# Site Application of PFASorb & E-Clay Remediation of PFOS Soil & Groundwater Contamination





Presentation by Simon Farr & David Slater 1<sup>st</sup> March 2024



#### PFAS

# AND VERY STABLE

The key to understanding the chemistry and environmental fate / transport of PFAS compounds is their surface-active behaviour.

The fluorinated **backbone 'tail'** is both hydrophobic (water repelling) and oleophobic / lipophobic (oil/fat repelling) while the functional group 'head' is hydrophilic (water loving).



This means that PFAS compounds tend to accumulate at the soil / groundwater interface. This is why groundwater only treatment strategies are not always effective as the PFOS / PFOA readily exchanges between the soils and water. An analogy often given is they are the "never-ending gobstopper"

The PFAS partitioning behaviour also is affected by the alkyl chain length and the charge on the terminal functional group. In general, PFASs with shorter alkyl chain length are more water soluble than those with longer lengths. Adsorption to soil surfaces has been shown to be greater for PFASs with longer alkyl chain length. Equally pH / TOC play a major role in overall sorption and solubility.



# **E-Clay**



1600 Å

E-Clays have been utilised in the remediation of circa **200** contaminated land projects over the last **27** years. The technology has been successfully applied in both stabilisation, barrier (Permeable Reactive Barrier) and integrated treatment strategies.

That is a vast wealth of experience and knowledge in applying the technology in real world scenarios.



Envirotreat E-Clay is derived from the modification of naturally-occurring clays using selected chemical reagents. A reactive treatment medium is produced (a modified organo / inorgano clay) capable of chemically absorbing and immobilising a range of pollutants present within soils and water.

The key is the experience and knowledge in the application of this technology



Envirotreat was commissioned by the client to provide an outline remediation proposal and recommendations for supplementary site investigative works on the development area (a

parcel of land adjoining an existing fire station and th the existing fire station.

Significantly higher concentrations were encountered during baseline monitoring ~5,500ng/l

Previous site investigations had already highlighted the monitoring ~5,500ng/l soils and groundwater. Supplementary site investigation by Envirotreat indicated the presence of evaluated PFOS contamination in soils (684 ug/kg) and groundwater (3,030 ng/l EQS 0.64 ng/l) predominantly under the fire station car park.





https:/redditchstandard.co.uk/news/video-redditch-fire-station-drill-tower-demolished/



Based on the supplementary site investigative report, Envirotreat carried out a Remediation Options Appraisal, prepared a Remediation Strategy and a Remediation Method Statement.

The prime controlled water receptor was identified as the Batchley Brook (located ~15m from site boundary in the direction of projected groundwater flow).

The potential risks to human health will be addressed through pathway breaks (capping layer) and by the implementation of suitable gas membranes within the buildings.

These were agreed with the client, the client's consultants (LQM) and the appropriate regulatory bodies.

The following criteria were applied:

- A soil source treatment threshold of 5ug/kg (5,000ng/kg). Continuing treatment
  of soils with less than 5ug/kg was not considered to be commercially or
  environmentally sustainable. Reducing the RC from 5ug/kg to 1ug/kg would
  have seen the treatment volume increase by 250%, with treated PFOS mass
  increasing by only 3.5%.
- Leachate criteria based on a 95% reduction of anticipated PFAS concentrations (plus normal contingency factors including a worst-case assumption of a nondepleting source). The leachate criteria was determined by the PRB Design (integrated treatment design).
- A nominal groundwater treatment target value of 50ng/l subject to establishing background concentrations. The prime objective being to protect the brook.







Sample	Leachable Total PFOS (ug/kg) *				
Treated 22-1	0.47				
Treated 22-2	0.52				
Treated 23A	4.3				
Treated 23B	2				
Treated 24A	4.58				
Treated 24B	3.27				
Treated 27-1	0.17				
Treated 27-2	0.18				
Treated 28-1	0.49				
Treated 12-4	4.77				
Treated 13-4	23.3				
Treated 30A	2.5				
Treated 30B	10.7				
Treated 31-A	7.2				
Treated 31-B	2.9				
Treated 3A	11				
Treated 3B	28				
Treated 4A	2.7				
Treated 4B	25.3				
Treated 5A	3.6				
Treated 5B	6.6				
Treated 6A	0.8				
Treated 6B	6.9				
Treated 7A	2.7				
Treated 7B	2.9				
Treated 11/4/23C	2.9				
Treated 11/4/23D	3.8				
Treated 12/4/23C	15.9				
Treated 12/4/23D	6.7				
Treated 13/4/23C	1.76				

- Well within anticipated values
- Within design criteria for PRB
- No direct comparisons between untreated / treated samples (due to heterogeneity of soils)
- Average PFOS leachate of 6.3ug/kg (\*)
- MAX PFOS leachate of 28ug/kg (\*)
- Based on Total PFOS concentration of 684ug/kg anticipated PFOS leachate would be 275ug/kg (\*)
- Groundwater down gradient of PRB monitoring is ongoing

\* Sum of branched, 6:2 & sulphonate

Date	MBH201	MBH202	MBH203	MBH204	MBH205	MBH206	WS101	WS102
13/04/22	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.4	33.2
28/04/23	1370	126	63.3	-	<65	-	17.1	80.8
01/06/23	470	264	8.75	-	16.5	-	17.6	38.4
07/07/23	8360	181	6.17	121	-	14.9	67.9	36.7
03/08/23	7770	63.9	<6.5	98.9	10.3		110	<6.5
06/09/23	4770	88.9	23.4	120	<6.5	2530	141	35
09/10/23	7140	60.9	15	489	-	2580	309	35.6
08/11/23	2910	48.1	16	22.3	23.6	1710	2080	18.2
14/12/23	2470	11.6	6.46	6.79	-	20.9	58	14
10/01/24	2060	10.7	<6.5	11.6		35.4	36.6	25.6

MBH201

MBH206

B4184

0

AND A DECK

Middlehouse Ln

MBH205

WS101

441

84784

MBH204

WS102

MBH202

MBH203

Thank you for listening. Any questions?