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Field-Scale Remediation of a Metolachlor-Contaminated Spill Site Using Zerovalent Iron

S. D. Comfort*, P. J. Shea, T. A. Machacek, H. Gaber, and B.-T. Oh

ABSTRACT

Pesticide spills are common occurrences at agricultural cooperatives and farmsteads. When inadvertent spills occur, chemicals normally beneficial can become point sources of ground and surface water contamination. We report results from a field trial where approximately 765 m² of soil from a metolachlor [2-chloro-N-(2-ethyl-6-methylphenyl)-N-(2-methoxy-1-methylethyl) acetamide] spill site was treated with zerovalent iron (Fe⁰). Preliminary laboratory experiments confirmed metolachlor dechlorination by Fe⁰ in aqueous solution and that this process could be accelerated by adding appropriate proportions of Al₂(SO₄)₃, or acetic acid (CH₃COOH). The field project was initiated by moving the stockpiled, contaminated soil into windrows using common earth-moving equipment. The soil was then mixed with water (0.35–0.40 kg H₂O kg⁻¹) and various combinations of 5% Fe⁰ (w/w), 2% Al₂(SO₄)₃ (w/w), and 0.5% acetic acid (v/w). Windrows were covered with clear plastic and incubated without additional mixing for 90 d. Approximately every 14 d, the plastic sheeting was removed for soil sampling and the surface of the windrows rewetted. Metolachlor concentrations were significantly reduced and varied among treatments. The addition of Fe⁰ alone decreased metolachlor concentration from 1789 to 504 mg kg⁻¹ within 90 d, whereas adding Fe⁰ with Al₂(SO₄)₃, and CH₃COOH decreased the concentration from 1402 to 13 mg kg⁻¹. These results provide evidence that zerovalent iron can be used for on-site, field-scale treatment of pesticide-contaminated soil.

Pesticide spills take place each year on farmsteads and cooperatives. When these events occur, normally beneficial chemicals become sources of contamination for ground and surface water. Although the soil–water environment has an enormous potential to naturally attenuate xenobiotic compounds, this capacity can be exceeded when chemicals are either deliberately or inadvertently released to localized areas. To combat these point sources of contamination, treatments are needed that can alter the chemical structure of the contaminant so that natural attenuation can proceed.

The realization that many pollutants normally considered persistent in aerobic environments may be less persistent under anaerobic conditions has generated considerable interest in engineering a reducing environment in soils, sediments, and aquifers for remediation purposes. Under reducing conditions, detoxification of many contaminants can occur through reductive dehalogenation reactions. Although there are exceptions, as when vinyl chloride, a human carcinogen, is produced from reduction of more highly chlorinated compounds (Suffita et al., 1982), there is ample evidence to indicate that reducing or removing electron-withdrawing moieties from parent structures can result in more biodegradable products (Hundal et al., 1997; Singh et al., 1998a; Fathepure and Tiedje, 1999). Based on this premise, one technology gaining widespread acceptance is the use of zerovalent metals for remediating ground water contaminated with chlorinated solvents. Zerovalent iron (Fe⁰, Eₚ = −409 mV; Weast, 1978) is an avid electron donor and has a high capacity to reduce a wide array of organic compounds. Under aerobic conditions, oxygen is the usual electron acceptor, while in anoxic environments, electron release from the reaction of Fe⁰ with water can be coupled to the reduction of chlorinated and nitroaromatic compounds (Gillham and O’Hannesin, 1994; Agrawal and Tratnyek, 1996).

Current research has focused on the use of zerovalent metals for in situ treatment of contaminated ground water, with less research on using zerovalent metals for treating contaminated soils. Earlier work with zerovalent zinc demonstrated the utility of metals to treat soils contaminated with dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) (Staiff et al., 1977), methyl parathion (Butler et al., 1981), and polychlorinated biphenyls (Cutshall et al., 1993). More recent research indicates the tremendous potential of Fe⁰ to remediate soils contaminated with 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene (TNT), hexahydro-1,3,5-trinitro-1,3,5-triazine (RDX) (Hundal et al., 1997; Singh et al., 1998a, 1999), and atrazine (Singh et al., 1998b). Despite encouraging results, this work has yet to evolve into routine large-scale treatment of contaminated spill sites.

