

2005

Groundwater remediation using a coal washery discard permeable reactive wall

Stuart Gray
University of Wollongong

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses>

University of Wollongong

Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

Recommended Citation

Gray, Stuart, Groundwater remediation using a coal washery discard permeable reactive wall, PhD thesis, Faculty of Engineering, University of Wollongong, 2005. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/530>

NOTE

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION USING A COAL WASHERY
DISCARD PERMEABLE REACTIVE WALL**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

from

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

by

STUART GRAY, BE (Hons 1)

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

2005

CERTIFICATION

I, Stuart C. Gray, declare that this thesis, submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Engineering, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'fgray'.

Stuart C. Gray

23 May 2005

Table of Contents

<i>Certification</i>	ii
<i>Table of Contents</i>	iii
<i>List of Tables</i>	ix
<i>List of Figures</i>	xi
<i>Abstract</i>	xvii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xx
<i>List of Publications</i>	xxi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 AIMS OF THE RESEARCH THESIS	3
1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH THESIS	4
1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH THESIS	5
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 PERMEABLE REACTIVE WALLS	7
2.1.1 Geotechnical and Hydraulic Design Criteria for Permeable Reactive Walls	10
2.1.1.1 Installation Method and Design	10
2.1.1.2 Hydraulic Factors for Permeable Reactive Wall Design	13
2.1.2 Reactive Processes for Permeable Reactive Walls	17
2.1.2.1 Zero Valent Iron for the Reduction of Chlorinated Solvents	18
2.1.2.2 Treatment of Acidic Metal-Rich Drainage by Neutralisation and Precipitation	20
2.1.2.3 Ion Exchange by Aluminosilicates: Clay Chemistry	22
2.1.2.4 Chemical Sorption of BTEX Compounds and other Organics	27
2.1.2.5 Biodegradation within a Permeable Reactive Wall	29
2.2 COAL WASHERY DISCARD PRODUCTION, PROPERTIES AND UTILISATION	31
2.2.1 Coal Washery Discard Production Methods	31
2.2.2 Relevant Physical Properties of Coal Washery Discard	35

2.2.3 Chemical Properties of Coal Washery Discard	39
2.2.4 Coal Washery Discard Utilisation Technologies	43
2.3 BLAST FURNACE SLAG – A RESOURCE OR ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD?	45
2.3.1 Formation of Blast Furnace Slag	45
2.3.2 Chemical Composition of Blast Furnace Slag	47
2.3.3 Utilisation Options for Blast Furnace Slag	48
2.3.4 Leaching Characteristics of Blast Furnace Slag	49
2.4 SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW	51
 CHAPTER 3 STUDY SITE DETAILS AND THE INSTALLATION AND MONITORING OF THE FIELD PERMEABLE REACTIVE WALL	 54
3.1 STUDY SITE DETAILS	54
3.1.1 Site Location	54
3.1.2 Site Geology	55
3.1.3 Emplacement Details	57
3.1.4 Previous Groundwater Monitoring Studies	59
3.1.5 Impacts of High Rainfall	61
3.2 INSTALLATION AND MONITORING OF THE COAL WASHERY DISCARD PERMEABLE REACTIVE WALL	64
3.2.1 Coal Washery Discard as a Permeable Reactive Material	64
3.2.2 Installation Method and Design	66
3.2.3 Monitoring the Permeable Reactive Wall	68
3.2.3.1 <i>Reactivity of the Wall</i>	69
3.2.3.2 <i>Hydraulic Performance of the Wall</i>	70
3.3 SUMMARY	72
 CHAPTER 4 FIELD MONITORING RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	 73
4.1 REACTIVITY OF THE PERMEABLE REACTIVE WALL	73
4.1.1 pH Drop Across the Wall	73
4.1.2 Other Parameters	79
4.1.3 Discussion of Field Reactivity Data	81
4.1.3.1 <i>pH Drop Across the PRW</i>	81

