

MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM GOVERNOR JAMES C. KENNEY CABINET SECRETARY

November 1, 2021

Arturo Duran, Designated Agency Manager Environmental Management, U.S. Department of Energy Los Alamos Field Office 1200 Trinity Drive, Suite #400 New Mexico 87544

## RE: REVIEW - AQUIFER TESTING GUIDANCE R-71 AQUIFER TESTING WORK PLAN AND R-72 AQUIFER TESTING WORK PLAN LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY EPA ID#NM0890010515 HWB-LANL-21-053 & 21-054

Dear Arturo Duran,

The New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) received the United States Department of Energy's (DOE) Aquifer Testing Guidance for the Los Alamos National Laboratory Site (Guidance) on August 27, 2021. The Guidance, dated August 2021 and referenced as EM2021-0481, was submitted with two workplans titled *R-71* Aquifer Testing Plan (R-71 Workplan) referenced as EM2021-0480 and *R-72 Aquifer Testing Plan* (R-72 Workplan) referenced as EM2021-0395. These documents were submitted under one cover letter dated August 27, 2021 and referenced as EMLA-2021-BF152-02-001. DOE sent the Guidance in response to NMED's request for DOE to submit a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) to base all future aquifer testing and well hydraulic testing on technically sound methods. NMED based this request on a review of the testing conducted at monitoring well R-70 in 2019, which is discussed in detail below. NMED reviewed the Guidance, the R-71 Workplan and the R-72 Workplan and finds the submittal unacceptable because it appears DOE intends to continue to engage in an inappropriate technical approach regarding aquifer testing. NMED conveyed this to DOE previously in an August 30, 2021 email. As such, NMED prefers that DOE refrain from all intended testing until the matter can be settled.

The problems identified by NMED concerning DOE's inappropriate approach to well hydraulic and aquifer testing were provided on May 7, 2020, when NMED issued draft comments (Comments) regarding the numerous technical deficiencies of the "aquifer test" DOE conducted at monitoring well R-70 as documented in the report *Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70* (Report 1). Report 1, referenced as EM2019-0365, was submitted in December 2019 to satisfy Fiscal Year 2019 Milestone #8.

In the May 7, 2020, correspondence, NMED requested that DOE engage in a technical team meeting to discuss acceptable well hydraulic and aquifer testing methods before responding to NMED's Comments. NMED sent reminders on May 21, 2020, July 30, 2020, and again on August 4, 2020, for DOE to resolve NMED's Comments

before providing responses and before issuing a follow-up report based on the "aquifer testing" documented in Report 1. However, DOE did not meet with NMED until after sending the comment responses to NMED. The relevant correspondence is provided as Exhibit 1 to this letter.

Because DOE submitted responses to NMED's Comments on September 3, 2020 (Exhibit 2) without resolving the Comments, despite NMED's repeated requests to meet, DOE's responses did not address NMED Comments. DOE eventually held a technical team meeting to discuss NMED's Comments on September 8, 2020. During the September 8 meeting it appeared that DOE concurred with NMED that the approach used by DOE was flawed and agreed to withdraw the entire aquifer test from the revision of Report 1. However, Section 8.2 of the *Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70, Revision 1,* issued December 2020 and referenced as EM2020-0564, stated that elements of the R-70 aquifer test will be used in a follow-up report. In response, NMED issued a notice of disapproval on May 25, 2021, regarding the revision and to object to DOE's intent to use any element of the R-70 aquifer test in any future submittals until all technical issues have been resolved (Exhibit 3). DOE disregarded NMED's request in a July 23, 2021, response and issued the follow-up report, *Assessment Report for the Evaluation of Conditions in the Regional Aquifer Around Well R-70* (Report 2) on June 30, 2021, referenced as EM2021-0321.

During this entire process, NMED had been consulting with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to provide NMED with expertise regarding proper aquifer testing methods. As part of this consultation, NMED obtained the actual test data from DOE on January 14, 2021, for the EPA to analyze. The EPA could not reproduce DOE's test results at R-70 and concurred with NMED's May 7, 2020 Comments (Exhibit 4). The EPA was made aware of DOE's assertion that the test analyses and methods it employed are valid, and that DOE intends to continue using these methods in future tests. In lieu of the requested SOP, DOE sent the Guidance, which contained unacceptable concepts in aquifer testing (Exhibits 2 through 5). In response, NMED requested that the EPA review the Guidance and NMED's draft technical comments regarding the Guidance (Exhibit 5). Again, the EPA concurs with NMED (Exhibit 5). A meeting with the EPA is forthcoming and is pending scheduling with EPA subject matter experts.

This letter serves as NMED's formal response and non-concurrence based on technical merit of the following DOE submittals:

- Aquifer Testing Guidance for the Los Alamos National Laboratory Site, dated August 2021 and referenced as EM2021-0481
- *R-71 Aquifer Testing Plan*, dated August 2021 and referenced as EM2021-0480
- R-72 Aquifer Testing Plan, dated August 2021 and referenced as EM2021-0395

The technical basis for all hydrogeological investigations should be based on industry-accepted standard methods. DOE must take a direct approach in resolving technical issues with NMED during technical meetings.

Should you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Christopher Krambis (505) 231-5423.

Sincerely,

Chris Digitally signed by Chris Catechis Date: 2021.11.01 15:44:35-0600' Chris Catechis Acting Division Director Resource Protection Division cc with Attachment: N. Dhawan, NMED HWB C. Krambis, NMED HWB

M. Petersen, NMED HWB R. Greiner, NMED C. Catechis, NMED P. Longmire, NMED GWQB S. Yanicak, NMED-DOE-0B L. King, US EPA Region 6 S. Ellinger, US EPA J. Fields, US EPA R. Ross, US EPA R. Martinez, San Ildefonso Pueblo, NM D. Chavarria, Santa Clara Pueblo, NM L. Bishop, EM-LA C. Rodriguez, EM-LA C. Maupin, N3B E. Day, N3B W. Alexander, N3B P. Maestas, N3B emla.docs@em.doe.gov RegDocs@EM-LA.DOE.GOV

File: 2021 LANL, Review Aquifer Testing Guidance, R-71 and R-72 Aquifer Testing Work Plans HWB LANL-21-053 and 21-054 ATTACHMENT

EXHIBIT 1

.

t

From:	Krambis, Christopher, NMENV
To:	Danny Katzman; cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov; Christian T. Maupin
Cc:	<u>Neelam NMENV Dhawan (neelam.dhawan@state.nm.us); Patrick NMENV Longmire</u> (Patrick.Longmire@state.nm.us); Jojola, Michael, NMENV; Green, Megan, NMENV
Subject:	NMED Draft Comments - Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70 (December 2019) EM2019-0365
Date:	Thursday, May 7, 2020 10:30:31 AM
Attachments:	Draft Comments - R-70 Completion Report.pdf

The New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) has received the United States Department of Energy's (DOE's) document entitled *Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70* (Report), dated December 2019 and referenced by EM2019-0365. NMED is submitting draft comments as an attachment to this e-mail. The measures to take to resolve these comments should be discussed in a technical meeting before responses are submitted.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this correspondence, please contact me at 505-476-3078.

## Christopher Krambis, Jr., P.G.

Water Resource Professional IV New Mexico Environment Department Hazardous Waste Bureau - Los Alamos Field Office 1183 Diamond Drive, Suite B, Los Alamos, NM 87544 Office: 505-476-3078 Mobile: 505-231-5423 <u>Christopher.Krambis@state.nm.us</u> https://www.env.nm.gov/

From:	Rodriguez, Cheryl	
To:	Krambis, Christopher, NMENV; Danny Katzman	
Cc:	Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV	
Subject:	[EXT] RE: R-70 Well Completion Report Draft Comment	
Date:	Thursday, May 21, 2020 5:32:57 PM	

Hi Chris, thank you for the reminder. We're going get folks together to address the comments and set up a call with you probably the week after next.

Regards,

## Cheryl L. Rodríguez

Program Manager, FPD II Department of Energy, Environmental Management Los Alamos Field Office (EM-LA) Pueblo Complex (MS-M984) 1900 Diamond Drive Los Alamos, NM 87544 Office: (505) 257-7941 Cell: (505) 414-0450 Fax: (505) 606-2132 Email: <u>cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov</u>

From: Krambis, Christopher, NMENV [mailto:Christopher.Krambis@state.nm.us]
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2020 4:28 PM
To: Rodriguez, Cheryl <cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov>; Danny Katzman <danny.katzman@em-la.doe.gov>
Cc: Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV <neelam.dhawan@state.nm.us>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] R-70 Well Completion Report Draft Comments

Hi Cheryl and Danny,

Based on today's call, it sounded like you are planning to submit a response letter next week regarding NMED's May 7<sup>th</sup> draft comments on the R-70 Well Completion Report. The submitted comments are not final, and were provided to open a discussion before submitting final comments. I just wanted to confirm with you what you are planning to submit next week.

Please let me know.

Thanks.

#### Christopher Krambis, Jr., P.G.

Water Resource Professional IV New Mexico Environment Department Hazardous Waste Bureau - Los Alamos Field Office 1183 Diamond Drive, Suite B, Los Alamos, NM 87544 Office: 505-476-3078 Mobile: 505-231-5423 Christopher.Krambis@state.nm.us https://www.env.nm.gov/

From:	Krambis, Christopher, NMENV
То:	<u>cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov</u>
Cc:	<u>Neelam NMENV Dhawan (neelam.dhawan@state.nm.us); Patrick NMENV Longmire</u> (Patrick.Longmire@state.nm.us); Green, Megan, NMENV; Christian T. Maupin; Emily M. Day; "Steve J. Veenis"; Arturo Duran
Subject:	NMED Draft Comments on the on the 2020 Annual Periodic Monitoring Report for the Chromium Investigation Monitoring Group, Mortandad Canyon and Sandia Canyon Watersheds, May 2020
Date:	Thursday, July 30, 2020 1:36:02 PM
Attachments:	<u>NMED Draft Comments 2020 Cr PMR July 2020.pdf</u> <u>NMED Draft Comments - Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70 (December 2019) EM2019-0365.msg</u>

Cheryl;

Attached are NMED draft comments from the Chromium 2020 PMR technical review.

Also, I would like an update regarding your response to NMED's May 7<sup>th</sup> Draft Comments (attached) concerning the technical review of the December 20, 2019 Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70.

Thank you.

## Christopher Krambis, Jr., P.G.

Water Resource Professional IV New Mexico Environment Department Hazardous Waste Bureau - Los Alamos Field Office 1183 Diamond Drive, Suite B, Los Alamos, NM 87544 Office: 505-476-3078 Mobile: 505-231-5423 <u>Christopher.Krambis@state.nm.us</u> <u>https://www.env.nm.gov/</u>

From:	Christian T. Maupin
To:	Krambis, Christopher, NMENV
Cc:	Longmire, Patrick, NMENV; Green, Megan, NMENV; Richards, Jaben, NMENV; Yanicak, Steve, NMENV; cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov; Arturo Duran; Danny Katzman; Zoe A. Duran; Emily M. Day; Bruce A. Robinson; Felicia Aguilar; John McCord; David Nickless; Joseph Murdock; Kim Lebak; Steve S. White; lee.bishop@em.doe.gov; Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV; William Alexander; Mark C. Everett
Subject:	[EXT] RE: Updated R-70 Assessment Report Schedules
Date:	Tuesday, August 4, 2020 12:59:04 PM

Chris – Thanks for the reply. We are working to get the comments resolved on the R-70 well completion report, and will make sure to have those addressed prior to the submittal of the R-70 assessment report.

Thanks

Christian

From: Krambis, Christopher, NMENV <Christopher.Krambis@state.nm.us> Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2020 10:32 AM

To: Christian T. Maupin < Christian. Maupin@em-la.doe.gov>

Cc: Longmire, Patrick, NMENV <Patrick.Longmire@state.nm.us>; Green, Megan, NMENV <megan.green@state.nm.us>; jaben.richards@state.nm.us; steve.yanicak@state.nm.us; cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov; Arturo Duran <arturo.duran@em.doe.gov>; Danny Katzman <danny.katzman@em-la.doe.gov>; Zoe A. Duran <zoe.duran@em-la.doe.gov>; Emily M. Day <Emily.Day@em-la.doe.gov>; Bruce A. Robinson <bruce.robinson@em-la.doe.gov>; Felicia Aguilar <Felicia.Aguilar@EM-LA.DOE.GOV>; John McCord <John.McCord@em-la.doe.gov>; David Nickless <david.nickless@em.doe.gov>; Joseph Murdock <Joseph.Murdock@EM-LA.DOE.GOV>; Kim Lebak <Kim.Lebak@EM-LA.DOE.GOV>; Steve S. White <steve.white@em-la.doe.gov>; lee.bishop@em.doe.gov; Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV <neelam.dhawan@state.nm.us> Subject: RE: Updated R-70 Assessment Report Schedules

Christian,

The revised submittal date of June 30, 2021 for the Assessment Report for the Evaluation of Conditions in the Regional Aquifer Around Well R-70 is fine. However, if the R-70 aquifer testing results documented in the December 2019 *Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70* is to be used in the evaluation, the draft comments submitted by NMED on May 7<sup>th</sup> must be resolved beforehand.

Thank you.

### Christopher Krambis, Jr., P.G.

Water Resource Professional IV New Mexico Environment Department Hazardous Waste Bureau - Los Alamos Field Office 1183 Diamond Drive, Suite B, Los Alamos, NM 87544 Office: 505-476-3078 Mobile: 505-231-5423 Christopher.Krambis@state.nm.us https://www.env.nm.gov/

## From: Christian T. Maupin <<u>Christian.Maupin@em-la.doe.gov</u>> Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2020 5:02 PM

To: Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV <<u>neelam.dhawan@state.nm.us</u>>; Longmire, Patrick, NMENV <<u>Patrick.Longmire@state.nm.us</u>>; Green, Megan, NMENV <<u>Megan.Green@state.nm.us</u>>; Richards, Jaben, NMENV <<u>Jaben.Richards@state.nm.us</u>>; Yanicak, Steve, NMENV <<u>Steve.Yanicak@state.nm.us</u>>; Krambis, Christopher, NMENV <<u>Christopher.Krambis@state.nm.us</u>>; cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov; Arturo Duran <<u>arturo.duran@em.doe.gov</u>>; Danny Katzman <<u>danny.katzman@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; Zoe A. Duran <<u>zoe.duran@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; Emily M. Day <<u>Emily.Day@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; Bruce A. Robinson <<u>bruce.robinson@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; Felicia Aguilar <<u>Felicia.Aguilar@EM-LA.DOE.GOV</u>>; John McCord <<u>John.McCord@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; David Nickless <<u>david.nickless@em.doe.gov</u>>; Joseph Murdock <<u>Joseph.Murdock@EM-LA.DOE.GOV</u>>; Kim Lebak <<u>Kim.Lebak@EM-LA.DOE.GOV</u>>; Steve S. White <<u>steve.white@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; lee.bishop@em.doe.gov

Subject: [EXT] Updated R-70 Assessment Report Schedules

Neelam- This email is a follow-up to the email we provided NMNED on July 27 regarding the proposed submittal date for the R-70 Assessment Report. Upon further consideration, we'd like to revise our proposed submittal date from April 15, 2021 to June 30, 2021. This extra time is intended to accommodate inherent COVID-related uncertainties with the ability to operate the IM in an uninterrupted manner and interrogate potential responses at R-70 and surrounding wells. Please let us know if you have any questions or would like to discuss.

Thanks

Christian

From: Christian T. Maupin

Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 4:29 PM

To: Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV <<u>neelam.dhawan@state.nm.us</u>>; Longmire, Patrick, NMENV <<u>Patrick.Longmire@state.nm.us</u>}; Green, Megan, NMENV <<u>megan.green@state.nm.us</u>}; jaben.richards@state.nm.us; steve.yanicak@state.nm.us; 'Krambis, Christopher, NMENV' <<u>Christopher.Krambis@state.nm.us</u>}; Cheryl Rodriguez (<u>cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov</u>) <<u>cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov</u>>; Arturo Duran <<u>arturo.duran@em.doe.gov</u>>; Danny Katzman <<u>danny.katzman@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; Zoe A. Duran <<u>Zoe.Duran@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; Emily M. Day <<u>Emily.Day@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; Bruce A. Robinson <<u>bruce.robinson@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; Felicia Aguilar <<u>Felicia.Aguilar@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; John McCord <<u>John.McCord@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; David Nickless <<u>david.nickless@em.doe.gov</u>>; Steve S. White <<u>steve.white@em-la.doe.gov</u>>; <u>lee.bishop@em.doe.gov</u>

Subject: R-70 Sampling and Assessment Report Schedules

Neelam- This email serves to provide the schedule for sampling at R-70 and to propose a submittal date for the R-70 Assessment Report pursuant to NMED's requirement in the June 10, 2020 approval letter.