Our objective was to use zerovalent iron to remediate a metolachlor-contaminated field site. We report laboratory observations demonstrating the capacity of Fe⁰ to dechlorinate metolachlor in aqueous solution, then demonstrate the effectiveness of Fe⁰ to decrease metolachlor concentrations in static soil microcosms and at the field scale in soil windrows.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Metolachlor Spill Site

The metolachlor spill site was at a farm cooperative in southwestern Nebraska. This cooperative had been using a half-acre bentonite clay-lined lagoon to contain potentially contaminated storm runoff water and other excess wastewater. In 1995, an accidental release of metolachlor from a storage tank resulted in 2858 L of unrecovered product, some of which ran into the sump that drains into the lagoon. The spill resulted in approximately 765 m² (1000 yd²) of contaminated soil that was excavated from the lagoon, stockpiled into two large windrows, and held for remedial treatment. The targeted contaminant was metolachlor, which was present at concentrations in excess of 1400 mg kg⁻¹, but soil analysis revealed additional pesticides such as atrazine (6-chloro-N’-ethyl-N’-isopropyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine; initial concentration >250 mg kg⁻¹), alachlor [2-chloro-2’’,6’’-diethyl-N-(methoxymethyl)acetanilide;
>90 mg kg⁻¹], pendimethalin [N-(1-ethylpropyl)-3,4-dimethyl-2,6-dinitrobenzenamine; >90 mg kg⁻¹], and chlorpyrifos [O,O-diethylo-(3,5,6-trichloro-2-pyridyl) phosphorothioate; >25 mg kg⁻¹].

**Laboratory Solution Experiments**

Aqueous solutions of metolachlor were prepared from the commercial product Dual 8E (Syngenta, Greensboro, NC) and spiked with [¹⁴C]-metolachlor (28.6 μCi mg⁻¹) to produce a final concentration of 32 Bq mL⁻¹. Experimental units consisted of 250-mL Erlenmeyer flasks filled with 150 mL of metolachlor solution. All flasks were covered with Parafilm-coated stoppers and agitated on a reciprocating shaker at ambient temperature (23°C).

Two sets of companion batch experiments were conducted with zerovalent iron. The first set compared the destructive capacity of Fe⁰ with and without Al₂(SO₄)₃; the second used Fe⁰ with and without acetic acid. Initial metolachlor concentration was 1.09 mM for the Fe⁰–Al₂(SO₄)₃ experiment and 1.00 mM for the Fe⁰–acetic acid experiment. Each treatment (including controls) was replicated three times. Each treatment flask (containing 150 mL of metolachlor solution) received 18.75 g of unannealed Fe⁰, with and without 0.75 g commercial-grade Al₂(SO₄)₃ or 0.75 mL glacial acetic acid. At 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 24, and 48 h, 1.5-mL aliquots were removed and transferred to 1.7-mL polypropylene microcentrifuge tubes, centrifuged at 13 000 × g for 10 min, and analyzed by high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) for metolachlor and dechlorinated metolachlor. Carbon-14 in the aqueous solution was also monitored using the same sampling scheme by mixing 1 mL of uncentrifuged sample with 6 mL of Ultima Gold cocktail (Packard, Meriden, CT) and analyzed by liquid scintillation counting (LSC) using a Packard 1900TR liquid scintillation counter (Packard Instrument Co., Downers Grove, IL). Chloride analysis was also conducted on the samples taken for HPLC analysis with a Dionex (Sunnyvale, CA) DX-120X ion chromatograph using an AS14 IonPac column and a sodium carbonate (3.5 mM)–sodium bicarbonate (1.0 mM) eluent at a flow rate of 1.2 mL min⁻¹.

