Anaerobic Biochemical Reactor (BCR) Treatment of Mining-Influenced Water (MIW): Evaluation of Reduction in Concentrations of Metals and Aquatic Toxicity

Barbara Butler, USEPA ORD

Federal Remediation Technology Roundtable Meeting
USEPA Potomac Yard, Virginia
May 9, 2017

The views expressed in this presentation are those of the author's and do not necessarily represent the views or policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Presentation Outline

- BCR Treatment
- Research Questions
- Study Sites
- Methods
- Metals Removal
- Aquatic Toxicity (Acute)
- Concluding Remarks

BCR Treatment

- Passive / semi-passive treatments
  - Natural processes
  - Minimal or no energy requirement
    - Solar
- Biochemical reactor
  - Previously (and sometimes still) called sulfate-reducing bioreactor
  - Sometimes called anaerobic wetland
    - But, no vegetation

BCR Treatment

- Chemical, biological, and physical processes
  - Reduction, precipitation, adsorption, retention
- Hay, straw, wood chips, sawdust, compost ethanol, waste milk, limestone, manure…
- Aerobic polishing
  - Increase oxygen
  - Decrease BOD
  - Settle solids
    - Some release of sulfide precipitates, which oxidize and re-precipitate as metal oxyhydroxides
  - Degas sulfide and ammonia

BCR Treatment

- Overall goal of remediation is to minimize environmental and human health impacts

- Evaluation of BCR treatment generally through metal removal efficiency
  - Percentage of dissolved metals removed by the system
    - 100% * ([Influent concentration – effluent concentration] / influent concentration)

Research Questions Asked

- Are the effluents from the different pilot BCRs toxic (i.e., are there adverse effects to either test species that is statistically different from control water)?
- Is the toxicity reduced, relative to the influent?
- If effluents are toxic, is there a toxicant identifiable?

Study Sites

- Luttrell Repository, Helena, MT
- Peerless Jenny King, Helena, MT
- Park City Biocell, Park City, UT
- Standard Mine, Crested Butte, CO

Luttrell Repository (MT)

- Upper Ten-mile Creek Superfund site
- 2002
- 7,644 ft AMSL
- 1.5 gpm treated
- Al, As, Cd, Co, Cu, Fe, Mn, Zn

Peerless Jenny King (MT)

- Upper Ten-mile Creek Superfund site
- 2003
- 7,600 ft AMSL
- 20-25 gpm treated
- Cd, Fe, Zn

Peerless Jenny King (MT)

- Upper Ten-mile Creek Superfund site
- 2003
- 7,600 ft AMSL
- 20-25 gpm treated
- Cd, Fe, Zn

Park City Biocell (UT)

- Prospector drain in Silver Creek Watershed
- 2008
- 6,900 ft AMSL
- 29 gpm treated
- Cd, Zn

Park City Biocell (UT)

- Prospector drain in Silver Creek Watershed
- 2008
- 6,900 ft AMSL
- 29 gpm treated
- Cd, Zn

Standard Mine (CO)

- Crested Butte
- 2007
- 11,000 ft AMSL
- 1.2 gpm treated
- Cd, Cu, Fe, Pb, Mn, Zn

Standard Mine (CO)

- Crested Butte
- Aerobic Polishing Cells added in 2008

Methods

Methods

- Triplicate influent and effluent samples from Luttrell, PJK, and Park City
- Duplicate influent and effluent samples from the Standard Mine BCR and from the APC

Methods

- Filtered metals (0.45 µm) – inductively coupled plasma – optical emission spectroscopy (ICP-OES)
- Sulfate – ion chromatography
- Total sulfide – ion selective electrode
- Total ammonia – gas sensing electrode

Methods

- Whole effluent toxicity tests [WET]
  - Series of dilutions of the influent and effluent water samples
- Acute 48-hr LC_{50}
  - Percentage of water mixed with moderately hard dilution water
- *Ceriodaphnia dubia* [water flea]
- *Pimephales promelas* [fathead minnow]
- Control survival > 90%

Metals Removal

Influent Metals Concentrations

Analyte	Site			
	Luttrell	PJK	Park City	Standard Mine
Al (mg/l)	28 ± 0.3	BMDL	BMDL	BMDL
As (mg/l)	2.5 ± 0.03	BMDL	BMDL	BMDL
Cd (mg/l)	1.6 ± 0.11	BMDL	0.1 ± 0.01	0.18 ± 0.003
Cu (mg/l)	27 ± 0.1	BMDL	BMDL	0.24 ± 0.006
Fe (mg/l)	27 ± 0.3	0.27 ± 0.015	BMDL	0.12 ± 0.008
Ni (mg/l)	0.31 ± 0.003	BMDL	BMDL	BMDL
Pb (mg/l)	BMDL	BMDL	BMDL	0.21 ± 0.025
Zn (mg/l)	270 ± 25	1.2 ± 0.03	8.4 ± 0.15	27 ± 0.6
SO_4 (mg/l)	4.6 ± 1.1 (g/l)	49 ± 15.8	642 ± 39	254 ± 9

Influent & Effluent Water Chemistry

	Parameter (average)	Luttrell	PJK	Park City	SM-BCR	SM-APC
Influent	pH	3.6 ± 0.23	6.7 ± 0.08	6.2 ± 0.13	6.1 ± 0.06	
	DO (mg/l)	4 ± 0.8	3 ± 0.1	5 ± 0.1	6 ± 0	
Effluent	pH	6.4 ± 0.02	7.8 ± 0.04	7.1 ± 0.03	6.7 ± 0.06	8.6 ± 0.07
	DO (mg/l)	0.3 ± 0.24	3 ± 0.3	2 ± 0.1	0.6 ± 0.45	1 ± 0

