# Estimating NAPL Effective Hydraulic Conductivity and Potential Velocity in the Field Based on Laboratory Pore-Fluid Mobility Test Results

# OBJECTIVES

This study presents a screening-level calculation method to estimate the NAPL effective hydraulic conductivity (K<sub>n</sub>) and NAPL velocity in the field (if mobile). The method is applicable to any NAPL mobility assessment.

# BACKGROUND

Nonaqueous phase liquid (NAPL) mobility is important in NAPL site characterization, remedy selection, and remedial design.

## CHALLENGE

Distinguishing whether NAPLs are migrating or stable under field conditions.

## **CUSTOMARY APPROACH**

Laboratory NAPL mobility tests are performed using sediment or soil core samples containing NAPL. If no NAPL is produced from the mobility test using driving forces orders of magnitude stronger than field conditions (e.g., by centrifuge or "water-drive" method), NAPL in that test plug can be considered residual (i.e., immobile) under field conditions.

## **LIMITATIONS OF CUSTOMARY APPROACH**

When laboratory test gradients are orders of magnitude stronger than field conditions, any tests that produce NAPL movement in the field are inconclusive in terms of judging whether NAPL is greater or less than residual saturation in the field.

## **OPPORTUNITY**

The rate of NAPL movement in the laboratory provides quantitative insight into its mobility in the field.

# METHODS

## APPROACH

- Test for NAPL mobility in soil or sediment using laboratory water-drive or centrifuge method.
- Apply constant hydraulic gradient for specific period of time (for water-drive method or centrifuge method). The results can be interpreted as follows:
- No NAPL produced  $\rightarrow$  NAPL effective hydraulic conductivity  $(K_n) = 0$  (NAPL is at or below residual saturation and, therefore, immobile)
- NAPL produced  $\rightarrow$  calculate K<sub>n</sub>
- For tests with multiple hydraulic gradients that are all significantly stronger than those in the field, use results for lowest test gradient.
- Apply K<sub>n</sub> to calculate potential NAPL velocity if it is actually moving in the field (hypothetical assumption).



### ACTIVITIES

- 1 Obtain test plug from soil or sediment sample (plug should be as undisturbed as practicable)
- 2 Apply hydraulic gradient and measure volume of NAPL produced from test plug
- Obtain initial and final NAPL saturation, sample porosity, and test driving force from laboratory
- 4 Use Darcy's Law to calculate K<sub>n</sub>

Centrifugal force equals hydraulic gradient

### **DETAILED VIEW**





### SAMPLE

NAPL mobility test plug(s) normally taken from core interval(s) with highest apparent NAPL saturation

- Core photo under UV light (NAPL fluoresces)
- Same core photo under normal vhite light (NAPL is natural color)



## NOTE

<sup>1</sup>For centrifuge tests, gradient = factor of gravity forces (e.g., 10G = hydraulic gradient of 10)



INITIAL  $V_{n,start} = NAPL volume$ at start of test

**DURING TEST** Hydraulic gradient displaces some NAPL

ΔV<sub>n</sub>

FINAL V<sub>n.end</sub> = NAPL volume at end of test

Calculation Approach	
Volume of NAPL in Test Plug	V <sub>n</sub> =
V <sub>t</sub> = test plug volume; n = porosity; S = NAPL saturation	
Change in NAPL Volume	ΔV <sub>r</sub>
$V_{n,start} = V_n$ at start of test; $V_{n,end} = V_n$ at end of test	
NAPL Flow Rate	Q <sub>n</sub> :
t = test duration	
NAPL Effective Hydraulic Conductivity	K <sub>n</sub> =
A = area of flow perpendicular to gradient; i = test hydraulic gradient	

Example Results			
Example Results for Multi-Step Centrifuge Tests 10G, 100G, and 1000G Spin for 1 Hour Each			
Parameter	Example 1	Example 2	
porosity, n	0.6585	0.458	
NAPL saturation, S initial (%)	37.7	19.8	
NAPL saturation, S after 10G (%)	36.7	19.8	
NAPL saturation, S after 100G (%)	28.3	19.35	
NAPL saturation, S after 1000G (%)	10.1	12.7	
10G K <sub>n</sub> (cm/s)	9.3E-07	0.0E+00	
100G K <sub>n</sub> (cm/s)	7.8E-07	2.9E-08	
1000G K <sub>n</sub> (cm/s)	1.7E-07	4.3E-08	
Interpreted NAPL Mobility Condition	Potentially Mobile	Residual	
Field NAPL Velocity Calculation ( $v_n = K_n i / [nS]$ )			
Field Hydraulic Gradient	0.005	0.005	
Field NAPL Velocity (if mobile) (cm/s)	1.9E-08	0.0E+00	
Field NAPL Velocity (if mobile) (cm/yr)	0.6	0	
Example Results for Single-Step Centrifuge Tests 1000G Spin for 1 Hour			
Parameter	Example 3	Example 4	
porosity, n	0.462	0.533	
NAPL saturation, S initial (%)	29.2	9.3	
NAPL saturation, S after 1000G (%)	14.2	9.3	
1000G K <sub>n</sub> (cm/s)	9.8E-08	0.0E+00	
Interpreted NAPL Mobility Condition	Potentially Mobile	Residual	
Field NAPL Velocity Calculation ( $v_n = K_n i / [nS]$ )			
Field Hydraulic Gradient	0.005	0.005	
Field NAPL Velocity (if mobile) (cm/s)	3.6E-09	0.0E+00	
Field NAPL Velocity (if mobile) (cm/yr)	0.11	0	

Michael J. Gefell, PG, CPG (Lakewood, Colorado) Kevin Russell (Syracuse, New York) Mark Mahoney (Beverly, Massachusetts)



$V_n = V_t n S$
$V_n = V_{n,start} - V_{n,end}$
$Q_n = \Delta V_n / t$
$A_n = Q_n / Ai (Darcy's Law)$

# CONCLUSIONS

- Calculated K<sub>n</sub> values from 10G and single-step 1000G tests of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH)-rich NAPLs are usually in the range of 10<sup>-6</sup> cm/sec or less. We have observed similar results from water-drive tests.
- PAH-rich NAPL field velocities estimated based on K<sub>n</sub>, porosity, NAPL saturation, and field hydraulic gradient are often in the range of several centimeters per year or less.
- K<sub>n</sub> values calculated based on 10G, 100G, and 1000G centrifuge tests are generally similar and sometimes show a sequential decrease in calculated K<sub>n</sub> values from step to step. In these cases, the result from the first step (10G) is considered the most representative of the K<sub>n</sub> value in the field because that test condition is closest to field hydraulic gradients and the sample is closest to its original condition.
- We have seen NAPL movement in samples with initial NAPL saturations as low as 2.5% with 1000G centrifuge and 3.7% with 100G centrifuge, demonstrating that these test conditions are too excessive to characterize NAPL residual saturation values in the field.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thanks to Andrew Kirkman (BP) for his review and insights.