To determine differences in biodegradability between metolachlor and the Fe⁰-treated metolachlor products (primarily dechlorinated metolachlor), 25 mL of 0.35 mM metolachlor solution (spiked with [¹⁴C]-metolachlor) was treated with and without 4.5 g Fe⁰ and mixed with 24 mL of double-strength Pseudomonas minimum media (without glucose; Hundal et al., 1997). Solutions were transferred to sterilized glass jars, then inoculated with 1 mL of a consortium obtained from the metolachlor-contaminated soil. This inoculum was extracted by shaking 4 g soil with 20 mL of saline solution for 48 h. The saline solution contained (g L⁻¹) NaCl (8.5), KH₂PO₄ (0.3), Na₂HPO₄ (0.6), and peptone (0.1). Evolved [¹³C]CO₂ was captured by placing 10 mL of 0.5 M NaOH in a 20-mL scintillation vial and suspending it inside the scaled glass jar and over the inoculated media. Carbon dioxide traps were changed approximately every 5 d. Captured [¹³C]CO₂ was determined by transferring 0.5 mL from the CO₂ traps, mixing with scintillation cocktail, and determining total [¹³C] activity by liquid scintillation counting.

**Laboratory Soil Incubation Experiments**

Because solution experiments provided evidence that small additions of CH₃COOH or Al₂(SO₄)₃ facilitated Fe⁰-mediated destruction of metolachlor, we subsequently conducted batch studies with the metolachlor-contaminated soil to determine optimum concentrations needed for efficient metolachlor destruction in static soil microcosms. This was accomplished by incubating 20 g (oven dry) soil with 5% Fe⁰ (w/w) in 40-mL Teflon centrifuge tubes at 30°C and a soil water content of 0.40 kg kg⁻¹. Aluminum sulfate additions were between 0 and 5% (w/w) [0–1.0 g Al₂(SO₄)₃ to 20 g soil]. Acetic acid additions were between 0 and 2.5% (0–0.5 mL to 20 g soil). Soil treated with Fe⁰ + Al₂(SO₄)₃ was incubated for 2 d; soil treated with Fe⁰ + CH₃COOH was incubated for 7 d. Following incubation, the soil was extracted with 20 mL of CH₃CN and analyzed by HPLC (procedure described in Soil Analysis, below).

**Field Experiment**

The stockpiled soil was moved with a front-end loader into seven windrows, five of which were used in the field experiment. Windrow dimensions were 3.35 to 3.65 m wide by 1.07 to 1.37 m high and 25.91 to 60.66 m in length. The soil in each windrow was mixed three times within 24 h by using a tractor-pulled, high-speed soil-mixing and fractionation implement (Frontier Industrial Corp., Salem, OR), sold under the trade name Microenfractionator (H&H Eco Systems, North Bonneville, WA). This implement is similar in appearance to a conventional composter but differs in that its components have been augmented and redesigned to handle windrows containing 100% soil. This is facilitated by a John Deere (Moline, IL) 6068T 170-horsepower diesel engine that propels a large 32-cm (diam.) stainless steel rotating drum with 50 fan-knife blades (30.8-cm length). This implement also allows simultaneous injection of liquids (i.e., water and CH₃COOH) in this experiment into the mixing tunnel via pressurized lines connected to a water tank, which is pulled along with the Microenfractionator (Fig. 1).

Following initial soil mixing, windrows were sampled approximately halfway up each side by using a hand-held soil probe (2.5-cm i.d., 53-cm length). Three cores were taken every 6.1 m and composited. Samples were placed in an insulated cooler and transported to the laboratory. Each composite sample was analyzed for metolachlor and average concentrations per windrow were calculated.

