

More Soil Data Faster



# Adopting New Field Screening Methods – A Set of Case Studies



### Currently available for PHC and Salinity Parameters



# Set up scanner in a truck or field trailer



# Process in the Field



Scan calibration blank soil samples



Typical industry practice – drilling or grab



Place probe in contact with soil



Entering location, comments and click scan (2sec)







- Retail Fuel Station
- USG leakage from
  Phase II
  - Remedial Excavation
- Commercial Coarse Alberta Tier 1 Criteria
- 2 days of site work

#### OUTCOME:

- Analyzed 38 samples with 5 scans per sample
- Segregate clean soils in near real time piled suspected clean material
- 4 Rush lab samples confirmed field results
- Avoided 270 m^3 of soil in land fill
- Landfill = 125\$/cubic meter
- Maapera's costs = \$2400

Case 1

Over \$30k Savings



- Bulk Fuel Storage site being decommissioned
- 13 years of operations
- Phase II Assessment
- Commercial Coarse
  Alberta Tier 1 Criteria
- 6 days of site work
- Winter site work



Summary of Site Work:

- Equipment operated by trained Envirosearch personnel
- 38 bore holes drilled
- 236 samples analyzed with 3 scans per sample
- Also used PID probe for case study evaluation
- 42 lab analytical samples

Case 2

#### **OUTCOME:**

- PID had 15 out of 42 lab samples with False +ve/-ve
- Spectroscopy had 47% fewer False +ve/-ve
- Spectroscopy provided full F1-F4 values
- Value of Spectroscopy on this site:
  - Able to achieve delineation drilling with dynamic step out decisions
  - No return trip for supplemental drilling required
  - Able to select high value samples for lab with large volume of data

\$18k Savings

• Cost of Spectrometry = \$5,500





- Upstream Well Site
- Rainbow Lake Area
- Phase II
- 3 days of site work
- Salinity Impacts were
  primary concern

Case 3

Summary of Site Work:

- Equipment operated by Maapera Analytics as part of 60 site demonstration program
- 44 bore holes drilled
- 347 samples analyzed with 5 scans per sample
- 100 lab analytical samples with duplicates to a second lab
- Consultant leading the site was not using this data
  to direct their work or decisions



## Major Deviation Example

A single value could have errors for many reasons as this is field work. This highlights the value of more data and trend review

	Maapera EC	Maapera Cl	Maapera SAR	Lab EC	Lab Cl	Lab SAR
BH19-12 1.4m	2.7	220	2.3	3.21	346	1.8
BH19-12 2.9m	3.7	310	2.7	4.7	548	2.1
BH19-12 3.7m	1.6	96	1.9	4.02	273	2.8
BH19-12 4.4m	2.6	130	1.7	3.81	277	2.6

#### Would not have affected decision making

Case 3

Case 3

#### OUTCOME:

- Similar RPD performance to interlab duplicates
- On 12 of 44 holes (27%) samples sent to lab were selected in error and additional samples needed to be run
- On 9% of holes drilled, decision to stop drilling at depth was an error

• Site required remobilization, supplemental drilling, and additional lab samples to be processed

\$16k Savings

# What did we learn?

- Better field screening is possible
- Value for assessment and remediation
- High value lab sample selection
- Interlab variability is 30% 70%, on average
- Lab values are not ground truth
- Trends in sample analysis from more data is helpful

## gkawulka@maapera.com 780-263-5770

In summary...

More Soil Data Faster