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The Journal of Dredging is published by the Western Dredging Association (WEDA) to provide dissemination of technical and project information on dredging engineering topics. The peer-reviewed papers in this practice-oriented journal will present engineering solutions to dredging and placement problems, which are not normally available from traditional journals. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to, dredging techniques, hydrographic surveys, dredge automation, dredge safety, instrumentation, design aspects of dredging projects, dredged material placement, environmental and beneficial uses, contaminated sediments, litigation, economic aspects, and case studies.
THE DELFT HEAD LOSS & LIMIT DEPOSIT VELOCITY FRAMEWORK (DHLLDV)

S. A. Miedema¹, R. C. Ramsdell²

ABSTRACT

Models for modeling slurry flow present difficulties on long lines with large pipe diameters and with broad graded sands or gravels.

In order to get more insight in the slurry flow process, a framework has been developed, the DHLLDV Framework, integrating 5 main flow regimes of slurry transport: fixed or stationary bed transport; sliding bed transport; heterogeneous transport; homogeneous transport and sliding flow transport. Additional models—for the limit deposit velocity, the holdup function, the bed height, the concentration distribution and graded sands and gravels—complete the framework.

The framework is based on constant spatial volumetric concentration curves for uniform sands and gravels. The models for the flow regimes and the limit deposit velocity are based on energy considerations. By means of a holdup function, the constant spatial volumetric concentration curves can be transformed into constant delivered volumetric concentration curves. Curves for graded sands and gravels can be constructed by splitting the particle size distribution (PSD) into fractions and use the superposition principle on the resulting curves of each fraction.

The framework makes use of two important graphs. The mixture hydraulic gradient (ordinate) as a function of the line speed (abscissa) and the relative excess hydraulic gradient (ordinate, solids effect) as a function of the liquid hydraulic gradient (abscissa). The latter has the advantage of being almost dimensionless for constant spatial volumetric concentration curves.

The framework can be used with user models, but here newly developed models are described. The framework is validated with many experiments from literature.
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INTRODUCTION

Although sophisticated 2 and 3 layer models exist for slurry flow (here the flow of sand/gravel water mixtures), the main Dutch and Belgian dredging companies still use modified Durand & Condolios (1952) and Fuhrboter (1961) models for heterogeneous transport, while the main companies in the USA use a modified Wilson et al. (1992) model, and the coal industry uses the Wasp model or the Saskatchewan Research Council (SRC) model. The empirical models use one term for the excess head losses resulting from the solids (the solids effect). Most models are based on experiments in small diameter pipes. The use of these models does not give a satisfying result on projects with large diameter pipelines (Dp>0.75 m), very long pipelines (up to 36 km) or broad PSD’s (particle size distributions). This is the reason to study all existing models and develop a framework that agrees with most existing models, but also solves the shortcomings. The result is the DHLLDV Framework.

Figure 1: The algorithm to determine the constant $C_{vs}$ and $C_{vt}$ curves for uniform sands and gravels.
The DHLLDV Framework determines the resulting hydraulic gradient curve for spatial volumetric concentrations and uniform sands, consisting of parts of all flow regimes occurring for the pipe and particle diameter in question.

Since the slurry flow process in dredging is a non-stationary process, the PSD and concentration may be time and space dependent, resulting in time varying line speeds, density waves, moving dunes and so on, the modelling should be based on time averaged properties and parameters. In the DHLLDV Framework the main models are based on energy considerations. Each flow regime has its own physical and mathematical model. Once the resulting hydraulic gradient curve and the limit deposit velocity (LDV) are determined, a holdup function enables the user to construct the delivered volumetric concentration curve and the bed height. The latest addition to DHLLDV is a method to determine the concentration distribution based on the LDV and the Wasp model. The LDV is defined here as the line speed above which there is no stationary or sliding bed.

For graded sands and gravels the curves are determined for each uniform grain fraction individually, and the resulting curves are then combined by superposition to form the overall hydraulic gradient curve, holdup function and bed height curve.

THE DHLLDV FRAMEWORK

The DHLLDV Framework (Miedema & Ramsdell, 2014) is based on the philosophy that hydraulic gradients and limit deposit velocities can only be determined based on the spatial volumetric concentration for uniform PSD’s, in contrast with most empirical models from literature, which are based on transport volumetric concentrations. Most physical models have the spatial concentration as an input and the transport concentration as an output. To find constant transport concentration curves, iterative methods are used. For heterogeneous and homogeneous transport the spatial and transport volumetric concentrations are close, but for the fixed, the sliding bed and the sliding flow regimes the differences are substantial.

To use the DHLLDV framework for uniform sands and gravels, the following steps have to be carried out:

1. The hydraulic gradient curves and the relative excess hydraulic gradient curves for the fixed or stationary bed regime (FB), for the sliding bed regime (SB), for the heterogeneous flow regime (He), for sliding flow regime (SF) and for the homogeneous flow regime (Ho) have to be determined separately.
2. The resulting curve, based on the algorithm according to Figure 1 has to be constructed.
3. The limit deposit velocity has to be determined. There are 5 possible LDV regions and 1 limiting condition; very small particles, small particles, medium particles or transition region, large particles and very large particles where d/Dp>0.015.
4. The transport or delivered concentration curves are determined based on a holdup or slip factor function, where the LDV plays a very important role.
5. The bed height and bed fraction are determined based on the LDV and the slip factor.
6. The concentration profile is also determined based on the LDV.
THE FIXED OR STATIONARY BED

The model for the force equilibrium on a stationary or sliding bed has been described by Wilson et al. (1992) and lately by Miedema (2014) and Miedema & Ramsdell (2014). Only modifications will be discussed here. In the following equations, the index 1 points to the liquid-pipe wall interface or liquid velocity, the index 2 to the bed-pipe wall interface or bed velocity and the index 12 to the liquid-bed interface. For the flow in the restricted area above the bed, the shear stress between the liquid and the bed for small values of \( v_{12} \), when sheet flow is not occurring, is:

\[
\tau_{12} = \frac{\lambda_{12}}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho_1 \cdot v_{12}^2
\]

with:

\[
\lambda_{12} = \frac{1.325}{\ln \left( \frac{0.27 \cdot d}{D_H} + \frac{5.75 \cdot Re^{0.9}}{Re^{0.9}} \right)} \quad \text{and} \quad Re = \frac{v_{12} \cdot D_H}{v_1}
\]

(1)

In this equation the particle diameter is used as the bed roughness. Others use the particle diameter multiplied with a factor ranging from 0.6 to a multiple. For larger values of values of \( v_{12} \), when sheet flow does occur, the following equation has to be applied:

\[
\tau_{12} = \frac{\lambda_{12}}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho_1 \cdot v_{12}^2
\]

with:

\[
\lambda_{12} = 0.83 \cdot \lambda_1 + 0.37 \cdot \left( \frac{v_{12}}{\sqrt{2} \cdot g \cdot D_H \cdot R_{sd}} \right)^{2.73} \cdot \left( \frac{\rho_s \cdot \pi \cdot d^3}{\rho_1 \cdot l^3} \right)^{0.094} = 0.83 \cdot \lambda_1 + 0.37 \cdot Fr_{DC}^{2.73} \cdot \left( \frac{m_p}{\rho_1} \right)^{0.094}
\]

(2)

Miedema & Matousek (2014) derived the above equation, except for the particle mass term. This last term increases the correlation coefficient of the curve fit of experimental data from 0.86 (without this term) to 0.91 (including this term). Reason for adding this last term is, that in sheet flow energy losses are not only determined by the submerged weight of the particles, but also by the mass of the particles. The use of equations (1) and (2) is simple, if equation (2)>equation (1), equation (2) is used and sheet flow is assumed, otherwise equation (1) is used and a flat bed with maybe individual particles moving is assumed. Wilson et al. (1992) assume that the sliding friction is the result of a hydrostatic normal force between the bed and the pipe wall multiplied by the sliding friction factor. It is however also possible that the sliding friction force results from the weight of the bed multiplied by the sliding friction factor. For low volumetric concentrations, there is not much difference between the two methods, but at higher volumetric concentrations there is. The average shear stress as a result of the sliding friction between the bed and the pipe wall, according to the weight normal stress approach, as is used here, is:

\[
\tau_{2,sf} = \frac{\mu_{sf} \cdot \rho_1 \cdot g \cdot R_{sd} \cdot C_{vb} \cdot A_p \cdot \beta \cdot \sin(\beta) \cdot \cos(\beta)}{\beta \cdot D_p \cdot \pi}
\]

(3)
THE SLIDING BED

For the sliding bed the same set of equations is used as for the stationary bed. The only difference is that for a stationary bed the bed velocity \( v_2 \) equals 0, while of course for a sliding bed the bed has a positive velocity \( v_2 \), smaller than \( v_1 \). A convenient parameter to show the results of the calculations is the Relative Excess Hydraulic Gradient, \( E_{rhg} \). This parameter gives an almost dimensionless graph of the head losses.

\[
E_{rhg} = \frac{i_m - i_l}{R_{sd} \cdot C_{vs}}
\]  

(4)

Figure 2 shows the \( E_{rhg} \) parameter as a function of the relative volumetric concentration \( (C_{vr}=C_{vs}/C_b) \) and the relative line speed \( (v_{r} = \frac{v_{ls}}{v_{sm},ldv,max}) \) for the weight approach sliding bed friction (Miedema & Ramsdell (2014)) and a sliding bed friction factor \( \mu_{sf}=0.416 \), including sheet flow. The \( E_{rhg} \) parameter is very close to the sliding friction coefficient \( \mu_{sf} \), especially for relative line speeds up to 1.5, the region where most probably the sliding bed will occur. This parameter does not seem to depend much on the spatial volumetric concentration and the line speed, so the conclusion is, that in the sliding bed regime this parameter approximates the sliding friction coefficient.
So for the sliding bed regime, the $E_{rhg}$ will be set equal to the sliding friction coefficient $\mu_{sf}$ for the constant spatial volumetric concentration case. The coefficient for sand and gravel is derived below, or can be measured experimentally.

