

Environmental Geophysics Applied to Site Characterization, Plume Mapping, and Remediation Monitoring

Dale Werkema, Ph.D. Research Geophysicist ORD, NHEERL, WED, PCEB

werkema.d@epa.gov



Why geophysics?

- Prior to expensive and invasive surgery we utilize medical imaging.
- Each medical imaging method is used for specific purposes.



x-ray of knee



MRI of knee

images credit: Lee Slater

- Prior to expensive earth intrusive investigations (e.g., drilling, excavating, etc.) we can utilize geophysical imaging.
- Each geophysical method is used for specific purposes





Abandoned well mapping





- Locating subsurface objects and infrastructure
- Plume detection and monitoring
- High resolution characterization and Conceptual Site Model (CSM) Development
- GW/SW Interactions
- Online resources

Geophysical methods include a set of tools in the site investigator's tool box.



Finding USTs & subsurface

infrastructure



- What are the physical properties of the target, i.e. UST and associated infrastructure?
 - metal?, ferrous metal? fiberglass?
- Any potential interference?

Likely applicable geophysical methods:

- 1. Magnetic
- 2. Electromagnetic
- 3. Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR)



Geonics EM-31



Geometrics G-858 Cesium vapor magnetometer



Geophex GEM2



Mala GPR system

Finding USTs & subsurface infrastructure









Finding USTs & subsurface infrastructure











Geonics EM-31

Finding USTs & subsurface infrastructure



Ground Penetration Radar (GPR) UST and utility examples

500 MHz antenna



400 MHz antenna





GSSI antenna

- pipes oriented perpendicular to the profile.
- Darker reflections show higher amplitude due to greater electrical property impedance.
- Faint reflections show muted or low amplitude reflections due to the attenuation of the GPR energy from electrically conductive material.

Note: <u>Hyperbolic</u> Reflections

GPR sections from Bill Sauck

Mapping contaminant plumes



Direct Current (DC) Resistivity



 ρ_e = a ϕ^{-m} S⁻ⁿ ρ_w

 $\label{eq:resistivity} \begin{array}{l} \rho_{e} = \text{resistivity of the earth} \\ \varphi = \text{fractional pore volume (porosity)} \\ \textbf{S} = \text{fraction of the pores containing fluid} \\ \rho_{w} = \text{the resistivity of the fluid} \\ \textbf{n}, \textbf{a} \text{ and m are empirical constants} \end{array}$









<u>Deep Water Horizon (DWH) ,</u> <u>Grand Terre, LA.</u>

- Uninhabited barrier island impacted by Deepwater Horizon oil spill
- No anthropogenic noise makes it ideal to study the long term fate of the oil contamination
- Oil contamination is located 40-60 cm below the surface and is bounded by sand





Heenan, J., Slater, L.D., Ntarlagiannis, D., Atekwana, E.A., Fathepure, B.Z., Dalvai, S., Ross, C., Werkema, D.D., and Atekwana, E.A., *Geophysics*, 2014



Microcosm experiments using site samples shows rapid and dynamic hydrocarbon degradation





Adaptation of field resistivity system to remote solar power acquisition



Heenan, J., Slater, L.D., Ntarlagiannis, D., Atekwana, E.A., Fathepure, B.Z., Dalvai, S., Ross, C., Werkema, D.D., and Atekwana, E.A., Geophysics, 2014

NonAqueous Phase Liquid (NAPL) DC

resistivity response

1.6

De Ryck et al., 1993



Controlled Kerosene Spill Conductivity (mS/m) 0.00 1.00 2.00 3.00 4.00 5.00 6.00 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 **Depth** (m) -0L 0.8 100L 200L 1 <mark>⊁</mark> 343∟ 1.2 L of Injected 1.4 Kerosene

Decreasing conductivity

Hydrocarbons are Electrically Resistive (initially)

ARCHIE'S LAW (1942):

$$\rho_{e}$$
 = a ϕ^{-m} S⁻ⁿ ρ_{w}

- $\rho_{\text{e}}\,$ = resistivity of the earth
- S = fraction of the pores containing fluid
- ρ_w = the resistivity of the fluid n, a and m are constants

Field Site: Bulk Conductivity Profiles in-situ

resistivity probes



fermenters

Werkema Jr., D.D., Atekwana. E.A., Endres, A., Sauck, W.A. and Cassidy. D.P., Geophysical Research Letters, 2003

