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Contaminated Sediment Management

– Significant, wide-spread issue, yet remedial choices are limited:
  • Dredge
  • Cap
  • Monitored Natural Recover/Enhanced Monitored Natural Recovery

– Sediment and wetland remediation cleanup efforts will likely more than double in next 5 years

– Projects tend to be large and long-term

– Early in life cycle on many projects

10% of USA sediment is contaminated (1.2b CY)!

43% of US Navy cleanup budget focused on sediments in next decade

Innovation presents opportunities for 50% + savings on site remediation & restoration costs, and far lower Risk of Remedy
Types of Dredging

• Hydraulic
  – High disturbance
  – Substantial water treatment
  – No visual assessment

• Mechanical
  – High disturbance
  – Less water treatment
  – Visual assessment when performed in the dry

Key tool to address risk – when benefits of sediment removal outweigh habitat disruption
Range of Capping Technologies

**Pros**: effective, cost-effective isolation & exposure pathway elimination

**Cons**: reductions in flood storage & depth; can be compromised
Why Consider Amendments for In Situ Remediation?

– Establishing more environmentally friendly means to reduce risk from contaminated sediments is a regulatory priority
  • New remediation approaches are needed to supplement existing methods
  • Amendment treatment can reduce costs by more than 50% while reducing footprint of cleanups
  • Effective tool when sources are eliminated and newly deposited sediment is clean?

– Proven ability to reduced toxicity, mobility, and bioavailability = reduced risk

– Sorption capacity of amendment are well understood
  • Amendments have been used for years for groundwater and soil management
  • AC has large surface area, pore volume, and adsorptive capacity

“Amendments applied directly to the contaminated sediment may be particularly useful in areas where MNR, caps, or dredging are not likely to be effective in reducing risks” USEPA, 2013
Direct Amendment Addition Objectives and Challenges

Objectives

– Reduce or eliminate:
  • Bioaccumulation in benthos
  • Transfer to aquatic food chain
  • Flux of pollutants into water column

– Change the native sediment geochemistry without creating a new cap or new surficial substrate

Challenges

– How to deliver a thin layer application in dynamic aqueous environments?

– How to mix into bioactive zone?
  • Bioturbation
  • Mechanical equipment

– Treatment capacity?
  • Interactions with natural system
  • Long-term performance
  • Ongoing sources

– Risk profile
Examples of In Situ Sediment Amendments

- Granular Activated Carbon
- Biochar (wood charcoal)
- Sedimite™
- Zero-Valent Iron (ZVI)
- Siderite (iron carbonate)
- Iron Sulfide
- Organoclay-MRM®
- Elemental Sulfur
- AquaGate +PAC +Sorbster™
# Field Projects (AC and Biochar)

(Source: Patmont et al., 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Initiated</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Contaminant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed Field Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Anacostia River, Washington, DC</td>
<td>PAHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Hunters Point, CA</td>
<td>PCBs and PAHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Grasse River, NY</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Trondheim Harbor, Norway</td>
<td>Dioxins/furans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Spokane River, WA</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>De Veenkampen, Netherlands</td>
<td>NA (benthic study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Grenlandsfjords, Norway</td>
<td>Dioxins/furans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bailey Creek, VA</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Canal Creek, MD</td>
<td>PCBs and Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Studies Underway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Onondaga Lake, NY</td>
<td>Chlorinated benzenes/PAHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>South River, VA</td>
<td>Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Sandefjord Harbor, Norway</td>
<td>PCB, TBT, &amp; PAHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Bergen Harbor, Norway</td>
<td>PCBs and TBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Leirvik Sveis Shipyard, Norway</td>
<td>PCB, TBT, &amp; metals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Naudodden, Norway</td>
<td>PCB, PAHs, TBT, &amp; metals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Berry’s Creek, NJ</td>
<td>Hg and PCBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, WA</td>
<td>Hg and PCBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Custom Plywood, WA</td>
<td>Dioxins/furans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Duwamish Slip 4, WA</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Mirror Lake, DE</td>
<td>PCBs and Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Pearl Harbor, HI</td>
<td>PCBs and Hg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canal Creek Wetland Restoration Demonstration Project

- Can *in situ* technologies be used to sequester contaminants in wetlands without negatively impacting the ecology of these sensitive systems?

- Metrics for success
  - Ecological impact
  - Risk reduction
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - Regulatory acceptance
  - Sustainability

- USA funded DoD demonstration/validation projects
  - PCBs
  - Mercury
Demonstration of *In Situ* Sediment Treatment Technologies

- **SediMite®**
- **AquaGate™**

**Pelletized Carbon**

**Laboratory Studies**

**Carbon Slurry Delivery**

**Dry Broadcasting**

**Monitoring**

**Reporting**

![Graph showing data comparison](image)
Test Design – Field Application

Carbon Slurry

Dry Broadcast
SediMite® Applications: Blowers and Spreaders (source Menzie 2013)
MeHg in worm tissues: 1-year post-application sampling

50% reduction
Overall results are encouraging, but additional field monitoring is necessary to demonstrate the efficacy of using activated carbon.

Canal Creek Summary

1. Overall results suggest that addition of AC may be effective in wetland setting
   a. PCB and Hg heterogeneity
   b. Small sample sizes
   c. Slow mixing of placed carbon
   d. Migration of placed carbon
   e. Sample and monitoring program design
   f. Methyl mercury dynamics

2. Bench scale testing confirmed PCB and Hg sequestration and reductions in bioavailability

3. Equipment to deploy carbon readily available and implementable

Confounding Factors
1. Can activated carbon or other amendments reduce the bioavailability of Hg, MeHg, and PCBs?