4.1.3.2 <i>Changes in pH with Time and Rainfall</i>	83
4.1.3.3 <i>Changes in Metal Concentrations Across the PRW and with Time</i>	86
4.2 HYDRAULIC PERFORMANCE OF THE PERMEABLE REACTIVE WALL	89
4.2.1 Development of the MODFLOW Flow Model	89
4.2.2 Impact of the Permeable Reactive Wall on Local Groundwater Movement	91
4.2.3 Impact of Rainfall on the Permeable Reactive Wall	96
4.2.3.1 <i>Effect on Groundwater Levels</i>	96
4.2.3.2 <i>Effect on Groundwater Flow Rates and Residence Time Within the Wall</i>	102
4.3 SUMMARY	105
 CHAPTER 5 COAL WASHERY DISCARD CHARACTERISATION AND LABORATORY METHODS FOR DETERMINING REACTIVITY ..	
5.1 COAL WASHERY DISCARD CHARACTERISATION	106
5.1.1 Particle Size Distribution	108
5.1.2 Hydraulic Conductivity	110
5.1.3 Coal and Volatile Content	113
5.1.4 Mineral Phase Determination	114
5.1.5 pH and Oxidation Tests	119
5.1.6 Specific Surface	121
5.2 LABORATORY METHODS FOR DETERMINING CWD REACTIVITY	124
5.2.1 Static Batch Tests	124
5.2.1.1 <i>Standard Batch Procedure</i>	124
5.2.1.2 <i>Base Neutralisation Capacity</i>	125
5.2.2 Column Test Method	126
5.3 SUMMARY OF CWD CHARACTERISATION TESTS	130
 CHAPTER 6 BATCH TEST RESULTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF THE TREATMENT MECHANISM	
	132

6.1 STANDARD BATCH TEST RESULTS	132
6.1.1 Results from Batch Test 1	132
6.1.2 Results from Batch Test 2	135
6.1.3 Results from Batch Test 3	136
6.1.4 Results from Batch Test 4	138
6.1.5 Results from Batch Test 5	139
6.2 DISCUSSION OF STANDARD BATCH TEST RESULTS	140
6.2.1 Discussion of Batch Test 1 Results	141
6.2.2 Discussion of Batch Test 2 Results	142
6.2.3 Discussion of Batch Test 3 Results	145
6.2.4 Discussion of Batch Test 4 Results	147
6.2.5 Discussion of Batch Test 5 Results	148
6.3 CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF THE PRIMARY TREATMENT MECHANISM	148
6.3.1 Concepts of Clay Surface Chemistry	149
6.3.2 Summary of Primary Treatment Mechanism	150
6.3.3 Proton Release Calculations	151
6.3.4 pH Dependent Charge and Cation Exchange Reactions	153
6.3.5 Chemical Stability of Reacted CWD	156
6.3.6 Significance of the Initial CWD pH	157
6.4 BASE NEUTRALISATION CAPACITY TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	157
6.4.1 Results of the Base Neutralisation Capacity Test	157
6.4.2 Discussion of the Base Neutralisation Capacity Test Results	158
6.5 SUMMARY OF THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL	160
CHAPTER 7 COLUMN TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	161
7.1 COLUMN TEST RESULTS	161
7.1.1 Results from Column Test 1	161
7.1.2 Results from Column Test 2	164
7.1.3 Results from Column Test P3	166
7.1.4 Results from Column Test P4	169
7.1.5 Results from Column Test 5	170