Once the initial samples were obtained, five treatments were initiated, one per windrow. Treatments included: (i) control (no Fe⁰), (ii) Fe⁰ only, (iii) Fe⁰ + CH₃COOH, (iv) Fe⁰ + Al₂(SO₄)₃, and (v) Fe⁰ + CH₃COOH + Al₂(SO₄)₃. Treatments were added as a percentage of the oven-dry soil mass, which was estimated by multiplying the volume of each windrow times a soil bulk density of 1.4 g cm⁻³. The Fe⁰ was added at 5% (w/w), CH₃COOH at 0.5% (v/v), and commercial grade Al₂(SO₄)₃ at 2% (w/w). Expressing these percentages in the
more conventional unit of mass of chemical added per cubic yard (1 yd$^3 = 0.765$ m$^3$) of soil (1070 kg or 2360 lb, assuming a 1.4 g cm$^{-3}$ bulk density), our treatment rates were equivalent to 53.5 kg (118 lb) of Fe$^0$, 21.4 kg (47.1 lb) of Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$, and 5.4 L (1.42 gal) of acetic acid per 0.765 m$^3$ (yd$^3$) of contaminated soil.

The Fe$^0$ was unannealed iron purchased from Peerless Metal Powders (Detroit, MI) in 22.7 kg unlined paper bags. This Fe$^0$ had a specific surface area of 2.53 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$ (Micromeritics, Norcross, GA). Aluminum sulfate (commercial grade) was purchased in 22.7-kg bags from Van Waters & Rogers (Bellefonte, PA) connected to a Shimadzu (Kyoto, Japan) UV detector or photodiode array detector. The mobile phase was 50:50 acetonitrile and water at 1.0 mL min$^{-1}$ for metolachlor and its dechlorinated product. 5.4 L (1.42 gal) of acetic acid per 0.765 m$^3$ (yd$^3$) of contaminated soil. vial at 4°C until analysis.

The required amounts of iron and Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$ (in 22.7-kg unlined paper bags) were placed on top of the windrows and directly mixed in with the Microenfractionator a minimum of three times. Water and acetic acid were also added during the mixing process until the soil gravimetric water content was between 0.35 and 0.40 kg kg$^{-1}$ between 0.35 and 0.40 kg kg$^{-1}$. Statistical comparisons of metolachlor concentrations and soil pH among treatments were conducted using Tukey’s multiple comparison procedure (Steel and Torrie, 1980) with a 5% probability of a Type I error ($\alpha = 0.05$).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Laboratory Solution Experiments

Adding Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$, alone had no effect in altering metolachlor concentration. By contrast, when Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$ was added with Fe$^0$, first-order destruction rates were greatly increased (0.24 vs. 0.08 h$^{-1}$; Fig. 2). Assuming removal of one mole of Cl$^-$ per mole of metolachlor, we recovered >80% of the Cl$^-$ from the Fe$^0$ treatments. A near stoichiometric recovery of Cl$^-$ coupled with the production of the dechlorinated product confirmed that dechlorination was the primary transformation occurring. Given that approximately 20% of the $^{14}$C activity was lost within the first 2 h from solutions receiving Fe$^0$, some adsorption of metolachlor and/or its dechlorinated product(s) onto the Fe$^0$ occurred (Fig. 2). A decline in the dechlorinated product in the Fe$^0$ + Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$ treatment after 12 h, without further loss in solution $^{14}$C activity, indi-
Fig. 2. Changes in metolachlor concentration, 14C activity, and production of Cl⁻ and dechlorinated metolachlor following addition of Fe⁰ or Fe⁰ + Al₂(SO₄)₃ to aqueous solutions containing 1.09 mM metolachlor spiked with ¹⁴C-metolachlor.

Iron metal added to aqueous solutions of metolachlor efficiently dechlorinated this chloroacetamide herbicide. The dechlorinated product [N-(2-ethyl-6-methylphenyl)-N-(2-methoxy-1-methylethyl)acetamide] is formed when metolachlor accepts electrons released from oxidation of the Fe⁰ to Fe²⁺ and Fe³⁺. This reaction is promoted under acidic conditions and limited oxygen content. In summarizing the pathways of metolachlor degradation, Chester et al. (1989) indicated that the same dechlorinated metolachlor product occurs naturally as a result of abiotic degradation in soil and sediment under anaerobic conditions.