2. What factors control and limit bioavailability and update?
   - Urban watershed
   - 416 hectares
   - Hg and PCBs in tidal marshes
   - Laboratory and marsh pilot study
   - Hg speciation

*Work conducted by Dow/Morton and Partners*
Berry’s Creek Superfund Site: Proof of Concept

– Sediment slurry studies demonstrated that AC reduced concentrations of PCBs, Hg, and MeHg in porewater
  • MeHg in pore water reduced by 45 to 90% relative to controls
  • MeHg in test organisms reduced by 30 to 90% relative to controls
– Amendments were most effective in sediments with low native sediment: water MeHg partition coefficients
Berry’s Creek Superfund Site: Field Pilot Study

- Various AC applications at 5% by dry weight (top 10 cm)
  - Amendments survived major storm events (Superstorm Sandy/Hurricane Irene)
  - AC penetrated 3 cm+ surficial sediments (3 plus years)

- PCBs
  - Reduced porewater concentrations and uptake in field-caged and laboratory organisms
  - Reduced concentrations in surficial detritus

- Hg
  - THg in pore water and caged biota ~50% in AC (Sedimite™) plots compared to controls
  - MeHg dynamics complex, but similar reductions observed in some treatments (complicated by elevation and tidal inundation dynamics)
Berry’s Creek: Concentrations of PCBs in porewater substantially decreased in treated plots relative to control, with largest reduction (97%) in SediMite™ Plot.
Mirror Lake, DE

- First full-scale placement of AC in US
- 2-hectare urban pond

Goals
- Enhance the sorptive capacity of native sediment
- Reduce PCB bioavailability and uptake without altering the existing sediment bed
- Reduce or eliminate fish advisory

Planning
- Extensive stakeholder engagement and public outreach efforts

Implementation
- 79 tons of SediMite™ delivered over 10 days
- Ca. $1M including planning, design, construction, and 3-year monitoring

Monitoring
- Bulk sediment
- Water
- Fish tissue
- Passive samplers
- Bioaccumulation studies
- Sediment cores
Mirror Lake Passive Samplers

60 percent reduction in porewater and water column 1 year post-treatment

Source: Cargill, 2015
50 to 60 percent reduction in PCBs in resident fish (0 to 40% in migratory fish)

Source: Cargill, 2015
Test Area

- PCBs and Hg in surface sediment
- Soft sediment under piers
- Active submarine berthing and repair area
Treatability Studies Under Sierra 1 Pier, Pearl Harbor

[Diagram of Sierra 1 Pier with treatability studies and soil profile information]

- Sierra 10 Pier Section Transect Profile from 2012 Under-pier Survey
- Clay, soft sediment
- Clay, concrete rubble
- Concrete rubble, rock-size 15 feet
- Soft sediment
- Rock and debris with thin coating of sediment
Pearl Harbor Under Pier AC Treatment Studies

– Primary Criteria
  • Thickness placement depth
  • AC maintained at designed dose (2.5%)
  • Minimum 50% reduction in porewater and tissue PCB concentrations

– Secondary Criteria
  • Mixing of AC in the biologically active zone
  • Efficient placement techniques identified
  • Presence of infauna following AC placement
SPI conducted at 26 locations
- All locations displayed presence of amendment
- Some over-application observed
- Native sediment layers observed
- Material persisted 6 months following application
- Evidence of benthic activity after 6 months

Pearl Harbor Sediment Profile Imaging
– Sediment Porewater Chemistry
  • Decreased porewater PCB concentrations in test plots
  • Higher percent decrease with Aquagate+PAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activated Carbon Amendment Type</th>
<th>Total NOAA-18 PCBs % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SediMite™</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquagate+PAC</td>
<td>-71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Criterion</td>
<td>Criterion Met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedimite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve minimum design thickness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average black carbon content ≥ baseline level + 2.5%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average TOC ≥ baseline level + 2.5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% reduction in porewater COC concentration over the Treatability Study duration</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing of AC amendment in the BAZ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of benthic infauna post-emplacement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Cost

– Conventional wetland remedial costs
  • Often exceed $1M million per hectare
  • Restoration alone can be $250K/hectare + depending on the type of wetland habitat for even shallow excavations

– Costs for application of in situ AC remediation
  • ~ $150K to $500K/hectare typical in literature (AC, field placement, monitoring)

– Cost drivers
  • Mobilization/Demobilization (for small applications)
  • Site preparation (for sites with challenging access)
  • Long-term monitoring (tissue sampling, congener analysis, 30-year duration, etc.)
  • Expectation that costs may drop eventually with technology acceptance
Additional Concerns

1. **Is the material toxic?**
   a. Limited toxicity or biological effects testing in field
   b. Potential effects minimized when AC doses are low (<4%)

2. **Long-term success?**
   a. Longer term studies show promise (Grasse River, Hunters Point, etc.)
   b. Increasing database (5 to 10 years) suggests material effectiveness increases with time

3. **Regulatory acceptance**
   a. Permits have been issued
   b. Mirror Lake Delaware is agency-driven

4. **Monitoring Needs?**
   a. Technology (materials and placement) generally costs less than conventional remedies…but
   b. Complex long-term monitoring can be costly
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In situ treatment technologies represent a viable option at some sediment sites

- AC can rapidly address key exposures
- Placement with range of conventional construction equipment possible
- Not appropriate when contaminants are present in unstable environments (Dredging or Capping preferable)
- Represents a sustainable technology to consider in sensitive environments
- Potentially useful at sites where combination of technologies are applied