$$E_{rhg} = \frac{i_m - i_l}{R_{sd} \cdot C_{vs}} = \mu_{sf}$$

(5)

The sliding friction coefficient $\mu_{sf}$ is the tangent of the external friction angle $\delta$ between the sand or gravel and the steel pipe wall. From soil mechanics it is known that the external friction angle $\delta$ is about $2/3$ of the internal friction angle $\phi$. This internal friction angle has a minimum of about $30^\circ$ for loose packed sand, giving $20^\circ$ for the external friction angle. The tangent of $20^\circ$ is 0.364. Miedema & Ramsdell (2014) also analyzed the hydrostatic approach of Wilson et al. (1992) and the normal stress carrying the weight approach. These two approaches are similar up to a relative concentration of 0.5, giving an increase of the $E_{rhg}$ parameter with a factor 1.3 compared to the weight approach as used here. In practice the relative concentration will be between 0 and 0.5 giving a multiplication factor between 1 and 1.3 depending on the relative concentration. Taking an average, gives a sliding friction factor of about 0.416. Resuming it can be stated that the $E_{rhg}$ parameter should have a value of about 0.364 if the weight approach is applied, or a value of about 0.416 if the hydrostatic or normal stress carrying the weight approach are applied. In the current model a constant value of 0.416 is used to be on the safe side, resulting in linear hydraulic gradient versus line speed curves parallel to the liquid curve as already observed by Newitt et al. (1955) and others.

### HETEROGENEOUS TRANSPORT

Miedema & Ramsdell (2013) derived an equation for the Relative Excess Hydraulic Gradient for heterogeneous transport based on energy considerations. This equation consists of two parts. A first part for the contribution due to potential energy losses and a second part for the kinetic energy losses. The equation is based on uniform sands or gravels, but Miedema (2014) also derived a modified equation for graded sands and gravels. In its basic form the equation looks like:

$$E_{rhg} = \frac{i_m - i_l}{R_{sd} \cdot C_{vs}} = \frac{v_t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{C_{vs}}{\kappa C_{vs} + \kappa C_{vs}}\right) + \left(\frac{v_{sd}}{v_t}\right)^2}{\frac{v_t}{v_s}} = S_{hr} + S_{rs}$$

(6)

The Settling Velocity Hindered Relative, $S_{hr}$, is the Hindered Settling Velocity of a particle $v_t \cdot (1 - C_{vs}/\kappa C_{vs})$ divided by the line speed $v_{ls}$. The $S_{hr}$ value gives the contribution of the potential energy losses to the Relative Excess Hydraulic Gradient. The $S_{hr}$ is derived for and can be applied to the heterogeneous regime. The Slip Relative Squared $S_{rs}$ is the Slip Velocity of a particle $v_{sl}$ divided by the Terminal Settling Velocity of a particle $v_t$ squared and this $S_{rs}$ value is a good indication of the Relative Excess Hydraulic Gradient due to the solids, since its contribution to the total is 90%-100%. The $S_{rs}$ value gives the contribution of the kinetic energy losses to the Relative Excess Hydraulic Gradient. The $S_{rs}$ is derived for and can be applied to the heterogeneous regime. The
potential energy term is explicit and all the variables involved are known, so this term can be solved. The kinetic energy term however contains the slip velocity, which is not known. The kinetic energy term has been derived by Miedema & Ramsdell (2013) based on kinetic energy losses due to collisions or interactions with the pipe wall or the viscous sub layer. This means that the slip velocity used in the above equation is not necessarily the average slip velocity, but it is the slip velocity necessary to explain the kinetic energy losses. The average slip velocity of the particles will probably be larger, but of the same magnitude. The derivation of the slip velocity equation for uniform sands or gravels will be subject of Miedema (2015), but the resulting equation for the $E_{rhg}$ parameter is given here. Giving for the relative excess hydraulic gradient, the $E_{rhg}$ parameter:

$$E_{rhg} = \frac{i_m - i_1}{R_{sd} \cdot C_{vs}} = S_{hr} + S_{rs} = \frac{v_t \cdot \left(1 - \frac{C_{vs}}{\kappa C}\right)^\beta}{v_h} + 8.5^2 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_t}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{v_t}{\sqrt{g \cdot d}}\right)^3 \cdot \left(\frac{(v_t \cdot g)^{1/3}}{v_h}\right)^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

The equation has been modified slightly since the original article of Miedema & Ramsdell (2013). The potential energy term now contains a factor $\kappa C$ taking the vertical concentration distribution in the pipe into account. The value of $\kappa C$ is estimated at $0.175 \cdot (1 + \beta)$. The kinetic energy term now contains the Darcy-Weisbach friction coefficient $\lambda_d$ for the wall friction of the carrier liquid.

**HOMOGENEOUS TRANSPORT**

The basis of the homogeneous transport regime model is the equivalent liquid model (ELM). In terms of the relative excess hydraulic gradient, $E_{rhg}$, this can be written as:

$$E_{rhg} = \frac{i_m - i_1}{R_{sd} \cdot C_{vs}} = \frac{\lambda_t \cdot v_h^2}{2 \cdot g \cdot D_p} = i_1$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

Now it is known that the so called fines influence the effective density and viscosity of the carrier liquid. The definition of fines is not always clear. Sometimes the fraction $d<0.063$ mm is used, but this is disputable. Here the fraction $d<0.1$ mm is used. A criterion based on the $d/D_p$ ratio, the line speed $v_{ls}$ and the spatial concentration $C_{vs}$ is subject to further research. Once this fraction $f$ is known, the density of the carrier liquid can be determined by:

$$\rho_{l,m} = \rho_l \cdot (1 + R_{sd} \cdot f \cdot C_{vs})$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Based on this Thomas (1965) derived an equation to determine the modified liquid dynamic viscosity as a function of the concentration $f \cdot C_{vs}$ of the fine particles in the mixture.

$$\mu_{l,m} = \mu_l \cdot \left(1 + 2.5 \cdot f \cdot C_{vs} + 10.05 \cdot (f \cdot C_{vs})^2 + 0.00273 \cdot e^{16.6 \cdot f \cdot C_{vs}}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)
Talmon (2013) derived an equation to correct the homogeneous equation (the ELM model) for the slurry density, based on the hypothesis that the viscous sub-layer hardly contains solids at very high line speeds in the homogeneous regime. This theory results in a reduction of the resistance compared with the ELM, but the resistance is still higher than the resistance of clear water. Talmon (2013) used the Prandl approach for the mixing length, which is a 2D approach for open channel flow with a free surface. The Prandl approach was extended with damping near the wall to take into account the viscous effects near the wall, according to von Driest (Schlichting, 1968). Miedema (2015) improved the equation for pipe flow and a concentration distribution giving for the relative excess hydraulic gradient $E_{rhg}$:

$$E_{rhg} = \frac{i_m - i_l}{R_{sd} \cdot C_{vs}} = 1 + \frac{1}{R_{sd} \cdot C_{vs}} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\frac{A_{Cv}}{\kappa} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\rho_m}{\rho_l}\right) \cdot \frac{\lambda_1}{8} + 1\right)^2}$$

The concept of Talmon (2013) is applicable for determining the pressure losses in the homogeneous regime, however this concept has to be modified with respect to the shear stress distribution, the concentration distribution and a check on conservation of volume flow and concentration. The resulting equation (11) with $A_{Cv}=1.3$ gives a good average behavior based on the data of Talmon (2011) and Thomas (1976). The original factor $A_{Cv}=3.4$ of Talmon (2013) seems to overestimate the reduction of the solids effect. It should be mentioned that the experiments as reported by Talmon (2011) were carried out in a vertical pipe ensuring symmetrical flow. For horizontal pipes the results may differ, since the velocity and concentration profiles are not symmetrical at the line speeds common in dredging. Since the model is based on a particle free viscous sub-layer and the viscosity of the carrier liquid, it may not give good predictions for very small or large particles. Very small particles may influence the viscosity, while very large particles are not influenced by the viscous sub-layer.

The error of using $A_{Cv}=1.3$ is difficult to define. With respect to the relative excess hydraulic gradient $E_{rhg}$ the accuracy is about +/- 10%. With respect to the hydraulic gradient $i_m$, which is of interest for the dredging companies, the accuracy is better to much better, since this hydraulic gradient equals $i_m = i_l + E_{rhg} \cdot R_{sd} \cdot C_v$.

**SLIDING FLOW VERSUS HETEROGENEOUS FLOW**

For fine and medium sized particles there is a transition from a sliding bed to heterogeneous transport at a certain line speed. Figure 9 shows this transition clearly. However for large particles the turbulence is not capable of lifting the particles enough resulting in a sort of sliding bed behavior above this transition point. One reason for this is that the largest eddies are not large enough with respect to the size of the particles. Sellgren & Wilson (2007) use the criterion $d/D_p>0.015$ for this to occur. The density of the bed decreases with the line speed. Gillies (1993) gave an equation for the reduction of this bed density:
The resulting curves match very well with the SRC model in the range of operational line speeds. This method also explains the reduction of the power of the line speed in the Sellgren & Wilson (2007) 4 component model for very large particles.

**THE LIMIT DEPOSIT VELOCITY**

It should be noted that the limit deposit velocity, LDV, as used here is the velocity above which there is no stationary or sliding bed. In the Wilson et al. (1992) approach the limit deposit velocity is the velocity where the bed starts to slide, the limit of stationary deposit velocity, LSDV. Miedema & Ramsdell (2015) derived a new model for the LDV based on energy considerations. Figure 3 shows the algorithm to determine the LDV. Basically the model distinguished 5 particle size ranges, with borders based on solid, liquid and geometrical properties. These ranges are:

1. Very fine (very small) particles.
2. Fine (small) particles.
3. Medium sized particles or transition region.
4. Coarse (large) particles.
5. Very coarse (large) particles, \( d/D_p > 0.015 \).