Our results are consistent with previous reports of metolachlor dechlorination by iron metal in water (Eykholt and Davenport, 1998). Mass balance experiments using ¹³C-metolachlor, with measurement of the dechlorinated compound and recovery of Cl⁻ released from metolachlor, indicated that the conversion is essentially complete, without the initial formation of other products.

Because dechlorination was the main destructive mechanism of the Fe⁰ treatment, we compared the biodegradability of metolachlor with the Fe⁰–treated metolachlor products in a mixed culture. The Fe⁰–treated products were five times more utilizable as a sole carbon source than metolachlor (cumulative ¹⁴CO₂: 4.6 vs. 0.89%, Fig. 4), indicating that they are more biodegradable than the parent metolachlor. Singh et al. (1998b) similarly found in a 120-d study that adding Fe⁰ to atrazine-contaminated soil increased cumulative mineralization from 4.1 to 11.2%.

**Laboratory Soil Incubation Experiments**

Although batch solution experiments indicated that Al₂(SO₄)₃ and acetic acid had a complementary effect on Fe⁰–mediated metolachlor destruction, the optimum quantities required to treat the spill-site soil needed to be determined. Short-term soil incubations indicated that 2% Al₂(SO₄)₃ (w/w) and 0.5% acetic acid (v/v) effectively increased metolachlor destruction in static soil microcosms (Fig. 5). Because the greatest metolachlor destruction occurred within the first day of treatment (see below), these short-term incubations adequately determined the quantities of Al₂(SO₄)₃ and CH₃COOH required for field-scale treatment.

**Metolachlor Spill Site**

The metolachlor concentration declined dramatically within 1 d after treating the soil windrows. Concentrations decreased from 1789 to 972 mg kg⁻¹ (46% decline) for the Fe⁰–only treatment and from 1402 to 65 mg kg⁻¹ (95% decrease) for the Fe⁰ + CH₃COOH + Al₂(SO₄)₃
in windrows containing Al2(SO4)3. This is probably due to the formation of green rust and reduced iron. Green rusts, often found as corrosion products of iron metal or as precipitates in anaerobic soils and sediments, are layered Fe(II)–Fe(III) hydroxides with anionic interlayers (CO2/HCO3, Cl/HCO3, and SO4/HCO3) (Erbs et al., 1999). Green rusts have been shown to play a role in the reduction of NO (Hansen et al., 1996) and carbon tetrachloride (Erbs et al., 1999), which indicates that they may also promote the reduction of other nitrogenated and chlorinated compounds. In addition to their importance as reductants, green rusts can also be strong adsorbents due to the potential of their interlayers to sorb and exchange anions and polar uncharged molecules (Erbs et al., 1999).

