

Quantification of Vapor Phase-related Natural Source Zone Depletion Processes

API PUBLICATION 4784
FIRST EDITION, MAY 2017



AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

Special Notes

API publications necessarily address problems of a general nature. With respect to particular circumstances, local, state, and federal laws and regulations should be reviewed.

Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, committees, or other assignees make any warranty or representation, either express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained herein, or assume any liability or responsibility for any use, or the results of such use, of any information or process disclosed in this publication. Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, or other assignees represent that use of this publication would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

API publications may be used by anyone desiring to do so. Every effort has been made by the Institute to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data contained in them; however, the Institute makes no representation, warranty, or guarantee in connection with this publication and hereby expressly disclaims any liability or responsibility for loss or damage resulting from its use or for the violation of any authorities having jurisdiction with which this publication may conflict.

API publications are published to facilitate the broad availability of proven, sound engineering and operating practices. These publications are not intended to obviate the need for applying sound engineering judgment regarding when and where these publications should be utilized. The formulation and publication of API publications is not intended in any way to inhibit anyone from using any other practices.

Any manufacturer marking equipment or materials in conformance with the marking requirements of an API standard is solely responsible for complying with all the applicable requirements of that standard. API does not represent, warrant, or guarantee that such products do in fact conform to the applicable API standard.

Copyright © 2017 American Petroleum Institute. No part of this work may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Contact the Publisher, API Publishing Services, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Foreword

Nothing contained in any API publication is to be construed as granting any right, by implication or otherwise, for the manufacture, sale, or use of any method, apparatus, or product covered by letters patent. Neither should anything contained in the publication be construed as insuring anyone against liability for infringement of letters patent.

The verbal forms used to express the provisions in this document are as follows.

Shall: As used in a standard, “shall” denotes a minimum requirement in order to conform to the standard.

Should: As used in a standard, “should” denotes a recommendation or that which is advised but not required in order to conform to the standard.

May: As used in a standard, “may” denotes a course of action permissible within the limits of a standard.

Can: As used in a standard, “can” denotes a statement of possibility or capability.

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	2
1.2 Document Objectives	2
1.3 Intended Audience and Use	2
1.4 Guidance Applicability and Limitations	2
1.5 Document Content Reference Key	3
1.6 Data Uses for NSZD Measurements	3
1.7 Site Applicability and Technology Limitations	3
2 Theory of NSZD	6
2.1 Attenuation Processes	9
2.2 Thermal Signatures of Biodegradation	16
2.3 Estimation of Natural Source Zone Depletion	17
3 General NSZD Evaluation Considerations	17
3.1 Program Design Considerations	17
3.2 Gas Flux Monitoring Field Implementation	24
3.3 Data Evaluation	27
4 Gradient Method	30
4.1 Method Description	30
4.2 Program Design Considerations	31
4.3 Field Monitoring	36
4.4 Data Evaluation	40
5 Passive Flux Trap Method	41
5.1 Description	41
5.2 Program Design Considerations	41
5.3 Trap Deployment and Retrieval	43
5.4 Data Evaluation	45
6 Dynamic Closed Chamber Method	47
6.1 Description	47
6.2 Program Design Considerations	48
6.3 Survey Implementation	50
6.4 Data Evaluation	52
7 Emerging Methods	54
7.1 Biogenic Heat Monitoring	54
7.2 CH ₄ Flux Monitoring	58
7.3 ¹⁴ C Isotopic Correction for the Gradient and DCC Methods	59
8 Conclusions	60
8.1 Key Points of Guidance	60
8.2 Future Research Needs	61
Annex A (informative) Example Procedures	63
Annex B (informative) Case Study of Three NSZD Estimation Methods	91
Bibliography	110

Figures

1-1 Conceptualization of Vapor Phase-related NSZD Processes at a Petroleum Release Site	6
2-1 Conceptualization of Saturated Zone NSZD Processes	10

