



**Smart ISCO
Application**



Pauline van Gaans & co

19 October 2011

Outline

- Perspectives
- Upsoil approaches
- From research to Smart ISCO application
- Conclusions/discussion

Perspectives

proposition 1:

Regional management of contamination focussing on groundwater plume containment should consider source removal as part of the overall approach.

Perspectives

ISCO for source zone remediation

conventional

- excavation
- pump & treat

in situ


- (enhanced) NA
- mobilisation



Technologies	Dimensions		
	cost	time	Sustainability
conventional:			
Excavation (source zone)	-	+	-
Pump-and-treat (plume)	-	-	-
in-situ:			
Bioremediation (plume)	+	-	+
NA (plume, source by long term depletion)	+	-	+
ISCO & ISCR (plume, source)	-	+	-
UPSIL:			
Smart coupling (source and plume)	+	+	+
Frontier technologies (source and plume)	+	+	+


Perspectives

Upsoil and the land use cycle



Active phase of (bio-) chemical remediation

Passive phase of bioremediation




Goal:
reach concentration for allowable risk while considering treatment efficiency and post-treatment soil properties

Goal:
determine conditions required for longterm bioremediation

Perspectives

ISCO main issue: where is the source zone?



Perspectives

ISCO main issue: effectiveness and efficiency

potential of technology:

Contaminant Type	In-situ remediation technologies			
	Biological Oxidation	Chemical Oxidation	Biological Reduction	Chemical Reduction
Chlorinated Aliphatic Hydrocarbons (CAH)	Low	High	High	High
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)	High	High	No	No

Perspectives

ISCO main issue: effectiveness and efficiency

potential of technology:

Contaminant Type	In-situ remediation technologies			
	Biological Oxidation	Chemical Oxidation	Biological Reduction	Chemical Reduction
Chlorinated Aliphatic Hydrocarbons (CAH)	Low	High	High	High
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)	High	High	No	No

effectiveness: %Contaminant removed

eff/ectiveness: %Soil buffer retained

efficiency: [Contaminant removed]/[Oxidant applied]

Perspectives

ISCO main issue: effectiveness and efficiency

potential of technology:

Contaminant Type	In-situ remediation technologies			
	Biological Oxidation	Chemical Oxidation	Biological Reduction	Chemical Reduction
Chlorinated Aliphatic Hydrocarbons (CAH)	Low	High	High	High
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH)	High	High	No	No


effectiveness: %Contaminant removed

eff/ectiveness: %Soil buffer retained

efficiency: $[\text{Contaminant removed}]/[\text{Oxidant applied}]$

→ soil *and* contaminant characteristics

→ selectivity of oxidant



Upsoil approaches



Upsoil search to improve efficiency

- oxidant selectivity
- real-time feedback
- minimal ISCO, maximal BIO (Nora Sutton)
- better targetting of oxidant (Ole Stubdrup)

Upsoil approaches



Oxidant selectivity and temperature

lab experimental approach

oxidant = permanganate

contaminant = tetrachlorethylene (PCE) (as NAPL)


soil organic matter modelled by cellulose (as pure phase)






Upsoil approaches

Oxidant selectivity (samples: diesel spill, anthropogenic fill)

permanganate



persulphate




Upsoil approaches






Oxidant selectivity

(samples: diesel spill, peat layer)

permanganate



persulphate



Upsoil approaches


Oxidant selectivity, conclusions sofar

- use (low) temperature to advantage
- consider SOM *composition* in choice of oxidant
- consider longer term effect of oxidant on SOM
-
-

Upsoil approaches


Indicators for feedback

model approach



- ✓ PCE residual NAPL
- ✓ permanganate
- ✓ sandy aquifer with
 - SOM
 - pyrite
 - calcite





Reference model - Mineral concentrations
Layer 5: cell 18 (end of domain)



Upsoil approaches




Indicators for feedback



Upsoil approaches

Feedback improved efficiency



Upsoil approaches



Feedback driven, conclusions sofar

- case of PCE: pH good indicator
- other potential indicators: Cl, SO₄
-
- **zero PCE concentration** in downstream observation well **not a good indicator!**
- efficiency can be increased
Adjustable oxidant injection characteristics:
 - Concentration
 - Injection rate
 - Location of injection

From lab research to field application

model

“known” system

- composition
- flow regime
- chemical processes
- complete observation

lab (batch experiment)

- (partly)known systems
 - composition
 - chemical processes
- high water to soil/NAPL ratios
 - optimal mixing
 - optimal contact surface
- high oxidant concentrations possible
 - prolonged reaction, simulating multiple injections with time

field

- black box
- many other processes going on as well
 - fluid injection → displacement of groundwater & dissolved contaminant
 - multiple well-field → enhanced local flow & dispersion
 - temp increase → enhanced volatilization
 - gas production (bubbles) → volatilization, stripping, enhanced dispersion
 - oxidation of soil matrix → desorption of contaminant (if anti-selective)
 - high residual NAPL saturation → low effective permeability!
 - solubilization (=from residual to dissolved)
 - mobilization (=from residual to pool)
- black box

Conclusions


- **ISCO methods fill a niche in soil remediation for source removal**
- **Current ISCO applications can be improved considering dimensions of cost and sustainability**
- **Bridging of research findings and field experience important**

Discussion



proposition 2:

***To get SMARTer, we need to learn from experience.
Regional management of subsurface contamination could
foster research involvement in modelling and monitoring
designs for ISCO.***



Thanks for your attention