With time, diffusion of oxygen into the windrow was inevitable and the brown oxidation layer at the surface gradually increased in size. Whereas the oxidation of green rust to goethite may also provide a source of electrons for reduction reactions, formation of a Fe(III) oxide layer passivates the iron surface. At the 14-d sampling, we took a vertical core in the Fe0/CH3COOH/Al2(SO4)3-treated windrow and segmented it into three 10-cm increments. The top (surface) segment, which was spiked with 14C-metolachlor, had a metolachlor concentration of 34 mg kg\(^{-1}\) while the middle (brown-green) and bottom (green) sections (10–20, 20–30 cm) had concentrations ≤9 mg kg\(^{-1}\). Notable observations from the field included dramatic changes in soil color following treatment. Within 1 d, the surface of the soil had begun to brown from the oxidation of the iron. Immediately below the surface (ca. 1 cm), the soil was gray to greenish gray, especially after the post–90 d mixing. Notable observations from the field included dramatic changes in soil color following treatment. Within 1 d, the surface of the soil had begun to brown from the oxidation of the iron. Immediately below the surface (ca. 1 cm), the soil was gray to greenish gray, especially
Table 2. Extractable metolachlor concentrations following treatment with zerovalent iron.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Fe$^0$</th>
<th>Fe$^0$ + CH$_3$COOH</th>
<th>Fe$^0$ + Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$</th>
<th>Fe$^0$ + CH$_3$COOH + Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial (mixed)†</td>
<td>1813a‡</td>
<td>1709a</td>
<td>1656a</td>
<td>1402a</td>
<td>1813a‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 d</td>
<td>1976a</td>
<td>972b</td>
<td>105c</td>
<td>65c</td>
<td>972b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (mixed)†</td>
<td>1766a</td>
<td>769b</td>
<td>107c</td>
<td>41c</td>
<td>107c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 d (mixed)</td>
<td>1638a</td>
<td>537b</td>
<td>104c</td>
<td>34c</td>
<td>98c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 d</td>
<td>1555a</td>
<td>467b</td>
<td>98c</td>
<td>52c</td>
<td>98c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 d</td>
<td>2035a</td>
<td>676b</td>
<td>53c</td>
<td>25c</td>
<td>53c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 d</td>
<td>1867a</td>
<td>651b</td>
<td>59c</td>
<td>34c</td>
<td>59c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 d</td>
<td>1826a</td>
<td>486b</td>
<td>108c</td>
<td>45c</td>
<td>108c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Mixed: windrows were mixed three times immediately before sampling.
‡ Values with same letter within columns are not significantly different ($\alpha = 0.05$).

The addition of Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$, acetic acid, or both with Fe$^0$ significantly increased metolachlor destruction. This was particularly apparent in treatments containing Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$, which yielded the lowest metolachlor concentrations. Reasons for enhanced destruction by the addition of Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$ and acetic acid are complex but can in part be attributed to alterations in soil solution pH, redox potential, and soil solution composition during corrosion of the Fe$^0$ surface. Decreasing pH will increase destruction rates by providing protons for reductive transformations and slow down Fe(II) oxidation and passivation of the iron surface. Although the Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$ amendment significantly decreased soil pH in the windrows, the acetic acid treatment only slightly lowered the pH after application and residual effects were relatively short-lived (Table 3). After the first few samplings, pH tended to be higher in windrows receiving acetic acid than the comparable treatment [Fe$^0$ or Fe$^0$ + Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$; Table 3].

The addition of acetic acid provided a readily utilisable carbon source that may have facilitated reductive transformations by producing an additional oxygen demand and source of electrons. It was also noted that individual grains of Fe$^0$ in windrows treated with acetic acid were less visible and the soil as a whole appeared to have a more uniform iron coating. Metal–organic complexes on surfaces will increase iron dissolution (Sidhu et al., 1981, Schwertmann et al., 1986). Therefore, the acetic acid probably facilitated the initial dissolution and subsequent distribution of dissolved iron throughout the soil. High concentrations of organic acids can also inhibit crystallization of iron oxides, favoring less well-structured matrices (such as ferrihydrite, green rust, and magnetite) with greater surface area (Heck and Mermut, 1999).