Cross-flow purging of screen 1 at R-70 was completed on Friday July 17. Additionally, EM-LA provided a 15-day notification for collection of samples at R-70 S1 and S2 on July 17. The 15-day notice would set a schedule for collection of the next samples at R-70 no sooner than Saturday, August 1. Therefore, we are scheduling sampling at R-70 to occur on August 4 which is the first day of the 21-day sampling calendar for the monthly Chromium Interim Measure Performance Monitoring campaign. We anticipate starting interim measure operations at CrEX-5 and CrINs-1 and CrIN-2 no later than early in the week of August 10. As currently scheduled, the subsequent samples at R-70 would be collected on a monthly basis on or close to September 8, October 6, November 3, December 3, etc.

As noted in EM-LA's June 4, 2020, "Request for Extension of Assessment Report for the Evaluation of Conditions in the Regional Aquifer around Well R-70", the evaluation being conducted for the R-70 assessment report requires data from multiple (at least 3) sampling rounds at R-70 (and surrounding wells) and from being able to incorporate observations of chromium concentration response following a sustained period of extraction of CrEX-5 and injection into CrIN-1 and CrIN-2. Based on: 1) the sampling schedule, 2) the necessity of having at least 6 - 7 months of observation of IM performance (specifically focused on R-70), and 3) the necessity of incorporating this information into an updated groundwater model, EM-LA proposes a submittal date of April 15, 2021 for the R-70 assessment report.

Thanks

### **Christian Maupin**

Newport News Nuclear BWXT Los Alamos (N3B) Regulatory & Stakeholder Interface o. 505-257-7421 c. 505-695-4281 e. <u>christian.maupin@em-la.doe.gov</u>



EXHIBIT 2

From:	Christian T. Maupin
То:	Dhawan, Neelam, NMENV; Krambis, Christopher, NMENV; Danny Katzman; Bruce A. Robinson; Steve J. Veenis;
	Pamela T. Maestas; William Alexander; Hai Shen; cheryl.rodriguez@em.doe.gov; Thomas Klepfer; Thomas
	McCrory; Mark C. Everett; Sherry L. Gaddy; Emily M. Day; Joseph Murdock; John McCord; Felicia Aguilar
Subject:	[EXT] Draft Responses to NMED Comments on R-70 Well Completion Report
Date:	Thursday, September 3, 2020 4:21:06 PM
Attachments:	Resp to Comments R-70 Compl Rpt 090320.docx

Neelam/Chris – On May 7, 2020 NMED provided draft comments on the "Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70, December 2019." Attached are EM-LA/N3B's draft responses to the

comments provided. Currently, a meeting is scheduled for September 8<sup>th</sup>. Please review the draft responses, and let me know if we still need to have the meeting to discuss any of the information provided. If the meeting isn't required, then please provide concurrence on the draft responses.

Thanks

Christian Maupin Newport News Nuclear BWXT Los Alamos (N3B) Regulatory Compliance o. 505-257-7421 c. 505-695-4281 e. christian.maupin@em-la.doe.gov

Alamos 1200 Trinity Drive, Suite 150 Los Alamos, NM 87544

## Response to the New Mexico Environment Department's Draft Comments on the Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70, December 2019, Dated May 7, 2020

#### INTRODUCTION

To facilitate review of this response, the New Mexico Environment Department's (NMED's) comments are included verbatim. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Environmental Management Los Alamos Field Office responses follow each NMED comment.

#### COMMENTS

#### NMED Comment

#### 1. Section 8.1, Well Development, p 10

**Permittees' Statement:** "During development, the pumping rate in screen 1 varied from 100.7 to 129.7 gpm. The pumping rate in screen 2 varied from 101.7 to 115.6 gpm. The average pumping rates for screens 1 and 2 were 108.5 and 105.4 gpm, respectively."

**NMED's Comment:** Please provide in Table 8.1-2 the pumping rates recorded during development. Of specific interest to NMED is when the development was conducted under the pumping rates of 100.7 to 129.7 gpm in screen 1 (S1) and 101.7 to 115.6 gpm in screen (S2) as described on page 10 versus the trial test rates of 46 gpm as described on page E-3, Section 1.0 of Appendix E.

#### **DOE** Response

 Pumping rates vary during the different phases of well development. The pumping rates quoted from page 10 reflect the discharge during initial flow-rate testing and step development of the two screens. Regarding the pumping discussed on page E-3, Section 1.0, discharge rates were lowered during the final stages of development for trial testing and to achieve more accurate turbidity readings by reflecting pump rates that will be seen during sampling with the final dedicated Baski sampling system and its associated pump.

We concur that Table 8.1-2 needs to be revised to include pumping rates.

#### **NMED** Comment

#### 2. Section 8.1.1, Well Development Field Parameters, p 11

**Permittees' Statement:** "In screen 2 the final parameters at the end of well development were pH of 8.13, temperature of 21.4°C, specific conductance of 290.4 µS/cm, DO of 6.76 mg/L, ORP of 198.3 mV, and turbidity of 0.72 NTU. Table 8.1-2 shows field parameters measured during well development."

**NMED's Comment:** Explain why the final well development field parameters discussed on page 11 for S2 do not match the final parameters provided in Table 8.1-2, Field Parameters Measured During Well Development at R-70, and explain why turbidity, which is provided in the text on page 11 is not provided in this table for both screens.

1

## **DOE Response**

2. The final well development field parameters listed on page 11 for Screen 2 are in error and do not reflect the final readings. As previously mentioned, Table 8.1-2 needs to be revised; turbidity readings will be added to the table during revision.

## **NMED Comment**

## 3. Section 8.1.1, Well Development Field Parameters, p 11

**Permittees' Statement:** "The sampling system is a Baski, Inc.-manufactured system that uses a single 5-hp, 4-in.-O.D. environmentally retrofitted Grundfos submersible pump capable of purging each screened interval discretely via pneumatically actuated access port valves. One 1- in. stainlesssteel check valve was installed within the pump shroud above the pump body. A weep valve was installed at the bottom of the uppermost pipe joint to protect the pump column from freezing. The system includes a Viton-wrapped isolation packer between screened intervals. Pump riser pipes consist of threaded and coupled nonannealed (pickled), passivated1- in.-diameter stainless steel. Two 1-in.-diameter polyvinyl chloride (PVC) tubes were installed along with, and banded to, the pump riser for dedicated transducers. The tubes are 1-in.-I.D. flush-threaded schedule 80 PVC pipe. The upper PVC transducer tube is equipped with two 5-ft sections of 0.010-in. slot screen with a threaded end-cap at the bottom of the tube. The lower PVC transducer tube is equipped with a flexible nylon tube that extends from a threaded end- cap at the bottom of the PVC tube through the isolation packer to measure water levels in the lower screen. Two In-Situ Inc. Level Troll 500 transducers were installed in the PVC tubes to monitor water levels in each screened interval.

Installation and construction details for the monitoring well R-70 sampling system are presented in Figure 8.3-1a."

**NMED's Comment:** Please indicate and label in Figure 8.3-1a the details of the Baski sampling system, including the drop pipe, check valves, pump location, the sample port locations in both screens, the location of both pressure transducers and the packer separating screen 1 from screen 2. Figure 8.3-1a does not show or label these details, which NMED believes are important to the as-built diagram for regional well R-70.

## DOE Response

3. We concur that the installed depths of the various Baski system components should be added to Figure 8.3-1a; the figure will be revised accordingly.

## **NMED** Comment

- 4. Table 8.1-2, Field Parameters Measured During Well Development at R-70, p 29 NMED's Comments:
  - a) Explain how the development field parameters from S2 were measured on May 20<sup>th</sup> between 3:00 PM (15:00) and 4:00 PM (16:00) when the pump was supposedly off for recovery as described on page E-3 of Appendix E. Likewise, explain how the development field parameters shown in Table 8.1-2 from S1 were measured on May 20<sup>th</sup> between 10:30 PM (22:30) and 11:30 PM (23:30) when the pump was off for recovery as described in page E-3. Based on page E-3, both periods correspond to the start of the trial tests. The same issue is noted in Table B-2.2-1, Field Parameters Monitored during Aquifer Testing.

- b) Explain the cause for the significant and sudden increase in the specific conductance on May 20th between 1:13 PM (13:13) and 1:48 PM (13:48) for S2 and the decline in temperature during development of S2 on May 20th between 5:31 PM (17:31) and 8:37 PM (20:37). A similar pattern for the specific conductance is also noted in Table B-2.2-1, Field Parameters Monitored during Aquifer Testing.
- c) Explain why well development field parameters are provided for S1 about one-half hour (at 07:28:01) prior to starting the 24-hour pumping test on May 23rd at 08:01 (page E-3). Discuss if well development continued right up to the start of the 24-hour pumping test. Discuss if the water table was at static prior to the start of the 24-hour pumping test for S1. If S1 was not being pumped at the time of the field parameters were measured, explain how they were measured.
- d) Explain why the field parameters measured on 05/21/2019 2:03:07, which appear to correspond to well development time, are not reported in Table 8.1-2 but are in Table B-2.2-1, Field Parameters Monitored during Aquifer Testing on page B-5.

#### **DOE Response**

- 4.a. Discrepancies between the tables and narratives are noted and need to be resolved. As previously noted, Table 8.1-2 will be revised. Table B-2.2-1 will also be revised as needed.
- 4.b. The abnormal specific conductivity and temperature readings noted in Table 8.1-2 are clearly erroneous and most likely caused by lack of groundwater moving through the flow-through cell of the meter used to collect parameters. This will be noted in the revised table. Table B-2.2-1 contains incorrect data as described in Comment 4b and as responded to below.
- 4.c. Table B-2.2-1 contains data collected from well development, which should not be included with aquifer testing data, and also has erroneous time/data sets. The table will be revised. Well development did not continue to the start of aquifer testing; the water table was static when testing began. These points will be clarified in the revised text.
- 4.d. See response to Comment 4c above.

#### NMED Comment

5. Appendix B, Table B-2.2-1, Field Parameters Monitored during Aquifer Testing, p B-4 through B-6

a) Please indicate from which screen the data are from in this table or provide separate tables for each screen.

b) Explain why no field parameters are provided for the R-70 S2 24-hour pumping test conducted on May 26<sup>th</sup> but are provided for R-70 S1 24-hour test.

#### **DOE Response**

5. Table B-2.2-1 contains multiple errors and will be revised, and comments 5.a and 5.b will be fully addressed in the revised table.

#### **NMED** Comment

#### 6. Appendix E, Section E-1.0 Introduction, page E-1

**Permittees' Statement:** "The tests on R-70 were conducted to characterize the saturated materials, quantify the hydraulic properties of the screened intervals, and evaluate the hydraulic connection between R-70 and other R-wells in the vicinity. Testing consisted of brief trial pumping during well development, background water-level data collection, and a 24-hr constant-rate pumping test on each of the two screen zones."

- a) Explain how the hydraulic connection between R-70 and other R-wells was completed without providing an assessment of water level data from the nearby R-wells during the pumping tests. Discuss if data from the nearest R-wells were evaluated to determine whether observable responses from the R-70 pumping tests were evident. If so, please perform the appropriate analysis to derive aquifer parameters between R-70 and the nearby well(s) that exhibited a response to R-70 pumping tests. If not, please provide a hydrograph of the nearby R- wells over the timeframe that the well development and aquifer testing were conducted to demonstrate the lack of response to R-70 pumping.
- b) Discuss whether pumping from PM-3 and/or injection from nearby CrIN-1 or other interim measure pump and treat activities impacted the pumping tests at regional well R-70.
- c) Discuss why the aquifer testing was conducted over a 24-hour period knowing the regional aquifer is an unconfined aquifer, which typically requires a 72-hour period of pumping to evaluate and account for delayed yield (Driscoll, 1986; Kruseman and de Ridder, 1990; and U.S. Department of the Interior, 1995).

#### **DOE Response**

6.a. Water-level response data from regional aquifer wells nearest to R-70, including R-11, R-13, R-28, R-35a, R-35b, R-44 S1, R-44 S2, R-45 S1, and R-45 S2, were examined for possible pressure responses to aquifer-test pumping at R-70. Several of the wells showed some indication of very small pressure responses, but most were too small to support a detailed analysis from this single aquifer test.

A thorough analysis of aquifer parameters in the R-70 area will be presented in the pending assessment report for evaluation of conditions in the regional aquifer around well R-70 that will be submitted to NMED by June 30, 2021. The more comprehensive analysis will consider the responses at nearby wells from aquifer test pumping at R-70 and will also incorporate substantial additional information from observations that include cross-hole responses at R-70 from pumping at PM-3, extraction well CrEX-5, and injection in CrIN-1 and CrIN-2.

6.b. Regarding possible effects of interim measure pump-and-treat activities, the extraction and injection wells had all been shut down for approximately two weeks prior to monitoring of water levels in R-70 and thus are unlikely to have had an effect. Pumping was occurring at PM-3 at the time of the aquifer tests at R-70 and certainly could have had some effect on the very small pressure responses associated with the R-70 aquifer tests. As noted in DOE's response to NMED comment 6.a, a more detailed analysis that evaluates all of the pumping and response data will be presented in the R-70 Assessment Report.

4

6.c. Selection of pumping test duration takes into account the data needs, costs (including waste management), and potential benefits of extended pumping and recovery time. Various test durations have historically been used at LANL, all with good results and success in assessing the aquifer properties of interest. We believe that the 24-hour aquifer test for a transmissive aquifer such as that in the R-70 area is suitable for obtaining the objective aquifer parameters.

Tests of the R-wells over the years have shown mixed confined and unconfined responses. In other words, some zones exhibit confined response and some exhibit unconfined response. It is not always possible to know in advance which will be the case.

Extended pumping time, especially in unconfined settings, tends to be most useful in instances where either (1) there are nearby observation wells that allow significant, analyzable drawdown to be induced by extended pumping; or (2) the aquifer is not extremely thick, so that the cone of depression cannot continue to grow without limit to great depths. In typical R-well tests at LANL, there have been few, if any, wells close enough to be used as viable observation wells. Furthermore, the aquifer beneath the Laboratory is up to several thousand feet thick. Because of this, pumping the R-wells commonly results in steady growth of the cone of depression to great depths, which flattens the drawdown or recovery curve throughout the entire test, regardless of pumping duration. In such cases, the late pumping data are not particularly useful. (For example, see the late recovery data from the R-70 test, which show generally flat, uninteresting plots.)

#### **NMED** Comment

#### 7. Appendix E, Section E-1.0 Introduction, page E-1

**Permittees' Statement:** "The filter pack at screen 1 extended above the screen and intersected the water table 15 ft above the top of the screen. This meant that filter pack drainage and refilling would occur during pumping and recovery at screen 1, creating the possibility of a storage effect on the test data."

**NMED Comment:** Provide publication(s) that support this statement. NMED is aware how filter packs can affect the falling head "slug" test analyses when the water table intersects the well screen but is not familiar with this situation having the same impact on drawdown and recovery data from pumping tests.

#### **DOE Response**

7. This is covered in the discussion of wellbore storage in *Groundwater and Wells, Third Edition* (Robert J. Sterrett, 2007). [This is a revision of the Driscoll reference cited by NMED.] Some explanation is warranted here.

The significance of filter pack drainage is a function of its permeability. At the low end of the spectrum where, say, the filter pack permeability is less than or equal to that of the aquifer, there would be no storage effect.

However, if the filter pack permeability were great, it would drain rapidly when the well was pumped as the water level in the pack kept pace with the declining pumping water level in the well. In this instance, the water volume stored in the filter-packed annulus plays the same role as water standing in the casing in a conventional pumping test (with no packer) and causes a storage effect. An easier way to visualize this would be to picture no filter pack in the annulus. If this were the case, the water standing in the open annulus, like standing water in a well casing with no packer, would drain immediately when pumping began and would give the classic casing storage response. Placing the filter pack in the annulus takes up space, thereby reducing the stored water volume, but it does not eliminate the storage response. If the permeability of the filter pack were great enough, water drainage could occur just as rapidly and cause a storage effect.

#### **NMED Comment**

8. Appendix E, Section E-1.0 Introduction, page E-1

**Permittees' Statement:** "R-70 was drilled at an angle of 25 degrees off vertical and in a direction 20.3 degrees east of north."

**NMED Comment:** Describe how the well angle affects the analysis of the pumping test data. Discuss if an evaluation was conducted to assess if the angled screen may have had any effects on the drawdown analysis as discussed by Zhan and Zlotnik (2002).

#### **DOE Response**

8. The following statement is proposed to be added to Section E-8.2 in a revised report:

"The Neuman analysis that was applied to the pumping test was based on vertical wells. To apply it to the slanted screens, the simulated screens in the Neuman calculations were assumed 1) to be vertical, 2) to span the same vertical extent as the actual screens, and 3) to be located such that their midpoints were at the same locations as the midpoints of the actual screens. This substitution can be made with negligible error in the calculated results."