Percentage Metals Removal

Analyte	Site				
	Luttrell	PJK	Park City	SM-BCR	SM-APC
Al	99 ± 1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
As	98 ± 2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cd	99 ± 10	n/a	96 ± 12	100 ± 2	100 ± 2
Cu	100 ± 0.3	n/a	n/a	94 ± 9	94 ± 9
Fe	99 ± 2	90 ± 12	n/a	-266 ± -518	100 ± 10
Ni	94 ± 5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Pb	n/a	n/a	n/a	94 ± 16	91 ± 17
Zn	100 ± 13	94 ± 11	100 ± 3	100 ± 3	100 ± 3
SO_4	72 ± 29	-78 ± -137	-1 ± -8	39 ± 4	72 ± 5

Acute Aquatic Toxicity



Gray – water flea
Black – fathead minnow



Gray – water flea
Black – fathead minnow



Gray – water flea
Black – fathead minnow



Gray – water flea
Black – fathead minnow

Acute Aquatic Toxicity

- What caused acute toxicity in Luttrell and Standard Mine BCR effluent samples?
- Low dissolved oxygen?
  - SM-BCR field average 0.6 mg/l DO; Luttrell field average 0.3 mg/l DO
  - Test units must have > 4 mg/l
    - Generally > 6 mg/l
- Metals, sulfide, ammonia?

Concentrations calculated at observed LC50's

Sample ID	*Ceriodaphnia dubia*				
	Cd (ug/l)	Cu (ug/l)	Zn (ug/l)	H_2S (mg/l)	NH_3 (ug/l)
LR-EFF-A	NA	NA	61	**26**	5
LR-EFF-B	NA	NA	27	**9.3**	2
LR-EFF-C	NA	NA	NA	**3.2**	0.5
SM-BCR-A	NA	NA	NA	**1.29**	0.06
SM-BCR-B	NA	NA	NA	**0.74**	0.1
Comparison Value	31.4	6	425	**0.002**	500 - 5000

Sample ID	*Pimephales promelas*				
	Cd (ug/l)	Cu (ug/l)	Zn (ug/l)	**H_2S (mg/l)**	NH_3 (ug/l)
LR-EFF-A	NA	NA	0.13	**0.58**	0.1
LR-EFF-B	NA	NA	0.53	**1.83**	0.4
LR-EFF-C	NA	NA	NA	**1.28**	0.2
SM-BCR-A	NA	NA	NA	**0.298**	0.01
SM-BCR-B	NA	NA	NA	**0.087**	0.01
Comparison Value	29.2	69.6	725	**0.002**	200 - 3400

NA = none detected in undiluted sample

Dissolved H_2S and NH_3 calculated from total values, temperature, and pH



Test species – fathead minnow



Dissolved Gaseous Species
Luttrell Repository
Reference Toxicity Levels
2 ug/l H_2S
.2 to 5 mg/l NH_3
H2S (aq)
NH3 (aq) (10 °C)
NH3 (aq) (20 °C)
Sulfide (mg/l)
Ammonia (mg/l)
pH
140
120
100
80
60
40
20
0
25
20
15
10
5
0
2
4
6
8
10
12


Dissolved Gaseous Species
Standard Mine
Reference Toxicity Levels
2 ug/l H_2S
.2 to 5 mg/l NH_3
H2S (aq)
NH3 (aq) (10 °C)
NH3 (aq) (20 °C)
Sulfide (mg/l)
Ammonia (mg/l)
pH
2.5
2
1.5
1
0.5
0
0.05
0.04
0.03
0.02
0.01
0
2
4
6
8
10
12

Concluding Remarks

- Results suggest toxicity from dissolved hydrogen sulfide gas
  - Effluents more toxic to fathead minnow than to the *C. dubia*
  - Fathead minnow known to be more sensitive to dissolved gases than *C. dubia*
  - Dissolved H_2S concentrations above species mean acute values
  - Toxicity from 100% sample removed with aeration at Standard Mine and reduced at Luttrell

- Other BCRs may have different toxicants, depending on:
  - Contaminants present and efficiency of removal
  - Concentrations of dissolved gases and pH of the effluent

Concluding Remarks

- BCR treatment is effective at removing significant proportions of metals from MIW, but aquatic toxicity may still be present

- Sufficient in-field aeration following BCR treatment is an important step to remove potential toxicants resulting from the processes occurring within BCR cells

- Combining chemical and biological monitoring can lead to better treatment system designs
  - To meet the goal of minimizing environmental and human health impacts

Acknowledgements

- Co-authors:
  - David Reisman – U.S. EPA ORD, NRMRL, LRPCD
  - Jim Lazorchak – U.S. EPA ORD, NERL
  - Mark Smith – McConnell Group [deceased, prior contractor to U.S. EPA ORD]
- Others:
  - Pegasus and McConnell Group – contractors to EPA
  - Regional RPM’s
  - City of Park City, UT

Thank you!
Butler, BA, Smith, ME, Reisman, DJ, Lazorchak, JM. 2011. Metal removal efficiency and ecotoxicological assessment of field-scale passive treatment biochemical reactors. Environmental Toxicology & Chemistry. 30(2):385-392.
37