7.1.6 Results from Column Test 6	172
7.1.7 Results from Column Test 7	175
7.1.8 Results from Column Test 8	178
7.1.9 Results from Column Test 9	180
7.2 DISCUSSION OF COLUMN TEST RESULTS	183
7.2.1 Discussion of Column Test 1 Results	183
7.2.2 Discussion of Column Test 2 Results	187
7.2.3 Discussion of Column Test P3 Results	190
7.2.4 Discussion of Column Test P4 Results	192
7.2.5 Discussion of Column Test 5 Results	194
7.2.6 Discussion of Column Test 6 Results	197
7.2.7 Discussion of Column Test 7 Results	198
7.2.8 Discussion of Column Test 8 Results	200
7.2.9 Discussion of Column Test 9 Results	202
7.3 SUMMARY OF COLUMN TEST RESULTS IN TERMS OF THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL	205
7.4 COMPARISON BETWEEN FIELD OBSERVATIONS AND COLUMN TEST DATA	208
 CHAPTER 8 PHREEQC MODEL OF THE PRIMARY TREATMENT MECHANISM	 211
8.1 DEVELOPMENT OF THE PHREEQC MODEL	211
8.1.1 Desired Outcomes of the PHREEQC Model	211
8.1.2 Outline of the PHREEQC Model	212
8.1.2.1 <i>Theoretical Foundations to the Model</i>	212
8.1.2.2 <i>Laboratory Data Incorporated into the Model</i>	218
8.1.2.3 <i>Key Features of the Model Code</i>	222
8.2 VALIDATION OF THE PHREEQC MODEL	224
8.2.1 Details of Column Tests Used to Test the PHREEQC Model	224
8.2.2 Model Output and Discussion	225
8.3 NUMERICAL MODELLING OF THE FIELD PRW	237
8.3.1 Long Term Chemical Stability of Exhausted CWD	239
8.3.2 Worst-Case Scenarios for the Reactive Life of the Field CWD	

Permeable Reactive Wall	240
8.4 SUMMARY	242
CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	244
9.1 FIELD STUDY CONCLUSIONS	244
9.2 LABORATORY STUDY CONCLUSIONS	246
9.3 NUMERICAL MODELLING CONCLUSIONS	247
9.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	249
CHAPTER 10 REFERENCES	252
APPENDIX A DATALOGGER PROGRAM FOR pH MONITORING IN THE FIELD	267
APPENDIX B RECHARGE AND INJECTION WELL INPUT FILES FOR THE MODFLOW MODEL	269
APPENDIX C A PHREEQC INPUT FILE FOR SOUTH BULLI CWD	281
APPENDIX D A PHREEQC INPUT FILE FOR LONG TERM CHEMICAL STABILITY ANALYSIS	285
APPENDIX E ADDITIONAL FIELD DATA	288
APPENDIX F ADDITIONAL LABORATORY DATA	290
APPENDIX G PHREEQC MODEL OF CWD pH EQUILIBRIUM	293

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Classification of in situ remediation technologies	8
Table 2.2. Specific gravity of various coarse and fine CWD samples	36
Table 2.3. Hydraulic conductivity of samples of coarse and fine CWD	38
Table 2.4. Mineralogy of various coarse CWD samples by mass from around the world	40
Table 2.5. Chemical composition of BFS as oxides (% mass)	47
Table 3.1. Chemical analysis of groundwater within the BFS emplacement (from Gray, 1997)	60
Table 3.2. Chemical analysis of water in the stormwater pond and Griffins Bay after the August 1998 storms (from Yassini, 1998)	63
Table 4.1. Material properties and field characteristics used in the MODFLOW model	91
Table 4.2. Coefficient of correlation between field and model groundwater level data	96
Table 4.3. Model flow rates through the wall for 2 outlets and 0 outlets	102
Table 4.4. Groundwater velocities at the drain and groundwater residence times within the wall for 2 outlets and 0 outlets, based on MODFLOW output	103
Table 5.1. Hydraulic conductivities of coarse New South Wales CWD	112
Table 5.2. pH of each CWD sample before and after H ₂ O ₂ oxidation	120
Table 5.3. EGME specific surface and mineral fractions of each sample	123
Table 5.4. Details of each standard batch test	125
Table 5.5. Details of each column test	127
Table 5.6. Chemical analysis of each column test contaminant solution	129
Table 6.1. Batch test 5 results – pH and calcium concentration after 3 days	139
Table 6.2. Results of the base neutralisation capacity test on CWD samples	158
Table 8.1. Clay mineral fractions for each CWD sample	219
Table 8.2. Specific surface of each reactive site for E values from 10% to 50% (m ² /g CWD)	220
Table 8.3. Total equivalents of protons available for release from each reactive site for E values from 10% to 50% (× 10 ⁻⁵ eq/g CWD)	221

Table 8.4. Correlation coefficients between model and experimental data for South Bulli CWD	228
Table 8.5. Correlation coefficients between model and experimental data for West Cliff CWD	232
Table 8.6. Correlation coefficients between model and experimental data for Newcastle CWD	234
Table 8.7. Correlation coefficients between model and experimental data for Hunter CWD	237

