

Presentation

Dutch Advanced In Situ Remediation Technologies in Canada

A "success" story on Canadian-Dutch co-operation in Canada between private Solution Providers supported by both Canadian and Dutch Governments



Yvo M.M. Veenis Managing Director Groundwater Technology BV Yve@gtbv.nl www.gtbv.nl







- Topics
- **1. Canadian Perspective**
- 2. Dutch Perspective
- 3. Business Perspective
- 4. Cases

Canadian Perspective



Canadian Governmental institutions involved:
Provincial Governments (AB, ON, QU)
Local (City) Governments
Support from National Government
Support from Centers of Excellence (e.g. OCE, MCEBR)

Scientific Institutions and private businesses

Missions & meetings



Dutch Governmental institutions involved:
Dutch ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment (VROM);
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (LNV)
Ministry of Economic Affairs (EZ).

Scientific Institutions (e.g. Deltares) and private businesses (e.g. Groundwater Technology)

Under 2g@there/NSP support for network/business development and demonstration projects; missions, meetings & conferences

Dutch Perspective



NSP is financially supported by its participants and the Dutch government through the 2g@there program administered by the EVD office for the Dutch ministry of Economic Affairs.

- NSP is a collective network, introducing Dutch state-of-art technologies and sustainable integrated solutions to its partner countries. It offers participants a platform to:
- Exchange information about the international soil market
- Create opportunities to access the international soil market
- Organize workshops or seminars to promote Dutch solutions
- Organize incoming missions and outgoing missions
- Obtain reports about the development of international markets

Private Business point of view



Economies comparable, land use pressure vastly different Netherlands: accustomed to high pressure on land use Canada: increasing pressure on land use through legislation Business culture: compatible

October 2009

Groundwater

lechni

Private Business Groundwater point of view

Therefore: mutual business opportunities:

- Bring Dutch experience & know how to Canadian Market
- Bring Canadian experience & know how to Dutch Market





Province of Quebec, Major City

- Down town site, ex service station
- Prime real-estate, in use as day care centre
- Contaminated, free product, migrating towards river















Solutions:

- Excavation impossible (building & too deep)
- Complicated geology & high concentrations
- Consultant interested in innovation
- Client (Municipality) interested in new technologies to remediate while minimising nuisance





- Co-operation between
- Technorem, Inc (Quebec)
- Groundwater Technology BV (The Netherlands)
- Deploy a train of in situ technologies to optimise remediation
- Heat enhanced recovery (Steam injection) for high mass removal, mobilisation and precursor to next step
- In Situ Chemical Oxidation in hot soil after steam injection
- Evaluation of effectiveness



Case 1 Status



- B2B matters: contracts in place
- B2B plans (implementation, action plan etc): complete
- Governmental positions: Positive view
- Financial issues (government support, grants) developing

Start-up: awaiting final green light on government financing





Former metal factory, soil and groundwater contaminated by heavy metals and Chlorinated Hydrocarbons Site in urban redevelopment area

Development consortium handles redevelopment and source zone excavation

GT requested to address deep & off-site plume

Case 2: Site Overview





Presentation RemTech Banf October 2009



Case 2: Second Phase



Direct injection of a mixture of methanol, lactate and protamylasse leads to biodegradation of the Chlorinateds

- Low redox levels lead to sulphate reduction
- Sulphate reduces to Sulphite
- Sulphite & nickel bond to form NiS
- NiS has very low solubility => NiS precipitates



Case 2: Conceptual Groundwater model

Basic model:
Topsoil, very fine sand, slightly permeable; 0-2.5 m
Clay 2– 6 m
Clay & peat layers 6– 7 m
Deeper than 7m: Aquifer (7 – 10 m: fine sand)

Case 2: Lab testing

Biodegradation of the VOCI's takes place
Immobilisation of the Ni takes place
Extra addition of sulphates has a positive effect on the immobilisation of Ni

🕥 Groundwater

Technology







Phase 1: Application of 2.5 tons sulphates (solid form) in excavation



•Presentation RemTech, Banff, October 2009





Phase 2: Direct injection;

After backfilling: in total 254 injections 127 m³ substrate mixture injected



•Presentation RemTech, Banff, October 2009





Monitoring during 5 years 3 & 6 months, 1, 2, 3 and 5 years after the injections)





First results after 3 months:
Ni concentrations dropped,
DOC up to 1.000 mg/l
PER/TRI/CIS concentrations decreasing
VC, ethene, ethane increasing

Case 2: Costs / duration



Phase	Duration	Cost estimate (euro)
Lab testing	3 months	€25.000
Sulphates application	1 week;	€ 5.000
Injection (substrate) first round	3 weeks	€80.000
Injection (substrate) second round	3 weeks	€40.000
Monitoring	5 years	€30.000
Lump sum risk	-	€100.000



- Ex dry-cleaners facility in 16th century building. Designated monument & on cultural heritage list; part of old city centre Weesp on water front
- Volatile chlorinated ethenes, degading
- Low permeability soil
- Highly susceptible to subsidence
- Transfer of ownership: future liability is an issue

🕥 Groundwater

Technoloav





- Migration appears to be minimal
- Typical approach: 'monitored natural attenuation)

🕥 Groundwater

lechnology

Case 3: Actual question

Groundwater

- 1. What GT can provide provide to avoid 'perpetual' monitoring
- 2. Perpetual monitoring is unwanted burden
- Perpetual monitoring decreases value of site

Case 3: Site Overview







Basic model:

- Topsoil, very fine sand, slightly permeable;
 0-2.5 m
- •Clay 2–6 m
- •Clay & peat layers 6-7 m
- Deeper than 7m: Aquifer (7 10 m: fine sand)

Case 3: GT Solutions

Groundwater

Ruled out:

- Standard approach is most cost-effective. (Costs of active measures will not be off-set by savings on monitoring)
- Pump & treat, sparge & vent ruled out (subsidence)
- ISCO ruled out (presence of peat)
- In Situ Anaerobic Biodegradation (monitoring phase too long)

Ruled in:

- In Situ chemical reduction
- In Situ stabilization

Case 3: GT approach



Intensive mass reduction followed by in situ stabilization Intensive step: In Situ chemical reduction: inject nano-iron slurry in vegetable oil Inject substrate & nutrients to promote in situ biodegradation Polishing step: Reduce permeability to stop migration





Two injection zones: 1.In front of premises First round: 20 injection points, some oblique underneath building, to 7 m – grade: nano-iron & substrate Second round: 20 injection points, some oblique underneath building, to 7 m grade: to reduce permeability 2. At waterfront 15 injection points (vertical) as precaution 21-10-2009 ('just in case')



Case 3: Costs / duration



Option	Duration	Cost estimate (euro)
monitoring	perpetual	€1500 per annum
Basic injection (nano- iron)	Per injection event: 1 week; Total: 1-2 years	€35K
Additional injection (substrate)	No additional time; May save one basic injection round	€17K
In Situ Fixation	No additional time; May save one basic injection round	€16K





For Your Attention

