### Evaluating the Practicality of LNAPL Recovery

Jeff Lane, P.G. November 17, 2015



International Petroleum Environmental Conference (IPEC) IPEC 22 Contact information: <u>Jeff.lane@c-ka.com</u> 281-885-5454 616 FM 1960 West, Suite 575 Houston, Texas 77090

# When is it necessary to recover LNAPL?

- Explosive vapors
- Expanding LNAPL or dissolved phase plume
- Threat to an underground utility or structure
- Surface water impact





LNAPL – light nonaqueous phase liquid (i.e. oil, gasoline)

### **Federal Regulation**

• 40 CFR 280.64 – owners and operators of <u>USTs</u> must remove free product to the *"maximum extent practicable"...*as determined by the implementing agency





#### **LNAPL Closure Requirements**





#### **Remedial Technology Evaluation**

- ITRC Guidance provides a tool for screening remedial technologies
  - Site setting
  - Geological information
  - LNAPL properties
  - LNAPL distribution
  - LNAPL recoverability information
  - LNAPL mobility and stability
  - Identified remedial objective



### **Remedial Alternatives**

- Excavation
- Liquid recovery (single & dual phase)
- Vapor recovery
- Air sparging
- Insitu treatment (i.e. soil mixing, chemical oxidation, soil flushing)
- Natural Source Zone Depletion (i.e. MNA)



# **Example Site Conditions**

**SVE** 

and/or

Soil venting

- Highly volatile LNAPL
- High hydraulic conductivity
- Thick vadose zone

- Crude oil in shallow subsurface
- Surface water seepage
- Low hydraulic conductivity



Hydraulic recovery and/or Excavation

#### **Remedial Alternatives**



# Limiting Site Conditions

Deep contamination	Limits: Excavation, Insitu treatment
Equipment obstructions	Limits: Recovery systems, Insitu treatment
Limited radius of influence	Limits: Vapor and Hydraulic recovery systems
Low residual saturation	Limits: Vapor and Hydraulic recovery systems
Lack of vadose zone	Limits: Vapor recovery



#### **Reasonable Remedial Objectives**

- Prevention of plume spreading
- Protection of receptors
- Reduce plume longevity
- Recovery to extent practical



### **Evaluation Criteria**

- Stable plume footprint
- Verifying the absence of receptors
- Recover trends
- Transmissivity



# When is it potentially unnecessary to recover LNAPL?

- Already recovered to the extent practical
- When only residual saturation exists
- No receptors at risk (vapors/water wells/surface water)
- Stable plume
- No ongoing sources
- When institutional controls are possible



# When it might be necessary to recover LNAPL...





# When it might <u>not</u> be necessary to recover LNAPL...





# **Thoughts from EPA**

- Applicability of potential remedial technologies depends on site-specific hydrogeologic characteristics, nature and distribution of contaminants, and remedial objectives.
- Technologies for removal of mobile LNAPL exist and may be applicable at some sites.
- Subsurface restoration to precontamination conditions may require removal of virtually all LNAPL and much of the contamination sorbed to aquifer material. Technological limitations to complete LNAPL removal may exist at many sites. (EPA Ground Water Issue - EPA/540/S-95/500, 1995)



#### **Important Considerations**

- ► No LNAPL source = No LNAPL spread (ITRC 2009)
- Most remedial technologies leave residual product in place (except excavation)



TTRC – Remedial Technologies Evaluation 2009

#### **Important Considerations**

- Dissolved hydrocarbon plume growth is typically restricted by natural attenuation
- Deed restriction can prohibit water well use (i.e. institutional control)



#### Conclusions

- Site-specific conditions influence options
- Regulations provide structure and options
- Receptors can be protected by LNAPL removal or LNAPL control
- Implementation of institutional controls is frequently necessary

# It may or may not be necessary to remove LNAPL to protect receptors.



### **QUESTIONS?**

Contact information: Jeff.lane@c-ka.com 281-885-5454 616 FM 1960 West, Suite 575 Houston, Texas 77090