List of Figures

Figure 2.1. Cut and fill excavation for the installation of a PRW	11
Figure 2.2. Plan view of a funnel-and-gate system	12
Figure 2.3. Hydraulic gradient through an ideal PRW	14
Figure 2.4. Kaolinite unit cell showing tetrahedral and octahedral sheets	23
Figure 2.5. Kaolinite basal and edge surfaces	24
Figure 2.6. Kaolinite edge surface sites under different pH conditions	25
Figure 2.7. Physical cleaning (washing) techniques for raw coal: (a) jig and (b) cyclone, for coarse fraction; (c) froth flotation for fine fraction	33
Figure 2.8. Particle size distributions of coarse and fine CWD samples from several coal producing countries	35
Figure 2.9. Changes in % pyrite, % carbonates and leachate pH over time within a CWD emplacement in Germany	41
Figure 2.10. Mass balance for a typical iron blast furnace	46
Figure 2.11. Utilisation of BFS from Port Kembla, New South Wales	49
Figure 3.1. Aerial photograph of the site taken in 1993	55
Figure 3.2. Borelog taken near the emplacement site in 1967	56
Figure 3.3. Schematic borelog through the BFS emplacement	57
Figure 3.4. Small test pit in the emplacement showing coarse CWD and BFS particles	58
Figure 3.5. Aerial view of study site showing emplacement area and stormwater pond	59
Figure 3.6. Annual rainfall depth in the vicinity of the emplacement, 1994-2000	62
Figure 3.7. Griffins Bay foreshore after the August 1998 storms	63
Figure 3.8. Coarse CWD stockpile at the South Bulli colliery north of Wollongong	65
Figure 3.9. Schematic section through the CWD permeable reactive wall (facing south) showing the filled zone and piezometer locations	67
Figure 3.10. Gabion wall (left) at effluent end of wall and stormwater culvert (right) to drain water to Griffins Bay	68
Figure 3.11. A PH100 analog sensor outside piezometer 19	70
Figure 4.1. Variation in pH with time at piezometers 19, H and G, and daily	

rainfall depths over the monitoring period	74
Figure 4.2. Comparison between the pH at piezometer H with daily rainfall depth	75
Figure 4.3. Comparison between the pH at piezometer G with daily rainfall depth	76
Figure 4.4. Scatter plot of the daily changes in pH at H and daily rainfall depth ..	77
Figure 4.5. Scatter plot of the daily changes in rainfall depth and pH at G one day after the change in rainfall	77
Figure 4.6. Variation in pH with distance along the CWD permeable reactive wall	78
Figure 4.7. Variation in Ca, Na and K with distance along the CWD permeable reactive wall	79
Figure 4.8. Variation in Mg, Fe and Al with distance along the CWD permeable reactive wall	80
Figure 4.9. Schematic plan view of the emplacement site	82
Figure 4.10. Schematic plan view of the MODFLOW finite difference grid	89
Figure 4.11. Field groundwater levels measured within the CWD wall during the monitoring period	92
Figure 4.12. Comparison between field and model groundwater level data between piezometer 19 and the effluent end of the wall for: (a) day 217; (b) day 299; (c) day 334; (d) day 362; (e) day 405; (f) day 441; (g) day 469; (h) day 554	95
Figure 4.13. Comparison between groundwater level at piezometer 19 and daily rainfall depth	97
Figure 4.14. Comparison between model groundwater level data for two roof outlets and no roof outlets for: (a) day 217; (b) day 299; (c) day 334; (d) day 362; (e) day 405; (f) day 441; (g) day 469; (h) day 554	101
Figure 5.1. Location of the coalfields of New South Wales	107
Figure 5.2. Coarse CWD sample from each colliery	108
Figure 5.3. Particle size distribution curves for coarse CWD	109
Figure 5.4. Schematic of the constant-head hydraulic conductivity test setup	111
Figure 5.5. Particle size distribution curves for crushed and uncrushed South Bulli CWD	111