Contents

	Page	
2-2	Conceptualization of Vapor Phase-related NSZD Processes	12
2-3	Conceptualization of Vapor Phase-related NSZD Processes (a) with and (b) without Hydrocarbon Impacts in the Vadose Zone	17
3-1	Example Use of Nomograms to Estimate NSZD Rates	21
3-2	Example Placement of Survey Locations for DCC Method	25
3-3	Example Conceptual Depiction of Site-wide NSZD Rate Contouring	29
4-1	Schematic of Gradient Method Monitoring Setup with (a) and without (b) Hydrocarbon Impacts in the Vadose Zone	33
4-2	Conceptualization of Soil Gas Concentration Profiles with (a) and without (b) Hydrocarbon Impacts in the Vadose Zone	34
4-3	Choice of Measurement Points and Influence on Estimated Gradient CO ₂ Gradient in Soil with (a) and without (b) Hydrocarbon Impacts in the Vadose Zone	35
4-4	Determination of b Parameter in Equation 4.2 from Nonreactive Tracer Test Measurements of Mass and Vapor Recovery (Excerpt from Johnson et al., 1996)	38
5-1	Schematic (Left) and Photo (Right) of a Passive CO ₂ Flux Trap	42
6-1	LI-COR 8100A DCC Apparatus and Setup	48
6-2	Example Output from a CO ₂ Efflux Measurement Using a DCC	53
7-1	Schematic Diagram of NSZD-derived Heat Flux and a Subsurface Thermal Profile	56
B-1	Site Layout and Locations of NSZD Monitoring	92
B-2	Cross Section A-A'—Soil Texture, LNAPL Occurrence, and NSZD Monitoring Locations	93
B-3	Soil Gas Concentration Depth Profile at NSZD-1	97
B-4	Soil Gas Concentration Depth Profile at NSZD-2	97
B-5	Soil Gas Concentration Depth Profile at NSZD-3	98
B-6	Soil Gas Concentration Depth Profile at NSZD-4	98
B-7	Estimated Hydrocarbon Degradation Rate Using Depth and Porosity	100
B-8	Estimated Hydrocarbon Degradation Rate Using Effective Oxygen Diffusion Coefficient and Depth	101
B-9	Passive Flux Trap CO ₂ Efflux Measurement Results	105
B-10	DCC Results Compared with Soil Moisture and Ambient Temperature	107
B-11	Comparison of NSZD Rate Estimates	108
Tables		
1	Summary of Intended Uses for This Guidance	2
2	Document Overview and Content Reference	4
2-1	Summary of Site Conditions that Preclude or Affect Vapor Phase-related NSZD Monitoring	7
3-1	Summary of Key LCC Elements and Their Relations to NSZD	18
3-2	Spectrum of Data Use Objectives and the Associated Scope of NSZD Monitoring	19
3-3	NSZD Monitoring Method Screening Criteria	23
3-4	Units of NSZD Measurement	27
3-5	Example Representative Hydrocarbons and CO ₂ Flux Stoichiometric Conversion Factors	28
4-1	Sources of Uncertainty, Variability, and Mitigations Associated with the Gradient Method	37
5-1	Sources of Uncertainty, Variability, and Mitigations for the Passive Flux Trap Method	44
6-1	Sources of Uncertainty, Variability, and Mitigations Associated with the DCC Method	50
R-1	Summary of Key Content in the Case Study	91
B-1	Summary of Measurement Methods and Locations	92
B-3	Soil Gas Sampling Results	94
B-4	Oxygen Effective Diffusion Coefficients	100
B-5	Summary of Calculated NSZD Rates	103
B-6	Passive CO ₂ Trap Method Results	104
B-7	DCC Method Results	105

Acronyms and Abbreviations

°C	degrees Celsius
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
A/A	aerobic/anaerobic
AMS	accelerator mass spectrometry
ASTM	ASTM International
bgs	below ground surface
C ₇ H ₁₆	heptane
CH ₄	methane
cm	centimeter
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CSM	conceptual site model
D ^{eff} _v	diffusion coefficient
DCC	dynamic closed chamber
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Fe ²⁺	dissolved iron
FID	flame ionization detector
g/ft ² /d	gallons per square feet per day
g/m ² /d	gallons per square meter per day
gal/ac/yr	gallons per acre per year
gal/yr	gallons per year
GIS	geographic information system
GRO	gasoline-range organics
H ₂	hydrogen
H ₂ O	water
IRGA	infrared CO ₂ gas analyzer
ITRC	Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council
lb/ac/d	pounds per acre per day
lb/d	pounds per day
lb/yr	pounds per year
LCSM	LNAPL conceptual site model
LIF	induced fluorescence
LNAPL	light non-aqueous phase liquid
m	meters
mg/L	milligrams per liter
Mn ²⁺	manganese
N ₂	nitrogen
NO ₃	nitrate
NSZD	natural source zone depletion