DC Resistivity of mature LNAPL plume

Environmental Protection % change conductivity contaminated - clean Agency 100 200 300 400 -100 0 100 200 300 400 -100 0 142% 10 No LNAPL 200 200 Free LNAPL -Lab •-Field 227.0 CB ↑ 25<u>0%</u> 160 Ca²⁺ mg/L 20 epth Ù 226.5 E DIC mg (120 ↑ 120% evation 30 226.0 80 80 ₄₀↑ 1<u>7</u>5% 40 225.5 40 wt range Λ Lab Field Lab Field 225.0 50 % change of Ca²⁺ and DIC 224.5 clean 60 contaminated 224.0 No LNAPL Bacteroidetes ed 70 Residual LNAPL Bacilli Clostridia Free LNAPL Dissolved LNAPL Bacilli Aquitard – Clay α-proteobacteria Unit 16S rRNA gene community composition



Geophysical response is coincident with microbiology and geochemical changes

Werkema Jr., D.D., Atekwana. E.A., Endres, A., Sauck, W.A. and Cassidy. D.P., Geophysical Research Letters, 2003



Induced Polarization (IP) and **Spectral Induced Polarization (SIP)**

<u>SIP (frequency domain):</u>

Real or In-phase: $(\sigma' = |\sigma| \cos \phi)$

- fluid chemistry, electrolytic conduction, and interfacial component

Imaginary, out-of-phase, or quadrature (σ " = $|\sigma| \sin \phi$) • physicochemical properties at fluid-grain interface

- surface charge density, ionic mobility,
- surface area, and
- tortousity



Grair

Time (s)

Chargeability = $M = \frac{1}{V} \int V(t) dt$

Grain

 $E \neq 0$



Slide credit: Lee Slater

IP (time domain):



Abdel Aal, G. Z., Atekwana, E. A., Rossbach, S., and Werkema Jr., D.D., Journal of Geophysical Research, 2010



Relationship of Chlorinated Solvent (CS) abiotic degradation rates and Magnetic Susceptibility



- CS abiotic degradation rates in saturated soil vs. Magnetic Susceptibility
- Wilson has suggested that MS should be measured at all chlorinated solvent sites to identify abiotic degradation rates. (Wilson, PM, 2013)



Magnetic Susceptibility (MS) at Bemidji, MN

Atekwana, Mewafy, Abdel Aal, Werkema, Revil and Slater, Journal of Geophysical Research, 2014

9020 . susceptibility correlation

Distance in 10 meters

from 421A

Magnetic Property Enhancement





Microbial Growth & Metabolism in Porous Media



Microbes + Organic Carbon + Nutrients + Mineral Substrate

Production of Biomass

Microbial Cells Extracellular Polysaccharides (EPS) Biofilms Proteinaceous Appendages

Generation of Metabolic Byproducts

Organic Acids Biogenic Gases Biosurfactants

Microbial-Mediated Electrochemical Processes

Redox Reactions Biomineralization

Can Lead to Physical/Chemical Changes...

Porosity/Permeability Surface Area/Roughness Pore Throat Geometry Tortuosity Changes in Pore Fluid Chemistry Enhanced Mineral Dissolution Increased Porosity/Permeability Increased Pore Pressure Changes in Wettability Reduced Species Redox Gradients Enhanced Mineral Precipitation

Changes in Petrophysical Properties

Electrical Resistivity, Induced Polarization, Spontaneous Potential, Seismic, GPR, Magnetic Susceptibility

Slide credit: Estella Atekwana



Biogeophysics

"The geophysical investigation of microbial processes/interactions in the earth"

- Geophysical methods to detect/monitor microbial activity & their by-products or presence in the subsurface
- Optimization of remediation programs
- Assess redox transformations and biogeochemical cycling of elements
- Guide microbial sampling in biogeochemical hot zones

Atekwana and Slater, 2009, Biogeophysics: A new frontier in Earth science research: Rev. Geophys., 47, RG4004, doi:10.1029/2009RG000285





Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) monitoring using Self-Potential (SP)

Former fire training facility, Oscoda, Michigan

Large quantities of fuel were burned.