The Neuman method was used instead of Zhan and Zlotnik because it is readily available in commercial aquifer test analysis software. The author used *Aqtesolv* (from HydroSOLVE, Inc.) for the Neuman calculations. *Aqtesolv*, first released in 1989, is probably the most widely used aquifer test software in the industry. The owner of HydroSOLVE, Inc., has reported that the company does not incorporate the Zhan and Zlotnik solution in *Aqtesolv* due to lack of demand.

Another popular aquifer test software program is *Aquifer Test* from Waterloo Hydrogeologic, Inc. Waterloo Hydrogeologic also reports that it does not support the Zhan and Zlotnik method for unconfined aquifers.

### **NMED Comment**

#### 9. Appendix E, Section E-1.0 Introduction, p E-1 and E-2

**Permittees' Statement:** "During the inflation and deflations of the downhole packers, attempts were made to determine the relative changes in water levels at each screen in order to discern the individual static water levels of the two screen zones and the difference in water levels between the zones. An accurate determination of the zone-specific water levels was made difficult by several factors:

The difference in water levels between the two screen zones was very small.

- The transducer output was abnormally "noisy" with data scatter often approaching a magnitude of 0.10 ft.
- A persistent leak through a defective coupling connection in the bottom joint of the 2- in. droppipe string continuously allowed drainage of drop-pipe water into the well, altering water levels slightly.
- Any time that packers are inflated or deflated, there is a substantial change in the tension to which the drop pipe is subjected. As a result, there can be slight physical movement of portions of the pipe string, which cause slight vertical movement of the attached transducers.

The combination of data scatter, drop-pipe leak, and changing tension in the drop pipe contributed to obscuring accurate data measurement. Three episodes of packer inflation/deflation produced inconsistent and contradictory measurements.

Nevertheless, the results suggested a slight upward gradient from screen 2 to screen 1 under ambient conditions. Measurements showed the screen 1 water level to be approximately 0.01 ft below the composite water level and the screen 2 water level to be approximately 0.05 ft above the composite level. Thus, the overall difference in the water levels was estimated to be 0.06 ft."

**NMED Comment:** Based on the issues, specifically the "inconsistent and contradictory measurements", and the very small head differences between R-70 S1 and S2 described by DOE, NMED believes the cross-flow calculation is speculative and not defensible. The 25° screen angle places the two screens in R-70 not only 40 feet apart vertically, but also about 18 feet apart horizontally. Consequently, the slight head difference conceivably can also be attributed to the horizontal hydraulic gradient between the two screens. Additionally, R-70 would have to be near an area of discharge for an upward hydraulic gradient to be present. Please explain to where the groundwater discharges if there is an upward gradient. NMED is not convinced that a slight upward vertical hydraulic gradient is present in R-70 as postulated by DOE. DOE should either remove the calculation from the Report or provide a convincing justification to retain it.

#### **DOE Response**

9. A subtle vertical gradient, such as that preliminarily estimated in the report, can be caused by aquifer heterogeneity, stratification, bed orientation, or other factors such as water-supply well pumping cycles and is therefore not dependent on nearby discharge points.

Our calculations for the screens' spatial locations indicate the *effective* horizontal hydraulic separation between screens 1 and 2 to be 31.7 ft rather than 18 ft. This is the horizontal distance between the centers of the two screens. Screens respond hydraulically as if they were located at their centers. Multiplying this dimension by the sine of 20.3 degrees puts the center of screen 2 approximately 11 ft in the downgradient direction from the center of screen 1, assuming an easterly flow gradient. Based on an estimated horizontal gradient of about 0.001 in this extraordinarily transmissive portion of the aquifer, it is expected that horizontal displacement accounts for about 0.01 ft of the head difference between screens 1 and 2 (in a direction from screen 1 to screen 2).

Additional data from a longer period of water level measurements obtained from dedicated transducers in R-70, and the ability to relate the long-term record to other Interim Measure activities and pumping from water-supply wells, will provide a more complete data set for determining gradients between the screened intervals in R-70.

7

This analysis will be conducted and integrated into the overall evaluation in the Assessment Report for the evaluation of conditions in the regional aquifer around well R-70, which is scheduled for submittal to NMED by June 30, 2021.

To address NMED's comment, it is proposed that language be added to the report that notes that because of the uncertainty and inconsistency in the relative head measurements between screens 1 and 2, the evaluation of transient gradients will be refined when a longer-term record of head data is available.

#### NMED Comment

10. Appendix E, Section E-1.0 Introduction, p E-2

**Permittees' Statement:** "Well R-70 was tested from May 20 to 28, 2019. Brief trial testing was performed from May 20 to 21 as part of the well development operation."

**NMED Comment:** The brief trial testing is stated to have been performed as part of the well development operation. Additionally, the note in Figure E-8.2-1 states that "possible ongoing well development" may have been occurring during the 24-hour pumping test for R-70 S1.

Explain when exactly well development took place and at what rates. If either situation is true, the results of the test analyses may be invalid.

#### **DOE Response**

10. The trial testing was indeed part of the testing effort, not the development effort, which had already been completed. It was, however, performed immediately following the development work using the same equipment setup that had been used for the development. Only later, after the trial testing was completed, was the equipment string changed over and modified for the 24-hr tests. Because of this sequence of events, the trial test execution in the field felt more like part of the development operation than the testing operation.

To address potential confusion, it is proposed that the revision to this report include language as follows:

From "Brief trial testing was performed from May 20 to 21 as part of the well development operation."

 To "Brief trial testing was performed from May 20 to 21 using the equipment setup that had been used as part of the well development operation."

Regarding the apparent change in well efficiency observed during the 24-hr test of screen 1, this phenomenon occurs commonly during aquifer tests. A change in efficiency, either positive or negative, can be attributed to such factors as (1) production of sand/solids during the test; (2) movement or settlement of filter pack material or formation material; or (3) either accumulation or expulsion of trapped gas/air from the formation voids near the well.

Many of the aquifer tests at LANL have shown significant observed gas content in the pumped water, either naturally occurring or possibly an artifact of drilling with compressed air. If air that has previously accumulated near the wellbore is released, the permeability of the nearby sediments will

increase, resulting in a reduction in drawdown. The opposite can occur as well, as in the screen 2 test, where it appears that air may have accumulated near the well during the pumping test, slightly reducing the efficiency. These phenomena do not invalidate the test results. They do however indicate that the portion of the drawdown graph from the pumped well affected by the efficiency change cannot be analyzed. In both the screen 1 and 2 tests, the affected data consisted of late data that would have shown flat, unusable slopes. Such random efficiency changes have no effect on the recovery data or observation-well data (screen 1 data collected during the screen 2 test, and vice versa).

#### **NMED Comment**

11. Appendix E, Section E-1.0 Introduction, p E-2

**Permittees' Statement:** "As stated above, the bottom joint of 2-in. drop pipe had a defective coupling that allowed drop-pipe water to leak continuously throughout testing. The primary effects of this were (1) interference with accurate water level measurements needed to determine the head difference between the two screen zones and (2) partially emptying the drop pipe before each of the 24-hr tests."

#### NMED Comments:

- a) The occurrence of leaking drop pipes appears to be a recurring issue during pumping tests at LANL, including those conducted on nearby regional aquifer wells (e.g., R-28, R-44, R-45, R-35a, R-35b, R-61). Explain why this appears to be a chronic issue, and how DOE will rectify this recurring problem to prevent impacts to future pumping test results.
- b) Please provide a detailed diagram and text that describes the equipment installed in R-70 for the 24-hour pumping tests (pump, drop pipe, packers, pressure transducers, annulus...). It is unclear where the test pump, packers, and pressure transducers are set in each screen during each test. It is also unclear how the drop pipe could have filled with water as shown in Figure E- 8.2-4 with the leaking coupling at the bottom joint.
- c) NMED estimates the 1,000-foot long 2" diameter drop pipe could hold 160 gallons of water. Explain to where this water leaked, and how the leak impacted drawdown and recovery data, specifically the initial recovery data attributed to "possible storage effect" on Figure E-8.4-3. Discuss whether a check valve was used to prevent the backflow of water from the drop pipe.

#### **DOE Response**

11.a. The R-70 experience notwithstanding, DOE actually has rectified the leakage problem. The leak that occurred at R-70 can best be described as an uncommon occurrence.

Over the years, LANL pumping tests were conducted using pumps run on conventional threaded and coupled steel pipe. Initially, the drilling contractor used its own pipe, which is standard practice in the industry. Unfortunately, the pipe that was used had apparently been installed numerous times and had worn threads and couplings. This resulted in periodic leakage.

Later, LANL purchased several strings of stainless steel drop pipe for use in the tests so that water sampling could be performed at the conclusion of testing. Eventually, as the pipe was reused repeatedly, thread wear became a problem, causing the same leakage issues. Possible

contributing factors include galling of the stainless steel threads, which may have accentuated wear, or the fact that threaded fittings often are not machined to proper industry standards.

Approximately 2 years ago, LANL purchased a supply of stainless-steel JSL pipe to replace the threaded material. Instead of threaded connections, JSL pipe uses a slip-in, spline-lock design fitted with O rings, which provides a connection that has been pressure-tested to thousands of psi without leaking.

Since LANL procured the JSL pipe, numerous pumping tests involving some 40,000 feet of drop pipe trip length have been conducted. In all of this use, the O-ring fittings have never leaked, including at R-70.

Prior to the R-70 pumping test, the driller purchased an additional string of JSL pipe. Unfortunately, one of the pipe ends was defective. There was a pinhole leak where one of the stainless steel grooved O-ring fittings was welded onto the end of the 2-inch pipe. Apparently, the welder at the factory did not complete the entire circumferential welding pass when attaching the fitting to the pipe body, or completed the pass improperly so that the weld looked fine but hid the small pinhole. This is an extremely rare occurrence not likely to be repeated. Note that the leak was through the steel body, not through the O-ring seal end connection. The defective pipe joint was culled from the working string and will not be reused.

- 11.b. The test string setup was straightforward, consisting of 2 packers roughly 60 ft apart with a pump between them. Three transducers were deployed to monitor the three distinct zones created when the packers were inflated:
  - 1. Upper transducer (just above the upper packer)
  - 2. Middle transducer (between the packers, just above the lower packer)
  - 3. Lower transducer (just beneath the lower packer)

A drawing of this setup was not included but can be provided if this explanation does not sufficiently address NMED's comment.

When screen 2 was straddled (pumped), the upper transducer monitored screen 1 while the middle transducer monitored screen 2. When screen 1 was straddled, the middle transducer monitored screen 1 while the lower transducer monitored screen 2.

Regarding Figure E-8.2-4, it shows water levels in the 8-inch well casing, i.e., the annulus outside the 2-inch drop pipe, not inside the drop pipe. As indicated on the figure, the upper transducer was initially several feet beneath the static water level. The measured head remained at that level, as slow drainage from the drop pipe was free to flow into the aquifer. As soon as the packers were inflated, the water level began to rise in the annulus above the upper packer, which sealed it off from the screen zones.

- 11.c. The pinhole leak in the drop pipe occurred approximately 3 feet above the upper packer. The leakage rate was approximately 0.11 gpm during testing. The effects of the leakage on the two pumping tests were negligible, as follows:
  - Screen 1 Test The 0.11 gpm leakage did not go through the flow meter, and the discharge
    rate was therefore underreported by 0.11 gpm (negligible: just over 0.1%). There was no
    effect on the drawdown or recovery data because the leaked water was contained in the
    annulus above the upper packer.

• Screen 2 Test – As with the screen 1 test, the discharge rate was underreported by 0.11 gpm (again, negligible). In addition, the 0.11 gpm leakage flowed steadily into screen 1 throughout the screen 2 test, artificially raising the screen 1 water level by 0.008 ft (also negligible).

The possible storage effect shown on Figure E-8.2-3 was unrelated to the pinhole leak in the drop pipe. It was most likely attributable to the accumulation and presence of air or gas bubbles around the borehole, which also would explain and be consistent with the increase in the drawdown slope on Figure E-8.2-2 and the contradictory recovery trends shown on Figure E-8.4-5.

There was a check valve in the pumping string, located just above the pump.

#### NMED Comment

#### 12. Appendix E, Section E-1.0 Introduction, p E-3

**Permittees' Statement:** "The empty drop pipe meant that when the 24-hr tests were started, the pump operated against reduced head and therefore produced a greater discharge rate initially (for a minute or two). As the drop pipe filled, the flow rate gradually declined to the steady-state rate. This had the effect of skewing the early drawdown data and complicating the analysis."

#### NMED Comments:

- a) It is unclear how an empty drop pipe would be the reason the pump would initially discharge at a higher rate as postulated by DOE on page E-12 to be 160 gpm. The physical limits of the pump are illustrated by its performance curve. Performance curves show the maximum capacity of a pump is when the water level in the aquifer is zero i.e. at land surface. Consequently, the greatest pumping rate occurs at the start of pumping when the water table is closest to the surface. Please provide the pump curve and specifications of the pump used for the 24-hour tests (not the dedicated or development pump).
- b) The leaking pipe, the gradually decreasing initial pumping rates, and various other uncontrollable variables that occur once pumping commences (i.e. well losses), render results obtained from the analysis of the initial data from the two 24-hour pumping tests as invalid. If aquifer parameters of the formation immediately around the well screens are desired, slug testing may be a more suitable method to obtain this information.

#### **DOE Response**

12.a. A graph of performance curves from the Grundfos product guide is being supplied separately in this response. The graph includes the bowl assembly used at R-70—Grundfos Model 85S300-26. As indicated on the plot, the pumping rates shown are truncated at 118 gpm. According to the graph, at this discharge rate the selected pump produces 620 ft of pressure head.

The pressure head that the pump operates against is essentially the difference between the head at the discharge side of the pump and the head at the intake. If the drop pipe is empty down to the static water level when pumping begins, the heads at the intake and discharge are equal, so the pumping head is near zero initially. This accounts for the greater assumed initial flow rate. After pumping begins, as the drop pipe fills, the head that the pump operates against increases gradually and steadily from zero to the sum of the eventual lift distance from the pumping water level to the discharge elevation (approximately 10 ft above land surface) plus friction loss. At R-70, the maximum pumping head was approximately 1000 ft.

12.b. DOE believe the pumping test approach is applicable and provides sufficiently accurate test data Slug testing is not conducted at LANL because slug tests often underestimate hydraulic conductivity by up to 1 or 2 orders of magnitude. In light of this, they would not likely provide any useful information on the aquifer properties at R-70.

(Osborne 1993) states the following:

"It should be emphasized that slug tests provide very limited information on the hydraulic properties of the aquifer and often produce estimates which are only accurate within an order of magnitude."

and

"...slug tests often produce results which are as much as an order of magnitude low."

#### **NMED** Comment

#### 13. Appendix E, Section E-2.0 Background Data, p E-4

**Permittees' Statement:** "The corrected barometric pressure data reflecting pressure conditions at the water table were compared with the water-level hydrograph to discern the correlation between the two and to determine whether water-level corrections were needed before data analysis."

**NMED Comment:** Explain whether water-level corrections were needed before data analysis. Such a discussion is not provided in this section. However, the first observation in Section E-9.0 on page E-16 suggests that such an analysis was conducted. Please provide the comparison of barometric pressure and R-70 water levels. Provide, in an electronic format, the raw barometric data, the corrected barometric data, the pressure transducer data, and the barometrically-compensated data, if the latter was performed.

#### **DOE Response**

13. It was assumed as a given that the lack of hydrograph response to barometric pressure changes meant that barometric corrections were not needed. This will be stated in the revised report by adding the following sentence at the end of paragraph 4 in Section 7.0:

"Because of the lack of correlation between the hydrograph and barometric pressure, no corrections were made to the test data."

The first observation in Section 9.0 is consistent with this.

The requested data files will be provided separately.

#### **NMED Comment**

#### 14. Appendix E, Section E-2.0 Background Data, p E-5

**Permittees' Statement:** "When pumping or recovery first begins, the vertical extent of the cone of depression is limited to approximately the well screen length, the filter pack length, or the aquifer thickness in relatively thin permeable strata. For many pumping tests on the Plateau, the early pumping period is the only time the effective height of the cone of depression is known with certainty because soon after startup, the cone of depression expands vertically through permeable materials

above and/or below the screened interval. Thus, the early data often offer the best opportunity to obtain hydraulic conductivity information because conductivity would equal the earliest-time transmissivity divided by the well screen length."

**NMED Comments:** Provide peer-review publications and research that support each of the technical issues in the statement, specifically:

- a) Explain what is meant by the "vertical extent of the cone of depression" and "the effective height of the cone of depression". Explain how these concepts differ from aquifer drawdown as described by many of the references provided below. Please provide supporting publications that explain the difference. If they are the same the conventional term "drawdown" should be used.
- b) Explain how the "vertical extent of the cone of depression" is limited to the well screen or filter pack length, knowing that the cone of depression occurs and expands laterally and vertically from along the water table regardless of the position of the well screen as shown by Driscoll (1986), Kruseman and de Ridder (1990), Lohman (1972), and described by Theis (1940) among many others. Provide supporting publications that explains how "the vertical extent of the cone of depression is limited to the well screen". NMED sees this to be true only when the water table is intercepted by the well screen. However, in the case of R-70, which has two fully submerged screens, this statement is confusing.
- c) Explain how the cone of depression can expand vertically below the well screen. Provide supporting publications to support this statement and explain how this is possible.
- d) Provide the reference(s) that support that "the early data often offer the best opportunity to obtain hydraulic conductivity information because conductivity would equal the earliest-time transmissivity divided by the well screen length." See comment 15a) if formation hydraulic properties along the screened interval are desired.

