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# Testing Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Chemical Tests</th>
<th>Geotechnical Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulk Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Material</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial-Cured Material</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Day-Cured Material</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Day-Cured Material</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binder Slurry Water (&lt;Fresh Water&gt;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Material Additional Water (&lt;Seawater&gt;)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leach: SPLP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leach: WET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leach: MLT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atterberg Limits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grain Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil Classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moisture Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconfined Compressive Strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Shear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permeability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R-Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* • indicates the presence of data for each test type.*
Testing Results: Geotechnical

- **Grain Size**
  - Coarsening after treatment (more apparent with increasing binder content)
  - Reduction in fines by 8-19% (clay cemented to larger particles)
  - Gravel fractions created in cured, compacted material (compaction effect; represents field condition)
Testing Results: Geotechnical

- Atterberg Limits and Soil Classification
  - Liquid and plastic limits (LL, PL) increase with higher binder content
  - LL and PL increase with cure time (more apparent with higher binder content)
  - Sandy silt (inorganic silts, very fine sands, silty/clayey fine sands)
Testing Results: Geotechnical

- Moisture Content
  - Reduced by 3.7% in first 12-24 hours, and 32% in next 27 days
  - Initial drying rate >3.7% per day. Average drying rate 1.2% per day
Testing Results: Geotechnical

- **Compaction**
  - Maximum dry density slightly decreases and optimum moisture content increases immediately after treatment (reasons unknown)
  - Compatibility of freshly treated material comparable to that of raw material; mid-range among typical soils
Testing Results: Geotechnical

Unconfined Compressive Strength

- Strength increases with binder content
- Large percent (72%) of final strength developed during later part (7-28 days) of curing period
- Portland cement more effective than fly ash in increasing strength
- Higher binder content (e.g. >5-6% cement) needed for unconfined application (UCS > 39 ton/m²)
Testing Results: Geotechnical

- **Shear Strength**

  - Strength and friction angle increases, cohesion decreases with increasing binder content and curing time (correlate well with coarsening)
  
  - Portland cement more effective than fly ash in increasing strength (consistent with UCS findings)
Testing Results: Geotechnical

- Consolidation
  - Settlement consistently decreases with increasing binder content
  - Fly ash particularly effective in reducing settlement
Testing Results: Geotechnical

- **Permeability**
  - Permeability generally decreases with increasing binder content (accounting for moisture/dry density differences among samples; trend weak)
  - Fly ash effective in reducing permeability
Testing Results: Geotechnical

➢ R-Value

• R-value increases with binder content
Testing Results: Geotechnical

Summary

- Treated material tends to coarsen
- Treated material exhibits consistent, pronounced increase in strengths (UCS and shear) and decrease in settlement and lateral deformation
- Permeability, plasticity, and compaction patterns less certain from data
Testing Results: Chemical

- **Raw Sediment Chemistry**
  
  - 4,4’-DDE and 4,4’-DDT exceed ER-M
  - Lead, mercury, zinc, PCBs, PAHs, chlordane exceed ER-L
  - Four cells similar in chemical characteristics
  - Lead, mercury, zinc as target constituents for treatment (common in dredged material; prior experience used as guide for binder and mix ratio selection)
Testing Results: Chemical

- Process Water
  - Mostly non-detect except for metals at low levels
Testing Results: Chemical

- SPLP and WET Leach Tests
  - Successful in binding zinc, lead, and cadmium
    (zinc by 1-2 orders of magnitude; lead and cadmium to below detection limits)
  - Some metals mobilized (can not bind all at single pH; method metal-specific)
  - Ability to bind organics uncertain
  - Certain irregularities in solubility-pH relationship (effects of differences in sample gradation, etc.)
Testing Results: Chemical

- **Monolithic Leach Test (MLT)**
  - NaCl selected for high solubility and threat to groundwater for upland placement. MLT selected for approximating field conditions.
  - 53% reduction in leached NaCl at 5.7% cement (minimal leach expected with higher, more common field range of mix ratios)
  - Leach of any constituents lower than predicted by SPLP/WET under field conditions (NaCl as a highly soluble tracer)
Cost

- Full Scale Cost = $46/m³
  - Dredge 100,000 m³
  - Treat in 5 cells at 4,000 m³/day for 25 days
  - Place at receiver site within 4 miles
Conclusion

- Effectiveness
  - Enhances engineering properties
  - Reduces leachability of targeted metals and chlorides
  - Contaminant-specific. Bench necessary for binder/mix ratio design
Conclusion

- Implementability
  - Proven implementable in the Region
  - Full-scale project site to be selected opportunistically due to short period of usage
  - Receiver site needs be identified
Conclusion

- Environmental Impact
  - Escape of volatiles during treatment not expected to be significant based on field observation. Quantification of volatilization requires further study.
  - Impact from spill not expected with rigorous implementation of Spill Prevention Plan
Lessons Learned

- Success of method relies on identification of targets. Bench necessary before project.
- Ability to treat organics uncertain. Method not appropriate for material with high organic contaminant levels.
- Binder in slurry form desirable to minimize emission.
- Mix ratio may impact schedule and cost through setting time. Optimize.