Aside from lowering the pH, it is likely that the Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$ played other roles in enhancing metolachlor destruction. An abundance of aluminum during Fe$^0$ oxidation promotes its incorporation into the oxidized iron structure (Schwertmann and Cornell, 1991). This is important because Al$^{3+}$ has a smaller ionic radius that disrupts crystallization and favors formation of ferrihydrite (Fe$_5$HO$_8$) (Stucki et al., 1988). Ferrihydrite has a large surface area (>$200$ m$^2$ g$^{-1}$; Schwertmann and Cornell, 1991) and can serve as a reservoir for reduced iron (Baltpurvins et al., 1996). Klausen et al. (1995) demonstrated that Fe(II) bound to iron hydroxide surfaces or surface coatings plays an important role in reductive transformation of nitroaromatic compounds. Experiments conducted in our laboratory indicated that the presence of Fe(II), Fe(III), or Al(III) during Fe$^0$ corrosion can facilitate metolachlor destruction in aqueous solution. In these experiments, Al(III) was readily sorbed by, and/or incorporated into, the oxidizing iron and this corresponded with a release of Fe(II) into solution. Therefore, an indirect effect of adding Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$ was likely its influence on Fe(II) concentration in the soil solution during the corrosion of Fe$^0$. Because sulfate was added as part of the Al$_2$(SO$_4$)$_3$, its presence must also be considered. Sulfate has been shown to sustain higher rates of iron corrosion (Reardon, 1995), apparently by dissolving the oxide film that coats the surface during oxidation (Gu et al., 1999). Under reducing conditions, sulfate also promotes formation of green rust II [Fe$_{II}$Fe$_{III}$$_{5}$(OH)$_{12}$SO$_4$ · nH$_2$O] (Refait et al., 1999).
Table 3. Soil pH following treatment with zerovalent iron.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Initial (mixed)†</th>
<th>1 d</th>
<th>14 d</th>
<th>28 d</th>
<th>42 d</th>
<th>60 d</th>
<th>75 d</th>
<th>90 d</th>
<th>90 d (mixed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>6.45b ‡</td>
<td>5.44a</td>
<td>5.99a</td>
<td>6.03a</td>
<td>6.16a</td>
<td>6.03a</td>
<td>6.03a</td>
<td>6.13a</td>
<td>6.06a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe⁰</td>
<td>6.43b</td>
<td>8.43d</td>
<td>8.29c</td>
<td>8.23c</td>
<td>8.17c</td>
<td>8.16c</td>
<td>8.14bc</td>
<td>8.22d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe⁰/H₂COOH</td>
<td>6.43b</td>
<td>8.39d</td>
<td>8.36c</td>
<td>8.59c</td>
<td>8.49c</td>
<td>8.46d</td>
<td>8.38c</td>
<td>8.16c</td>
<td>8.75e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe⁰/H₂COOH</td>
<td>Al₂(SO₄)₃</td>
<td>6.45b</td>
<td>7.01c</td>
<td>7.43b</td>
<td>7.34b</td>
<td>7.44b</td>
<td>7.16b</td>
<td>7.23b</td>
<td>7.03b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe⁰/H₂COOH</td>
<td>Al₂(SO₄)₃</td>
<td>6.05a</td>
<td>6.37b</td>
<td>7.16b</td>
<td>7.27b</td>
<td>7.52b</td>
<td>7.46bc</td>
<td>7.53b</td>
<td>7.51bc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Mixed: windrows were mixed three times immediately before sampling.
‡ Values with same letter within columns are not significantly different (α = 0.05).

Changes in Soil Chemical Properties

Initial analysis of the contaminated soil indicated that, in addition to metolachlor, this soil had very high concentrations of NO₃⁻, NH₄⁺, and P as well as diethylentriaminepentaacetic acid (DTPA)–extractable metals (Zn, Mn, Fe, Cu) (Table 1). Following 90 d of treatment, some notable increases and decreases in soil chemical properties were observed (Table 1). Phosphorus concentrations decreased in windrows receiving Al₃(SO₄)₃. Aluminum sulfate has been traditionally used to remove phosphate from wastewater streams by forming AIPO₄ (Snoeyink and Jenkins, 1980). Hsu (1976) indicated the optimum pH for P removal by Al was 5.5 to 8.0, well within the range observed in the soil windrows (Table 3). Under acidic conditions (pH < 6), AlPO₄ predominates, whereas at pH 6 to 8, an Al(OH)₃ forms, which removes P from solution by sorption of inorganic phosphate and entrapment of organic particles containing P (Cooke et al., 1986).