#### **DOE Response**

- 14. The best sources of information regarding the effects of partial penetration in relation to cone of depression are the Hantush papers listed in the References section of the R-70 report.
- 14.a. The cone of depression refers to the drawdown created by pumping, including the area (or volume) of influence. In the contexts of the report, it can be thought of as the "zone of drawdown" or "zone of pressure reduction." This includes the three-dimensional physical portion of the aquifer where drawdown occurs.

The USGS identifies two different definitions of cone of depression. The first is "a depression of the potentiometric surface in the shape of an inverted cone that develops around a well which is being pumped." This definition is flawed and simplistic, in that it likens the drawdown pattern to a simple two-dimensional surface (cone). This implies that the drawdown is constant with depth. Indeed, most text references show diagrams of cones that imply the same thing—that at any given geographic location around the well, a single drawdown value describes the head at all vertical horizons at that particular location.

However, that is never the case; there is always some variation in head with depth in real wells. Note that "cone of depression" does not refer just to the phreatic surface around a well in an unconfined aquifer. In unconfined aquifers, that definition would ignore the drawdown everywhere

13

August 2020

else in the three-dimensional zone affected by pumping; in confined aquifers, it would not be applicable at all.

The second USGS definition is "the depression of heads around a pumping well caused by withdrawal of water." This is a little more general in that 1) it includes all areas of the aquifer affected by pumping and all drawdown values; 2) it doesn't imply the oversimplification of a two-dimensional cone; and 3) it addresses more than just the phreatic surface or uppermost portion of the aquifer. Despite the name, the concept of a "cone" actually no longer applies. The "depression of heads" in real wells, particularly partially penetrating wells, is a complex three-dimensional field of drawdown values that can't be described by a two-dimensional surface. In unconfined aquifers, the phreatic surface is the only place where a "cone" comes into play. Everywhere else in the three-dimensional zone of pressure reduction in the unconfined aquifer, and everywhere around a well in a confined aquifer, the term "cone" is inappropriate. Nevertheless, the industry uses the term "cone of depression" to describe the "depression of heads," and most practitioners know what is actually meant by this term.

The zone that is depressurized has a physical size, i.e., a lateral extent, an upper extent, and a lower extent. The lateral limit of drawdown is often referred to as the radius of influence. There are also vertical limits of drawdown effect. In a partially penetrating well, the depressurized zone will extend some distance above the well screen and some distance beneath it. This may be what caused NMED's confusion over the statements about the cone of depression extending below the screen. This simply means that the zone where drawdown occurs includes some sediments beneath the screen; it does not mean that the physical water level itself is drawn down below the screen.

Just as the zone of depressurization has a physical lateral extent (radius of influence) it has a height or thickness at any particular location (the distance between the upper and lower limits of the depressurized zone). This is what is referred to as the height of the cone of depression in the report.

14.b. The well screen length mentioned in the report refers to that of the pumped screen.

When pumping begins, the drawdown pressure wave rapidly expands horizontally through the sediments adjacent to the well screen. It also expands vertically, both upward from the screened interval and downward, though at a slow rate because of the low vertical hydraulic conductivity of the sediments compared to the horizontal conductivity. Drawdown thus occurs both above and below the screened interval, even though the images of cones of depression that NMED refers to always show a cone shape above the well screen. According to the USGS definition, the cone of depression is the "depression of heads," i.e., the drawdown—not a graphical picture representing the magnitude of the drawdown. In other words, saying that there is drawdown beneath the screen does not mean that water levels are pulled below the screen. Rather, it means that sediments beneath the screen see some drawdown below the previous static piezometric head there.

The transmissivity value computed from standard analysis techniques is the transmissivity of the thickness of sediments through which the cone of depression is expanding horizontally. Initially, this zone of expansion is limited to a thickness of sediments approximately equal to the screen length. Thus, the early slope on a drawdown graph should yield the transmissivity of only that thickness. As time passes, there is viable vertical growth of the cone of depression, meaning that the horizontal expansion of the cone takes place through a progressively thicker and thicker portion of the aquifer. This results in a steady flattening of the drawdown slope, as the data reflect the properties of a

14

progressively thicker section of the aquifer. The Hantush equation for partial penetration confirms this.

To illustrate this point, the Hantush equation was used to generate synthetic drawdown data for a confined aquifer having the same thickness and screen 1 design as R-70 and a transmissivity of 55,000 gpd/ft. Angled screen 1 is approximately 41 ft long, making the equivalent vertical height 37.1 ft. The aquifer thickness was assumed to be 160 ft in the calculations. This makes the hydraulic conductivity 55,000/160, or 344 gpd/ft<sup>2</sup>. The transmissivity of a 37.1-ft thickness of sediments (equal to the screen length in the Hantush simulation) having this conductivity is 344 x 37.1, or 12,800 gpd/ft. Using the Hantush equation, the following figure shows the calculated drawdown from such an installation, assuming a discharge rate of 90.8 gpm and the various other parameters shown on the graph.



## Simulated Drawdown in a Partially Penetrating Well in a Confined Aquifer Using the Hantush Equation

Note that the initial slope on the graph produces a calculated transmissivity value of 13,800 gpd/ft, approximately equal to the known transmissivity of the screened interval (12,800 gpd/ft). This is because of the limited height of the cone of depression at early time. As the cone of depression (zone of depressurization) expands vertically throughout the test, a progressively greater effective transmissivity is reflected. Once the cone of depression is fully developed through the entire aquifer thickness, the data reflect the total aquifer transmissivity of 55,000 gpd/ft.

For further illustration, the Neuman equation was used to compute the theoretical drawdown in the pumped screen for an unconfined aquifer using the same set of input parameters. The following figure shows the results.



Simulated Drawdown in a Partially Penetrating Well in an Unconfined Aquifer Using the Neuman Equation

Similar to the Hantush analysis, the early slope shows the transmissivity of a section of the aquifer approximately commensurate with the well screen length.

The complex hydrogeologic setting at R-70—unconfined conditions, partial penetration, as well as possible leakage from a significant thickness of underlying sediments—masks the final slope shown on the R-70 pumping test graphs. Delayed yield causes flattening of the curve, as does leakage from below the aquifer, i.e., continued vertical growth of the cone of depression to depths below the aquifer being tested. Thus, the actual data set from R-70 does not show the slope indicating a transmissivity of 55,000 gpd/ft. Nevertheless, the examples shown above are useful in illustrating the early-time effects of partial penetration and, by implication, the concept of vertical growth of the cone of depression.

- 14.c. This question is related to semantics of the definition of cone of depression, or "zone of depressurization." The sediments beneath the screen see drawdown (depressurization). In other words, the drawdown effect extends below the screen. This does not mean that the physical water level falls below the screen.
- 14.d. Both *Groundwater and Wells, Second Edition* (Driscoll, 1986) and *Groundwater and Wells, Third Edition* (Sterrett, 2007) contain general discussions of the preference of early data when later data are affected by anomalies such as boundaries, recharge, and delayed yield. See also the response to NMED Comment 14b.

#### NMED Comment

## 15. Appendix E, Section E-2.0 Background Data, p E-5

**Permittees' Statement:** "Unfortunately, in many pumping tests, casing-storage effects dominate the early-time data, potentially hindering the effort to determine the transmissivity of the screened interval."

#### **NMED Comments:**

- a) Explain why "slug" testing was not conducted to evaluate the transmissivity of the screened interval.
- b) Explain why Equations E-3 and E-4 are provided and discussed if packers were used to eliminate casing storage as stated on page E-1. Casing storage is only one issue that complicates the practical use of initial drawdown data. Turbulent flow, non-radial flow, friction losses, and non-steady pumping occur when pumping first commences. These issues are difficult to account for and plague the inclusion of "Early Data" in aquifer test analyses.
- c) Provide publications that support the importance of "Early Data" as stressed by DOE on page E-5 over the remainder of drawdown data, and provide a detailed discussion why aquifer tests are routinely run for 24 hours for confined aquifers and 72 hours or more for unconfined aquifers (see comment 6c) if the "Early Data" are the most important for analysis. An example of a semi-log drawdown analysis using later time data is provided by Osborne (1993). If uncertain, the portion of drawdown data suitable for curve matching can be best determined by derivative analysis, which demonstrates when the required radial flow regime suitable for analysis has been achieved (Horne, 1995). The casing storage narrative on page E-5 should be removed from the report if it has not been used in the analysis.

#### **DOE Response**

15.a. DOE believes that slug testing of R-70 would not have provided useful information for the testing objective. See the response to NMED Comment 12b.

문화적인

15.b. Equations E-3 and E-4 are pertinent because they drive the decision to use packers in virtually all R-well tests, including single-screen wells. Further, they are germane to the general subject of storage effects, which can arise by means other than conventional casing storage. For example, filter pack storage has been observed in other wells at LANL and had the potential of cropping up in the screen 1 test; and storage related to gas bubble expansion and contraction may have occurred in the screen 2 test and has been observed elsewhere in the R-well testing program.

Regarding the list of phenomena that could plague early data, the following is provided to address NMED's comment:

Turbulent flow – When turbulent flow occurs, it increases the drawdown by a constant factor as long as the discharge rate is constant. This is no different than any other well inefficiency drawdown component that results in the pumped well drawdown exceeding the theoretical drawdown that would have been observed in a 100% efficient well. It has no effect on the analysis of time-drawdown data from the pumped well. For example, if a constant is added to each drawdown value in the Hantush example shown in the graph above, there would be no change in the slopes anywhere on the plot, and the exact same transmissivity values would be calculated.

17

Non-radial flow – The early data are the only data where the flow is, in fact, radial (or approximately so). Later, as the cone expands vertically to a significant extent, the flow becomes non-radial. Thus, it is the late data that are plagued by non-radial flow, not the early data. The later data show delayed yield and continued vertical growth of the cone of depression. In the Hantush example in the above graph, the early time transmissivity value and the straight line plot confirm that flow is largely radial early on. The subsequent flattening of the slope (the curved part of the graph) shows the onset of significant non-radial flow. The late data show radial flow again by virtue of the fact that the assumed confined aquifer in the calculation example is not affected by either delayed yield or unlimited vertical growth of the cone of depression, as seen in R-70. (In R-70, the late data continue to be affected by delayed yield and vertical expansion of the cone of depression, perpetuating non-radial flow throughout the test.)

Friction losses – It is was not clear whether NMED meant friction losses between the aquifer and the pump intake or in the discharge piping. In any case, neither one affects the usability of any of the test data, early or otherwise. The losses on the intake side of the pump are usually negligible but are nevertheless constant. Thus, as with turbulent flow, they increase all pumped well drawdown values by a constant factor and have no effect on the analysis. Those on the discharge side of the pump simply add to the total lift and remain constant as well (for tests in which the drop pipe remains full at all times).

Non-steady pumping – This does not occur with electric submersible pumps. The submersible motors have the remarkable properties of 1) getting up to speed rapidly (literally by the time the hydrologist's finger is off the start button); and 2) running at a constant speed and, therefore, at a constant rate (assuming again that the drop pipe is full). In general, the pump performance is the same at times of 1 second, 1 minute, 1 hour, and 1 day.

In summary, the early data are not plagued by turbulent flow, non-radial flow, friction losses, or nonsteady pumping as posited by NMED. They are, in fact, quite usable for analysis of near-well aquifer conditions.

As long as the drop pipe is full and potential casing storage sources are eliminated, about the only thing that can interfere with early data collection and analysis is inertial effects, which last for only a second or two.

15.c. As discussed in the response to NMED Comment 14d, both *Groundwater and Wells*, *Second Edition* (Driscoll, 1986) and *Groundwater and Wells*, *Third Edition* (Sterrett, 2007) contain general discussions about the preference of early data when later data are affected by anomalies such as boundaries, recharge, and delayed yield.

Regarding the rationale for conducting 24- and 72-hour pumping tests, the following information is provided:

Although early data from some pumping tests can be particularly useful, it does not obviate the need for extended pumping. The hydrologic setting being tested affects the overall pumping test response and its usability. In some settings, the best information may be obtained from the early data. In others, late data may be revealing. In many tests, good information can be acquired from the entire data set while in some tests, sadly, little useful information can be extracted from any part of the data set.

The early data reflect properties in the vicinity of the pumped well (say, 100 to 200 ft or so around the well). To obtain information on a broader area of the aquifer, and distant features such as

heterogeneities, boundaries, or recharge, longer pumping time may be useful, but that was not the objective of this single-well pumping test. The Neuman analyses in the R-70 pumping test utilized virtually the entire data sets to obtain a good set of aquifer parameters. Larger-scale evaluations of the aquifer around R-70 have been conducted as part of cross-hole aquifer tests and will be reported in the Assessment Report on the evaluation of conditions in the regional aquifer around well R-70, due to NMED by June 30, 2021.

The casing storage narrative should remain, based on the reasons discussed in the response to NMED Comment 15a.

#### NMED Comment

16. Appendix E, Section E-8.1 Well R-70 Screen 1 Trial Test, p E-12

**Permittees' Statement:** "To remove some of the "noise" in the data graph, the drawdown data were replotted as a rolling average on Figure E-8.1-3."

**NMED Comments:** Provide the time period that was used to remove the noise. Explain how much data was lost using the moving average, and how did it impact analyses. Explain if other filters were considered.

#### **DOE Response**

16. The following statement could be added to the discussion:

"The rolling average was computed by averaging each data point with the 4 preceding and 4 following data points. This resulted in minimal data loss – just 1 second at the beginning of the test and 4 minutes at the end."

No other filters were considered necessary.

#### **NMED** Comment

## 17. Appendix E, Section E-8.2 Well R-70 Screen 1 24-hr Test, p E-12

**Permittees' Statement:** "The initial discharge rate was not known because the pump curve does not cover this condition. An attempt was made to extrapolate the available pump performance data to project what the initial discharge rate might have been. This resulted in a rough estimate of 160 gpm although there could be substantial error in this figure. Over the next couple of minutes, as the drop pipe filled, the discharge rate gradually decreased to 90.8 gpm."

**NMED Comment:** Pump curves provide the initial (maximum) pump rates (see comment 12a). Extrapolation to find the maximum pumping rate of a pump is not necessary. The description in the last sentence indicates that discharge was not regulated at the well head by either a variable

rate pump controller or a gate valve that is required to maintain a constant pumping rate throughout the test (Osborne, 1993). A constant rate must be maintained to within  $\pm 5\%$  of the target pumping test rate throughout the test (U.S. Department of the Interior, 1995).

- a) Provide a discussion that details how the pumping rate was measured and maintained at a constant rate throughout both tests. Provide the field log/notes documenting the measured discharge rates made throughout both 24-hour pumping tests.
- b) If the pumping rate was not maintained at a constant rate throughout the tests, explain why a valve or variable-rate pump wasn't used to control discharge during the pumping test, and how long did it take for the pump to achieve the 90.8 gpm rate.
- c) If 90.8 gpm was the target pumping rate for the two 24-hour pumping tests, explain how that rate was determined.

## **DOE Response**

17. DOE does not agree with NMED's comment regarding pump curves and discharge rates. See the response to NMED Comment 12a.

There was a ball valve in the discharge line. However, it was left wide open for the 24-hr tests as discussed below.

17.a. The pumping rate was measured using an inline totalizing flow meter.

The pump operated at a constant rate and the pumping head changed little during the test, so valve adjustment was unnecessary. For example, during the screen 1 test, after the first few minutes of pumping, the drawdown (and pumping lift) remained in a narrow range of about 1.6 ft, i.e., plus or minus 0.8 ft from the midpoint. According to the pump curve, this corresponded to possible flow rate variations of plus or minus 0.08 gpm, or less than 0.1% of the total rate.

17.b. The target discharge rate was achieved as soon as the drop pipe filled—about a minute (plus or minus) for the two tests. (See the field data sheets.) Prior to that the rate was greater, starting out at a maximum, because of antecedent drainage of the drop pipe, and gradually declining as the drop pipe filled. Once water reached the surface, the rate remained constant. The small variations in rates observed during the tests were likely caused by slightly varying gas content in the water that affected the pump bowl efficiency.

It is essential in the deep R-well tests to leave the discharge valve setting unchanged, regardless of whether the valve is partially closed to constrain the flow rate or wide open to maximize it. The constant speed of the pump, combined with the great pumping lift compared to the minimal drawdown changes that occur during pumping, ensures that the discharge rate will remain consistent and uniform (except for the limitations of random changes in gas content in the pumped water). Striving for perfection by constantly fiddling with the discharge valve in this environment will always cause more noise, chaos, variation, and/or erratic pumping rates than would otherwise occur if the valve position is kept constant.

