhydroxides**

63

No Associated Notes

Biological PRB Media

- Added Terminal Electron Acceptor
  - **Aerobic - reduced contaminants (BTEX-MtBE)**
    - **O_2 most common e- acceptor**
    - **MgO_2, CaO_2**
  - **Anaerobic – oxidized contaminants (PCE)**
    - **nitrate, ferric iron, sulfate, e- acceptor**
- Added Co-substrate
  - **Vanilla – PCP**
- Bioaugmentation
  - **Add bacteria (MtBE)**

64

No Associated Notes

Sequential Treatment Design

- Use of two or more processes in sequence
  - treat a mixed plume
  - to increase effectiveness of principal treatment
  - polish treatment train
  - increase longevity of principal treatment

65

No Associated Notes

Sequential Treatment Design Issues

- Considerations
  - competing processes e.g. oxidizing v. reducing
    - sulfate competition
  - pH influences
  - interfering mineralization / biofouling
- Hydraulics
- Implementation

66

No Associated Notes

Question & Answers



Oregon Graduate Institute and New Mexico Tech

67

No Associated Notes

Links to additional resources: http://www.clu-in.org/conf/itrc/advprb/resource.htm

Your feedback is important – please fill out the form at: http://www.clu-in.org/conf/itrc/advprb/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 in ITRC:**

•Join a team – with just 10% of your time you can have a positive impact on the regulatory process

•Sponsor ITRC's technical teams and other activities

•Be an official state member by appointing a POC (Point of Contact) to the State Engagement Team

•Use our products and attend our training courses

•Submit proposals for new technical teams and projects

•Be part of our annual conference where you can learn the most up-to-date information about regulatory issues surrounding innovative technologies