Figure 5.6. Coal and volatile matter content of coarse New South Wales CWD ..	114
Figure 5.7. X-ray diffraction spectra of: (a) South Bulli CWD; (b) West Cliff CWD; (c) Newcastle CWD; (d) Hunter CWD	116
Figure 5.8. X-ray diffraction spectra of: (a) blast furnace slag sample; (b) granulated blast furnace slag (1), ungranulated blast furnace slag (2).	118
Figure 5.9. Schematic of the column test setup	127
Figure 6.1. Batch test 1 results – change in pH and conductivity over contact time	133
Figure 6.2. Batch test 1 results – change in sodium, calcium and potassium concentration over contact time	133
Figure 6.3. Batch test 1 results – change in aluminium, magnesium and iron concentration over contact time	133
Figure 6.4. Batch test 2 results – change in pH over contact time	135
Figure 6.5. Batch test 3 results – change in pH over contact time	137
Figure 6.6. Batch test 4 results – change in pH over contact time	138
Figure 6.7. Relationship between protons released from CWD clay mineral surfaces (meq/100g) and pH	152
Figure 6.8. Relationship between protons released from kaolinite surface sites (meq/100g) and pH	152
Figure 6.9. Relationship between both the meq of protons released from kaolinite surface sites and the meq of calcium ions removed from solution versus pH after 3 days contact time	153
Figure 6.10. Kaolinite surface charge density (mC/m^2) versus pH	155
Figure 6.11. Incorporating the base neutralisation capacity result for South Bulli CWD with the batch test results presented in Figure 6.7	160
Figure 7.1. Column test 1 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	162
Figure 7.2. Column test 1 results – effluent breakthrough curves for calcium, potassium, magnesium, iron and aluminium	163
Figure 7.3. Column test 1 results – effluent breakthrough curve for sodium	163
Figure 7.4. Column test 2 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	165
Figure 7.5. Column test 2 results – effluent breakthrough curves for calcium, magnesium and potassium	166
Figure 7.6. Column test 2 results – effluent breakthrough curve for sodium	167

Figure 7.7. Column test P3 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	168
Figure 7.8. Column test P3 results – effluent breakthrough curves for calcium, sodium and potassium	168
Figure 7.9. Column test P3 results – effluent breakthrough curves for magnesium, iron and aluminium	169
Figure 7.10. Column test P4 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	170
Figure 7.11. Column test 5 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	171
Figure 7.12. Column test 5 results – effluent breakthrough curves for calcium, sodium and potassium	172
Figure 7.13. Column test 5 results – effluent breakthrough curves for magnesium, iron and aluminium	173
Figure 7.14. Column test 6 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	174
Figure 7.15. Column test 6 results – effluent breakthrough curves for calcium, potassium, magnesium, iron and aluminium	174
Figure 7.16. Column test 6 results – effluent breakthrough curve for sodium	175
Figure 7.17. Column test 7 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	176
Figure 7.18. Column test 7 results – effluent breakthrough curves for calcium and sodium	177
Figure 7.19. Column test 7 results – effluent breakthrough curves for potassium, magnesium, iron and aluminium	178
Figure 7.20. Column test 8 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	179
Figure 7.21. Column test 8 results – effluent breakthrough curves for calcium, potassium, magnesium, iron and aluminium	179
Figure 7.22. Column test 8 results – effluent breakthrough curve for sodium	180
Figure 7.23. Column test 9 results – effluent pH breakthrough curve	181
Figure 7.24. Column test 9 results – effluent breakthrough curves for sodium and calcium	182
Figure 7.25. Column test 9 results – effluent breakthrough curves for potassium, magnesium, iron and aluminium	183
Figure 7.26. Cumulative proton release and cation adsorption in meq during column test 1	186
Figure 7.27. Cumulative proton release and calcium adsorption in meq during column test 2	189