17.c. The intent was to pump each zone at the maximum rate that the pump could attain.

#### NMED Comment

### 18. Appendix E, Sections E-8.1 through E-8.5, p E-12, E-13 and E-14

**Permittees' Statement:** "The late data showed a flattening of the curve associated with vertical expansion of the cone of impression and, possibly, delayed yield effects." – p E-12 "Late data on the

left-hand side of the plot showed continuing flattening of the data trace, corresponding to ongoing vertical expansion of the cone of impression at late time and delayed yield effects." – p E-13 "Subsequent data showed continuous flattening of the recovery curve, consistent with vertical expansion of the cone of impression and delayed yield. ... Subsequent data showed the effects of vertical expansion of the cone of impression and delayed yield." – p E-14

**NMED Comment:** The term "cone of impression" is used throughout these sections and on several figures in Appendix E. This term describes the conical shape of the mound formed by well injection (e.g., the "CrIN" injection wells) and in well image theory as described in multiple text books and publications (Kruseman and de Ridder (1990), Lohman (1972), Ferris et al. (1962), among many others). Explain if water was injected into R-70 during the recovery phases of the aquifer tests. Explain if backflow from the leaking 2" drop pipe injected water back into the well during the onset of the recovery tests. If not, explain why this term is used to describe the recovery of the cone of depression back to non-pumping water table conditions.

#### **DOE Response**

18. The water level recovery response to shutting off the pump is mathematically equivalent to what would have been observed had the real well continued pumping and an imaginary well injected water into the aquifer at the same pumping rate. The term "cone of impression" is defined as "a rise of the potentiometric surface in the shape of a cone that develops around an injection well."

The actual response was the superposition of 1) the extrapolation of the original cone of depression (zone of depressurization) into the future, assuming continued pumping; and 2) the cone of impression (zone of repressurization) associated with an imaginary well injecting water into the aquifer at the same pumping rate. Rather than repeat all of that each time, it was less cumbersome to simply use the term "cone of impression" as a shorthand description of the water level trends associated with recovery.

Water was not injected into the well during recovery, except for the ongoing drop-pipe leak. As discussed in the response to NMED Comment 11c, the leakage rate was 0.11 gpm. During screen 1 pumping and recovery, this had zero effect, as the leaked water was trapped in the casing annulus above the upper packer. During the screen 2 test, the leak had the effect of raising the water level at screen 1 by 0.008 ft for the duration of testing—both pumping and recovery.

#### NMED Comment

## 19. Appendix E, Section E-8.2 Well R-70 Screen 1 24-hr Test, p E-13

**Permittees' Statement:** "Figure E-8.2-4 illustrates response to the drop-pipe leak that occurred during the screen 1 24-hr pumping test. The plot shows data recorded in the annulus above the upper packer just above the top of screen 1. As shown in the figure, as soon as the downhole packers were inflated, water began accumulating in the annular space above the packer. The water level reached a height of approximately 60 ft overnight before the test. Once pumping began, the rate of rise was linear because the drop pipe remained full throughout the test, maintaining a constant head and steady leakage rate. During recovery after pump shutdown, the water level in the annulus continued to rise, eventually reaching a height of 173 ft by the time the packers were deflated."

**NMED Comment:** Describe where the drop-pipe leak is located relative to the packer, where the water that accumulated above the packer after pump shutdown came from, and how this was measured. Explain Figure E-8.2-4 in detail to better describe what happened, as the provided

explanation is confusing. Provide a figure that details the pumping test equipment setup down the well (see comment 11b) and explicitly illustrates the annular space above the packer, and where the drop-pipe leak is located.

#### **DOE Response**

19. The following dimensions may help clarify this issue.

<u>Component</u>	Approximate Depth
Static Water Level	948 ft
Pinhole Leak	951 ft
Upper Transducer	954 ft
Top of Upper Packer	954 ft
Bottom of Upper Packer	959 ft
Top of Screen 1	963 ft

After pump shutdown, the additional accumulated water in the annulus came from the drop pipe.

The water height in the annulus was measured via the upper pressure transducer.

#### NMED Comment

#### 20. Appendix E, Section E-8.3 Well R-70 Screen 2 Trial Test, p E-14

**Permittees' Statement:** "Subsequent data showed continuous flattening of the recovery curve, consistent with vertical expansion of the cone of impression and delayed yield."

**NMED Comment:** Explain what is meant by, and how "the vertical expansion of the cone of impression and delayed yield" can occur during recovery, especially considering delayed yield occurs during pumping (Kruseman and de Ridder, 1990; Mishra and Kuhlman, 2013, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1995). Similarly, explain the similar speculative conclusions shown in the notes on Figures E-8.1-1, E-8.1-3, E-8.2-2, E-8.3-1, E-8.3-2, E-8.4-3, and E-8.4-4.

#### **DOE Response**

20. When operating a partially penetrating well, just as the cone of depression or zone of depressurization expands vertically over time (per the Hantush equation), so too does the zone of repressurization expand when pumping stops (analogous to what would occur if an imaginary well began injecting water).

With respect to delayed yield, this occurs during pumping because the vertical drainage rate of water at the top of the aquifer lags the rate of elastic drawdown response to pumping. In the same manner, when pumping stops, the vertical flow that refills the void space above the phreatic surface is sluggish compared to the rapid elastic head buildup associated with recovery. Because the pore spaces are receiving water during recovery, rather than yielding water as they do during pumping, the effect is essentially more of a "delayed reception."

To view this from a different perspective, all standard well hydraulics equations apply to injection just as they do to pumping. The only thing that changes is that a negative sign is applied to the term *Q*.

DOE believes that the conclusions regarding delayed yield and vertical expansion of the cones in Figures E-8.1-1, E-8.1-3, E-8.2-2, E-8.3-1, E-8.3-2, E-4.1-3, and E-8.4-4 are correct and well-founded.

#### NMED Comment

## 21. Appendix E, Section E-8.5 Well R-70 Drawdown and Recovery Aquifer Coefficient Summary, p E-15

**Permittees' Statement:** "Excluding the anomalous values obtained from the 24-hr pumping period, the average upper-bound transmissivity for this approximately 20-ft thick zone was 16,730 gpd/ft, making the upper-bound hydraulic conductivity of the screen 2 zone 817 gpd/ft2, or 109 ft/day."

**NMED Comment:** Clarify if the upper bound value of 109 ft/day for hydraulic conductivity was attributed to R-70 S2 or S1. On page E-16 this value appears to be attributed to R-70 S1. In Table E-8.5-2, Section E-8.5 on page E-15, and conclusion #9 on page E-17 it is attributed to S2. Explain if the 109 ft/day hydraulic conductivity value is within the expected range of values for the aquifer rock according to published sources for similar rock.

#### **DOE Response**

21. DOE acknowledges the error. The revision will include a correction to read "screen 2."

Some anecdotal conductivity ranges from the literature (after converting to ft/d and rounding off):

- 1. Driscoll 0.1 to10,000 ft/d for fine to coarse sand
- 2. Zheng and Bennett 0.02 to 160 ft/d for coarse sand
- 3. Freeze and Cherry 1 to 4000 ft/d for clean sand

#### NMED Comment

22. Appendix E, Section E-8.6, p E-15

NMED Comment: Explain why there is no Section E-8.6.

#### **DOE Response**

22. DOE acknowledges the error: The section labeled 8.7 will be changed to 8.6 in the revised document.

#### NMED Comment

## 23. Appendix E, Figure E-8.2-1 Well R-70 screen 1 drawdown, p E-22

**NMED Comment:** Three curves appear to be discernable in the drawdown data for R-70 S1 during the 24-hour test following the 10-minute mark. The speculation in the note on this figure states that delayed yield could be one reason for the observed recovery at the 700-minute mark during pumping. If DOE speculated delayed yield as a cause of the recovery, discuss whether the Neuman solution was used on this data. If not, discuss whether the apparent recovery was due to a decrease in the pumping rate and/or affects from injection at nearby CrIN wells.

#### **DOE Response**

23. The note on the graph was intended to apply to the bulk of the late data, not just to what happened at the 700-minute mark. Delayed yield and vertical expansion of the cone of depression would have, by themselves, contributed to a flattening of the curve, but drawdown would have continued to increase slightly. The actual reversal of water levels was only possible because of a change in well efficiency (probably gas-related). The pumping rate remained constant throughout, and there was no other pumping going on in Mortandad Canyon after May 9.

The Neuman solution does not work effectively on the pumped well data in general, often because of the inefficiency drawdown component, which cannot readily be accounted for. Its application to screen 1 would have been particularly futile based on the combination of the elevated initial discharge rate and the well efficiency change that occurred.

#### **NMED Comment**

## 24. Appendix E, Figure E-8.4-2 Well R-70 screen 2 drawdown – expanded scale, p E-26

**NMED Comment:** Three curves can be discerned in the drawdown data for R-70 S2 during the 24-hour pumping test. However, the note on this figure speculates the later data of increased drawdown may be due to permeability reduction. Describe if the Neuman solution was used to evaluate whether a better fit of the solution to the data can be achieved.

#### **DOE Response**

24. As stated previously, the Neuman solution does not generally work well for pumped well data. The magnitude of the drawdown in the pumped well can be greater than the theoretical value due to inefficiency or the screen being located in a preferentially low conductivity zone within the aquifer. Conversely, it can be less than the theoretical value by virtue of the screen being set in a preferentially permeable portion of the aquifer. These effects—combined with the large initial discharge rate and subsequent dynamic efficiency degradation, as well as other boundaries or recharge that may be encountered (such as possible continued vertical growth of the cone of depression beyond the confines of the 160 foot thick upper aquifer)—tend to render the pumped well data unusable in the Neuman analysis.

The Neuman analysis involves extremely complex mathematics and must solve for four unknowns simultaneously: horizontal conductivity, vertical conductivity, storage coefficient, and specific yield. The anomalies cited above play havoc with the calculations. For example, a reasonable-looking Neuman type curve match to the screen 2 drawdown data (when pumping screen 2) yielded a transmissivity value approximately one-third too high, a storage coefficient four orders of magnitude too low, a specific yield three orders of magnitude too low, and an anisotropy ratio more than an order of magnitude too high. When the storage and anisotropy were constrained to reasonable values, the best possible data match was quite poor visually, and the resulting transmissivity was about 75% high. In short, it was not possible to obtain a sound, reasonable, and independent Neuman analysis using the pumped screen data.

#### NMED Comment

## 25. Appendix E, Figures E-8.4-2 and E-8.4-4, p E-26 and E-27

#### NMED Comment:

- a) Explain why the result for the S2 drawdown analysis (Figure E-8.4-2) and the result for the S2 recovery analyses (Figure E-8.4-4) provide highly different results.
- b) Explain why the result for the S1 drawdown and recovery analyses provided in Figure E-8.2-1 and Figure E-8.2-2, respectively provide highly different values for transmissivity compared to the result for the S1 drawdown response form pumping S2 (Figure E-8.4-6).
- c) Provide a discussion of the quality of the drawdown and recovery data and the reliability of the results made from the analyses of these data.

#### **DOE Response**

- 25.a. Early time snapshots of data from trial recovery (Figure E-8.3-1), trial drawdown (Figure E-8.3-2), and 24-hour recovery immediately following the storage portion of the curve (Figure E-8.4-4) yielded near-well transmissivity values for the screened zone of 16,900 gpd/ft, 17,000 gpd/ft, and 16,300 gpd/ft—fairly consistent. The empty drop pipe and the elevated and inconsistent initial discharge rate associated with the start of the 24-hour pumping period made it difficult to determine a reliable transmissivity value from Figure E-8.4-2.
- 25.b. Calculations on Figures E-8.2-1 and E-8.2-2 use early data and therefore reflect a portion of the aquifer having a thickness of approximately the length of screen 1. The Neuman analysis, on the other hand, accounts for partial penetration and delayed yield and utilizes the whole data set—early, mid, and late time—and reflects the entire aquifer transmissivity. (See the Hantush and Neuman partial penetration discussion in the response to NMED Comment 14b.)
- 25.c. Opinions about the quality and reliability of the data and results are highly subjective, reflecting different meanings, criteria, goals, expectations, and perspectives for different observers. A general comment concerning the pumping test approach at LANL can be offered. The pumping tests at LANL are planned as meticulously, and conducted with as much care, as any in the industry—in spite of the considerable challenges of testing very deep, small-diameter wells (without close-in observation wells) with 20-foot screens in an aquifer that is hundreds or thousands of feet thick and contains gassy or aerated water. The analyses are performed with a particular emphasis on obtaining the information that is obtainable and defensible.

#### **NMED** Comment

#### 26. Appendix E, Figure E-8.4-4, p E-27

**NMED Comment:** Regarding the curve matching shown on Figure E-8.4-4, describe what value of transmissivity would be obtained if the data between log cycle 100 to 10,000 was used. If the data between these log cycles were considered, provide a discussion how the results may compare to the values obtained from the pumping phase of the R-70 S2 24-hour test shown in Figure E-8.4-2, and Figures E-8.2-3 and E-8.4-6. Explain why the initial portion of recovery from log cycle 100,000 to 10,000 was used in Figure E-8.4-4 and the bulk of the recovery data was not considered in the analysis (see comment 15c). Explain how delayed yield can possibly be observed during the recovery

period after pumping and dewatering of the water table has stopped, and likewise describe how and why the cone of impression (depression?) expands during the recovery period (see comment 20).

### **DOE Response**

26. The bulk of the recovery curve is a giant arc that steadily flattens over time. Moving from a t/t value of 10,000 to 100, the corresponding erroneous transmissivity values obtained start at 35,000 gpd/ft and rise steadily to 76,000 gpd/ft. Continuing to smaller t/t values, the data plot continues to flatten, eventually supporting a transmissivity calculation of 640,000 gpd/ft at a t/t value of 10. Thus, depending on which part of the graph is used between t/t values of 10,000 and 10, the corresponding transmissivity can take on all values ranging from 35,000 gpd/ft to 640,000 gpd/ft. None of the computed values are legitimate except when the curve fortuitously and accidentally is at just the right slope to yield the correct transmissivity. Because the steadily changing slope supports all transmissivity values between 35,000 gpd/ft and 640,000 gpd/ft, it is inevitable that the true transmissivity will be encountered somewhere along the way, even though there is no way to know when or where that occurs.

The steady flattening of the data graph reflects two simultaneous effects: vertical growth of the "cone of impression" and delayed yield. It is not possible to sort out these effects mathematically, except by applying the Neuman mathematics, which is generally unsuccessful for the pumped well. At any point along the recovery arc, the slope is a function of 1) some unknown height of the cone of impression at that particular time and 2) some unknown delayed-yield effect at that particular time. Using any of these slopes to compute a transmissivity would be a prime example of "misapplying the wrong equation at the wrong time to the wrong portion of the data to get a wrong answer."

The early data were analyzed because the height of the cone of impression was better known (approximately equal to the screen length), and delayed yield would not yet have affected the data significantly.

The concept of delayed yield is the same during recovery as during pumping, as discussed in the response to NMED Comment 20.

The superimposed cone of impression—analogous to the effect of injection via an imaginary well grows laterally and vertically over time in the same way that the original cone of depression does. For example, if an injection test were conducted, the resulting head buildup and head changes over time would be the same as the drawdown patterns that would be observed if pumping were performed instead.

### REFERENCES

List to be added prior to submittal to NMED

## EXHIBIT 3

.



MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM GOVERNOR JAMES C. KENNEY CABINET SECRETARY

## **CERTIFIED MAIL - RETURN RECEIPT REQUIRED**

May 25, 2021

Arturo Duran Designated Agency Manager Environmental Management U.S. Department of Energy Los Alamos Field Office P.O. Box 1663 MS M984 Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

**Re: Notice of Disapproval** 

Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70, Revision 1, and the Response to the New Mexico Environment Department's Draft Comments on the Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70 Los Alamos National Laboratory EPA ID#NM0890010515 HWB-LANL-19-080

Dear Arturo Duran,

The New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) received the United States Department of Energy's (DOE) *Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70, Revision 1* (Revised Report) and the *Response to the New Mexico Environment Department's Draft Comments on the Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70* (November Response). The Revised Report is dated November 2020, is referenced by EM2020-0564, and was submitted in response to NMED's draft review comments on the original well completion report. DOE submitted the original *Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70* (Report), referenced by EM2019-0365 on December 20, 2019.

NMED's technical review of the Report found multiple inaccuracies and misrepresentations of well hydraulics and hydrogeological concepts and a draft comment letter (Comments) was sent via e-mail on May 7, 2020. In this correspondence, NMED requested a post-submittal meeting (Meeting) be held before DOE provided responses because of the severity of the technical deficiencies concerning DOE's approach to aquifer testing and understanding of well hydraulics.