Beside the 5 regions, there is a limit to the LDV, which is the transition line speed between the sliding bed regime and the heterogeneous regime as described by Miedema & Ramsdell (2015).

For very fine particles the Thomas (1979) approach is adopted, but slightly modified. For very large particles, transported in the sliding flow regime, it is the question whether one can still speak of an LDV, since there is a gradual transition of the sliding bed regime to the sliding flow regime. This will not be discussed here since it is still subject to further research.
For fine (small) particles it is assumed that when the required potential energy of the solids to keep them in suspension is larger than a certain fraction of the energy in the liquid flow, there will be a bed. If it is smaller, all particles will be suspended. In terms of the Durand & Condolios LDV Froude number $F_L$ this can be written as:

\[
F_{L,s} = \frac{v_{ls,ldv}}{\left(2 \cdot g \cdot R_{sd} \cdot D_p\right)^{1/2}} = \alpha_p \cdot \left(\frac{v_1 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{C_{vs}}{\kappa_C}\right) \cdot C_{vs}}{\lambda_1 \cdot \left(2 \cdot g \cdot R_{sd} \cdot D_p\right)^{1/2}}\right)^{1/3}
\]

with:

\[
\alpha_p = 3.5 \cdot \left(\frac{1.65}{R_{sd}}\right)^{1/9}
\]

\[
\kappa_C = 0.175 \cdot (1 + \beta)
\]

(15)
The values found for $\alpha_p=3.5$ and $\kappa_C=0.175\cdot(1+\beta)$ are based on many experiments from literature. The value of $\alpha_p$ of 3.5 found shows that the LDV occurs when the potential energy losses of the particles are about 2.33% of the energy losses of the liquid flow for small particles. The value of $\kappa_C$ means that the average particle is at $0.175\cdot(1+\beta)$ of the radius of the pipe, measured from the bottom of the pipe and not at the radius. This is in fact the concentration eccentricity factor. It also appears that the Limit Deposit Velocity found for small particles is close to the transition between the heterogeneous regime and the homogeneous regime, which makes sense, because in the homogeneous regime all particles are supposed to be in suspension. The value of $\alpha_p=3.5$ is based on the maximum LDV values found in literature and not on a best fit. In fact $\alpha_p$ may vary from 3.0 as a lower limit to 3.5 as an upper limit. So the value of 3.5 is conservative. A best fit would probably give a value of about 3.25. However in dredging the LDV should be a safe LDV, since the particle size, the concentration and the line speed may vary in time. For coarse particles an approach based on bed shear stress and a limiting relative volumetric concentration $C_{vr,ldv}$, resulting in a limited bed, is used. If the bed shear stress exceeds the sliding friction, the limited bed vanishes. In terms of the Durand & Condolios LDV Froude number this gives:

$$F_{L,r} = \frac{\nu_{ls,ldv}}{\left(2 \cdot g \cdot R_{sd} \cdot D_p\right)^{1/2}} = \alpha_p \cdot \left(1 - \frac{C_{vs}}{C_{vr,ldv}}\right)^{\beta} \cdot \frac{C_{vs} \cdot \mu_s \cdot C_{vb} \cdot \pi^{1/2}}{\lambda_l \cdot \frac{C_{l,1/2}}{\alpha_p}}$$

(16)

The limiting relative volumetric concentration $C_{vr,ldv}$ appears to depend on the pipe diameter $D_p$ and the relative submerged density $R_{sd}$. With a constant thickness of a thin layer $h$, the amount of solids in this thin layer is proportional to the pipe diameter $D_p$. The cross section of the pipe however is proportional to the pipe diameter $D_p$ squared. So the limiting relative volumetric concentration $C_{vr,ldv}$ will be reversely proportional to the pipe diameter. The limiting relative volumetric concentration $C_{vr,ldv}$ is decreasing with increasing relative submerged density $R_{sd}$. This can be explained by assuming that a certain critical bed shear stress $\tau_{12}$ requires a decreasing relative volumetric concentration $C_{vr,ldv}$ with an increasing relative submerged density $R_{sd}$.

$$C_{vr,ldv} = 0.00012 \cdot D_p^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{R_{sd}}{1.65}\right)^{-1} = \frac{0.0039}{2 \cdot g \cdot R_{sd} \cdot D_p}$$

(17)

The final $F_L$ value, including the transition region, can now be determined according to:

$$F_L = F_{L,s} \cdot e^{-d/d_0} + F_{L,r} \cdot \left(1 - e^{-d/d_0}\right) \quad \text{with:} \quad d_0 = 0.0005 \cdot \left(\frac{1.65}{R_{sd}}\right)^{1/2}$$

(18)

Figure 4 shows the resulting LDV curves compared with the Durand & Condolios (1952) experiments. The resemblance is very good, including the limiting LDV based on the transition of the sliding bed regime and the heterogeneous regime.
CONSTRUCTING THE TRANSPORT CONCENTRATION CURVES

In order to construct the transport or delivered concentration curves, the ratio between the spatial and the delivered volumetric concentration has to be known. This ratio is defined as:

\[
\frac{C_{vt}}{C_{vs}} = \left( 1 - \frac{v_{sl}}{v_{ls}} \right) = (1 - \xi)
\]  

The asymptotic value of this slip ratio for a line speed approaching 0 is not equal to 1, but equal to:

\[
\xi_0 = \frac{v_{sl}}{v_{ls}} = 1 - \frac{C_{vt}}{C_{vb}}
\]

The slip ratio around the LDV can be estimated as:

\[
\xi = \frac{v_{sl}}{v_{ls}} = \frac{1}{2 \cdot C_D} \left( 1 - \frac{C_{vt}}{0.175 \cdot (1 + \beta)} \right)^\beta \left( \frac{v_{ls,ldv}}{v_{ls}} \right)^4
\]
Figure 5: Construction of the slip ratio.

For line speeds from 0 to the LDV, the slip ratio is estimated by taking the tangent line from the line speed of 0 and the slip ratio of equation (20) to the curve of equation (21) as is shown in Figure 5. For line speeds above the LDV, the slip ratio determined for the heterogeneous regime is used. Figure 6 shows the resulting slip ratio curves compared with experiments of Yagi et al. (1972). Now 3 regions can be distinguished, the region of low line speeds giving a sliding bed, the region around the LDV and the region far above the LDV.

Once the slip ratio $\xi$ is known, the bed fraction $\zeta$ can be determined by dividing the original relative spatial concentration $C_{vr}$ by the slip factor. The bed fraction is the fraction of the pipe occupied by the bed as is shown in Figure 7 for a number of particle diameters.
Figure 6: Slip ratio curves matching the Yagi et al. (1972) experiments.

Figure 7: The resulting bed fraction curves.
Figure 8: The main flow regimes for constant spatial concentration.

Figure 9: The main flow regimes for constant delivered/transport concentration.
RESULTING RELATIVE EXCESS HYDRAULIC GRADIENT CURVES

Figure 8 gives an example of the resulting relative excess hydraulic gradient curves for a 0.1524 m diameter pipe and particles ranging from 0.1 mm to 10 mm, showing the different flow regimes for the spatial concentration case. Figure 9 shows the resulting relative excess hydraulic gradient curves for the delivered (transport) concentration case. These graphs also match the regime diagram of Newitt et al. (1955) showing that not all flow regimes occur for each particle diameter to pipe diameter ratio.

THE CONCENTRATION DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE PIPE

The advection diffusion equation when in equilibrium shows the balance between the upwards flow of particles due to diffusion and the downwards flow of particles due to gravity (the terminal settling velocity). Wasp et al. (1977) and Doron et al. (1987) use the solution of the advection diffusion equation for low concentrations, while Karabelas (1977) and Kaushal & Tomita (2002B) use the Hunt (1954) approach with upwards liquid flow. Hindered settling is not yet included in the basic solutions, but added by replacing the terminal settling velocity by the hindered terminal settling velocity. For the diffusivity and the relation between the sediment diffusivity and the turbulent eddy momentum diffusivity different approaches are possible. Using the Lane & Kalinske (1941) approach, the following equation can be derived for pipe flow:

\[
C_{vs}(r) = C_{vB} \cdot e^{-12 \frac{v_{sh}}{\beta_{sm} \cdot u_* \cdot D_p} \cdot r}
\]  
(22)

Now based on the assumption that the diffusivity has to have a value such that at the LDV the concentration at the bottom of the pipe equals the bed concentration (the definition of the LDV), the following equation can be derived:

\[
C_{vs}(r) = C_{vB} \cdot e^{\frac{\alpha_{sm} \cdot u_{adv} \cdot v_{tv} \cdot r}{u_* \cdot D_p \cdot v_{tv}}} \quad \text{with:} \quad \alpha_{sm} = 1.0046 + 0.1727 \cdot C_{vr} - 1.1905 \cdot C_{vr}^2
\]  
(23)

The settling velocity \(v_{sv}\) is the settling velocity of the particle, based on the properties of the liquid, adjusted for the homogeneous fraction, resulting in the vehicle liquid according to Wasp et al. (1977). The correction factor \(\alpha_{sm}\) appears to depend only on the relative concentration \(C_{vr}\).

The bottom concentration \(C_{vB}\) is now for line speeds above the LDV:

\[
C_{vB} = C_{vb} \cdot \frac{u_{adv} \cdot v_{tv}}{u_* \cdot v_{tv,ldv}}
\]  
(24)
The friction velocities used in these equations can be determined by, because the hydraulic gradients are known:

\[ u_* = \sqrt{\frac{\bar{f}_m \cdot g \cdot D_p}{4}} \quad \text{and} \quad u_{*,LDV} = \sqrt{\frac{\bar{f}_{m,LDV} \cdot g \cdot D_p}{4}} \]  

(25)

Figure 10 shows the concentration profiles for different relative concentrations, adjusted for the circular shape of the pipe at the LDV, compared with data from Kaushal et al. (2005) giving a reasonable match.

