

Management Strategies Implemented at Navy Large Dilute Plumes



Kenneth Bowers NAVFAC Atlantic June 20, 2012





•What is the best overall management approach? –No unacceptable risk

•Three similar sites

•3 very different solutions



Test Engine Cell – SWMU 9





FRTR Dilute Plumes





•Petroleum and organic solvent used

Removed source

•Groundwater plume



•Groundwater is non-potable •Per Florida regulations





•Human Health Baseline Risk Assessment –No unacceptable risk

•Ecological Risk Assessment

- -No unacceptable risk to terrestrial receptors
- -Concern that groundwater contaminant migration to surface water could occur and pose unacceptable risk to aquatic receptors



•Recommended that site groundwater be treated to reduce concentrations of organic compounds, which would reduce the possibility of future site-related risks to aquatic receptors.





Interim removal action

•Enhanced bioremediation with performance monitoring

-Groundwater treated with Oxygen Releasing Compound (ORC) and Hydrogen Releasing Compound (HRC) in 2001

•Review groundwater results after 5 years





•Benzene, Cis and Trans 1,2-DCE and vinyl chloride greater than Florida's Groundwater Cleanup Target Level (GCTL)

 Install two additional monitoring wells to further bound the plume

		_				_												ĩ	
S9'	M W-26	A ug-10	Dec-10	GCTL		S9M W-2	7 A	ug-10	D ec-10	GCTL		S9M W	21	A ug-10	Dec-10	GCTL	N N		
A COLUMN TO A COLUMN	nzene	NS	ND	1		B enz en		NS	ND	1		Benzen		ND	NS	1			
Chi	loromethane	NS	ND	2.7		Chlorome	thane	NS	ND	2.7		Chloro	met hane	16.9	NS	2.7			
cis	-1,2-DCE	NS	4.12	70		cis-1,2-D(CE	NS	19.3	70		cis-1,2-	DCE	801.5	NS	70			
trar	ns-1,2-DCE	NS	6.03	100		trans-1,2-	DCE	NS	25.8	100		trans-1,	2-DCE	2290	NS	100	А		
Vin	nyl Chloride	NS	ND	1		VinylChlo	oride	NS	0.591	1		VinyIC	nloride	ND	NS	1			
			1	10 mm			A CONTRACTOR		「日本の	S9MW-	-21		S9M VV Benzen		Aug-10	Dec-10 NS	GCTL		
						0	59MW-26		and the second designed to the second designe	-1		-	2	met hane	3.12	NS	2.7		
The second		17-1								1	4		cis-1,2-	195 march 197 march 197 march 197	107	NS	70	1	
RE THE SAL			9 MW-9	43	271	A F		S9 MW-	21	1213		0.00	trans-1,	2-DCE	301	NS	100		
AND PART	S9 MW-11	- 0		S	9 MW-E	B		E B	C			Sec.	VinyIC	hloride	1.11	NS	1		
S9 M	D IW-3	10	S9 MW-1		S9 MV	0		59 MW=7		S9MW	-22			6 ^{59 MV}	1-25		Sec. Sec.		
the state			40	O	5 14 44-2	2	591	AVV-4	<mark>ଜ</mark> ୁ ଆ	4W-14							- Aril		
S9 MW-12	T	0	S9 MW-1		COL	BM C	S9 MW	.19D				2 ^{S9M}	N-24 S9M W	25	A ug- 10	Dec-10	GCTL		
Sillin L	36 -	S9 MW-1	8	the second	○ ^{S9 M}	144-0	1	-	0				Benzen		ND	NS	1		
- AND	atur -	134	1	COM		-1	1.0	S9 M	W-15		-	ANT		met hane	3.44	NS	2.7		
the state			12	S9 M1	v-o 7	1	10.000	-	-	S9 MW	1-23		cis-1,2-	Laconce -	ND	NS	70		
	1	12.3		1		S9 M	IW-16	7		C	1			2-DCE	ND	NS	100		
Street 1						\$9 MW-1	3	1		1		and the second	VinyIC	hloride	ND	NS	1		
	-			/		y	MW-17		TR.	122			The West				8		
- Frank	and the second	There				0					1	S9M VV-	5454.55 	Aug-10	Dec-10	GCTL	R Lin		
Contraction in the	alla in	The	- /	-				- W	110			Benzene	<u></u>	ND 3.03	NS NS	2.7			
S9M W-5	Aug-10 De	-10 GC		-	15	-			-			cis-1,2-0	N ALL CLARK	99.3	NS	70	S. SIVE		
Benzene		IS 1		S9 M W-	13	A ug-10	Dec-10	GCTL			- 4	trans-1,2	_	220	NS	100	L. C. L		
Chloromethane	0.91 N	IS 2.	7	Benzene	1	ND	NS	1	21	11		VinyICt		1.4	NS	1	24 10		
cis-1,2-DCE	ND N	IS 70		Chloron	net han e	6.62	NS	2.7			- Fe	39M W-23	Aug-	10 Dec-1	10 GCT				
trans-1,2-DCE	ND N	IS 10	0	cis-1,2-0	CE	ND	NS	70		-	- 1 C	enzene	ND			18 m	1		
Vinyl Chloride	ND N	IS 1		trans-1,2		ND	NS	100	There a		0	Chloromethai	ne 2.43	2 NS	2.7		and and		
			L	VinylCh	loride	ND	NS	1			C	is-1,2-DCE	ND	NS	70				
											t	rans-1,2-DCI	E 0.40	15 NS	100		-		
Legend												/inyl Chlorid	e ND	NS	1		-		
🚯 New M	onitoring V	Vell				S9 M V	V-14	Aug-1	10 Dec-	10 GCT	L		1						
Sampled Monitoring Well					Benze	Benzene ND			1	1					ices in bold, yellow.				
	Monitoring Well					Chloro	o met han e	10.5	10.5 NS				**Units: ug/l. ***NS: Not Sampled.				1		
O Monito					cDCE 70 ug/l (GCTL) Contour Line					3 70			*****ND: N			on-detect.			
O Monito	70 ug/l (GC					cis-1,2	2.500 HATVOU	25.4	6.000	1.1			_	**ND: N	on-det	ect.		1	
CDCE 7		C₀ (.TT.)	ntour L	ine .		trans-	-DCE 1,2-DCE Chloride	25.4 63.0 1.13) NS	10 0		50	25	•••ND: N	ion-det	ect.	50		