Despite several reminders, DOE never scheduled the requested Meeting before submitting their draft response to the Comments (August Response) via email on September 3, 2020 (see Attachment 1). DOE also scheduled the Meeting for September 8, 2020, one week after submitting the August Response. DOE's August Response disputed most of NMED's Comments that pertained to the validity of DOE's aquifer testing methodology and

SCIENCE | INNOVATION | COLLABORATION | COMPLIANCE

Hazardous Waste Bureau - 2905 Rodeo Park Drive Bldg. 1, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505 - (505) 476-6000 www.env.nm.gov Mr. Duran Page 2

analyses. In the September 3, 2020 email, DOE requested NMED's concurrence with their August Response and, if found acceptable, to cancel the Meeting. NMED did not concur with DOE's responses, and the Meeting was held on September 8, 2020.

During the Meeting, NMED stated that the aquifer tests were improperly conducted by DOE and, consequently, the results were not usable. DOE explained that they used the "early time" data because the intent is to test only the hydraulic properties immediately around the well. NMED suggested use of "slug" testing in lieu of pumping tests to obtain such information. NMED recommended removing the aquifer test from the Report because hydraulic testing is not a specific requirement at every well per the Consent Order and the data was questionable. It was mutually agreed that a revision of the Report would be submitted without the aquifer tests.

NMED completed its review the Revised Report and the November Response and noted that DOE still intends to use information from the aquifer test in the pending *Assessment Report for the Evaluation of Conditions in the Regional Aquifer Around Well R-70* (Assessment Report). Due to DOE's intent to use the R-70 aquifer test in the Assessment Report, NMED had an independent third-party analysis on the data from the R-70 pumping tests. NMED received these data from DOE on January 15, 2021 and asked the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Kerr Environmental Research Center in Ada, Oklahoma to conduct the independent review. EPA provided comments and recommendations on the data on April 28, 2021 that concur with NMED's comments and recommendations.

NMED notes that the work plan was approved by NMED in April 2020, prior to completion of NMED's review of the Report. Based on NMED's evaluation and input from EPA the inclusion of R-70 aquifer test in the Assessment Report is not acceptable. DOE must exclude analyses from the R-70 aquifer test and any pumping not conducted at a true constant rate from the Assessment Report (see General Comments below).

NMED notes that DOE did not resolve all of NMED's Comments in the Revised Report. These Comments are provided below and must be resolved before NMED is able to approve the Revised Report.

### **General Comments:**

DOE's intent to use the results and conclusions from the aquifer test data presented in Appendix E of the Report in the pending Assessment Report or any future submittal is not acceptable because NMED has not approved this information. DOE's August Response to specific comments nos. 6, 7, 8, and 11 through 26 of NMED's Comments remain unresolved thus the aquifer test methods, approach and results remain unacceptable. During the Meeting, the use of the R-70 aquifer test results was found to be unacceptable because the pump was operated at maximum capacity from the start of the pumping. This and many other technical issues lead NMED to recommend removing the aquifer tests from the Report.

The pumping method used and defended by DOE in their August Response to NMED's specific comment no. 17 prevented the ability to regularly adjust pump backpressure that is required to maintain a true constant rate. NMED explained to DOE during the Meeting that pump efficiency losses that result from a continually lowered water level in the pumping well require continual adjustment to the pump backpressure to maintain an actual constant rate. DOE's pumping method is unacceptable because it prevents the expansion of the cone of

## Mr. Duran Page 3

depression, which violates the non-steady flow requirement of the applied mathematical solutions and the ability to evaluate hydraulic pressure responses at adjacent wells. The resulting hydraulic pressure responses, whether observed or unobserved at adjacent wells, would not reflect the water levels that would have materialized at those adjacent wells if the pumping rates were truly kept constant in these tests. As such, the data analyses and derived aquifer parameters from applying standard mathematical solutions are unusable and any conclusion that pumping effects at adjacent wells from R-70 or any test conducted in the manner R-70 was conducted will be deemed irrelevant and unacceptable for decision making purposes.

During the Meeting, NMED also conveyed to DOE that the selected time periods DOE analyzed as "early time" data are only from the first few seconds of pumping, which are not representative of radial flow from the aquifer (specific comment no. 15). NMED further disqualified the analyses of DOE's "early time" data because the flow into the well during initial pumping is plagued with known physical issues that typically preclude use of the data in the analytical solutions upon which aquifer parameters are derived. DOE's response to specific comment 15 is not acceptable. NMED rejects DOE's position on the validity of the aquifer testing at R-70 because DOE failed to provide credible sources as requested to defend its position in their August Response to NMED's specific comments No. 6, Nos. 12 through 15, Nos. 17 and 18, No. 20 and Nos. 23 through 26.

In their independent third-party review, EPA stated that the findings from the drawdown curves in Appendix E were not reproducible using the provided data, and that DOE's justification for procedures used to conduct the aquifer test are "concerning." EPA concluded that NMED's concerns regarding the data used and DOE's reasoning behind their procedures need to be corrected prior to conducting additional tests and before using the results of future tests in groundwater modeling efforts. EPA also questioned DOE's decision to exclude the 24-hour test "late time data" from transmissivity estimations. In response to EPA's recommendations, NMED requires DOE to submit a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) that will serve as the basis for future aquifer testing workplans. The SOP will be reviewed for comment (but not approval) by NMED and EPA and their contractors prior to receiving a work plan to conduct the next aquifer test. Because testing duration, goals and conditions may vary by future aquifer tests, NMED requires a specific workplan for each aquifer test. In addition, NMED will require DOE to catalogue all model input that is based on information from similarly conducted tests as the R-70 aquifer test. This submittal will be the basis of editing the models to be based on sound input.

## Specific Comments:

## 1. Title Page

**NMED Comment:** Explain why "Monitoring" was struck from the Report title considering R-70 is intended to serve as a monitoring well. Restore the original title to the Report in a second revision.

## 2. Section 8.1 Well Development, page 10.

**DOE Statement:** Field parameter data are discussed in greater detail in Appendix B, and aquifer test data will be discussed in the assessment report for evaluation of conditions in the regional aquifer around well R-70, which is due to NMED no later than June 30, 2021.

**NMED Comment:** Use of the R-70 aquifer test data in the pending Assessment Report is not acceptable. NMED and DOE agreed during the Meeting to remove this information from the Report because the testing was not conducted properly in the field nor the data analyzed correctly (see general comment above). In NMED's August 4, 2020 email to DOE that approved a revised submittal date for the Assessment Report, NMED stated that if the R-70 aquifer testing results are to be used in the Assessment Report that the Comments must be resolved beforehand. Considering that the Comments have not been resolved and that it was mutually agreed to remove the testing from the Report, it should have been obvious to DOE that these data are also not valid for use in any other submittal. NMED requires DOE to submit another revision of the Report that does not include this statement and to not use and reference the R-70 aquifer tests in any manner in future reports.

## 3. Section 8.1.1 Well Development Field Parameters, page 11.

**DOE Statement**: In screen 2 the final parameters at the end of well development were pH of 8.13, temperature of 21.4oC, specific conductance of 290.4  $\mu$ S/cm, DO of 6.76 mg/L, ORP of 198.3 mV, and turbidity of 0.72 NTU. Table 8.1-2 shows field parameters measured during well development.

**NMED Comment:** In specific comment no. 2, NMED requested clarification of the discrepancy between the final parameters listed on page 11 and in Table 8.1-2. In the August Response, DOE stated that the text on page 11 was in error and will revise the Report accordingly. However, the text remains unchanged in the November 2020 Revised Report. If the text on page 11 is in error, it should have been deleted from the Revised Report, but was not deleted in the red line version or from the Revised Report. Resolve this discrepancy and issue the correction in another revision of the Report including a separate red line version.

# 4. Section 8.1.1, Well Development Field Parameters, page 11/Figure 8.3-1a – Installation and construction details for the R-70 sampling system, page 21.

- a. Based on the most recent Well Completion Details<sup>1,2</sup>, the following are missing and need to be included in the well completion details for R-70 (Figure 8.3-1a) in a second revision of the Report:
  - i. Pad
  - ii. Transducer sleeves and description
  - iii. Borehole diameter and description
  - iv. Pump location and description
  - v. Check valve location
  - vi. Pump column and description
  - vii. Casing string shoe locations
- b. Revise Figure 8.3-1a for to be similar to previous regional aquifer monitoring wells mentioned above. Figure 8.3-1a in the Revised Report lacks the graphical clarity and details and well completion information provided in other dual screen chromium monitoring wells (i.e., R-43 through R-45, R-50, R-61) and in the most recent monitoring well (R-69), which provide far better understanding of the well construction, completion and Baski sampler set up. NMED would like to emphasize to DOE the importance of well construction as-built diagrams as technical references in future decision making and public review. For instance, in the current

<sup>1</sup> Newport News Nuclear BWXT-Los Alamos, LLC, October 2019, Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-69, Revision 1 (EM2019-0335): Figure 8.3-1a Monitoring well R-69 as-built diagram with borehole lithology and technical well completion details.

<sup>2</sup> Los Alamos National Laboratory, September 2011, Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-61 (EP2011-0274), Figure 8.3-1a Monitoring well R-61 as-built diagram with borehole lithology and technical well completion details and Figure 7.2-1 Monitoring well R-61 as-built well construction diagram.

figure, the symbols for the surface seal and the bentonite appear in the background of the well casing area obscuring necessary details. Also, the transducer tubes and pump column for R-70 need to be drafted in a manner that is well-defined and clear like those of the other well completion details.

- c. Revise Figure 3.2-1 *Monitoring well R-70 as-built construction diagram and technical well completion details* to include well development, final parameter and well survey information like Figure 7.2-1 for R-61<sup>2</sup>.
- d. Correct the different pattern used for the top filter pack to be the same as the bottom filter pack, the legend and Figure 3.2-1, if both screens have the same 10/20 gradation filter pack. Likewise, correct the pattern for the transition sand to match with that shown in the legend and Figure 3.2-1.
- e. Correct "Filter Rack" to read "Filter Pack" in the diagram annotations and make the descriptions in the figure on page 21 match the descriptions provided in the text on page 11. Provide better quality assurance and quality control on this and all figures submitted to NMED.
- f. Label the features shown in the as-built well diagram within the lower filter pack below the "lower transducer screen" as requested. It is not clear what these features are and how they relate to the other dedicated well components. Please label these features and make the well completion details in the as-built diagram clearer and readily understandable as in the previous chromium group monitoring wells. Revise Figure 8.3-1b to include and explain these features.
- g. Indicate where the lower screen transducer tube port is in the well head plan view in the pending revision of this figure.
- 5. Section 8.2 Aquifer Testing, page 11.

**DOE Statement:** Applicable *R*-70 aquifer test results and analysis will be included in the assessment report for evaluation of conditions in the regional aquifer around well *R*-70, which is due to NMED no later than June 30, 2021.

**NMED Comment:** NMED requires DOE to remove this and all similar statements and subsection 8.2 from the second revision of the Report. See NMED's general comment and specific comment no. 1 above.

### 6. Section 10.0 Acknowledgements, page 13.

**DOE Statement:** David C. Schafer designed, implemented, and analyzed the aquifer tests.

**NMED Comment:** Remove the aquifer tests acknowledgement and all references to the aquifer tests from the second revision of the Report considering NMED and EPA have judged the tests to have been improperly conducted and the results to be unsuitable for hydraulic analyses.

The second revision of the Report is due within 60 days of receipt of this letter. NMED's May 7, 2020 Comments with DOE's draft August Response is included as Attachment 1 with this letter.

Mr. Duran Page 5 Mr. Duran Page 6

Should you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Christopher Krambis (505) 231-5423.

Sincerely,

Kevin M. Pierard, Chief Hazardous Waste Bureau

Cc with Attachment:

N. Dhawan, NMED HWB C. Krambis, NMED HWB M. Petersen, NMED HWB C. Catechis, NMED-DOE-0B M. Hunter, NMED GWQB S. Pullen, NMED GWQB P. Longmire, NMED GWQB S. Yanicak, NMED-DOE-OB L. King, US EPA Region 6 R. Ross, US EPA Groundwater Technical Support Center T. Burton, US EPA Region 6 STL R. Martinez, San Ildefonso Pueblo, NM D. Chavarria, Santa Clara Pueblo, NM C. Rodriguez, EM-LA H. Shen, EM-LA D. Katzman, N3B J. Murdock, N3B S. Veenis, N3B E. Day, N3B C. Maupin, N3B P. Maestas, N3B W. Alexander, N3B

File: LANL 2021 and Reading, Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70, Revision 1, November 2020 HWB-LANL-19-080 EXHIBIT 4



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE GROUNDWATER CHARACTERIZATION AND REMEDIATION DIVISION 919 KERR RESEARCH DRIVE • ADA, OK 74820

April 28, 2021

## MEMORANDUM

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT:Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM (21-RC06-01)<br/>Aquifer Test Procedures for R-70 Review and RecommendationsFROM:Jon J. Fields, Jr., Hydrologist<br/>Technical Support & Environmental Restoration Branch

Randall Ross, PhD Director, Groundwater Technical Support Center

TO: Scott Ellinger, Regional Groundwater Center Coordinator USEPA Region 6

Per your request for technical support, various documents describing site conditions and aquifer testing efforts have been reviewed by Dr. Bruce Pivetz (CSS, a subcontractor to Eastern Research Group which provided technical support to the Groundwater Technical Support Center through the STREAMS III Contract) and us. The review focused on an initial evaluation of *Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70* (Report) and *Response to the New Mexico Environment Department's Draft Comments on the Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70* (Report) and environment Department's Draft Comments on the Completion Report for Regional Aquifer Well R-70. December 2019, May 7, 2020 (Response) with an emphasis on evaluating the validity of the aquifer test (Test) procedures and results in Regional Aquifer Well R-70. The following comments and recommendations are provided for your consideration. If you would like to discuss these comments further, please do not hesitate to contact us at your convenience (Fields: 580-436-8630; and Ross: 580-436-8611).

1. The Report states numerous times that problems, errors, and inconsistencies occurred leading up to, and while conducting, the Test. As presented in the Report, the problems:

Pages E-1 to E-2: "An accurate determination of the zone-specific water levels was made difficult by several factors:

- The difference in water levels between the two screen zones was very small.
- The transducer output was abnormally "noisy" with data scatter often approaching a magnitude of 0.10 ft.
- A persistent leak through a defective coupling connection in the bottom joint of the 2-in. drop-pipe string continuously allowed drainage of drop-pipe water into the well, altering water levels slightly.

 Any time that packers are inflated or deflated, there is a substantial change in the tension to which the drop pipe is subjected. As a result, there can be slight physical movement of portions of the pipe string, which cause slight vertical movement of the attached transducers.

The combination of data scatter, drop-pipe leak, and changing tension in the drop pipe contributed to obscuring accurate data measurement. Three episodes of packer inflation/deflation produced inconsistent and contradictory measurements."

Page E-2: "Note that these measurements [water levels in Screen 1 and Screen 2] are contradictory."

Pages E-2 to E-3: "...the bottom joint of 2-in. drop pipe had a defective coupling that allowed drop-pipe water to leak continuously throughout testing. The primary effects of this were (1) interference with accurate water level measurements needed to determine the head difference between the two screen zones and (2) partially emptying the drop pipe before each of the 24-hr tests.

The empty drop pipe meant that when the 24-hr tests were started, the pump operated against reduced head and therefore produced a greater discharge rate initially (for a minute or two). As the drop pipe filled, the flow rate gradually declined to the steady-state rate. This had the effect of skewing the early drawdown data and complicating the analysis."

Page E-3: "During the 24-hr test, the on-site generator failed on three occasions, shutting down the pump on May 26 for 5 min at 2:28 p.m. and 1 min at 4:46 p.m. and on May 27 for 2 min at 6:54 a.m. Each time, generator and pump operation were restored promptly, so the shutdowns had negligible effect on the test results."

Page E-9 "The analysis also requires assigning a value for the saturated aquifer thickness, b. This parameter is not well known but has been estimated at about 160 ft, on average, in Mortandad Canyon..."

Page E-11 "Examining the hydrographs showed a difference in data scatter from the left half of the figures to the right half. The data on the left were recorded with the transducer located between the inflatable packers to monitor the pumped interval (screen 1) while it was being pumped. The data on the right were measured with the transducer located above the upper packer to monitor screen 1 while screen 2 was being pumped. Ostensibly, the two transducers were identical but the magnitude of data scatter shown on the left was greater than normally seen from these instruments. There was no obvious explanation for the unusual output other than the transducer may have been slightly defective."

Page E-12 "... The data showed substantial scatter (nearly 1 ft) unrelated to actual waterlevel changes—in excess of any such response previously observed in test pumping the R- wells at LANL. The erratic transducer response likely was caused by mechanical noise and vibration associated with pump operation.