**GRADED SANDS AND GRAVELS**

For graded sands and gravels the following steps have to be taken according to Figure 11:

1. The PSD has to be divided into a number of fractions.
2. The homogeneous fraction has to be determined based on a limiting particle diameter.
3. The liquid density and viscosity have to be adjusted based on the homogeneous fraction.
4. The sliding flow fraction has to be determined based on the \( d/D_p > 0.015 \) Sellgren & Wilson (2007) criterion and the Zandi & Govatos (1967) criterion.
5. Now head loss curves and bed height hydraulic gradient curves are determined for each fraction independently, both for \( C_{vs} \) and for \( C_{vt} \), using the liquid density and viscosity from step 3.

6. Summation of the head loss curves and bed height curves proportional to their fraction, both for \( C_{vs} \) and for \( C_{vt} \).

Figure 11 shows the algorithm in order to determine the hydraulic gradient and the relative excess hydraulic gradient curves for graded soils. The method is straightforward. For each fraction of the PSD the hydraulic gradient is determined and the hydraulic gradients determined are added up to a resulting hydraulic gradient, both for constant spatial and constant delivered concentration curves.

\[
i_m = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i \cdot i_{m,i}
\]  

(26)
Figure 12: Graded sand $d_{s8}/d_{s50}=d_{s50}/d_{s15}=e$, $d_{s50}=0.5$ mm.

Figure 13: Graded sand $d_{s8}/d_{s50}=d_{s50}/d_{s15}=e$, $d_{s50}=5$ mm.
In the case the sand contains fines, first the fraction of fines is determined based on a particle diameter. The fraction of fines is used to adjust the liquid density and viscosity with equations (9) and (10). With the adjusted liquid density and viscosity, the hydraulic gradients for each fraction of the PSD are determined and added up according to equation (26). In the case the sand contains a coarse fraction matching the criterion of Sellgren & Wilson (2007), first this fraction is determined. If the fraction times the volumetric concentration matches the criterion of Zandi & Govatos (1967) the hydraulic gradients of the corresponding PSD fractions are determined with the sliding flow model. All fractions with smaller particle diameters are determined with the heterogeneous model.

Figure 12 and Figure 13 shows the resulting Erhg curves for a medium sand with d50=0.5 mm and a coarse sand/gravel with d50=5 mm. Figure 12 shows a reduction of the power of the line speed for the graded sand as already predicted by Wilson et al. (1992). The effect of the very coarse particles according to the Sellgren & Wilson (2007) criterion is clear in Figure 13.

**APPLICATION OF THE DHLLDV FRAMEWORK**

The absolute hydrostatic pressure at the inlet of the suction mouth of the cutter head or in the drag head is:

\[ p_s = \rho_l \cdot g \cdot H_{0,in} + 100 \]  

(27)

The pressure losses from the suction mouth to the end of the pipeline are:

\[ p_m = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho_m \cdot v_{ls}^2 + \lambda_1 \cdot \frac{L_{tot}}{D_p} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho_l \cdot v_{ls}^2 + \rho_l \cdot g \cdot L_{tot} \cdot R_{sd} \cdot C_{vt} \cdot E_{rhg} + \sum_{t=0}^{n} \xi_t \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \rho_m \cdot v_{ls}^2 \]

\[ + \rho_m \cdot g \cdot \left( H_{0,in} + H_{n+1,out} \right) - \rho_l \cdot g \cdot H_{0,in} \]  

(28)

In this example it is assumed that the suction pipe and the discharge pipe have the same diameter. In reality this is often not the case. The suction pipe is usually a bit larger than the discharge pipe. However for this example it does not make a lot of difference.

1. The first term represents the acceleration losses. Outside the pipe the mixture is assumed not to have a velocity, but inside the pipe it has the line speed. So the mixture has to be accelerated, resulting in some pressure loss. For the total pressure loss this is not relevant, but for the calculation of possible cavitation at the inlet of the first pump it is.

2. The second term is the so called Darcy-Weisbach term for straight pipeline resistance of pure liquid (water in this case). The Darcy-Weisbach friction factor can be determined from the Moody diagram.

3. The third term is the solids effect based on the DHLLDV Framework. Figure 15 shows the relative excess hydraulic gradient for different particle diameters in a 30 inch pipe as a function
of the line speed. The graph is constructed for a 17.5% constant delivered volumetric concentration. For other concentrations the graph can also be used for the heterogeneous and the homogeneous regimes (so if the slip can be neglected), but not for the sliding bed regime.

**Figure 14: A pump pipeline system with boosters.**

4. The fourth term represents the pressure losses due to fittings, telescopes and so on.
5. The fifth term represents the total elevation pressure loss, from suction mouth to discharge.
6. The sixth term represents the hydrostatic pressure at the location of the suction mouth.

The Limit Deposit Velocity can be determined with:

\[
v_{ls,ldv} = F_L \cdot \left(2 \cdot g \cdot R_{sd} \cdot D_p\right)^{1/2}
\]  

(29)

The value of the \( F_L \) Froude number can be found in Figure 16.

For a 0.762 m (30 inch) pipe, a particle diameter of 0.5 mm, a pipe length of 4000 m, a water depth of 20 m and an elevation of 10 m, the pressure losses are given in Figure 17. The graph shows the water curve (blue), the ELM curve (brown), the DHLLDV Framework curve (red) and a resulting pump curve for the mixture. The graph also shows the LDV and the concentration dependent LDV curve. The LDV is 6.35 m/s or 10417 m³/hour. The working point (intersection of pump and resistance curves) is above 11000 m³/hour. The pressure losses at this working point are about 1500 kPa or 15 bar.

It should be mentioned that in this example one should not stop pumping and later try to restart, since at low flow rates the pipe resistance is higher than the available pump pressure.
CONCLUSIONS & DISCUSSION

The DHLLDV Framework is explained for determining head losses and the limit deposit velocity based on uniform sands and gravels and a spatial volumetric concentration. Using a holdup function, the delivered concentration head loss curve(s) can be determined and from there the bed height. By means of superposition, after some adjustments of the liquid properties, the head loss curve(s) for graded sands and gravels can also be determined. The full DHLLDV Framework is more complicated and detailed as described here and would require a multiple of pages. On the website www.dhlldv.com many additional graphs can be found and the latest developments will be shown after being published, including a list of papers about this subject. In 2016 a book will be published revealing all the details.

The choice of basing the model on spatial volumetric concentration and uniform sands or gravels enables an explicit formulation for the different sub-models.

The criteria determining heterogeneous flow or sliding flow still require more investigation, although they match the Doron & Barnea (1993) experiments and the SCR model. Concentrations of 4.2% and 5% of their experiments clearly show heterogeneous behavior, while all higher concentrations show sliding flow behavior.
Figure 16: The limit deposit velocity for a 30 inch pipe.

Figure 17: Pressure losses versus flow for d=0.5 mm particles.
The method for graded sands is promising, but may need some fine tuning. Unfortunately there is not much experimental data available, while only Wasp (1963), Kaushal & Tomita (2002C) and Sellgren & Wilson (2007) developed models for graded PSD’s.

The DHLLDV Framework has been compared with the Wasp (1963), the Wilson et al. (1992), the Kaushal & Tomita (2002C) and the SCR model, as well as many more from literature, with good results. In addition the model compares well to a wide range of experimental data from literature. These comparisons are also available on the website. The DHLLDV Framework enables the user to implement user defined sub models for the different flow regimes, for the holdup function, for the bed height function and for the concentration distribution function.

The DHLLDV framework gives a reference framework for slurry flow in horizontal pipes. The DHLLDV Framework will be published as a book in 2016, with detailed information on how to use it. The book will be accompanied by an Excel workbook and Python software. The book, the Excel workbook and the Python software will be published free of charge in Open Access at the WODCON in Miami, June 2016.

**NOMENCLATURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_{CV}$</td>
<td>Coefficient homogeneous regime (1.3 by default)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_p$</td>
<td>Cross section of the pipe</td>
<td>m$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{vb}$</td>
<td>Bed volumetric concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{vb,max}$</td>
<td>Maximum bed volumetric concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{vB}$</td>
<td>Concentration at the bottom of the pipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_D$</td>
<td>Particle drag coefficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{vs}$</td>
<td>Spatial volumetric concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{r}$</td>
<td>Relative concentration $C_{vs}/C_{vb}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{r,ldv}$</td>
<td>Relative concentration in bed at LDV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{vt}$</td>
<td>Transport or delivered volumetric concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_x$</td>
<td>Durand &amp; Condolios coefficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>Particle diameter</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_0$</td>
<td>Particle diameter LDV transition region</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_H$</td>
<td>Hydraulic diameter</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_p$</td>
<td>Pipe diameter</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{rhg}$</td>
<td>Relative excess hydraulic gradient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{rhg,SF}$</td>
<td>Relative excess hydraulic gradient in the sliding flow regime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{rhg,HeHo}$</td>
<td>Relative excess hydraulic gradient in the heterogeneous/ homogeneous flow regimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>Fraction of fines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>Factor determining sliding flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_L$</td>
<td>Durand limit deposit velocity Froude number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{L,s}$</td>
<td>Durand limit deposit velocity Froude number, smooth bed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{L,ss}$</td>
<td>Durand limit deposit velocity Froude number, small particles smooth bed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{L,vs}$</td>
<td>Durand limit deposit velocity Froude number, smooth bed, very small particles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{L,r}$</td>
<td>Durand limit deposit velocity Froude number, rough bed, large particles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{L,ul}$</td>
<td>Durand limit deposit velocity Froude number, upper limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{L,ll}$</td>
<td>Durand limit deposit velocity Froude number, lower limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Fr_{DC}$</td>
<td>Durand &amp; Condolios Froude number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>Gravitational constant (9.81) $m/s^2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>Thickness of bed at LDV $m$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_l$</td>
<td>Hydraulic gradient of liquid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_m$</td>
<td>Hydraulic gradient of mixture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{m,i}$</td>
<td>Hydraulic gradient of $i^{th}$ fraction of PSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{m,ldv}$</td>
<td>Hydraulic gradient mixture at LDV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K$</td>
<td>Durand &amp; Condolios constant (85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_p$</td>
<td>Mass particle $kg$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Zandi &amp; Govatos deposit criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>Position in pipe starting at the bottom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Re$</td>
<td>Reynolds number based on velocity difference liquid flow - bed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{sd}$</td>
<td>Relative submerged density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Sr_r$</td>
<td>Settling Velocity Hindered Relative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{rs}$</td>
<td>Slip Velocity Relative Squared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u^*$</td>
<td>Friction velocity $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u^*,ldv$</td>
<td>Friction velocity at the LDV $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_1$</td>
<td>Average velocity above the bed $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_2$</td>
<td>Velocity of the bed $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{12}$</td>
<td>Velocity difference bed interface $(v_1-v_2)$ $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{ls}$</td>
<td>Cross-section averaged line speed $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{ls,ldv}$</td>
<td>Limit Deposit Velocity (LDV) $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_r$</td>
<td>Relative line speed $v_{ls}/v_{ls,ldv,max}$ or $v_{ls}/v_{sm}$ $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{sl}$</td>
<td>Slip velocity (velocity difference between particle and liquid) $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{sm}$</td>
<td>Maximum LSDV according to Wilson $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_t$</td>
<td>Particle terminal settling velocity $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{ht}$</td>
<td>Hindered settling velocity $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{tv}$</td>
<td>(Hindered) settling velocity in the vehicle (Wasp model) $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_{tv,ldv}$</td>
<td>(Hindered) settling velocity in the vehicle (Wasp model) at LDV $m/s$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_h$</td>
<td>Coefficient homogeneous equation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_p$</td>
<td>LDV factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{sm}$</td>
<td>Factor concentration distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Angle of bed with vertical $rad$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Power of Richardson &amp; Zaki hindered settling factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{sm}$</td>
<td>Relation sediment diffusivity eddy momentum diffusivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi$</td>
<td>Internal friction angle $rad$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>External friction angle $rad$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1$, $\lambda_1$</td>
<td>Darcy Weisbach friction factor liquid to pipe wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_{12}$</td>
<td>Darcy Weisbach friction factor bed interface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>Von Karman constant (about 0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\kappa_C & \text{Concentration distribution constant} \\
\rho_l & \text{Density of liquid} \\
\rho_{l,m} & \text{Density of liquid including fines} \\
\rho_m & \text{Mixture density} \\
\rho_s & \text{Density of solids} \\
\nu_l & \text{Kinematic viscosity liquid} \\
\mu_l & \text{Dynamic viscosity liquid} \\
\mu_{l,m} & \text{Dynamic viscously liquid including fines} \\
\mu_{sf} & \text{Sliding friction coefficient} \\
\tau_{2,sf} & \text{Shear stress bed} – \text{pipe wall due to sliding friction} \\
\tau_{12} & \text{Bed shear stress} \\
\xi & \text{Slip ratio} \\
\xi_0 & \text{Slip ratio asymptotically for line speed zero} \\
\zeta & \text{Bed fraction}
\end{array}\]
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REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING IN NORTH AMERICA: 
CURRENT PRACTICE AND LESSONS LEARNED
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ABSTRACT

Environmental dredging has been used for more than 30 years to remove contaminated 
sediments from water bodies in an effort to restore them from historical chemical impacts. 
Contaminated sediment cleanup has been implemented under a number of regulatory 
frameworks, and one of the most commonly used tools, dredging, has been used to remove 
contaminated sediment deposits with an aim to reduce potential risks to human health and the 
environment. As would be expected, there are valuable lessons from these projects, including 
positive and negative aspects, which can help inform current and future projects around the 
world. This paper provides an overview of the history of environmental dredging in 
North America, highlighting important lessons learned, and how they have informed 
subsequent projects. The performance of these projects are evaluated to determine where 
progress has been made, and also to identify areas requiring further improvement. Finally, 
some general guidelines for claims avoidance are provided, based on the author’s experience 
in related litigation support, over the years.

Keywords: contaminated sediments, remediation, superfund, adaptive management, case 
studies, costs

INTRODUCTION

Contaminated sediments exist around the world and pose unique challenges, both technically 
and administratively. In the United States and Canada, federal and state governments and 
responsible parties have been investigating, evaluating, and remediating contaminated sites 
since the early 1980s. To date, environmental dredging has been the most common technique
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employed for contaminated sediment cleanup. Over the past 30 years, much has been learned from environmental dredging experience. Many of the lessons learned have been considered and recognized in recent guidance documents developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA; 2005) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Bridges et al., 2008; USACE, 2008), as well as in the U.S. National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study on the effectiveness of environmental dredging (NAS, 2007). Some other studies offer additional insights as well (Mohan and Thomas, 1997; Doody and Cushing, 2002; Patmont and Palermo, 2007; Bridges et al., 2010). This paper builds further on those lessons learned, particularly from the more highly contaminated and regulated sites across the remediation spectrum, with an aim to improve planning and implementation of future environmental dredging projects.

Typical regulatory programs driving contaminated sediment cleanup in the United States and Canada include the following:

- USEPA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (also known as Superfund)
- USEPA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
- USEPA Clean Water Act
- Fifty different state regulatory programs (some similar to USEPA programs)
- Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan (Canada)

Although each of these programs has unique regulatory processes and other requirements, they all involve investigation of potential risks posed by contaminated sediment sites, evaluation of alternative site-specific cleanup remedies, implementation of the agency-selected remedy, and often (but not always) long-term monitoring to document the effectiveness of the remedy.

Compared with upland cleanup sites, contaminated sediments present unique challenges from a technical perspective. For example, there are often multiple sources of contamination (e.g., legacy and ongoing sources that may or may not have been fully controlled) and different chemical contaminants that may not behave similarly during dredging; these and other key variables need to be well understood in order to develop and implement an effective cleanup remedy. Contaminated sediment deposits from a given source may be spread over relatively large areas and may also be subject to a range of environmental forces and transport pathways. The types of aquatic environments can vary amongst and within sites, ranging from marine tidal environments and oceans to freshwater lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams—all of which present different technical challenges. The underwater environment can also provide unique and sensitive habitats for aquatic flora and fauna.

Experience in North America has shown that environmental dredging can be expensive, with a large portion of the total cost attributable to management and disposal of the sediment removed from the waterway. The combined cost to remediate three of the largest sites in the United States—the Hudson River, Onondaga Lake, and the Lower Fox River—is currently estimated at more than $3 billion, with other large sites on the horizon. Observations and data from smaller projects, and during implementation stages of the Hudson River, Onondaga Lake, and Lower Fox River projects, clearly demonstrate that there are limitations associated with environmental dredging that need to be recognized when embarking on future projects. Several of the important lessons learned include the following:

- Implications of technology advancements (bucket designs and hydraulic equipment)
- Improvements in survey and sampling equipment
• Inevitability of residuals, resuspension, release, and risk (the Four Rs; e.g., see Bridges et al., 2010)
• Limited effectiveness of resuspension control techniques (silt curtains, rigid containment systems)
• Recognition of the need for post-dredge residuals management
• Benefits associated with integrating adaptive management principles
• Understanding project costs associated with environmental dredging projects

SUMMARY OF REMEDY DECISIONS FOR CONTAMINATED SEDIMENT

To help provide some context of remedy decision making in the United States, Doody et al. (2011) and Patmont et al. (2013) presented results of research into USEPA decisions for contaminated sediment sites over the past three decades. The research included a review of USEPA Record of Decision (ROD) documents to evaluate trends resulting from the expanded dialogue, scientific review, and development of agency guidance on environmental dredging that has occurred since the late 1990s. Figure 1 illustrates the chemical contaminants for which cleanup levels were established in the ROD. As shown, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) have been the primary contaminant targeted for sediment cleanup at sites in the United States, and there has been little change in this trend during the past decade.

Figure 1. Primary Contaminants of Concern in USEPA Records of Decision.

Sediment removal continues to represent the largest proportion of USEPA’s sediment cleanup decisions; however, since 2005, there has been an increase in remedies with multiple approaches, such as removal, capping, and monitored natural recovery (MNR; referred to as hybrid remedies). The year 2005 was used as it coincides with the year USEPA released its contaminated sediment remediation guidance (USEPA, 2005). All of the hybrid remedies implemented since 2005 have included removal, and environmental dredging continues to represent the most frequently selected sediment cleanup technology, even for projects with hybrid remedies. Figure 2 illustrates the shift in the decision making process by USEPA.
Another important trend is that post-dredge residual management, such as placing a clean cover, backfill, or cap layer over dredged areas, is becoming more frequent with environmental dredging, particularly since 2005 (Figure 3). One of the important lessons learned is that environmental dredging will inevitably leave behind some contaminated sediment on the newly exposed surface (Bridges et al., 2008). This residual layer of contaminated sediment typically has contaminant concentrations equal to the average dredge prism concentration over the entire cut (USEPA, 2010). Because pre-dredge subsurface sediment dredge prism concentrations are often higher than surface sediments, dredging can increase risks at least temporarily. Management of dredging residuals has been an increasing focus of environmental dredging projects, particularly at sites with relatively low cleanup levels (e.g., for PCBs and other bio-accumulative compounds when based on USEPA’s assumptions of relatively high consumption rates of fish and shellfish). As a result, it is becoming increasingly common that environmental projects include post-dredge residual management to try to mitigate such dredging-related risks.
ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING EXPERIENCE IN NORTH AMERICA

Doody and Cushing (2002) examined 59 completed projects, which included 32 environmental dredging projects (mechanical or hydraulic dredging) and 27 wet/dry excavation projects. The authors noted the prevalence of post-dredge residual, sediment resuspension, and dissolved contaminant release impacts associated with many of these projects; the need for residual management actions; and the relatively high cost of environmental dredging projects. Information from these completed projects is documented in the Major Contaminated Sediment Sites Database (SMWG, 2008).