O ₂	oxygen
SO ₄	sulfate
PID	photoionization detector
ppm	parts per million
ppmv	parts per million by volume
PVC	polyvinyl chloride
QA/QC	quality assurance/quality control
RPD	relative percent difference
Sch	Schedule
SF ₆	sulfur hexafluoride
SO ₄ ²⁻	sulfate
SVE	soil vapor extraction
SZNA	source zone natural attenuation
TB	trip blank
TPH	total petroleum hydrocarbons
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
VOC	volatile organic compound

Currently in preview, click buy full version

Currently in preview, click buy full version

Quantification of Vapor Phase-related Natural Source Zone Depletion Processes

1 Introduction

Natural source zone depletion (NSZD) has emerged as an important concept within the realm of environmental remediation. NSZD is a term used to describe the collective, naturally occurring processes of dissolution, volatilization, and biodegradation that results in mass losses of light non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL) petroleum hydrocarbon constituents from the subsurface.

This document provides practical guidance on NSZD theory, application, measurement methods, and data interpretation. It is intended to be used by practitioners to help plan, design, and implement NSZD monitoring programs in support of petroleum hydrocarbon site remediation.

This section of the document provides an introduction to the origin of the NSZD term, motivation, objectives, intended audience, and uses. To set the context for subsequent discussions, it also provides a broad overview on how measurements of NSZD can be used for decision making at remediation sites impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons.

1.1 Background

In 2000, the National Research Council issued its report on natural attenuation that included detailed discussion of the petroleum hydrocarbon degradation processes (NRC 2000). Largely building on the work by others (Wiedemeier et al. 1995), it established a formal mass budgeting process by which biotic processes could be measured to estimate the assimilative capacity, or biodegradation capacity, within the groundwater via intrinsic microbiological processes. It focused solely on estimating dissolved hydrocarbon constituent losses within the saturated zone based on changes in various geochemical parameters (i.e. dissolved oxygen, nitrate, sulfate, ferrous iron, and methane [CH₄]). Its methods required only traditional groundwater sampling and field and/or laboratory analyses. In a field study by Borden et al. (1995), it was observed, however, that groundwater advection of electron acceptors and biodegradation byproducts alone was insufficient to explain the observed increase in carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the groundwater. They postulated that the transfer of atmospheric oxygen (O₂) into the groundwater plume from the soil gas could account for the remaining carbon and close the mass balance.

In 2006, source zone natural attenuation (SZNA) was introduced (Lundegard and Johnson 2006). SZNA was defined as the collective mass losses from LNAPL source zones via dissolution in groundwater, dissolved electron acceptor delivery and biodegradation, volatilization of organic compounds (VOCs), and emission of vapor phase biodegradation byproducts. Underpinning vapor phase mass losses was a significant advancement in remediation practice, and demonstrated that saturated zone methods missed a significant portion of the total losses in LNAPL source zones. The first method demonstrated for monitoring vapor phase SZNA processes was the gradient method. This method consists of measuring soil gas concentration profiles of O₂, CO₂, CH₄, and the effective soil gas diffusion coefficient (D_{eff,v}), and using Fick's first law as a basis to estimate the rate of losses via vadose zone volatilization and aerobic biodegradation. The gradient method requires soil gas sampling and field and/or laboratory analyses.

In 2009, the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC) introduced a new term, natural source zone depletion (NSZD), to describe the same set of subsurface processes as encompassed by SZNA (ITRC 2009a). It proposed a systematic process to qualitatively assess and quantitatively measure NSZD through evaluation of source zone dissolution to groundwater, biodegradation of dissolved source zone mass, source zone volatilization to the vadose zone, and biodegradation of volatilized source zone mass. In addition to describing the use of the gradient method, it also discussed use of LNAPL chemical compositional change determinations, bench testing, and modelling as optional bases for NSZD quantification.

Since 2009, significant advances have been made in the methods used to measure NSZD, particularly with the vapor phase portion of the assessment. In addition to the gradient method (see Section 4), two new methods including the passive flux trap (see Section 5) and dynamic closed chamber (DCC) (see Section 6) are discussed herein. They are

included because they are published in peer-reviewed literature, are well-developed and have established industry-accepted field and analytical procedures, are accepted by the regulatory community, and are in widespread onsite use for NSZD monitoring. Other emerging methods for NSZD monitoring, including thermal monitoring using biogenic heat, are discussed in Section 7 because they are currently considered in a developmental stage.

1.2 Document Objectives

This document provides a summary of the theory and provides guidance on the use of three established NSZD methods: gradient, passive flux trap, and DCC. Its main objective is to provide a basis for improved consistency in the application and implementation of NSZD monitoring efforts and evaluation of NSZD data. Using proper terms of practice, it provides additional guidance on collection of Group II Data as specified in Johnson et al. (2006) to estimate NSZD rates.