While the explanation for the observed response is not known, it is possible that it may result from running the pump off vertical. In vertical wells, the pump shroud may rest lightly against one side of the well casing, but the pump probably hangs away from the inner wall of the shroud. In angled wells, however, the pump shroud lies tightly against the well casing and the pump, in turn, may rest directly on the inner surface of the shroud. It is possible that this configuration could induce more vibration than would the vertical orientation."

Page E-12 "When pumping started, most of the drop pipe was empty, having leaked overnight through the defective coupling on the bottom joint of 2-in. stainless-steel pipe."

Page E-12 "The transmissivity value determined from the initial slope was 16,700 gpd/ft. There was minimal confidence in the accuracy of this value because of the unknown discharge rate and the fact that the rate steadily declined during pumping."

Page E-13 "Note that there can be some uncertainty in the results obtained from the Neuman solution because of the great number of unknowns—(1) aquifer thickness, (2) transmissivity, (3) vertical hydraulic conductivity, (4) elastic storage, and (5) specific yield. With so many unknowns, it is possible to find a range of solutions to the problem."

Page E-14 "The data showed the anomalous response caused by drainage of a portion of the drop pipe before the test. The three episodes of generator failure are clearly seen in the data plot as well."

Page E-14 "The transmissivity value determined from the line of fit shown on the graph was 51,300 gpd/ft, corresponding to an upper-bound hydraulic conductivity value of 2500 gpd/ft2, or 335 ft/day. These parameter values were considered unreliable because of the variable discharge rate that resulted from starting the test with a partially empty drop pipe."

Page E-14 "An alternate explanation for this response was a steady and gradual permeability reduction adjacent to the wellbore. Such an occurrence could result from a gradual accumulation of air bubbles in the formation pore spaces. Many of the R-wells at LANL have shown the presence of air in the formation, presumably injected there during air drilling operations."

Page E-14 "Figure E-8.4-3 shows recovery data recorded for 1440 min following cessation of the 24-hr pumping test on screen 2. The very early data on the plot showed an unusual response that had the appearance of a storage effect."

Pages E-16 to E-17 "2. The transducer data showed substantial "noise," or data scatter. This may have been caused by mechanical vibration associated with operating the

pump/shroud resting tightly against the casing. One transducer in particular showed more variation in output than the others and may have been defective in that regard.

3. A leak in the 2-in. stainless-steel drop pipe allowed drainage of the pipe during nonpumping periods and contributed to invalidating the early pumping data from the 24-hr tests by allowing large discharge rate variations.

4. Anomalous responses at screen 2 suggested the possibility that air in the aquifer accumulated in the pores near the wellbore during pumping, reducing the permeability of the sediments near the well and altering the magnitude of the drawdown observed.

5. Because of unconfined aquifer conditions, most of the drawdown and recovery data were largely unanalyzable, reflecting the complex simultaneous effects of delayed yield and vertical expansion of the cone of depression throughout testing..."

Page E-17 "An accurate determination of the relative heads in the two zones was hampered by (1) the noisy transducer output, (2) the persistent drop-pipe leak, and (3) slight movement of the transducers in response to changing tension in the drop pipe when inflating and/or deflating the packers."

- 2. The findings from the drawdown curves in Appendix E were not able to be reproduced from data provided in the Report. The justification for procedures used to conduct the Test in Regional Aquifer Well R-70 are concerning. Many of the questions raised regarding applicable data used for the Test and the facility's reasoning behind the procedures, questions which are the same as those raised by New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED) in the Response, should be addressed before conducting another Test or evaluating the Test data for use in modeling.
- 3. The Report focuses on the use of early-time data, however, the data collected during that time coincided with errors and problems during the Test. The data from the 24-hour pump test was excluded from the estimation of transmissivity for Screen 1 as a result of "anomalous values obtained" (page E-15). Instead, data collected outside of this 24-hour pump test (i.e. trial periods) were used to estimate transmissivity. Similarly, data from the 24-hour pump test was excluded from the estimation of transmissivity for Screen 2, without explanation. Because of this the aquifer test should be reconducted. It is recommended that the initial evaluation be of early recovery data as opposed to the early pumping data.
- 4. As stated elsewhere in this memorandum, the transducer data were noisy and scattered. The Report states nonvented pressure transducers were utilized during the Test. Although most current transducers regularly produce high barometric efficiencies, one would expect lower than demonstrated efficiencies considering the noise and data scatter of a nonvented pressure transducer. It is recommended to use vented pressure transducers for aquifer tests as it reduces chances for error.

5. There were unexplained significant discrepancies in the water quality parameter data during the well development through the pump tests (especially for over three hours during the development of Screen 2), as noted in the NMED comments in the Response. That these discrepancies occurred in the first place and were not noticed during field testing is very troubling. The Response indicated that "*The abnormal specific conductivity and temperature readings noted in Table 8.1-2 are clearly erroneous and most likely caused by lack of groundwater moving through the flow-through cell of the meter used to collect parameters.*" Not noticing that water is not flowing through the meter's flow-through cell shows technical carelessness. Not noticing the anomalous data in the data table, or not attempting to explain it, is similarly careless.

cc: Terry Burton, Region 6 STL

EXHIBIT 5

#### **General Comments:**

- 1. DOE states their goal for the aquifer testing is to collect data "...from the pumped screen at an early time [to provide] an excellent snapshot of the hydraulic response immediately around the well and makes it possible to obtain a reliable estimate of the hydraulic conductivity of the screened interval." The most reliable and frequently used method to accomplish DOE's goal is to perform a series of falling head and rising head "slug" test because early time pumping is wrought with too many physical issues to be usable and are routinely discarded in practice. A standard operating procedure for rising head and falling head slug testing, better known simply as slug testing, should be submitted to NMED for review and comment. In standard practice and in accordance with the Order of Consent, monitoring wells are designed with screens 5 to 10 feet long (20 feet in the case of a fluctuating water table) to monitor groundwater quality and levels, not to serve as pumping test wells. As such the hydraulic testing of formation properties at monitoring wells is best performed using slug tests and/or step drawdown tests. DOE's concept of early time analysis is seriously flawed and needs to be discarded in favor of slug testing, or step drawdown testing. Additionally, in areas where the groundwater is contaminated, slug testing offers a cost effective method where no investigative derived waste is generated.
- 2. For the chromium plume corrective measures, NMED will require an actual aquifer test be performed using a specially designed extraction well (that may be repurposed for remediation) that will fully penetrate the chromium plume thickness in the regional aquifer and be designed to yield in the hundreds of gallons per minute. Responses to this pumping will be monitored at multiple monitoring wells. Results of the test will provide a basis to develop the ongoing groundwater flow model development to aid in the design of a pump and treat final remedy. As such, the ineffective pumping tests currently conducted by DOE should be reconsidered in favor of slug and/or step drawdown testing.
- 3. DOE should either adapt or use common industry standard operating procedures for conducting and analyzing aquifer tests and slug tests. Some examples include:
  - a. USEPA, 1993. Suggested operating procedures for aquifer pumping tests (EPA/540/S-93/503), Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, Ada, Oklahoma, 23p.
  - b. USBR, 1995. Ground Water Manual, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D.C., 661p.
  - c. Kruseman, G.P. and N.A. de Ridder, 1994. Analysis and Evaluation of Pumping Test Data (2nd ed.), Publication 47, Intern. Inst. for Land Reclamation and Improvement, Wageningen, The Netherlands, 370p.
  - d. ASTM D4043 Standard Guide for Selection of Aquifer Test Method in Determining Hydraulic Properties by Well Techniques.
  - e. The California Environmental Protection Agency, 1995, Aquifer Testing for Hydrogeologic Characterization, 28p.
- 4. In the introduction, DOE describes that the geology at LANL is unique compared to most other environmental sites around the country because of the great depths of the investigation, the more complex hydrogeologic setting and highly heterogeneous sediments complicate aquifer test data. However, the hydrogeologic setting is not unique compared to most environmental

sites, specifically those in karstic and fractured bedrock systems that are prevalent around the country. Also, all the Coastal Plain deposits along the eastern seaboard and the Gulf Coastal areas of the country are just as heterogenous, anisotropic and complex hydrogeologically as anything at LANL. NMED does not recognize DOE's claim that the site is unique to a point that aquifer test data must be collected only by the means they proposed herein.

#### Specific Comments

#### Section 2.0 General Approach, page 2

1. DOE Statement: "Constant-rate testing will be used to obtain an analyzable data set."

**NMED Comment:** Describe DOE's understanding of what constitutes "constant-rate testing", where DOE derived its understanding of what constitutes "constant-rate testing", and how DOE intends to accomplish this type of testing that differs from the test submitted with the R-70 monitoring well completion report. What DOE has provided for aquifer test guidance is not an industry standard approach to aquifer testing using the constant-rate method. NMED strongly urges DOE adopt the EPA guidance for its constant rate testing standard operating procedure (see NMED general comment number 3).

2. DOE Statement: "Data will be recorded throughout the test in the pumped well (both screens in dual-screen wells) and any nearby monitoring wells close enough to be used as observation wells, including existing monitoring wells and piezometers likely to be hydraulically connected to the pumped well, whenever they are available."

**NMED Comment:** Explain in detail what DOE means by other "*monitoring wells and piezometers likely to be hydraulically connected to the pumped well*" and how DOE will determine this before the testing. This statement appears to suggest that wells are not in hydraulic connection to the pumped well. Is DOE referring to the monitoring wells installed in the intermediate perched and alluvial aquifers? Or that DOE believes not all regional aquifer monitoring wells are hydraulically connected despite all being in the same aquifer? Clarify this statement and defend your position with site-specific data.

**3. DOE Statement:** *"For the duration of the testing effort, the data collection frequency in the observation wells will be increased from the standard 2-hr readings that are normally collected to a frequency sufficient to enable analysis and modeling of the transient response."* 

NMED Comment: DOE should use the standard data collection frequency provided below:

Maximum Recommended Time Intervals for Aquifer Test Water Level MeasurementsTime since pumping startedTime intervals0 to 5 minutesevery 30 seconds5 to 15 minutesevery 1 minute15 to 60 minutesevery 5 minutes60 to 120 minutesevery 10 minutes2 hours to 5 hoursevery 1 hour

**4. DOE Statement:** "It is important to remove the effects of barometric pressure changes on the water levels measured at the site."

**NMED Comment:** For all phases of each test, the use of "vented" cable pressure transducers with dataloggers that record gauge pressure is strongly recommended to eliminate influences on the water level in the wells from barometric pressure changes.

5. DOE Statement: "The existing monitoring wells in the area are equipped with vented pressure transducers. Because the aquifer is highly barometrically efficient, the resulting hydrographs from these wells have large barometrically induced water-level fluctuations, likely several times greater than the drawdown at these distant locations that will be induced by test pumping. This highlights the importance of establishing an accurate data correction protocol to remove the barometric noise."

NMED Comment: Based on discussions with DOE in the past, the existing monitoring wells in the chromium group are not equipped with vented pressure transducers, but with non-vented pressure transducers that collect absolute, not gauge, pressures. Clarify this statement.

The regional aquifer is not barometrically efficient. Both DOE and NMED came to a mutual understanding in February 2021, upon which DOE's February 2021 comment response EM2021-0119 (Supplement to EM2020-0392) is based, that it is the water level within well bore that is highly sensitive to barometric effects, not the water table in the aquifer itself (i.e., outside of the well bore). The best way to eliminate the effects of barometric pressure changes within the well bore during an aquifer test is to use vented cable pressure transducers that are designed to recorded only gauge pressure, not absolute pressure (see NMED specific comment number 4).

6. DOE Statement: "The screen(s) in the pumped well will be monitored using In-Situ Level TROLL 700 non-vented pressure transducers(s) or equivalent and will likely need little or no correction for barometric pressure effects, particularly those zones that are nearly 100 percent barometrically efficient. ... Barometric pressure will be monitored using a 30-psi In-Situ Level TROLL 700 non-vented pressure transducer or equivalent maintained on-site throughout the testing."

**NMED Comment:** These statements are confusing. If DOE intends on using non-vented In-Situ Level TROLL 700 pressure transducers, barometric compensation will be required. Additionally, if DOE intends to monitor barometric pressure changes, appropriate equipment must be used. The In-Situ Level TROLL 700 non-vented pressure transducer does not measure barometric pressure. Please consult with In-situ for the proper barometric recording device. Again, please refer to NMED specific comments 4 and 5 for the best approach for barometric compensation.

7. DOE Statement: "During testing, water purged from the well will be stored in tanks on-site pending proper disposition. Water handling methods will be determined on a case-by-case basis for each well."

**NMED Comment:** DOE is required to work with NMED Ground Water Quality Bureau to determine proper disposition of the IDW generated from the testing.

#### Section 3.2 Casing Storage, pages 3 and 4

8. DOE Statement: "In ordinary pumping tests, casing storage effects limit the usefulness of early pumping and recovery data. When pumping starts, the casing begins to dewater, contributing to the discharge rate of the pump. As time goes on, casing contribution lessens and, therefore, aquifer contribution gradually increases asymptotically, resulting in a complex variable discharge rate. Recovery data are affected similarly as the casing refills following pump shutoff—rapidly at first and more slowly over time.

The time it takes for the casing storage effect to subside is significant. For example, when a typical 5-in. monitoring well at the Laboratory is pumping 5 gallons per minute (gpm) with 10 ft of drawdown, the casing storage effect can persist for as long as 20 min. Often, by the time storage effects can be ignored, the zone of influence has already expanded through a substantial and unknown thickness of the aquifer, hindering the ability to analyze the early drawdown response and early partial penetration effects.

To eliminate this casing storage effect and to prevent drainage, pumping tests will be performed with an inflatable packer above the pump to seal inside the casing between the water level and the top of the screen. In single-screen wells, a single packer will be used above the pump. In dualscreen wells, the upper screen test will incorporate two packers, one above the screen to eliminate storage effects, and one below it to isolate it from the lower screen. The lower screen test will require a packer above the screen to isolate it from the upper screen."

**NMED Comment:** DOE's method does not eliminate the wellbore storage effects because there is still a significant volume of water in the screened section of the wellbore and in the filter pack between the packers plus the volume of water in the pump drop pipe. Additionally, the initial pumping time in a pumping well is wrought with numerous other issues besides storage effects (e.g., head losses due to well inefficiencies, friction and turbulent flow, and frequent pumping rate adjustments) that preclude use of the initial "early time" drawdown data using standard analysis methods. Common practice and understanding of aquifer tests aim to use the drawdown and recovery data from observation wells and, if no other data is available, recovery data from the pumping well.

It should be noted that in a true aquifer test, the expansion of the cone of depression to the point where observation wells record pumping responses is desired, not to be avoided. Additionally, DOE's statement that the "zone of influence" expands through a substantial and unknown thickness in the aquifer is unsubstantiated. NMED's mapping of the water table surface and heads in the deeper screened zones of the dual screened monitoring wells in the chromium interim measures area shows that there is no discernable movement of groundwater at depth in the regional aquifer in response to pumping higher in the stratigraphic sequence at rates of 50 to 100 gallons per minute. This means that at rates DOE typically employs in its pumping tests, which are an order of magnitude less than the interim measures extraction, will most certainly not cause the zone of influence to expand vertically. DOE must abandon its false understanding that "early time" data is the only meaningful data for use in aquifer testing and adopt the derivative analysis to determine the exact data to use in each analysis.

9. DOE Statement: "Storage effects can also be caused by inadvertently entraining air in the filter pack. This can occur if the pumping water level in the well is drawn below the top of the well screen at any time. If this happens, water in the filter pack above the top of the screen will drain, allowing air to become trapped outside the blank casing just above the screen. When test pumping begins, the trapped air expands in response to pressure reduction. Likewise, when pumping stops, the trapped air compresses as water levels recover. Even when an inflatable packer is used, the change in volume associated with air expansion and compression has the same storage effect as draining a similar volume of water from the well casing in a test conducted with no packer.

Because of this, care must be taken during both well development and test pumping to avoid pulling the pumping water level into the well screen at any time, as described in section 3.3.

There is one other subtle storage effect that can occur in the pumping tests. Most of the aquifer tests at the Laboratory have shown ample gas content in the pumped water—either naturally occurring or possibly an artifact of drilling with compressed air. This gas/air can accumulate near the well bore, or even inside the well where it can be trapped beneath the inflatable packer. Similar to trapped air in the filter pack, this accumulated gas can expand and contract during initial pumping and recovery, creating a small storage effect. There is little that can be done to overcome this problem. One option may be to deflate and reinflate the packer a short time before the pumping test to release any air that might be trapped just below the packer. However, this can introduce some noise in the data set and, in dual-screen wells, can allow unwanted crossflow to occur, also inducing transient fluctuations in groundwater heads."

**NMED Comment:** DOE's description of other storage effects issues provides a case to discard the initial pumping data from the pumping for well hydraulics analysis. NMED instructs DOE to not use the "early time" data from pumping wells to evaluate aquifer parameters, and to adopt the derivative analysis to determine what portion of the data from nearby observation wells are suitable for use (see NMED specific comment number 8). Slug tests are to be used for simple, quick, and effective method to derive values of hydraulic conductivity of the formation immediately around the well screen.

