#### SURFACTANT ENHANCED PUSH-PULL METHOD FOR IN-SITU REMEDIATION OF PETROLEUM CONTAMINATED SOIL AND GROUNDWATER

**Presenter** 

George (Bud) Ivey Ivey International Inc.

**22<sup>nd</sup> International Petroleum Environmental Conference** 



l Petroleum Environmental Conference ember 17–19, 2015 • Denver, CO nd Hvatt in Downtown Denver November 17 to 19, 2015 Denver, CO Grand Hyatt Downtown Denver



# **Chester River Hospital Center**

### Fuel Oil Spill Release Discovery 1991 vey-sol<sup>®</sup> Surfactant Pilot Scale Application July 2014 (Evaluation Report January 2015)

#### **Remediation Team Members**





"Today's Environmental Solutions For A Better Tomorrow"







# **Public Domain Presentation**

#### CHESTER RIVER HOSPITAL CENTER GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION 2013/2014 ACTION PLAN MODIFICATIONS CASE NO. 1987-2534-KE PILOT TEST EVALUATION REPORT AND PROPOSED 2015 ACTION PLAN JANUARY 19, 2015









#### Site Location Chestertown MD USA





### e Background Information

- ter River Hospital Center 7.1 Acres
- levelopment since 1935 as hospital
- Oil release discovered May 1991 (10,000 Gal. tank was y over a weekend)...*likely leaking for years*
- c Water supply well 850 ft. (259 m) down gradient, shut until remediation system was installed
- ndwater remediation system installed 1991
- Earth Data report indicated ≈ 83,452 Gal. (315,900 L) of PL removed from site between 1991 to July 2012
- tion of MDE 12 month Closeout Monitoring July 2012 to 2013, and the treatment system was shut off;
- evels of TPH (DRO) detected in June 2013 at Eight (8) of
- nteen (17) downgradient monitoring wells 😕
- o & Treatment System Turned Back On!
- eholder Concerns Started Mounting!



#### stertown Wellhead Protection Area (Unconfined Aquifer)



2. Chestertown Wellhead Protection Area with Potential Contaminant Sources





### ology & Hydrogeology

- ndwater and Surface water drains into the ter River, a tidal tributary of Chesapeake Bay h west)
- red sand and silty sand to approximately 120 ft. ia Formation, primary aquifer near site; sauken Formation, generally absent near site)
- er-table elevations fluctuate seasonally between 5 feet [*Smear Zone*] with depth to groundwater nd 30 - 50 ft. bgs on-site
- tertown's water supply from an 'Unconfined fer'



Potentiometric Surface of the Aquia Aquifer in Southern Mar September 2007

Stephen E. Curtin (USGS), David C. Andreasen (MGS), and Andrew W. Staley (I

Open-File Report 2009–1080

### Historical Product Levels (ft.) 1991 - 2013





# Recent Product Levels (ft.) 2013-2015

				MW001	MW002	MW003	MW004	MW005	MW00	8 MW009	MW010R	MW011	MW012	
				MW013	MW014	MW015	MW016	MW017	MW01	8 MW019	MW020	MW021	MW022	
				MW023	MW024	MW025	MW028	MW029	MW03	1R MW032	MW033	MW034	MW035	
				MW037	MW040	MW041	MW042	MW043	MW04	4 MW045	MW046	MW047	MW048	
			I	MW049	MW050	RW004	RW01B	RW02D	RW03E	3				
					1									
											m			
013/1013/1013/1013/1013/1013/1013/1013/	118/2013 118/2013 118/115/20	13-12013-120 1217126120	12/2/12/2/12/2/19/2/16/	2013/2013/2013	10121/2013 1012	1/2013/2013/2013	21/2013/2013/20 12/2013/2013/20	1201201271201372	120/2014 201 120/214/201	A201A201A201A	122122221212012	2014 2014 2014	1212 1212 1212 1212	8/19/2015

# takeholder Concerns

#### Chester River Iospital Center

- ime to Closure
- >20 Yrs.)
- ligh Costs \$\$\$/yr. O&M
- nvironmental Risks
- egal Liability
- **Aedia Relations**
- ublic Perception

#### Chestertown Water Supply

- Hydraulic Control
- Off-site TPH Migration
- Risk to Well Field (Town Aquifer)
- Legal Concerns
- Communications [Did not know about 2012 closure]
- Public Perception



Maryland Department of Environment (MDE)

- Regulatory Oversight
- Off-site Migration
- Clean-up Standards
- Mediation
- Legal Concerns
- Public Perception

### reatment System Background

- over twenty (20) years CRHC's focus was:
- emove liquid petroleum hydrocarbons (free product)
- emediate the groundwater using a "Pump and Treat" P&T) system consisting of six (6) recovery wells, four (4) re-filters (sediment and Fe), and two (2) MYCELXCELX<sup>®</sup> tration units, with discharge to storm sewer
- r expanded to Seven (7) Recovery wells and present ion/treatment system
- System Designed for 100-120 Gallons of groundwater ninute (379 to 455 L/min) extraction rate requiring ment (*They have effective hydraulic control on-site*)



3,452 Gallons (315,900 L) of LNAPL product recovered between 1991 - July 2012

### **Treatment System**



ecovery wells pump into holding tank (wet well)



# Pre-treatment Filtration system (sediment)

### 'Pump and Treat' - Treatment System



**Discharge to Storm Sewer – Under MDE Discharge** 

### 'Pump and Treat' - Treatment System



#### Maryland Department of Environment GW Cleanup Standards for Type I and II Aqu

Benzene	Toluene	Ethylbenzene	Xylenes	Total BTEX	MTBE	Naphthalene	TPH-DRO	ТР
			ug/L				mį	g/L
5	1,000	700	10,000	NA	20	NA	0.047	(