1990s, the free product 0.3 m thick and > 200 m down gradient



Vukenkeng C.A., Atekwana Estella.A., Atekwana, Eliot, A., Sauck, W.A., Werkema Jr., D.D., Geophysics, vol. 74, 2009



GPR Response to SVE System





Landfill investigations using Induced Polarization (IP)





- · Air and water injected to enhance microbial activity
- Flows adjusted to maintain optimum temperatures

25

Slide credit: Norm Carlson

<u>Conceptual model illustrating the temporal</u> <u>behavior of bulk electrical conductivity due</u> <u>to natural attenuation (biodegradation)</u>

Atekwana E.A., Atekwana E.A., Werkema Jr., D.D., Allen, J.P., Smart, L.A., Duris, J.W., Cassidy, D.P., Sauck, W.A., and Rossbach. S., 2004

Electrical Resistance Tomography (ERT) Imaging

15

30

IP for lithologic imaging

- Sensitivity of IP to surface area makes it well-suited for imaging lithology
- Lithologic boundaries are sharper in the imaginary response

High Resolution CSM development

GPR detection and mapping of animal burrows

Cutter ant burrow GPR image with 100 MHz antenna

A) the transition from sandy to clay-rich soils (vertical line) and inactive cutter ant burrows (rectangle).

B) zoomed-in view of the inactive cutter ant burrows from 180E to 240E.

C) Zoom in from 210 to 240

B) & C) Hyperbolic reflections related to the burrow system are traced in bold.

The relative permittivity is estimated at 5 for all profiles in this figure, indicating a velocity of 0.13 m/ns.

Sherrod, L., Sauck, W., Simpson, E., Werkema, D., Swiontek, J., Case histories of GPR for animal burrows mapping and geometry, Journal of Environmental and Engineering Geophysics, In press, 2018

High Resolution CSM development

Groundhog burrow GPR image depicting the entrance shaft, tunnel, ramp, and chamber imaged with the 400 MHz antenna and the 900 MHz antenna.

Manual picks chosen for the identification of the groundhog burrow system through hyperbolic reflections in the 400 MHz data.

Sherrod, L., Sauck, W., Simpson, E., Werkema, D., Swiontek, J., Case histories of GPR for animal burrows mapping and geometry, Journal of Environmental and Engineering Geophysics, In press, 2018

FO-DTS: Fiber-Optic Distributed Temperature Sensor Technology

Optical Time Domain Reflectometry - OTDR

- A narrow laser pulse is sent into the fiber and the backscattered light is detected and analyzed by the system
- The time it takes the backscattered light to return to the detection unit is used to determine the location of the temperature event.
- This is completed along the length of the cable enabling the generation of temperature profiles
- Diurnal variability is removed

Control Unit:

AC 115V house power 30-40 W on average, peak ~70 W. Run from laptop

Groundwater – surface water interactions

Fiber Optic Distributed Temperature System (FoDTS)

Recent advances in UAV-based infrared

*temperature is uncalibrated, bank and nearshore whiter areas indicate colder groundwater seepage

Handheld FLIR

image compiled by C. Holmquist-Johnson, preliminary (not reviewed)

UAV photogrammetry for topography; e.g. Pix4D

Slide images credit Marty Briggs

Stream Electromagnetic Induction

Moab, UT

EMI allows the characterization of many km/day over land and shallow water

Slide credit: Marty Briggs

Environmental Geophysics web presence: tech transfer, assistance, guidance, and decision support tools

Environmental Geophysics explores the physics of the earth related to environmental problems. This site includes technical scientific content, decision support tools, predictive models, and data interpretation models to facilitate the proper use, application, and interpretation of geophysics to environmental problems.

About

- Overview
- Geophysical Methods
- Applications

Tools

- Decision support
- Forward models
- Inverse models

Related Links

- Professional societies
- Journals
- Equipment
- Other Feds
- <u>Universities</u>

Publications and Research

Resources

- EPA publications
- Ongoing research

- Surface Methods
- Borehole Methods
- Marine Methods
- Geophysical Properties
- Inversion
- <u>Terms</u>
- References

Once finalized this will be found at:

www.epa.gov/environmental-geophysics

Models & Decision Support

Environmental Geophysics

		~	~	~	~
CONTACT US	SHARE	(f)	(🕑)	(\mathbf{P})	(🖂)

Geophysical Methods Borehole Geophysical

Home

Borehole Geophysical Methods

Marine Geophysical Methods

Surface Geophysical Methods

Electrical Methods

Electromagnetic Methods

Nuclear Methods

Potential Field Methods

Seismic Methods

Inversion

Geophysical Properties

Density

Electrical Conductivity and Resistivity

Geomechanical (Engineering) Properties

Magnetic Susceptibility

Porosity

Reflectivity

Seismic Velocities (VS,VP)

Surface Geophysical Methods

This section covers most of the commonly used surface geophysical methods.