Figure 7.28. Cumulative proton release and cation adsorption in meq during column test P3	191
Figure 7.29. Comparison between effluent pH breakthrough curves for column tests 2 and P4	193
Figure 7.30. Comparison between cumulative proton release in meq for column tests 2 and P4	194
Figure 7.31. Comparison between effluent pH breakthrough curves for column test 1 (0.55 mL/min), column test 3 (2.25 mL/min) and column test 5 (5.5 mL/min)	195
Figure 7.32. Comparison between cumulative proton release in meq for column test 1 (0.55 mL/min), column test 3 (2.25 mL/min) and column test 5 (5.5 mL/min)	196
Figure 7.33. Cumulative proton release and cation adsorption in meq during column test 5	197
Figure 7.34. Cumulative proton release and calcium adsorption in meq during column test 7	199
Figure 7.35. Cumulative proton release and calcium adsorption in meq during column test 8	201
Figure 7.36. Comparison between effluent pH breakthrough curves for South Bulli CWD (column test 1), West Cliff CWD (column test 7), Newcastle CWD (column test 8) and Hunter CWD (column test 9) .	203
Figure 7.37. Comparison between cumulative proton release in meq for South Bulli CWD (column test 1), West Cliff CWD (column test 7), Newcastle CWD (column test 8) and Hunter CWD (column test 9) .	203
Figure 7.38. Cumulative proton release and calcium adsorption in meq during column test 9	205
Figure 7.39. Field pH levels presented as breakthrough curves: (a) breakthrough at H, (b) breakthrough at G, (c) breakthrough at the effluent end. Curves begin at day 189	209
Figure 8.1. Block diagram showing the amphoteric oxygen sites present at the surfaces of 1:1 and 2:1 clays (reactive sites have been shaded)	217
Figure 8.2. PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of South Bulli CWD and longitudinal dispersivity of 0.1L	226

Figure 8.3. PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of South Bulli CWD and longitudinal dispersivity of L	226
Figure 8.4. Comparison between the PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of South Bulli CWD with longitudinal dispersivity of 2L and effluent pH breakthrough curve data from laboratory column tests 1 and 5	227
Figure 8.5. PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of West Cliff CWD and longitudinal dispersivity of 0.1L	230
Figure 8.6. PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of West Cliff CWD and longitudinal dispersivity of L	230
Figure 8.7. Comparison between the PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of West Cliff CWD with longitudinal dispersivity of 2L and effluent pH breakthrough curve data from laboratory column test 7	231
Figure 8.8. PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of Newcastle CWD and longitudinal dispersivity of 0.1L	233
Figure 8.9. PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of Newcastle CWD and longitudinal dispersivity of L	233
Figure 8.10. Comparison between the PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of Newcastle CWD with longitudinal dispersivity of 2L and effluent pH breakthrough curve data from laboratory column test 8	234
Figure 8.11. PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of Hunter CWD and longitudinal dispersivity of 0.1L	235
Figure 8.12. PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of Hunter CWD and longitudinal dispersivity of L	236
Figure 8.13. Comparison between the PHREEQC effluent pH breakthrough curves for the small sample of Hunter CWD with longitudinal dispersivity of 2L and effluent pH breakthrough curve data from laboratory column test 9	236
Figure 8.14. Comparison between the PHREEQC breakthrough curve and effluent pH levels measured at the field PRW	238

Abstract

Groundwater remediation has become increasingly necessary for environmental sustainability in industrial, agricultural and urban settings. One reason for this need has been the emplacement of rock waste materials (e.g. coal washery discard (CWD) and blast furnace slag (BFS)) from mining and metallurgical industries in areas such as the Illawarra region of New South Wales. Since there has been a lack of rigorous research into the potential for these emplacements to pollute groundwater, the majority of these emplacements were constructed without the installation of engineering leachate controls. Indeed, until research over the last 15 to 20 years proved the contrary, available evidence suggested that these rock wastes were inert and would not threaten groundwater quality. Therefore, there is a need to identify the environmental impacts of these rock waste emplacements and develop groundwater remediation strategies at existing emplacement sites, as well as develop economically and environmentally sustainable utilisation technologies for these rock waste materials.

This thesis presents a field study of a BFS emplacement located within the Illawarra region of New South Wales. High pH groundwater (pH 12-13) has been found to be migrating from this emplacement into an adjacent coastal saline lake, resulting in severe impacts on fish and benthic fauna. An innovative engineering solution, which involves the installation of a low pyrite CWD permeable reactive wall at the site, has been proposed and tested. Depending on the particle size, the equilibrium pH of this CWD material ranges from about 7.5 to over 9.0.

