**NC STATE UNIVERSITY** 

Dept. of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering Box 7908, Raleigh, NC 27695-7908

February 12, 2011

Timothy Parker EOS Remediation, Inc. 1101 Nowell Rd. Raleigh, NC 27607

Dear Mr. Parker,

Per your request, we have completed the oil retention testing of the samples of aquifer material provided by Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Group from a perchlorate impacted site in Henderson, NV. As you are aware, the original plan was to conduct column tests to evaluate the retention of EOS598b42 and a lecithin emulsion in by the aquifer material. However, the very high silt-clay content of the material (28% passing a #200 sieve) resulted in a very low hydraulic conductivity and rapid clogging of the columns.

After consultation with Shaw and their client, we developed an alternative approach to evaluate oil retention. The aquifer material was first passed through a #4 sieve to remove large particles. Then, a batch sorption test was conducted by adding 40g moist soil to 50 mL falcon centrifuge tubes and sufficient tap water to cover the soil surface. The tubes were then amended with 0, 0.1, 0.4 or 1.0 mL of EOS598B42 or lecithin emulsion. The tubes were filled to the 50 mL mark with water, sealed, mixed to distribute the emulsion, and then allowed to settle overnight, and then the aqueous phase was decanted off to determine the amount of oil not attached to the soil. The soil settled very well and centrifugation was not required to separate the soil from the liquid phase. The tubes were then refilled with water, washed, settled overnight, and decanted two additional times to determine the amount of oil that would be released during additional washing. Liquid and soil volatile solids concentrations were determined by drying at 105 °C followed by ashing at 550 °C. All sorption tests were run in duplicate. Oil retention was calculated as VSS of the final soil sample minus the average VSS of untreated control sample. The average VSS of the untreated control was 14.74 mg/g (Sample  $A = 14.67$  mg/g, Sample  $B = 14.82 \text{ mg/g}.$ 

Overall, the very large majority of the oil was retained by the soil and very little was released in the aqueous phase. On average, 99.5% (range = 99.1 to 99.7%) of the volatile solids were present in the soil and 0.10%, 0.14%, and 0.25% of the volatile material was present in the first, second and third wash, respectively.

Figure 1 shows the measured oil retention vs the VSS concentration in the first water decant. Oil retention increases somewhat with aqueous phase concentration. However, most of this increase is due to the larger amount of oil added. This effect is illustrated in Figure 2. The fraction of VSS present in the aqueous phase increases with aqueous phase concentration. However, the total amount of VSS in the aqueous phase never exceeded

1%, regardless of the aqueous phase concentration. This indicates that we never approached the maximum oil retention of this soil.



Figure 1 Oil retention vs VSS concentration of first water wash.



Figure 2 Fraction oil in the aqueous phase (sum of wash 1, 2 and 3) vs VSS of first water wash.

Overall, the sorption tests indicate the maximum oil retention of the sample provided to us is over 0.02  $g/g$  for EOS598B42 and over 0.06  $g/g$  for the lecithin emulsion. My understanding is the groundwater flow velocity at the site is very high. This is not consistent with the high silt-clay content of the sample provided to us, indicating this sample may not be representative of condition at the site. If the sample provided to us is not representative of field conditions, the sorption test results would not provide a useful indication of the likely extent of oil retention at the site.

If you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Alt C. Bak

Robert C. Borden, Professor Dept. of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering 919-515-1625 (ph) rcborden@eos.ncsu.edu

## CQM, INC.

and the company's world

, where the contract constraints are contracted in the following  $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathcal{A}}$  , and

## SIEVE ANALYSIS OF COARSE TO FINE AGGREGATES (ASTM D422)



REVIEWED BY: *Robert R Roca*s DATE REVIEWED:

Remarks:

 $\tilde{\psi}$ 





 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  $\epsilon$ 



 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

F-ALL-C-006-Rev.05 (30Oct2009) SCUR Form

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$