



SUSTAINABLE SOLAR-POWERED SOIL VAPOR EXTRACTION (SVE) SURF Case Study #0013

This case study highlights the use of solar-powered SVE to remediate former evaporation pits at remote natural gas compressor stations. Sustainability metrics were evaluated for implementing solar SVE vs. the traditional dig-andhaul treatment typically selected for these types of sites.

BACKGROUND

- Pits were identified and investigated in 2014 as part of due diligence activities.
- Over 3,000 cubic yards of soil up to 35 feet below ground surface were impacted by total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs).
- Multiple pads in the area required remediation in accordance with Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (COGCC) regulations for pits.
- The site is in a remote natural gas field with no power infrastructure nearby.



• The closest landfill is over 60 miles away – one way.



REMEDIAL STRATEGY

- The remedial objectives were to clean up soil to meet COGCC cleanup standards and BLM lease requirements.
- The following two remedial options were screened based on effectiveness, implementability, and cost:
 - Dig and haul (excavation and off-site disposal)
 - o SVE
- With no power infrastructure in the area, the SVE system was powered via solar panels, further reducing the environmental footprint of the remedy.

VariSun Mobile Solar System, 6 kW array, 5 hp Regenerative blower with telemetry capabilities

1

SUSTAINABLE REMEDIATION TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE

Dig and Haul vs. Solar Soil Vapor Extraction

ENVIRONMENT

Solar SVE

- Less waste (> 3,000 yds³ vs. < 5 yds³)
- Less greenhouse gases (152 metric tonnes CO₂e vs. 16 metric tonnes CO₂e)
 - Less on- and off-site emissions (nitrogen and sulfur oxides, particulate matter)
 - No loss of topsoil

SOCIAL

Dig and Haul

- Includes negative aspects of truck traffic (safety, dust, noise, and road degradation)
 - Provides more jobs, but only temporarily
 - Reduces local landfill capacity

ECONOMIC

- Dig and Haul = > \$200K
 - Solar SVE = \$150K
- Using alternatives for remediation portfolio (three pits) = > \$600K (Dig and Haul) vs. \$300K (Solar SVE)

ENVIRONMENTAL FOOTPRINT ASSESSMENT

Environment Assessment - SiteWise™ Greenhouse Gases – Metric Tonnes CO₂e

Dig and Haul 152.95 Solar SVE 16.1

ENVIRONMENTAL FOOTPRINT ASSESSMENT (continued)

Environment Assessment - SiteWise™

Remedial Alternatives	GHG Emissions	Total energy Used	Water Consumption	Electricity Usage	Onsite NO _x Emissions	
	metric ton	MMBTU	gallons	MWH	metric ton	
Dig and Haul	152.95	2.73E+03	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.26E-02	
Solar SVE	16.10	3.29E+03	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.30E-02	

Remedial Alternatives	Onsite SO _x Emissions	Onsite PM ₁₀ Emissions	Total NO _x Emissions	Total SO _x Emissions	Total PM ₁₀ Emissions	Accident Risk	Accident Risk Injury
	metric ton	metric ton	metric ton	metric ton	metric ton	Fatality	rtiok injury
Dig and Haul	1.06E-02	4.88E-03	5.54E-01	5.14E-01	6.24E-01	2.80E-04	3.40E-02
Solar SVE	1.34E-03	1.18E-03	3.97E-02	2.63E-02	4.67E-03	5.20E-05	6.12E-03

SOCIAL ASSESSMENT

Social Assessment – Social Sustainability Evaluation Matrix



3

KEY LESSONS LEARNED

- Using sustainability metrics to support selection of the remedial options provided stakeholders additional information beyond selecting excavation for its short-term effectiveness.
- Perception of the project by agency representatives has influenced other pit owners in the area to consider green technologies.
- Although not in state regulations or guidance, stakeholders were interested in reviewing the output of the sustainability assessment.





FOR MORE INFORMATION...

This case study is the topic of a SURF webinar.

To access the webinar, click here.

Case Study Contacts



Rob Rebel, P.E. (Senior Engineer) LT Environmental, Inc., Proud member of WSP Bend, Oregon (303) 548-5097 <u>rrebel@ltenv.com</u> <u>www.ltenv.com</u>

Ernesto Montenero (Equipment Fabrication) Sustainable Technologies Alameda, California (510) 523-1122 <u>info@sustainabletech.cc</u> <u>www.sustainabletech.cc</u>