Field monitoring has been conducted to assess the hydraulic performance and reactivity of the CWD wall. A consistent and significant pH drop across the wall has been observed; the pH at the effluent end of the wall averaged 7.2 over the 825 day monitoring period. In addition, the wall was not found to impede natural groundwater flow. A three-dimensional MODFLOW model of the site and the wall reveals that flow through the wall conforms to fundamental flow equations.

Laboratory batch and column tests have been conducted to develop a conceptual model of the chemical interactions within the CWD wall. According to this model, the primary pH reduction mechanism is the deprotonation of reactive amphoteric oxygen sites at the clay edge surfaces and gibbsite basal surfaces within the CWD. This is an acid-base controlled reaction in which protons are drawn into solution by the concentration of hydroxide ions. Deprotonation of clay surfaces results in negatively charged surfaces that attract and adsorb available cations (primarily calcium) from solution.

The conceptual model has been used to develop a quantitative PHREEQC geochemical model of the wall. This model has been thoroughly tested using column test data and found to be valid. It is used to show that exhausted CWD is chemically stable and that the worst-case reactive life of the CWD permeable reactive wall at the BFS emplacement site will be 3.23 years. Under average rainfall conditions, the life of the wall should exceed 60 years.

This solution is shown to be an efficient and economical engineering application of clay surface chemistry. It simultaneously addresses three issues relevant to groundwater remediation: the need for groundwater remediation strategies at existing rock waste

emplacements, the need to develop economical and environmentally sustainable utilisation technologies for rock waste and the need for new field applications for permeable reactive walls.

Acknowledgements

I give thanks and praise to the Lord for providing me with everything that I have needed to complete this thesis. May this research and qualification be for His glory and be used for His service.

Now to him who is able to do immeasurably more than all we ask or imagine, according to his power that is at work within us, to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus throughout all generations, for ever and ever! Amen. (Ephesians 3:20-21).

Special thanks to my wife, Kylie Gray, for her unending support, encouragement and patience. I also appreciate the financial, personal and academic assistance from my supervisor, Associate Professor M Sivakumar.

I am very grateful to have received assistance from several other people and organisations throughout the duration of this project. Thanks to Garnock Engineering for financial assistance, Dr. Iradj Yassini for offering his scientific expertise regarding the field study, Wollongong City Council for making available their laboratory and field monitoring equipment, Professor B Indraratna for initially encouraging me to pursue a PhD, Dr. Ric Morris for financial assistance as well as advice regarding permeable reactive barriers, laboratory column tests and geochemical modelling, and Greg Tilman, Steve Selby and Joanne George for laboratory assistance.

List of Publications

- Gray, S.C. and Sivakumar, M. (peer reviewed and re-submitted). 'Remediation of High pH Groundwater with a Coarse Coal Washery Discard Reactive Wall'. Submitted to *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, ASCE.
- Gray, S.C., Indraratna, B. and Yassini, I. (1999). 'Contaminant Transport through a Coal Washery Discard Reactive Wall'. *Environmental Engineering 1999: Proceedings of the ASCE-CSCE National Conference on Environmental Engineering*, Norfolk, Virginia. Schafran, G.C. (Ed.). pp. 757-765.
- Gray, S.C., Morris, C.E. and Sivakumar, M. (2000). 'Laboratory Evaluation of the Treatment of Alkaline Leachate with Coal Washery Discard'. *Proceedings 4th Australia New Zealand Young Geotechnical Professionals Conference*, Perth. House, A. and Watson, P. (Eds.). pp. 99-104.
- Gray, S.C., Morris, C.E. and Sivakumar, M. (2000). 'Groundwater Neutralisation with Coal Washery Discard'. *GeoEng2000: An International Conference on Geotechnical and Geological Engineering*, Melbourne.
- Gray, S.C., Sivakumar, M. and Morris, C.E. (2001). 'The Coal Washery Discard Permeable Reactive Wall: An Engineering Application of Clay Deprotonation'. *GeoEnvironment 2001: Proceedings 2nd Australia New Zealand Conference on GeoEnvironmental Engineering*, Newcastle.