In the mid-2000s, NAS undertook a study of the effectiveness of environmental dredging (NAS, 2007), and examined 26 sediment dredging projects for which detailed monitoring data were available. More recently, Mohan et al. (2010) prepared an updated summary of the costs of environmental dredging projects and associated management actions, compiling the cost basis of more than 100 completed environmental dredging projects throughout North America. Table 1 provides a summary of major remedial dredging projects in North America, while Table 2 provides a unit cost analysis, identifying that the major component of the environmental dredging cost is for disposal.

Table 1. Summary of Major U.S. Remedial Dredging Projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Contaminant(s) of Concern</th>
<th>Dredge Method</th>
<th>Volume Dredged (m³)</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Lavaca Bay</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter</td>
<td>53,200 (70,000 cy)</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Ashtabula River</td>
<td>PCBs, PAHs, heavy metals</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter</td>
<td>478,800 (630,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Bayou Bonfouca</td>
<td>PAHs (creosote), VOCs</td>
<td>Mechanical; custom backhoe</td>
<td>128,440 (169,000 cy)</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Black River</td>
<td>PAHs</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter; mechanical clamshell</td>
<td>45,600 (60,000 cy)</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Buffalo River</td>
<td>PAHs, PCBs, lead, mercury</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>349,600 (460,000 cy)</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Commencement Bay, Sitcum Waterway</td>
<td>Metals, PCBs</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter and mechanical clamshell</td>
<td>1,720,800 (2,258,000 cy)</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Elizabeth River, Money Point Site</td>
<td>PAHs</td>
<td>Mechanical clamshell</td>
<td>38,000 (50,000 cy)</td>
<td>2017 (Planned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Summary of Major U.S. Remedial Dredging Projects (cont’d).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contaminant(s) of Concern</th>
<th>Dredge Method</th>
<th>Volume Dredged (m³)</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Calumet River (USX)</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>PAHs, metals, PCBs</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter</td>
<td>598,880 (788,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasse River</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Mechanical dredge (anticipated)</td>
<td>82,840 (109,000 cy; estimate)</td>
<td>2018 (Planned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Mechanical buckets</td>
<td>&gt;1,520,000 (&gt;2,000,000 cy)</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Champlain</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter</td>
<td>144,400 (190,000 cy)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipari Landfill Site</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Dry and wet excavation</td>
<td>124,260 (163,500 cy)</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Fox River (Phase 2)</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Horizontal auger; backhoe</td>
<td>38,240 (50,316 cy)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Fox River (OU’s 2-5)</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter</td>
<td>2,888,000 (3.8 million cy); Expected total 3,876,000 (5.1+ million cy)</td>
<td>2018 (Planned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Rouge River – Old Channel</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>PAHs</td>
<td>Mechanical dredge (anticipated)</td>
<td>58,140 (76,500 cy; ROD estimate)</td>
<td>2017 (Planned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Saginaw River</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Environmen tal clamshell bucket</td>
<td>262,200 (345,000 cy)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTV Steel Site</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>PAHs and oil</td>
<td>Diver-assisted vacuum; hydraulic cutter</td>
<td>82,840 (109,000 cy)</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manistique River and Harbor</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Diver-assisted, hydraulic auger</td>
<td>89,338 (117,550 cy)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon Battery Company</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Heavy metals</td>
<td>Horizontal auger; dry excavation</td>
<td>76 152 (100,200 cy)</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milltown Reservoir</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Arsenic, copper</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>1,770,800 (2,330,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga Lake</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>PAH, PCB, mercury, others</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter; mechanical</td>
<td>1,640,080 (2,158,000 cy)</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Summary of Major U.S. Remedial Dredging Projects (cont’d).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contaminant(s) of Concern</th>
<th>Dredge Method</th>
<th>Volume Dredged (m$^3$)</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orion Project 1</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed-bucket clamshell</td>
<td>76,000 (100,000 cy)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Long Beach IR Site 7 Naval Base Remediation</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>PCBs, metals</td>
<td>Clamshell</td>
<td>532,000 (700,000 cy)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hueneme CAD Site Development</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>PCBs, TBT, metals</td>
<td>Clamshell and hydraulic cutter</td>
<td>760,000 (1,000,000 cy)</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhine Channel</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>PCBs, metals, DDT</td>
<td>Clamshell</td>
<td>76,000 (100,000 cy)</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence River</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Horizontal auger; mechanical</td>
<td>10,070 (13,250 cy)</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Branch Creek (Phase I)</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Dry excavation</td>
<td>70,680 (93,000 cy)</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Heckathorn Superfund Site</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>DDT</td>
<td>Mechanical bucket</td>
<td>82,080 (108,000 cy)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan Harbor (Outboard Marine)</td>
<td>Waukegan</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter</td>
<td>39,000 (50,000 cy)</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Waterway Phase 1 Removal Action, Port of Seattle</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>PCBs, metals, PAH</td>
<td>Mechanical clamshell</td>
<td>197,600 (260,000 cy)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Waterway</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Mercury, arsenic, metals, PAH</td>
<td>Mechanical clamshell</td>
<td>82,080 (108,000 cy)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Waterway Stage 1, Port of Seattle</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>PCBs, metals, PAH</td>
<td>Mechanical clamshell</td>
<td>161,120 (212,000 cy)</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Lagoon/ Detroit River</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>PCBs, PAHs, heavy metals, oil, grease</td>
<td>Mechanical clamshell</td>
<td>87,400 (115,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant Mill Pond</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Dry excavation</td>
<td>110,960 (146,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Bay, Middle Waterway</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Mercury, arsenic, metals, PAH</td>
<td>Mechanical clamshell</td>
<td>82,080 (108,000 cy)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement Bay, Thea Foss/ Wheeler Osgood Waterway</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Zinc, lead, mercury, PAHs, PCBs, and NAPL</td>
<td>Hydraulic</td>
<td>401,280 (528,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Summary of Major U.S. Remedial Dredging Projects (cont’d).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contaminant(s) of Concern</th>
<th>Dredge Method</th>
<th>Volume Dredged (m³)</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Bay (Lake Champlain Basin Program)</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>PCBs, PAHs, PCDDs, PCDFs</td>
<td>Hydraulic</td>
<td>148,200 (195,000 cy)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlaw Brook/Butterfield Brook/Limestone Stream</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Pesticides, PAHs, PCBs, TPHs, lead</td>
<td>Dry and wet excavation</td>
<td>115,520 (152,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnickinnic River</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>PCBs and PAHs</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>126,920 (167,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh Lake</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Hydraulic cutter; mechanical excavation</td>
<td>446,880 (588,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine River</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>DDT</td>
<td>Cofferdam and excavation</td>
<td>486,400 (640,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddiman Creek/Pond</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Cadmium, chromium, lead, and PCBs</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>68,400 (90,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton Naval Complex</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>PCBs, PAHs, mercury, arsenic, copper, lead, and zinc</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>171,000 (225,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Pond, Edison Pond, Willow Run Sludge Lagoon</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>PCBs</td>
<td>Dry excavation</td>
<td>342,000 (450,000 cy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roebling Steel Co. (Delaware River)</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>PAH, metals</td>
<td></td>
<td>182,400 (240,000 cy)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Wood Industries, Elizabeth River</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>PAH</td>
<td></td>
<td>119,320 (157,000 cy) estimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Complex</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>PCBs and mercury</td>
<td></td>
<td>171,000 (225,000 cy)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
cy = cubic yard
DDT = dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
D/F = dioxins and furans
m³ = cubic meter
NAPL = non-aqueous phase liquid
PAH = polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCB = polychlorinated biphenyl
PCDD = polychlorinated dibenzodioxin
PCDF = polychlorinated dibenzofuran
ppm = part per million
ROD = Record of Decision
TBT = tributyltin
TPH = total petroleum hydrocarbon
VOC = volatile organic compound
Table 2. Summary of Unit Costs for Key Components of U.S. Environmental Dredging Projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average Cost (US $)</th>
<th>Range of Costs (US $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum Cost</td>
<td>Maximum Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Excavation ($/m³)</td>
<td>92 (70/cy)</td>
<td>177 (135/cy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Dredging ($/m³)</td>
<td>99 (75 cy)</td>
<td>283 (215/cy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydraulic Dredging ($/m³)</td>
<td>79 (60 cy)</td>
<td>256 (195/cy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Treatment ($/L)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.045/gal)</td>
<td>0.624 (0.165/gal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Disposal ($/m³)</td>
<td>105 (80/cy)</td>
<td>289 (220/cy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special (TSCA) Disposal ($/m³)</td>
<td>263 (200/cy)</td>
<td>631 (480/cy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Costs shown are based on Mohan et al. (2010).
Minimum and maximum range costs should be considered as outliers.
cy = cubic yard
gal = gallons
L = liter
m³ = cubic meter
TSCA = Toxic Substances Control Act
USD = U.S. dollars

Table 3 presents the summary of environmental dredging costs, split into three tiers (to represent volume ranges). A closer look at the historical cost data of completed environmental dredging projects reveals the following (with respect to the economic advantage in having local dredged material disposal options available for cost-effective dredging projects):

- **Local Disposal.** Where effective local disposal was available for placing the sediments, the total cost of dredging and disposal ranged from $20/cubic meter (m³; $15/cubic yard [cy]) to $809/m³ ($615/cy) for projects with at least 7,600 m³ (10,000 cy) of sediments. Because the one project that had the lowest on-site confined disposal facility cost was implemented in a manner more like a navigational dredging project than an environmental dredging project (i.e., hydraulic dredging and disposal in a nearshore confined disposal facility), it would be prudent to account for a more realistic range of costs in the range of $66/m³ ($50/cy) to $263/m³ ($200/cy), when a local disposal facility is available at a reasonable cost within close proximity of the dredge area. Where on-site incineration was needed, costs escalated to the $658/m³ ($500/cy) to $2,105/m³ ($1,600/cy) range. For smaller volume projects (less than $8,552/m³ [6,500 cy]), costs ranged as high as $3,816/m³ ($2,900/cy).