- <u>Electrical Methods</u>
 - Equipotential and Mise-a-la-Messe Methods
 - Induced Polarization
 - <u>Resistivity Methods</u>
 - Self-Potential (SP) Method
- <u>Electromagnetic Methods</u>
- <u>Nuclear Methods</u>
- Potential Field Methods
- <u>Seismic Methods</u>

Contact Us to ask a question, provide feedback, or report a problem.

electrical tomography and cross-o

View HTML Pop

368-377, 2003.

Save as HTML ...

Keywords Input Summary

What are the anticipated near surface geologic conditions? INSTRUCTIONS DATA INPUT RESULTS Unknown What is the type of land surface at the site? Competent Bedrock INSTRUCTIONS RESULTS DATA INPUT Rural: general rural land surface Fractured/ Weathered Bedrock Suburban: 3 or more houses per acre What is the objective of your geophysical Alluvial / Unconsolidated Sediment project? Urban: high density city High Clay Content Unconsolidated Sediment Map and Locate Anthropogenic Objects Industrial: warehouse, manufacturing, retail, etc. Peat / Organic Sediment Subsurface Contaminant Plume Detection Active Military Base Monitor Remediation Efforts Metada Service station: automobile service station Landfill Investigation Notes Surface water body CSM (Conceptual Site Model) Development Method Inside a building Citatio A., "Geophysical Investigation of Vadoze Zone n the Application of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental Problems, 2001. Keywords Keywords: clay, conductivity, contamination, electromagnetic, GPR, ground penetrating radar, hydrocarbon, hydrocarbons, LNAPL, magnetic, monitoring, permeability, phase, resistivity, resolution, sand, vadose zone Abdel Aal, Gamal Z., Slater, Lee D., and Atekwana, Estella A., "Induced-polarization measurements on unconsolidated sediments from conductivity a site of active hydrocarbon biodegradation", Geophysics, Vol. 71, No. 2, pp. H13-H24, 2006/3. Keywords: conductivity, contamination, experiments, field, geochemistry, hydrocarbons, induced polarization, IP, microorganisms, organic electrical conductivity compounds, phase, scanning electron microscopy, soil pollution, water content electrical resistivity Waxman, M.H., and Smits, L.J.M., "Electrical conductivities in oil-bearing shaly sands", Soc. Pet. Eng, Vol. Trans. AIME 243, pp. 107-122, 1968. electromagnetic Keywords: conductivity, electrical, electrical conductivity, ELECTRICAL-CONDUCTIVITY, sand, shaly sands seismic Abdu,H., Robinson,D.A., Seyfried,M., and Jones,S.B., "Geophysical imaging of watershed subsurface patterns and prediction of soil texture and water holding capacit Methods Keywords: clay, electromagnetic, electro Acworth, R.I., "Physical and chem (3) Surface Geophysical Methods > Electromagnetic Methods > Time-Domain Electromagnetic Methods Geology and Hydrogeology, Vol. 3 Keywords: chemical analysis, chlorina hydrochemistry, resistivity, sand, soil (3) Surface Geophysical Methods >> Electromagnetic Methods >> Frequency Domain Electromagnetic Methods >> Terrain Conductivity Method Acworth, R.I., and Dasey, G.R., "Ma

- (3) Surface Geophysical Methods > Electrical Methods > Resistivity Methods
 - (3) Surface Geophysical Methods > Electrical Methods > Equipotential and Mise-a-la-Messe Methods
 - (2) Surface Geophysical Methods > Electromagnetic Methods > Ground-Penetrating Radar
 - (2) Surface Geophysical Methods > Electromagnetic Methods > Frequency Domain Electromagnetic Methods
 - (2) Surface Geophysical Methods > Electrical Methods > Self-Potential (SP) Method
 - (1) Warnings and Special Considerations >> Survey When Dry

https://clu-in.org/characterization/technologies/geophysics/

Werkema Jr., D.D., Jackson, M., and Glaser, D., EPA/600/C-10/004, 2010

Geophysical Decision Support System (GDSS)