#### Interim Risk Based Goal: < 0.1

	Agency	n-Alkane Range	Aromatic Range	Boiling Point Range	Sample Preparation	Analysis
ge Organics)	US EPA	C10-C28	n/a	170-430 °C	solvent extraction	GC-FID
	Alaska	C10-C25	n/a	170-400 °C	solvent extraction	GC-FID
	Wisconsin	C10-C28	n/a	170-430 °C	solvent extraction	GC-FID
Petroleum Hydrocarbons)	Massachusetts	C9-C36	C11-C22	150-265 ℃	solvent extraction + SPE fractionation	GC-FID
e Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons)	Connecticut	C9-C36	n/a	n/a	solvent extraction	GC-FID
inge Organics)	US EPA	C6-C10	n/a	60-170 °C	purge/trap or direct injection	GC-FID
	Alaska	C6-C10	n/a	60-170 °C	purge/trap	GC-FID
	Wisconsin	C6-C10	n/a	60-220 °C	purge/trap	GC-FID
Range Organics)	Florida	C8-C40	n/a	n/a	solvent extraction	GC-FID
Volatile Organic Compounds)	Wisconsin	<b>A</b>	n/a	60-220 °C	purge/trap	GC-PID
nology and Remediation Series)	New York	٠	•	•	•	GC-MS
eum Hydrocarbons)	Texas	C6-C35	n/a	n/a	solvent extraction	GC-FID
	Washington	C7-C30	n/a	n/a	solvent extraction	GC-FID
roleum Hydrocarbons)	Massachusetts	C5-C12	C9-C10	36-220 °C	purge/trap	GC-PID-FID

BACKGROUND: Analytical Methods

RELATIONSHIP OF MADEP VPH/EPH/APH TO TPH AND GRO



nes the PVOC analyte list as the Wisconsin GRO list minus naphthalene.

DE

e of New York document that provides guidance on the handling, disposal, and/or reuse of excavated petroleum-contaminated soil, with MS per US EPA Methods 8260 and 8270, modified with short, specific analyte lists.

### How Did We At IVEY Get Involved...



# SURFACTANT ENHANCED PUSH-PULL METHOD Pilot Scale In-situ Application July – August 2014

#### **Completion of Three (3) Push-Pull Applications**



# te Layout and /draulic Control

Pilot Test Area

IN FILLER

Downgradie<u>nt</u> Well Monitoring







#### Correction: RW3B Screen Interval Starts at 9.45 ft.





#### OSS SECTION IVEY-SOL INJECTION DIFFUSION RADI











1:50 Ratio of Ivey-sol To Water For The Pilot Scale Application







#### IVEY Developed Field Testing Method for Surfa Has >96% correlation with laboratory testin



#### THE FUTURE OF FIELD TESTING FOR SURFACTANT

4 4 Date me:12:30 Date 946 lest Details ample ID ELNO Time: 12:44 Date: Test Details Sample ID \_\_\_\_\_ Time: 12:45 Date: Test Details MNO Time: 12:30 Date: 9 Sample ID mw 4.2 Yes TINO Time: 12:45 Date: Time: 12:30 Date: 9 Sheet / NITIALS

#### **IVEY-SOL**

#### rey-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection and Diffusion Radiu







Appendix D Figure 3- Pilot Study Capture Zone During Extraction

# **TPH-DRO Mass Recovery Calculations**

y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #1 426% Increase in TPH-DRO
y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #2 6,240% Increase in TPH-DRO
y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #3 6,846% Increase in TPH-DRO

y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #1 7,333% Increase in TPH-DRO y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #2 5,133% Increase in TPH-DRO y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #3 5,156% Increase in TPH-DRO

y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #1 *Not Calculated (Missed Sample)* y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #2 **18,966%** Increase in **TPH-DRO** y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #3 **3,226%** Increase in **TPH-DRO** 

y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #1 948% Increase in TPH-DRO
y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #2 824% Increase in TPH-DRO
y-sol<sup>®</sup> Injection #3 3,737% Increase in TPH-DRO

Averaged TPH-DRO Concentration Pre Injection Eve [Pre Ivey-sol injection TPH-DRO (ppm) X Concentrations

Averaged TPH-DRO Concentration Post Injection Ever [Post Ivey-sol Injection TPH-DRO (ppm) X Concentrations

Mass Recovery =

[Averaged TPH-DRO Concentration Post Injection Event] > [Averaged TPH-DRO Concentration Pre Injection Even

= % Mass Recovery Increase For The Ivey-sol® Push-Pull Ev

#### Mass Recovery Calculations Completed by EBA Engineering



# SUMMARY

result of the investigations, analysis, and calculations of mass recovery the Tecl I determined that in the Push-Pull wells recovery rates were significantly enhar

ne thousand percent (1,000%) to Eighteen thousand percent (18,000%) TPH

polation:

ubstantial soil and groundwater remediation results can be achieved from usi ush-Pull' Ivey-sol® process at the original up-gradient source area and the sev id to down-gradient regions of the TPH plume

fective for treating sorbed TPH in smear zone

asy to inject 'Push' and does not require pressure using gravity feed eld surfactant test minimized volume of groundwater extracted during the 'P nase

cale:

DE approved full scale application in June 2015 (Priority Zone 1, 2, 3, 4 Approach) arted Full Scale applications on August 31, 2015 (Early results look very promising)

### **CONTACT INFORMATION**

Ivey International Inc. George (Bud) Ivey, B.Sc., CES, CESA, P.Chem., EP President and Senior Remediation Specialist Mobile: + 1 250 203 0867 Email: budivey@iveyinternational.com

Web: www.iveyinternational.com