- **Off-site Disposal.** For projects that included off-site disposal, the costs generally varied from $132/m³ ($100/cy) to $658/m³ ($500/cy). For projects that required special (e.g., Toxic Substances Control Act) disposal, total costs were more on the order of $908/m³ ($690/cy) to $4,026/m³ ($3,060/cy).
Table 3. Summary of Environmental Dredging Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Remediation Volume Range (m³)</th>
<th>Range of Observed Costs and Average ($/m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>760 to 11,400 (1,000 to 15,000/cy)</td>
<td>263 to 3,815 (1395 average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(200 to 2,900/cy [1,060/cy average])²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>11,400 to 76,000 (15,000 to 100,000/cy)</td>
<td>52 to 1,039 (382 average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(40 to 790/cy [290/cy average])³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>greater than 76,000 (greater than 100,000/cy)</td>
<td>26 to 1270 (336 average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20 to 965/cy [255/cy average])⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Costs shown are based on Mohan et al. (2010). These costs do not include non-construction costs (such as design, planning, permitting, project management, and agency oversight) or source control costs.
2. The higher end denotes projects with small dredging volumes (less than 4,940 m³ [6,500 cy]), pilot projects with unique local restrictions, or hot spot dredging, and, in some cases, several passes of dredging.
3. Denotes efficient mid-size volume projects, generally dredging, with some backfill/cap after dredging; lower end of the range denotes projects with local, on-site disposal.
4. Efficiencies of (volume) scale influence Tier 3 cost ranges; the higher end denotes a project with on-site incineration and higher levels of contamination than normal, and, in some cases, several passes of dredging.

cy = cubic yard

The authors also reviewed project information from their collective professional experience and generated an approximate order of costs for post-dredged backfill placement. In general, $50,000 to $150,000 per acre should be sufficient for most backfill layers (for approximate layer thickness of 0.15 to 0.30 m [0.5 to 1 foot]), noting that local site-specific conditions can affect these costs considerably.

A review of completed projects from a cost and schedule perspective, and comparing them specifically with the cost estimate developed during the selection of the remedial approach (e.g., feasibility study) reveals that sediment remediation projects tend to cost more and take longer to complete than expected (Figures 4 and 5). There are three key aspects to this observation.

- First is that cost and schedule data from completed projects needs to be carefully considered and integrated in developing estimates during remedy evaluations for future projects such that decisions are made using the most accurate information possible.
- Second, and just as importantly, effective project management and control of these factors are needed during remedy implementation to align projects better with the original schedule and cost estimates.
- Finally, experienced construction professionals or contractors are rarely engaged to perform constructability reviews during the feasibility study and conceptual design phases.
Figure 4. Comparison of Estimated and Actual Costs for Completed Remediation Projects.

Figure 5. Comparison of Estimated and Actual Schedule for Completed Remediation Projects.
LESSONS LEARNED FROM COMPLETED PROJECTS

A review of completed environmental dredging projects in the United States clearly demonstrates that thorough characterization of site conditions is critical to effectively designing and implementing successful projects. Inadequate site characterization can increase the frequency of undisturbed residuals encountered at the base of the dredge cut (Figure 6), which can cause delays, result in higher costs, and can potentially lead to failure to meet cleanup levels. To be successful, environmental dredging projects also need to be developed using an integrated approach, ensuring that dredging operations are compatible with materials handling, transport, treatment, and disposal. Sometimes multiple dredge types may be used to optimize operations, depending on the specific project goals (for example, a relatively large dredge is often more appropriate for production cuts, whereas a smaller dredge may be more optimal for thin cuts and residuals passes). Management actions to improve overall project effectiveness should be thoroughly considered, including the use of appropriate control measures, post-dredge residual management, and other best management practices (BMPs).

Figure 6. Four Rs of Environmental Dredging (adapted from USACE, 2008).
As discussed in Bridges et al. (2010), all environmental dredging operations leave some residual contaminated sediment behind (Figure 6). This is not surprising given the limitations of even the most modern dredging equipment, the variable distribution of contamination found in many sites (including relatively high levels at depth from legacy releases), and the limited degree of pre-dredging characterization that has been performed at some environmental dredging sites. The inevitability of post-dredging residuals and their influence on risk has been increasingly recognized over the last decade. Recent technological innovations in statistically based site characterization, survey and dredging equipment, and BMPs for reducing residuals have shown some improvements over conventional equipment and practices, but residuals are still unavoidable. Because the purpose of environmental dredging is to reduce contaminated sediment risks, dredging residuals are a continuing concern.

The state of practice in modeling dredging processes is not sufficient to make precise predictions of post-dredging residual contaminant concentrations, but empirical approaches based on detailed case study information can provide good estimates. Detailed pre- and post-dredge characterization data collected at some of the higher profile environmental dredging projects (e.g., Hudson River, Lower Fox River, and Ashtabula River) suggest that the average concentration of contaminants in generated residuals will approximate the average sediment concentration over the entire dredge cut profile (e.g., USEPA, 2010). Generated residuals have been estimated using mass balance calculations on more than 30 environmental dredging projects, including the Hudson River, Lower Fox River, Ashtabula River, and Esquimalt Harbor projects that used statistically based pre- and post-dredge sampling programs to provide particularly high confidence in the generated residual characterization (Patmont and Palermo, 2007; Patmont et al., 2015). At those sites, generated residuals represented approximately 1% to 11% of the mass of contaminants or solids dredged over the entire design cut. Undisturbed residuals can result in leaving behind additional contaminated sediment.

The nature and extent of generated residuals are related to multiple environmental factors, including sediment geotechnical and geophysical characteristics, variability in contaminant distributions, and physical site conditions such as the presence of bedrock, hardpan, debris, or other obstructions. Operational factors that likely affect generated residuals include dredging equipment size and type, number of dredge passes, selection of intermediate and final cutline elevations, allowable overdredging, dredge cut slopes, accuracy of positioning, operator experience, and the sequence of operations (Bridges et al., 2008, 2010; Palermo et al., 2008; Fuglevand and Webb, 2009). However, sediment liquidity appears to be the most important site factor determining the amount of residuals generated at environmental dredging projects. Sediment with low bulk density (e.g., water content exceeding the geotechnical liquid limit) has the highest potential to generate residuals, as slope failure, sloughing, and spillage processes that occur with even the most modern dredging equipment lead to the generation of fluidized mud during dredging operations (Figure 7). Further complicating factors in the dredging process (e.g., the presence of debris in the sediment bed or underlying rock/hardpan) can make environmental dredging process and achievement of risk-based cleanup levels very difficult as well as costly because dredging is less effective in these difficult environments.
Based on column settling tests, sediment transport modeling, and detailed post-dredge sampling data collected on the better characterized environmental dredging projects (e.g., Patmont and Palermo, 2007; Patmont et al. 2015), most resuspended sediments settle close to the dredge relatively quickly (in a matter of minutes to an hour); however, finer particles may be transported into the far field (outside of project area). Contaminant releases associated with dredging can occur in particulate, dissolved, or volatile fractions, with each characterized by a different transport and/or exposure pathway. Particulate-associated contaminants are often released by the dredge head in the form of fluid mud and, once in the dissolved phase, they can travel into the far field and increase contaminant exposure-related risk.

Even when the most modern dredging equipment and post-dredge residual BMPs are used, short-term sediment resuspension and associated contaminant release still limits the effectiveness of environmental dredging. Environmental dredging operations unavoidably resuspend sediment, releasing dissolved contaminants into the water column and generating residuals that may or may not be confined to the dredge footprint and amenable to BMPs. Thus, environmental dredging results in short-term and potentially longer-term risks.
Table 4. Environmental Dredging Release Case Studies\(^1\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Environmental Dredging Activity</th>
<th>Best Management Practices</th>
<th>Source of Release Estimate</th>
<th>Indicator of Contaminant Mass Released</th>
<th>Primary Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999 – 2000 Fox River</td>
<td>62,320 m(^3) (82,000 cy) hydraulic</td>
<td>Operational BMPs/silt curtains</td>
<td>Water quality monitoring</td>
<td>Average 2% (about 30% dissolved)</td>
<td>Steuer, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Duwamish/ Diagonal</td>
<td>53,200 m(^3) (70,000 cy) mechanical</td>
<td>Operational BMPs</td>
<td>Fate/transport and food web modeling to simulate measured fish tissue PCBs</td>
<td>Midpoint 3% (range: 1% to 6%)</td>
<td>Stern, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Grasse River</td>
<td>19,000 m(^3) (25,000 cy) hydraulic</td>
<td>Operational BMPs/silt curtains</td>
<td>Water quality monitoring</td>
<td>Average 3% (&gt;50% dissolved)</td>
<td>Connolly et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Lower Passaic River</td>
<td>3,040 m(^3) (4,000 cy) mechanical</td>
<td>Operational BMPs/rinse tank</td>
<td>Water quality monitoring</td>
<td>Average 3% to 4% (range: 1% to 6%)</td>
<td>Lower Passaic River Restoration Project Team, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Hudson River</td>
<td>209,000 m(^3) (275,000 cy) mechanical</td>
<td>Operational BMPs/silt curtains</td>
<td>Water quality monitoring</td>
<td>Average 3% to 4% (about 80% dissolved)</td>
<td>Anchor QEA and Arcadis, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 to 2015 Hudson River</td>
<td>174,800 m(^3) (2,300,000 cy) mechanical</td>
<td>Operational BMPs</td>
<td>Water quality monitoring</td>
<td>Average 1% (about 80% dissolved)</td>
<td>GE and Anchor QEA, unpublished data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Preliminary data summaries; subject to revision.
BMP = best management practice
cy = cubic yard
m\(^3\) = cubic meter