FRTR Dilute Plumes

 \bigcirc

NATAC



•Florida Groundwater Cleanup Target Levels (GCTLs)

•The concern, as outlined in the Statement of Basis, was to aquatic receptors

-Marine Surface Water Criteria is the proper criteria for evaluation per the site model under F.A.C.





Analyte	Primary Groundwater	Marine Surface Water				
	Criteria 62-550	Criteria 62-777 62-302				
Benzene	1 ppb	71.3 ppb				
Cis-1,2-DCE	70 ppb	NA				
Trans-1,2-DCE	100 ppb	11,000 ppb				
Vinyl Chloride	1 ppb	2.4 ppb				





•The selected remedy has been successful

•The enhanced bioremediation has reduced site contaminant concentrations and also the risk to aquatic receptors

•Current data

-Below Marine Surface Water Criteria





•Propose Risk Management Option Level II – No Further Action with institutional controls



Two Navy Sites – Florida and Maine









• Dilute plumes

•No unacceptable risk from groundwater –Land Use Controls

Source has been removed

•Historically active remediation to treat plume

Currently above ARARs







Location – Florida and Maine

Plume migration

- -Stationary Florida
- -Surface water discharge Maine

Maine Stakeholders have more concerns

Selected remedies

- -MNA Florida
- -P&T Maine







- •Land Use Controls preventing exposure to groundwater
 - -No unacceptable risk
- Monitored Natural Attenuation
 - -Stakeholder concern minimal
 - -Effectiveness
 - •Showing a downward trend

TCE Concentration - Florida



19

Maine Site



• Dilute plume

Land Use Controls preventing exposure to groundwater

-No unacceptable risk

Surface water

- -Below surface water criteria
- -No unacceptable risk

•Pump and Treat

- -Stakeholder concern high
- -Effectiveness?
 - Faster in theory
 - Treating "clean" water
 - Contaminant removal vs. costs

Pump and Treat Results





Cost per Gallon





Figure 10. Cost Increase over Time Due to Reduced VOC Concentrations (ECC, 2009c)

FRTR Dilute Plumes





- •High costs and technical difficulties involved in treating large volumes of water dispersed over large areas
- •Sometimes plumes are too deep for cost-effective containment (no PRBs)
- •Concentrations will exceed standards for a long time with or without treatment and may not be significantly different
- •Much of the contaminant mass within some plumes can be in relatively immobile forms, resulting in low but persistent concentrations even long after the source is removed
- •Control of the geochemical environment over an entire plume can be very difficult and expensive





• Develop a consistent approach for dilute plumes –No unacceptable risk

•Some states consider all groundwater drinking water

- -Must show progress towards MCLs
- -What does "progress" mean?
- -We need a long term perspective
- -Attenuation often has peaks and valleys
- -Not a linear relationship
- -Resist temptation for active remediation
 - No unacceptable risk

•Stakeholder pressure for active remediation –What has been gained if still above MCLs?

What is Your Perspective?



On the Right Road