Forward and Inverse Models

Fractured rock geophysical selection tool

i in cells shaded aqua-blue (in column C). All other cells will be	automatically updated.	0	indicates meth indicates meth	iod is potentially su iod is likely not suit	kable able	0	ndicates metho ndicates metho	od is like od is not	ilg appro	opriatei	effectiv iste/effe	e ective	4 Pearlist		- Current	School Section
Project and site parameters	Methods	-	Appropriate	Effectiveness	Belative	Meth	nod contribu	tes to	goal:			IM a	ade infea:	ible by :	ite paramete	
What is the depth to bestrock (m)? 15			for goals	at site	cost	A	8 C D	E F	G (н т	J 1	K 1	2 3	4 5	6 7 8	9 10
What is the electrical resistivity of bedrock (ohm-m)? 100	Surface methods															
What is the minimum spacing between wells (m)? 4	3. EM terrole conductivity (induction)		•	0	2011										×	
what is the well casing." Open	2.281				2011	1				. *					-	
what is the vertical estent or open holes (m)? 40	A Decision and and a	18			1.09	1 4						1*	*		×	
Routener inne name inner popul(00). 100 Routene Aurenter (inches)	5 ED - scientful	1ő	ŏ		100											
Outwal FM interference? (utilities pixes etc.) Yes	6. Science schedules	ŏ	ě		Low		r									
is it possible to disturb the ground for electrodes or geop Yes	2. Seismie suffection	ō	é	ě	Aledom		1									
what is native groundwater conductivity (micro-Sitem)? 150	0. Time domain EM	۲	•	0	Low		1								×	
What is the project cost threshold for a given method? High	Cross-hole methods															-
	D. ERT	0	•	•	Alediote		/									
Goals	<u>10.928</u>		•	0	/kph		() () () () () () () () () ()		- 4	1.4			×			
klentily discrete itacture network characteristics Yes	1.12		•	•	Aledon		() () () () () () () () () ()			14						
Adentify Athenlogic contacts Yes	52. Szismis		•	•	19.01		1		- 4	/						_
Map depth to bedrook No	Borehole methods											_				
Understand large-scale anirotropy, average fracture cost No	15. ATV				Low	2.3										
Estimate could could effective but with mice properties	M. Longest	ă			100	1.2										
Estimate Jama scale backado nonactar Yer	M. Elements (cleak hale)	ă			Low		·	1.1								
kinntile intervel huit whic connections Yes	17. Flowmoter (groce-hole)	ō	÷	•	Low			14		14						
Time-lapse snapshots of amendment delivery Yes	18. Gommo		•	•	LOW	- 4	r									
Continuous manitoring of degradation No	13. IP and Normal Resistivity		•	•	LOW		¢									
Screening for inon minerals No	20. Magazzic caccoptibility		•	•	Low		6 - C									
	21.NMB	12	•	•	Aledon	. 4	0	- ×								
Assumptions	22.0TV	12		8	Low	4 4									×	
	20. Radar (bambale GPR)	18		8	Adedom	1. 3							*			
	24.7280.0000	0		0	2011	4 4		-	_	_	-	_	_	_	~	_
	rigutorogic tests	101		-	464	_			_	_	_	-		_		_
	25 Formed parket testing	Ĭŏ			4404			14	4							
	21. Field resistivity & temperature	۱ŏ.	•	•	Low			14		1						
Comments	20. Hab receiption temperature	Ĭŏ	•		1600			14								
	23. Open held hedroalic tests	10	•	•	Aledum				4							
	20. Trucci testa	0	÷	÷	High			14	4							
						_		_			_					_
	This STATE with the latest deductions									-		stand a s				
	The second second to beep a	and a	received and to so	save race opproprint	**** #004 p		na nances dase				ganth R	need pe	momentation of			

- user enters site parameters and objectives
- output table indicates feasible methods

Day-Lewis, et. al., Groundwater, 2016

Parameter input, model estimation

1DTempPro V2

- Temperature data collection
- Model construction and generation

Koch, et. al., Groundwater, 2015

SEER – Scenario Evaluator for Electrical Resistivity

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

Measurement error (%) 1

Borehole electrodes? yes

SEER is a simple spreadsheet tool for rapid visualization of the likely outcome of 2D electrical resistivity surveys.