Nitrate concentrations were also reduced substantially by all Fe⁰ treatments, corroborating previous research showing transformation of NO₃⁻ to NH₄⁺ upon addition of Fe⁰ (Cheng et al., 1997; Till et al., 1998). Other notable changes include an increase in Cl⁻, which is probably attributable to dechlorination of metolachlor, as well as increases in SO₄²⁻ for treatments receiving Al₃(SO₄)₃ (Table 1). Although adding Al₃(SO₄)₃ with Fe⁰ increased metolachlor destruction, the high SO₄²⁻ concentrations observed after treatment are a potential concern, especially in terms of salinity and subsequent influence on plant growth. It is also noteworthy that despite the large additions of Fe⁰ and aluminum added to the soil, changes in DTPA-extractable iron increased only about eightfold (40 to ca. 300 mg kg⁻¹) and no increases in extractable aluminum were observed (Table 1).

The ability of aluminum to complex with acidic functional groups of soil humus has been well documented (McBride, 1994). This property was manifested in the soil extracts from windrows receiving Al₃(SO₄)₃, which were transparent, whereas the others were dark brown. Binding of the dissolved organic fraction by the Al oxides probably explains the decreases in extractable organic matter observed in the Al₃(SO₄)₃ treatments and corresponding increases in cation exchange capacity (CEC) (Table 1).

Treatment Costs

In many U.S. states, pesticide-contaminated soils are usually handled in one of three ways: the contaminated soil is reapplied to farmland at label rates or the soil is excavated and shipped to a certified landfill or incinerated (Paulson, 1998). Land-spreading is relatively easy if access to appropriate acreages is obtained and pesticide concentrations are low, but problems arise when the soil contains more than one pesticide (limiting cropping options) or is grossly contaminated and requires dilution. Incineration or landfill options are often too costly and neither treat the soil on-site. Given the multitude of pesticide-contaminated sites on individual farms and cooperatives throughout the USA, additional treatment options are needed that can be readily implemented and are inexpensive for end-users.

An important factor in evaluating remediation technologies is cost. Although factoring in labor, capital outlays, and equipment depreciation is complicated, listing chemical expenditures per mass of soil treated is relatively straightforward. Given that the soil was treated with 5% Fe⁰ (w/w), and the unit cost of Fe⁰ (bagged and delivered) was $0.63 per kg, we calculated the cost of Fe⁰ at $44 per m³ ($34 per yd³). Using a similar approach for the Al₃(SO₄)₃ (unit cost: $0.37 per kg) and acetic acid ($0.90 per L), the cost of these additions per cubic meter (m³) of soil was $10.35 ($8 per yd³) for Al₃(SO₄)₃ and $6.35 ($4.84 per yd³) for acetic acid. Collectively, total chemical expenditures varied between $44 and $61 per m³ ($34–$47 per yd³). Additional costs were incurred for soil mixing, plastic sheeting, and analytical sampling. Unless personnel in charge of treating a contaminated site have access to their own mixing equipment, custom soil mixing would need to be factored into the overall costs. Soil mixing costs are often price-quoted on the volume of soil treated. H&H EcoSystems, the vendor of the soil mixing implement we used, estimated custom mixing charges of approximately $33 per m³ ($25 per yd³) for the volume of soil treated (T. Horn, H&H EcoSystems, personal communication, 2000). Therefore, chemical amendments plus mixing charges for treatment of the contaminated soil ranged between $77 and $94 per m³ ($59–$72 per yd³). This exceeds typical charges for land-spreading (ca. $39 per m³ or $30 per yd³) but is considerably less than what would be charged for removal and disposal by incineration ($261–$1961 per m³, $200–$1500 per yd³; USEPA, 1990). The quote from the local incinerator in Nebraska was $790 per m³ ($604 per yd³). Although land-spreading appears to be the most economical treatment currently available, this option may not be allowed for soils contaminated with the numerous pesticides that have been suspended or banned. Therefore, when land-spreading is not an option, results from our field trial support the
use of Fe\(^0\) as a possible alternative for on-site treatment of pesticide-contaminated soil.
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