# Remediation of Low Concentration Perchloroethylene Impacts at Former Dry Cleaning Facility Using In-Situ Chemical Oxidation

#### Kevin Shipley XCG Consulting Limited



#### XCG

Environmental engineering consulting services: site assessments, remediation, risk assessments



#### XCG

Environmental engineering consulting services: site assessments, remediation, risk assessments

Kevin Shipley:

- XCG Partner, based in Kingston office
- Leader of Corporate Remediation and Risk Assessment Group



## In-situ Chemical Oxidation (ISCO)

- ISCO is effective at reducing PCE and other VOC concentrations from thousands of ppb to tens of ppb
- Achieving and sustaining concentrations in the order of 1 ppb is challenging





## Case Study



#### Commercial Plaza, Kingston, Ontario



## **Case Study**



- Commercial Plaza, Kingston, Ontario
- Former dry cleaner operated on-site for 33 years



## Phase One and Two ESAs

- Phase One and Two ESAs completed in 2016
- Dry cleaner was identified as primary Area of Potential Environmental Concern (APEC)
- Dry cleaning operation was still active at time of Phase One ESA





## Phase One and Two ESAs

- Phase Two ESA found perchloroethylene (PCE) at 1.7 µg/L and 1.8 µg/L in one monitoring well
- Table 3 Site Condition
  Standard in Ontario is
  1.6 µg/L











#### Stage 1

- Injection wells INJ-1, INJ-2 and INJ-3
- Bedrock well MW17-7
- INJ-3 had PCE at 2.0 µg/L
- PCE was ND in INJ-1, INJ-2 and MW17-7





#### Stage 1

- Hydraulic conductivity in INJ-1, INJ-2 and INJ-3 was tested
- 4.4 x 10<sup>-3</sup> cm/s was the average k
- Seepage rate of 60 to 100 metres per year





#### **Preferential Pathways**

 Even distribution of the injected solution is highly unlikely

Limestone Bedrock





#### Stage 2

- Injection wells INJ-4, INJ-5 and INJ-6
- INJ-6 had PCE at 2.3 µg/L
- PCE was ND in INJ-4 and 1.1 µg/L in INJ-5





#### Stage 3

- Injection wells INJ-7 and INJ-8
- PCE was ND in both INJ-7 and INJ-8





#### Injection wells =





- Injection wells =
- Monitoring wells =





Depth of PCE-impacted groundwater = 3 m

Assumed soil porosity = 0.3

Average PCE concentration =  $2 \mu g/L$ 

 Area of PCE-impacted groundwater = 60 m<sup>2</sup>



 $60 \text{ m}^2 \text{ x} 3 \text{ m} \text{ x} 0.3 = 54 \text{ m}^3 = 54,000 \text{ litres}$ 

54,000 litres x 2 µg/L = 108,000 µg = 0.108 grams

This is equal to about 0.07 mL of PCE.



 $60 \text{ m}^2 \text{ x} 3 \text{ m} \text{ x} 0.3 = 54 \text{ m}^3 = 54,000 \text{ litres}$ 

54,000 litres x 2  $\mu$ g/L = 108,000  $\mu$ g = 0.108 grams

This is equal to about 0.07 mL of PCE.





 $60 \text{ m}^2 \text{ x} 3 \text{ m} \text{ x} 0.3 = 54 \text{ m}^3 = 54,000 \text{ litres}$ 

54,000 litres x 2  $\mu$ g/L = 108,000  $\mu$ g = 0.108 grams

This is equal to about 0.07 mL of PCE.

There is no way that this is the entire mass of PCE we are dealing with at this site!





# A more realistic scenario:







# Guigard, Stiver & Zytner (1996)



- Column filled with soil
- 135 mL of PCE applied to soil surface
- Infiltration times and liquid front movement measured for different soil types
- Cross-sectional area of column = 0.0031 m<sup>2</sup>



# Guigard, Stiver & Zytner (1996)



PCE liquid front movement in air dry soils: Green and Ampt Model. Figure 3.

of Immiscible Chemicals in Unsaturated Soil, Environmental Technology, 17:10, 1123-1130, DOI: 10.1080/09593331708616481



# Guigard, Stiver & Zytner (1996)



- Water table is 1.5 m below surface
- Assume crack 1 m long and 3 mm wide (area = 0.003 m<sup>2</sup>)
- Approximately 1 litre of PCE would need to penetrate the crack to reach the water table
- This is enough PCE to fill the saturated void space in the impacted zone with 2 µg/L of PCE over 14,000 times







## **Potassium Permanganate Health and Safety**

















- One 380-litre polyethylene tank used for mixing
- Injections by gravity







 Checking for presence of potassium permanganate in a monitoring well





### Results





## Conclusions

- Some progress towards reduced concentrations has been made
- An elusive PCE source zone is contributing to rebound of the PCE concentrations
- Additional site characterization and targeting of the source zone may be needed
- Risk assessment may be a more appropriate approach for this site





## Conclusions

- Some progress towards reduced concentrations has been made
- An elusive PCE source zone is contributing to rebound of the PCE concentrations
- Additional site characterization and targeting of the source zone may be needed
- Risk assessment may be a more appropriate approach for this site





## **Questions?**