Resuspension is the process of dislodgement and dispersal of sediment into the water column where it may be transported and dispersed through the water column (Figure 6). Resuspension may also result in short-term release of dissolved contaminants into the water column, primarily by contaminant desorption or porewater release from resuspended sediments, dredging residuals, or other fluid layers with high suspended solids concentration (e.g., fluid mud or the nepheloid layer; Bridges et al., 2010). The degree of resuspension and release at environmental dredging projects is influenced by site-specific sediment conditions (e.g., currents/waves, debris, and bedrock), as well as operational factors (e.g., dredge cut thickness, dredge speed/production, and operator skills). However, even when the most modern BMPs are used, environmental dredging release rates (expressed as the percent of dredged contaminant mass released to the water column; largely in the dissolved phase) have been relatively consistent across environmental dredging...
projects. Table 4 provides a summary of case studies regarding documented releases related to contaminated sediment dredging projects, mostly focused on PCBs. The release rates observed across these studies are generally in the range of 1% to 4%, with most of the release being in the bioavailable dissolved form. As demonstrated by these case studies, there are no documented differences in release rates between projects that use barrier controls (e.g., silt curtains) and those that do not.

Many environmental dredging projects conducted to date have resulted in significant residuals and/or releases during remedial construction, as evident through chemical monitoring of surface water quality and/or fish tissue before, during, and after construction. For example, fish tissue PCB concentrations at the Commencement Bay Nearshore/Tideflats Superfund Site in Tacoma, Washington, increased during environmental dredging operations and have persisted for a decade after the major dredging events (Figure 8; West et al. 2016). There are also concerns that diffuse, non-point sources of PCBs from the watershed may not have been fully controlled prior to cleanup. Similar results have been observed at a wide range of other environmental dredging projects (Bridges et al., 2010; Patmont et al., 2013).

![Figure 8. Dredging-related Increases in Fish Tissue Concentrations: Commencement Bay Nearshore/Tideflats Superfund Site, Washington](image)

Finally, experiences from completed environmental dredging projects have also shown that additional residual dredging to remove relatively low-density residual sediments is inefficient and often ineffective (Patmont and Palermo 2007; NAS 2007). Moreover, BMPs aimed at controlling resuspension and transport of sediment away from the project area show mixed success in preventing contaminant migration. For these reasons, residual contamination or releases following environmental dredging must be anticipated and considered in the remedy selection and design process.
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PROJECTS

During the feasibility study stage of a sediment cleanup project, it is important to evaluate the comparative advantages and disadvantages of each remedial technology and/or alternative in an equitable manner, especially from a short- and long-term risk perspective. A good understanding of the dredging Four Rs processes, as well as the recontamination potential from ongoing sources, is important at a number of different stages of the cleanup process. These evaluations allow decision makers to consider net risk reductions (and increases) during and after alternative implementation and to weigh them against potentially less intrusive remedial technologies (e.g., a hybrid remedy). Environmental dredging is generally appropriate in those situations where it would significantly improve net risk reductions and provide net environmental benefits compared to other alternatives, and where the additional cost and implementation considerations of dredging relative to less invasive technologies is not disproportionate to its additional protectiveness (Bridges et al., 2012).

During remedial design, an understanding of the sources and characteristics of likely residuals, resuspension, and release can be important for developing appropriate equipment selection and operation/management protocols (e.g., the decision between re-dredge passes and post-dredge cover). Dredge plan development should focus on achieving realistic removal goals (e.g., achieving design elevations) and facilitating the implementation of appropriate adaptive management plans to achieve risk-based remedial goals. Limited cleanup dredging passes; post-dredge residuals covers, backfill, or in some cases armored caps; and post-removal data analyses are important components of a successful adaptive management plan. However, the process must begin with careful pre-design characterization and subsequent data analyses, including geostatistical methods where appropriate, which have proven to be useful in reducing the potential for undisturbed residuals at environmental dredging sites. Other proven models are also available to estimate the nature and extent of releases during environmental dredging, including impacts to water quality and fish tissue. The use of model-predicted, post-remedy conditions allows for an assessment of residual risks and provides an opportunity to optimize the design prior to construction, thus improving the effectiveness of the overall action.

It is important to realize that even with appropriate planning, careful dredge plan design, and good construction BMPs, releases and residuals are still expected at environmental dredging projects. During the design phase, an adaptive management plan should be developed to establish the framework for timely evaluation of various management options for the effective management of dredging-related releases and residuals. Though releases are unavoidable and are often difficult to manage, residual management options (RMOs) can be developed to effectively and efficiently achieve the project cleanup goals. These RMOs should be developed during remedial design so that field decisions can be made in a timely manner to prevent extended downtime during construction. A well-structured decision framework can be developed prior to construction and utilized in the field for identifying appropriate RMO approaches based on the results of post-dredge confirmation sample results. Such a decision framework should consider site conditions
(including hardpan and debris), selected equipment and operational mode, engineering features (such as structures, utilities, offsets), estimated residual layer thickness, residual mass, density and concentrations, ratio of generated residuals to undisturbed residuals, and cost.

An evaluation of the above variables will help identify appropriate RMOs to effectively address post-dredge conditions. RMOs implemented on other projects generally include MNR, additional dredging passes with varying required cut thicknesses, and placement of sand covers and engineered caps (Patmont and Palermo, 2007). Depending on the specific RMO selected, additional sediment verification sampling may need to be performed to verify the effectiveness of the action and to determine whether or not subsequent work is required to meet remedial goals. The general conditions under which these RMOs should be implemented, as well as the pros and cons of these options, are discussed below.

- **MNR.** MNR is an appropriate RMO to consider at sites where future sedimentation and/or chemical degradation rates can be reasonably forecasted, therefore allowing a reasonable estimate of residual chemical concentration decay within an acceptable time frame. MNR generally applies to sites where residuals concentrations are marginally above the remediation level.

- **Additional Dredging Passes.** At some sites, additional dredging is desirable to address residual sediments above the action level. RMOs that include additional dredging can be effective at some sites, but are often inefficient and costly. The additional dredging passes are typically most effective when they are used to remove a deeper deposit of undisturbed residuals that may have been missed by the initial site characterization. Accordingly, one of two dredging RMOs may be implemented:
  - **Cleanup pass.** A cleanup pass is a dredge pass set at an elevation in such a way as to attempt to remove only a thin surficial layer of material, with the intent of removing a layer of reconsolidated generated residuals (allowing sufficient time for reconsolidation as practicable) and a minimal thickness of underlying clean material.
  - **Additional production pass.** One or more production passes target thicker layers of residuals, especially undisturbed residuals. This action would only be needed for cases in which the initial site characterization was incomplete and the setting of the initial production dredge cut elevation left a considerable thickness of contaminated sediment.

- **Backfill, Sand Covers, and Engineered Caps.** For sites where post-dredge conditions do not warrant re-dredging, backfill, sand covers, and engineered caps can be cost-effective and protective alternatives. Depending upon the nature and extent of the residuals, a backfill or sand cover may be used to enhance natural recovery processes and meet secondary project goals, such as habitat enhancement. Where higher levels of residuals contamination are identified within impracticable dredge areas (e.g., underlying hardpan or adjacent sensitive structures), engineered isolation caps may be designed and constructed to provide a protective solution to residual contamination.
KEY LESSONS LEARNED

A closer review of completed remediation projects reveals the following points that should be applied to the design and implementation of future projects:

- Mass removal does not necessarily imply risk reduction. In fact, just the opposite may be true.
- Use modeling tools and real site conditions to predict and manage for residuals and resuspension in the field.
- Remedial dredging is most efficient when it is combined with a post-dredge management plan such as placement of a backfill layer for restoration.
- Obtain a reliable set of pre-construction baseline data for post-construction verification purposes.
- Good documentation of design is key for effective communication. Develop clear and concise plans and specifications—avoid ambiguity.
- Perform the design/constructability review with a set of contractors who would likely bid on the project.
- Choose new and modern equipment, whenever feasible.
- Clearly define specifications for dredging, capping and backfilling, including performance and long-term verification goals.
- Use BMPs in the field to control the Four Rs.
- Provide a clear and concise measurement and payment clause. If multiple measurements are used, specify which takes precedence, in case of conflict.
- Track construction progress closely; track using multiple methods including volume, aerial extent, and earned value.
- Select the best qualified contractor, and communicate frequently on project expectations and actual progress made.
- Incentivize the contractor; do not penalize. Success, if shared, is a strong motivator.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Over the past 30 years, environmental dredging has been the tool of choice selected by North American federal and state regulators for implementing environmental cleansups in the aquatic environment; however, review of selected remedies in the last decade in comparison to previous periods has indicated a shift in USEPA’s approach to remedy selection. Remedy decision documents have increasingly included hybrid remedies that implement a combination of dredging, capping, and MNR, acknowledging that dredging alone may not be adequate (or cost effective) to achieve net risk reduction or relatively low remediation levels. This is further underscored by the recent industry trend of inclusion of post-removal backfill layers during the planning of cleanup projects.
Understanding and appropriately planning for residual contamination that may remain following dredging are critical components of successful environmental remediation projects. Recent efforts focused on characterizing the effectiveness of environmental dredging projects throughout North America have led to advances in understanding the processes leading to dredging residuals. Consideration of the limitations of dredging equipment and dealing with residual contamination following environmental dredging should be anticipated and considered in the remedy selection and design process, with dredge plan development (and equipment selection) aimed at achieving efficient and reasonable removal goals, and with facilitating the implementation of appropriate adaptive management plans for recovery in the longer term.
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