Specifically, this document presents the following materials:

- summary of key elements of the current literature related to the theory and application;
- practical, experience-based guidance on planning, design, and implementation;
- sample procedures, calculations, and demonstration through a case study.

1.3 Intended Audience and Use

This guidance was written for a broad audience, including regulatory agencies, practitioners, and academia. Table 1 presents a summary of expected uses for the document.

Table 1—Summary of Intended Uses for This Guidance

Intended Audience	Intended Guidance Uses
Regulators—environmental remediation regulation compliance reviewers and case workers	Reference for reviewing proposed actions, work plans, and monitoring reports Staff educational and training material
Practitioners—site owners, consultants, and technology providers	Reference for developing work plans and field procedures Data interpretation support Staff educational and training material
Academia—professors, students, researchers	Reference for guiding future research needs Guide for design of related research Student educational and training material

1.4 Guidance Applicability and Limitations

This guidance is generally applicable to a wide range of environmental remediation sites containing petroleum hydrocarbon impacts in the subsurface. Hydrocarbon impacts in the subsurface can exist as sorbed hydrocarbon, residual LNAPL, mobile LNAPL, and migrating LNAPL (ITRC 2009b). Its use is appropriate at sites that have a need for theoretical, qualitative, or quantitative understanding of vapor phase-related NSZD processes. This guidance discusses three methods currently being applied to measure NSZD as it is expressed in soil vapor. It excludes other NSZD monitoring methods such as direct measurement of changes in LNAPL chemical composition, bench testing, and modeling that are addressed elsewhere (ITRC 2009a). Because the vapor phase component of NSZD is considered a critical component of an LNAPL conceptual site model (LCSM), this guidance is applicable to most petroleum release sites where risk management and/or remediation is ongoing.

This document captures the state of the practice. Like many environmental remediation monitoring methodologies, this is an evolving field and the practical portions of the document are subject to change as new approaches evolve. As such, this document is useful as a guide to develop site-specific plans and evaluate data, but its materials must be placed into proper context by a project team that is well versed in site conditions and project data quality and data need objectives. The reader is also advised to consult current literature for more recent advances and method improvements.

It is also important to note that because the methods described herein are emerging, few environmental remediation regulatory agencies have formalized the consideration of NSZD for decision-making purposes. The authors believe that this guidance will facilitate technically sound application and consistency, and thereby allow for more widespread use of NSZD monitoring to help advance remediation sites through the regulatory process toward closure.

1.5 Document Content Reference Key

Table 2 summarizes the content of each section in this document. Consult it to more expeditiously find materials of interest.

1.6 Data Uses for NSZD Measurements

NSZD measurements can be used for a wide variety of purposes. These include, but are not limited to the following.

- Refining the LCSM with quantification of petroleum hydrocarbon loss rates.
- Delineating the LNAPL footprint using vapor phase indicators of biodegradation.
- Estimating the short- and long-term rates of naturally occurring source mass removal.
- Assessing LNAPL stability through mass balance of losses and measured LNAPL mobility (Mahler et al. 2012).
- Comparing mass removal rates from NSZD to other ongoing remedial actions.
- Supporting a cost/benefit analysis of remedial technologies and evaluating the value of additional remediation.
- Evaluating remedial progress via periodic measurements during an active remediation program.
- Comparing pre- and post-remediation site conditions and evaluating the effectiveness of installed remedies.
- Optimizing the location of further remedial operations.
- Determining an endpoint for active remediation.

After alignment to a particular general data use above, site-specific data objectives can be defined and an NSZD monitoring program designed and implemented, as discussed in Sections 3 through 6 of this guidance.

1.7 Site Applicability and Technology Limitations

Figure 1-1 presents a conceptualization of subsurface conditions with annotations for vapor phase-related biodegradation byproducts of NSZD at a typical petroleum release site. It depicts the site conditions under which NSZD monitoring is typically applied. LNAPL and sorbed-phase petroleum hydrocarbons are present in the subsurface, with the majority within and below the zone of water table fluctuation. Anaerobic biodegradation predominates within this hydrocarbon impacted zone and creates CH₄ and smaller amounts of CO₂. Hydrocarbon compounds are volatilizing and offgassing along with the CH₄ and CO₂ from methanogenesis into the vadose zone. Where these gaseous NSZD byproducts meet atmospheric O₂, oxidation occurs. The oxidation of both CH₄ and