Provide credible peer-reviewed research that substantiates DOE's claim of air entrapment in the aquifer, its effects on pumping tests and how long this trapped air persists in the aquifer following entrainment. Provide the gas data following each test to substantiate this claim and explain why this is not an issue elsewhere.

#### Section 3.3 Pumping Rate Selection and Initial Start-Up, page 4

**10. DOE Statement:** "The discharge rate will be controlled via a valve in the discharge line at the surface to prevent exaggerated drawdown. However, when the pump is first installed and started up, the valve will have no effect as the drop pipe begins to fill. Furthermore, because the pump operates initially against minimal head when the drop pipe is empty, the discharge rate on start-up is substantially greater than the nominal capacity of the pump. The combination of a greater start-up pumping rate and the inability to control it risks dewatering the well screen and filter pack depending on the pump specifications, yield characteristics of the aquifer, and

available drawdown. Therefore, special care must be taken to avoid any possibility of dewatering the screen."

**NMED Comment:** Explain what "exaggerated drawdown" is and how it differs from head losses in a pumping well from other phenomena at pump start up (see NMED specific comment number 8).

DOE's description of pump operation needs explanation. The pump does not operate against minimal head when the drop pipe is empty. Pump curves describe the discharge rate as a function of the water levels in the well not the drop pipe, and minimal head occurs when the initial static water level in the well is at an equivalent level as the discharge, such as the case of an artesian well. In the case of the regional aquifer, the initial head the pump must lift water to the surface is on the order of 1000 feet. As the water level in the pumping well drops from the initial static to the lowered pumping levels, the pump loses efficiency, and the pumping rate slows down in accordance with the pump curve. NMED will provide DOE with a proper understanding of well hydraulics and the use of pump curves in a technical team meeting to be scheduled.

### Section 3.5 Data Collection Protocol, page 5

**11. DOE Statement:** "In general, water levels in the pumped screen will be recorded at high frequency during pump start-up and pump shut-off, and at a lesser frequency for the balance of the time. The Level TROLL 700 non-vented pressure transducer allows the option of assigning multiple data collection frequencies. Collecting dense data from the pumped screen at an early time provides an excellent snapshot of the hydraulic response immediately around the well and makes it possible to obtain a reliable estimate of the hydraulic conductivity of the screened interval. Subsequent data are typically recorded at 1-min intervals.

The measurement frequencies for the non-pumped screen in a dual-screen well do not need to be as great as for the pumped screen.

Distant observation wells will be monitored at a constant interval matching that of the on-site barometric pressure transducer. The appropriate time interval will be selected based on distances to the relevant observation wells and anticipated hydraulic response."

**NMED Comment:** See NMED specific comments number 4 through 6 regarding water level data acquisition frequencies and the use of vented, not non-vented, pressure transducers to eliminate barometric compensation needs.

Early time pumping data do not provide excellent snapshot of hydraulic response immediately around the well screen nor does it provide any information on hydraulic conductivity of the screened interval (see NMED specific comment number 8). Slug tests are the accepted method to provide reliable and accurate information of formation hydraulic conductivity immediately around the well screen. NMED will consider information from properly conducted and analyzed slug tests to quantify formation hydraulic conductivity immediately around the well screen. However, NMED requires DOE provide a separate standard operating procedure for slug testing and analysis for NMED and EPA review and comment before DOE can base work plans from the procedure (see NMED general comment number 3).

#### Section 4.4 Brief Pumping, page 6.

**12. DOE Statement:** "At this early time, the height of the zone of influence may be assumed to approximate the well-screen length, thus providing an opportunity to accurately estimate the hydraulic conductivity and transmissivity of the screened interval. This type of pumping provides excellent data/information for minimal effort and should not be bypassed."

**NMED Comment:** DOE's assumption is unfounded and appears to be based on a misapplication of the theoretical concepts developed to mathematically describe flow to a pumping well that assumes the well to be infinitely thin (to avoid issues of wellbore storage and head losses from well inefficiency), and flow to be radial, laminar, and horizontal through homogenous and isotropic granular material. However, this is not reality. Once a pump is turned on, the flow is from wellbore storage, not the aquifer despite DOE's use of packers to section off the screen from other wellbore storage. In the case of virtually all of DOE's monitoring wells, which are 5-to 8-inch inside diameter, there remains substantial volume between the packers in the well bore and the filter pack plus the two-inch inside diameter pump drop pipe considering the typical 1,000 feet to the surface, if filled. Using typical monitoring well test set up dimensions, this volume is typically about 350 gallons or more. At typical pumping rates employed by DOE during their aquifer tests, this volume can take a long time to be purged so that flow from the aquifer is established.

In a pumped well, wellbore storage has a distinct bell shaped signature at early time on a log-log plot. Based on DOE's latest aquifer test at monitoring well R-70, the early time pumping data was analyzed using the simplistic Cooper-Jacob straight line method applied to the first several seconds of drawdown data. Such an analysis does not represent the aquifer hydraulic conductivity, nor does it provide any flow regime diagnostics like the derivative analysis provides. Hence, it is too simplistic for use in the early timeframe. Until the flow stabilizes and the change in drawdown becomes constant, common mathematical solutions cannot be applied to this early period of flow. DOE must perform diagnostics, such as the derivative analysis to confirm a radial flow regime that is from the aquifer and not wellbore storage to apply the straight line method to the drawdown data. In longer screens that span multiple preferential flow zones, flow is not equal along the entire screen but mostly from the highest transmissive layers. This also negates DOE's assumption.

The brief pumping trial tests should be bypassed and either a properly conducted step test conducted for the single well pumping test or for DOE to adopt slug testing. If DOE choses to perform a step test as a pretest, it must submit a separate standard operating procedure for this test method and analysis. Otherwise, DOE should perform slug testing to determine the hydraulic conductivity of the formation immediately around the well screen (see NMED's general comment number 3).

**13.** DOE Statement: "Theoretically, the extended test can provide the same type of information as the brief test. However, the very early pumping and recovery data from the extended test are often compromised. For example, during cold weather, the drop pipe must be drained overnight to prevent freezing. As a result, the pump starts up against one head condition and then encounters a different head condition once the discharge water refills the pipe and reaches the

control valve. Also, because of the high gas content in the pumped water in most wells at the Laboratory, during the extended test gas can accumulate in the formation pores or within the well itself and create a storage type of effect that can compromise the very early recovery data. The brief tests provide (1) redundancy that improves the capture of very early pumping and recovery data and (2) forensic information that can be used to assess possible causes of anomalies that may be seen in the early data from the extended test."

**NMED Comment:** Provide explicit details how exactly early pumping data obtained from an extended test can be compromised compared to the data obtained during brief tests. Provide credible peer-reviewed publications to support this assertion.

Pumping with or without a full drop pipe has no impact on the head that the pump must overcome to get water to the discharge valve because the head shown in pump curves has nothing to do with the water level in the drop pipe but is the distance between the water level in the well and the discharge valve (see NMED specific comment number 10). However, friction losses from the drop pipe does affect pump efficiency.

See NMED specific comment number 9 concerning DOE's claim of entrained air and gas at LANL and explain in detail exactly how extended pumping creates more air and accumulates more gas in the formation pores compared to the brief pumping tests. DOE's description of this problem may be attributed to pump cavitation. Pump cavitation can result when a low-yielding monitoring well is used as the aquifer test pumping well because monitoring wells are not designed for high yields. Again, DOE's argument against extended pumping tests supports discarding early pumping data.

#### Section 5.0 Equipment Requirements, page 8.

**14. DOE's Statement:** "If the Level TROLL 700 is chosen to monitor barometric pressure, it must be a 30-psi unit."

NMED Comment: See NMED specific comment number 6.

#### Section 6.0 Analytical Methods, page 9.

**15. DOE's Statement:** "Second, an appropriate analytical solution must be selected and applied to the drawdown data."

NMED Comment: Describe DOE's selection method.

#### Section 6.1 Data Pre-Processing

**16. DOE Statement:** "Observation wells that may be incorporated in the aquifer tests are generally monitored using vented transducers and, therefore, yield hydrographs with large background fluctuations that must be filtered out before analysis."

NMED Comment: This statement makes little sense. See NMED specific comment number 5.

#### Section 6.2 Importance of Early Data, page 9 and 10

**17. DOE Statement:** "In most instances, the use of packers has been highly successful in eliminating storage effects so that the early data can be analyzed."

**NMED Comment:** DOE has provided no evidence to support this statement. The packers are often set far enough apart that a large volume of stored water exists in the wellbore, screen and filter pack that will affect the usability of the early time drawdown data (see NMED specific comment number 8 and 12). Furthermore, the stored water in the two-inch inside diameter pump drop pipe (estimated to be 163 gallons at a 1,000 foot length) will also invalidate the early time drawdown data. Additionally, as stated repeatedly by NMED, there are numerous other physical issues that invalidate use of all early time drawdown data that DOE is not considering (See NMED comment number 8 and NMED's May 7, 2020, draft comment letter regarding the aquifer test for monitoring well R-70 and NMED comment number 12). Consequently, DOE's stressing of the importance of early data is not well founded nor acceptable to NMED. Please consult the attached guidance for proper aquifer testing protocol (see NMED general comment number 3 and specific comment number 1).

**18. DOE Statement:** "Because of this, even when inflatable packers are used, a careful analysis, including comparison of multiple pumping and recovery events for consistency, must be conducted to try to detect when this storage type effect has occurred so that only valid data are used to support determination of aquifer properties."

**NMED Comment:** see NMED specific comment number 12 for proper diagnostics of wellbore storage.

#### Section 6.3 Summary of Analytical Methods, page 11.

**19. DOE Statement:** "At early time, the expanding cone of depression is known to have a height roughly equal to the well screen length and, thus, the very early data may usually be analyzed using the Theis equation using an aquifer thickness equal to the screen length."

**NMED Comment:** Provide credible peer reviewed research that supports this statement and belief (see NMED general comment number 1 and specific comment number 8, 9, 11, 12 and others on this issue.) In applying the Theis curve-fitting method, and consequently all curve-fitting methods, early data may not closely represent the theoretical drawdown equation on which the type curve is based.

**20. DOE Statement:** "Other limitations at the Laboratory site are that the Theis equation is not applicable to the very early data from observation wells and can only be used to estimate transmissivity and hydraulic conductivity, and not storage coefficient."

**NMED Comment:** This statement is very inaccurate. DOE has shown a true lack of understanding of the Theis equation. It is the other way around – the Theis equation is more applicable to drawdown data collected from more distant observation points than from the pumping well itself. This is due to the argument of the well function, u, where the initial time can be derived for application of the straight line method. The Theis type curves are for use in observation wells and most certainly provides values of strorativity. Aquifer storativity derived from a single well pumping test is commonly discarded, because of the lack of a distant observation point, hence the data do not provide reliable aquifer properties.

**21. DOE Statement:** "For the pumped well, r is small (equal to the borehole radius) and therefore the computed threshold time limitation is minimal. In other words, the Cooper-Jacob equation usually is valid for very early times in the pumped well. Conversely, at great distances, the computed threshold time is large and can invalidate the use of the Cooper-Jacob equation for much or all of the observation well data."

**NMED Comment:** The term "r" in the Theis equation is the distance from the pumping well to the observation well, not the pumping well borehole radius. However, in practice where only a single well test is conducted, many practitioners do assume this in lieu of the intended distance to the observation data. However, for this condition to be valid early time data cannot be used.

DOE's assertion that the Cooper-Jacob straight line approximation is valid for early time drawdown data from a pumping well is false. The argument of the well function  $u = r^2S/4Tt$ . This term is used to evaluate whether the error in the Cooper-Jacob straight line method is small enough to accurately approximate the Theis solution and is commonly accepted to be less than 0.01. As can be seen, if  $u \le 0.01$ , the approximation becomes valid only if the time since pumping began, t is large when the data being analyzed is from a location of very small r. In other words, if one wishes to analyze early time data, r must be large and cannot be from the pumping well or a very close observation point.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE GROUNDWATER CHARACTERIZATION AND REMEDIATION DIVISION 919 KERR RESEARCH DRIVE • ADA, OK 74820

October 15, 2021

## **MEMORANDUM**

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

- SUBJECT: Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, NM (22-R01-02) Aquifer Testing Guidance for the Los Alamos National Laboratory Site
- FROM: Jon J. Fields, Jr., Hydrologist Technical Support & Environmental Restoration Branch
- TO: Scott Ellinger USEPA Region 6

Per your request for technical support, various documents describing site conditions and aquifer testing efforts have been reviewed by Dr. Milovan Beljin (CSS, a subcontractor to ERG, a STREAMSIII technical support contract) and me. The review focused on an initial evaluation of *Aquifer Testing Guidance for the Los Alamos National Laboratory* [LANL] *Site* (Letter) and New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) comments with an emphasis on evaluating the validity of the proposed aquifer test methods. The following comments and recommendations are provided for your consideration. If you would like to discuss them, please do not hesitate to contact us at your convenience (Fields: 580-436-8630).

- 1. NMED General Comment 1: early time data.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED's suggestion with the use of slug tests to capture a snapshot of the hydraulic response.
  - b. EPA concurs with NMED that DOE's concept of early time analysis is flawed. There are several misunderstandings and contradictions throughout the Letter.
- 2. NMED General Comment 2: chromium plume aquifer test.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED.
  - b. It is suggested that an analytical model be run using expected ranges of aquifer parameters to estimate the radius of influence of the pumping well and compared to distances of proposed monitoring wells.
- 3. NMED General Comment 3: use of standard operating procedures.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED that DOE should use common industry standard operating procedures for conducting aquifer and slug tests.
  - b. Please see USEPA, 1993. Suggested operating procedures for aquifer pumping tests (EPA/540/S-93/503), Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, Ada, Oklahoma, 23p. for more information, and

- c. <u>The Design, Performance, and Analysis of Slug Tests</u>, Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, 252 pp., 1998, by James J. Butler, Jr.
- 4. NMED General Comment 4: unique geology at LANL.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED.
- 5. NMED Specific Comment 1: pumping rate.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED.
  - b. Please see USEPA, 1993. Suggested operating procedures for aquifer pumping tests (EPA/540/S-93/503), Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, Ada, Oklahoma, 23p. for more information.
- 6. NMED Specific Comment 2: monitoring wells and piezometers.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED that wells and piezometers should be determined before testing. DOE should have estimates for hydraulic conductivity (K) and storativity (s) to inform DOE of which wells and piezometers to monitor for each test.
- 7. NMED Specific Comment 3: data collection frequency.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED.
  - b. Please see USEPA, 1993. Suggested operating procedures for aquifer pumping tests (EPA/540/S-93/503), Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, Ada, Oklahoma, 23p. for more information.
- 8. NMED Specific Comments 4-6: pressure transducers.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED regarding vented and non-vented pressure transducers.
  - b. Please see USEPA, 1993. Suggested operating procedures for aquifer pumping tests (EPA/540/S-93/503), Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, Ada, Oklahoma, 23p. for more information.
- 9. NMED Specific Comment 7: purged water handling.
  - a. Please see USEPA, 1993. Suggested operating procedures for aquifer pumping tests (EPA/540/S-93/503), Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, Ada, Oklahoma, 23p. for information regarding water handling methods. EPA defers to NMED for state regulations on managing investigation derived wastes (IDW).
- 10. NMED Specific Comments 8 and 9: well storage effects and early time data.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED. The Letter demonstrates a lack of understanding regarding aquifer tests and use of the resulting data.
  - b. Please see USEPA, 1993. Suggested operating procedures for aquifer pumping tests (EPA/540/S-93/503), Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, Ada, Oklahoma, 23p. for more information.
- 11. NMED Specific Comment 10: pumping rate selection.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED.

- b. A properly conducted step drawdown test will yield an optimal pumping rate to prevent dewatering of the screen. The first step has the lowest flow rate which is then gradually increased until the specific drawdown curve is non-linear. The expected rate is usually divided into 3 to 5 steps of equal duration, typically 2 hours.
- 12. NMED Specific Comment 11: data collection.
  - a. Please refer to Comment 7 above.
- 13. NMED Specific Comments 12 and 13: brief and extending pumping.a. Please refer to Comment 10 above.
- 14. NMED Specific Comment 14: pressure transducer.
  - a. Please refer to Comment 8 above.
- 15. NMED Specific Comments 15-21: analytical methods.
  - a. EPA concurs with NMED. Please see Comment 10 above.
- 16. Other comments:
  - a. Equal attention should be given to recovery data.
  - b. The table of recommended wells to be used as observation wels should include screen depths.
  - c. The pumping rate of the existing production well must be documented during the pumping and recovery periods of the test.
- cc: Terry Burton, Region 6 STL Gregory Lyssy, Region 6 Vince Malott, Region 6 David Bartenfelder, HQ Cynthia Frickle, HQ Edward Gilbert, HQ David Gwisdalla, ETSC Director