Terry, N., Day-Lewis, F., Robinson, J., Slater, L., Halford, K., Binley, A., Lane Jr., J., Werkema, D., 2017

Model Development example: Landfill Long Term Cell Performance

A critical factor to understand landfill performance, degradation, and containment is knowledge of **landfill moisture content and distribution**

- 1. Mapping Soil-Moisture using Electromagnetic Induction
 - calibrate EM data with NMR (Nuclear Magnetic Resonance)
 - generate model/code to determine water content from surface EM data
- Software and Field Approaches for Landfill Moisture Characterization: A Landfill Module for the Geophysical Toolbox Decision Support System (GTDSS)

MoistureEC - flowchart

- a) Electrical conductivity (EC) data
- b) Moisture content values used to calibrate transform function
- c) Petrophysical transform function converts EC data to
- d) moisture
- e) Data are weighted
- f) Final moisture estimate using all data, errors, and generates an optimal data fit and smoothing

Terry, N., Day-Lewis, F.D., Werkema, D., Lane Jr., J.W., Groundwater, 2017.

MoistureEC GUI

🗋 mEC • GUI inputs **MoisturEC** • plot of the input data – Inputs Outputs Console Messages Data files Grid Parameters Archie parameters EC data form the $\delta \sigma_u$ maxgrid σ_w EC Data File 7 1000 0.5 0 mEC_soft_small.csv Browse .. background contour plot nx $\delta \phi$ ny nz ф NA NA 0.3 0 NA Moisture Data File 👔 $\delta \phi_{int}$ xmin xmax ϕ_{int} Browse... mEC hard small.csv 0.2 NA NA 0 ymin δm ymax mResolution Data File (optional) 2 0 NA NA zmin δn Browse... mEC_R_small.csv zmax \boldsymbol{n} 2 NA NA Moisture EC Calibration Data File (optional) ? Browse ... mec_calib.csv use Archie's Law use data Inversion calculate moisture moisturEC error theta -0.2 theta 0.5 -0.4 0.25 -0.6 >_____ -1MoistureEC GUI 2D moisture estimate and propagated error, -1.2expressed in terms of moisture content. -1.4 10 16 12 14

Terry, N., Day-Lewis, F.D., Werkema, D., Lane Jr., J.W., Groundwater, 2017.

Moisture EC – synthetic 3D example

- (a) true moisture model;
- (b) inverted electromagnetic induction data collected over true moisture model;
- (c) moisture estimate based on electrical conductivity using an Archie parameterization;
- (d) point moisture data locations and values;
- (e) resulting moisture estimate from MoisturEC.

Terry, N., Day-Lewis, F.D., Werkema, D., Lane Jr., J.W., Groundwater, 2017.

Geophysical methods can be used to characterize and monitor:

- 1. Subsurface objects; e.g., tanks, utilities
- 2. Direct detection of some contaminants
- 3. Active and passive remediation detection and monitoring
- 4. Biogeochemical reactions and interactions
- 5. CSM development and high resolution characterization
- 6. Dynamic Hydrogeologic processes, GW/SW interaction
- 7. Forward models and decision support systems help reduce uncertainty of results and inform stakeholders

The geophysical response is a function of the geology, hydrogeology, biology, and chemistry of the subsurface.

Look for physical property contrasts, understand the mechanism of that contrast and if geophysical methods have the requisite resolution to detect the contrast.

What are the physical property contrasts?

Are these contrasts geophysically detectable?

Acknowledgements & Collaborators

- John Lane, Fred Day-Lewis, Marty Briggs, Carole Johnson, Eric White, Terry Neal: USGS and University of Connecticut
- Lee Slater, Dimitris Ntgarlantis, Judy Robinson, Rutgers University
- Estella Atekwana & Eliot Atekwana: University of Delaware
- Gamal Abdel Aal: Assiut University, Egypt
- Andre Revil: Colorado School of Mines
- Barbara Luke: University Nevada-Las Vegas
- Bill Sauck & Silvia Rossbach: Western Michigan University
- Yuri Gorby: J. Craig Venter Institute
- Students:
 - UConn: Emily Voyteck, John Ong, Rory Henderson
 - UNLV: Meghan Magill, Nihad Rajabdeen, Lisa Hancock
 - *Rutgers*: Jeff Heenan, Yves Robert-Personna, Sina Saneiyan, Sundeep Sharma, Angelo Lamousis,
 - Oklahoma State U: Farag Mawafy, Ryan Joyce, Dalton Hawkins, Brooke Braind, Cameron Ross, Carrie Davis, Che-Alota Vukenkeng,
 - Colorado School of Mines: Marios Karaoulis

Disclaimer: Any use of equipment or trade names does not constitute endorsement by the USEPA

Questions?

werkema.d@epa.gov