A STUDY OF SOIL MATRIC
POTENTIAL AND TEMPERATURE
IN HANFORD SOILS

Battelle

Pacific Northwest Laboratories
Richland, Washington 99352

1973

Prepared for the U.S. Atomic Energy
Commission under Contract AT(45-1):1830

NOTICE

The report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST LABORATORY
operated by
BATTELLE
for the
U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
Under Contract AT(45-1)-1830

Printed in the United States of America
Available from
National Technical Information Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22151
Price: Printed Copy \$5.45; Microfiche \$1.45

A STUDY OF SOIL WATER
POTENTIAL AND TEMPERATURE IN HANFORD SOILS

by

J. J. C. Hsieh
A. E. Reisenauer
L. E. Brownell*

Water and Land Resources Department
*Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company

1973

This report is based on work sponsored by the
Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company under United
States Atomic Energy Commission Contract AT(45-1)-2130

BATTELLE
PACIFIC NORTHWEST LABORATORIES
RICHLAND, WASHINGTON 99352

SUMMARY

This document describes in detail the construction and installation of a string of thermocouple psychrometers and diode temperature transducers in the soil between the soil surface and the groundwater table on the Hanford Reservation. The results of fifteen months of data gathering from these instruments indicate that moisture movement in the soil profile, if any, is extremely small.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY	iii
FIGURES	vi
TABLES.	vi
INTRODUCTION.	1
CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA	3
INSTRUMENTED CABLE INSTALLATION	6
Assembly of the Instrumented Cable	6
Installation of the Instrumented Cable	8
DATA ANALYSIS	9
Soil Moisture.	14
Temperature Measurements	17
CONCLUSIONS	21
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	23
APPENDIX A - BASIC SOIL WATER RELATIONSHIPS	A-1
APPENDIX B - MATRIC POTENTIAL VERSUS DEPTH PLOTTED FOR SELECTED MONTHS.	B-1
APPENDIX C - AVERAGE MONTHLY MATRIC POTENTIALS FOR SELECTED PSYCHROMETER DEPTHS	C-1
APPENDIX D - AVERAGE MEASURED MONTHLY SOIL TEMPERATURES FOR SELECTED DEPTHS	D-1

FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Stagger Well Casing Method.	8
2	Soil Temperature Profile on October 13, 1970. . .	11
3	Water Content by Weight of Original Soil Profile.	12
4	Matric Potential as a Function of Soil Depth . .	13
5	Projected Equilibrium Curve for Soil Psychrometers at 50 and 240 Feet.	14
6	Matric Potential Versus Depth for Selected Months.	15
7	Soil Water Matric Potential as a Function of Depth in Well 699-19-47B	16
8	Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths.	18
9	Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) as a Function of Depth for Selected Month. .	20
10	Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature Versus Time for Selected Depths	22

TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Weather Data During the Study	4
2	Temperature and Mean Sky Cover.	5
3	Solar Radiation and Wind Activity	6
4	Soil Moisture and Temperature Probe Installation. .	7
5	Soil Separates for Profile at Instrument Installation.	10
6	The Trend of Matric Potential Values at Various Soil Depths from the Soil Surface	19

A STUDY OF SOIL WATER
POTENTIAL AND TEMPERATURE IN HANFORD SOILS

INTRODUCTION

A knowledge of the movement of precipitation water in the arid soil of the Hanford Reservation is important in the evaluation of long-term waste management practices at the Reservation. Research has been carried out in conjunction with Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company for the Atomic Energy Commission to gain such knowledge. Wells have been drilled and hydraulic characteristic and vapor equilibrium measurements have been made on soil samples taken from these wells in an effort to obtain conclusive information about subsurface rainfall movement. Tritium measurements were also made on the moisture contained in the soil samples and the wells were logged with a neutron probe. However, inconclusive results were obtained from these studies and it was not possible to determine conclusively whether moisture derived from precipitation would eventually migrate to the water table.

To provide more definitive results, a new approach was initiated using the energy status of the moisture in the soil profile to quantify the total water flux. The total water flux is a function of the water potential and thermal gradients and requires treatment of both the vapor and liquid phases. The water potential can be decomposed into the following components:

$$\psi_w = \psi_s + \psi_p + \psi_m + \psi_g \quad (1)$$

where

ψ_w = total water potential

ψ_s = osmotic (solute) potential

ψ_p = pneumatic (pressure) potential

ψ_m = matric (capillary) potential

ψ_g = gravitational potential

The ψ_p term is small in almost all instances and is considered negligible.

It can be seen from the above equation that the water potential is a function of the moisture content and hydraulic characteristic of the sediments (ψ_m) as well as temperature. This use of the

energy approach to compute the total water flux requires reliable data on water potentials, temperatures and the hydraulic characteristics of the sediments for the entire soil profile.

To provide the data necessary to use the energy approach, in August of 1970 a well was drilled from the ground surface to the groundwater table at a location about 1 mile south of 200 East Area. Soil samples were taken from this well to determine the hydraulic characteristics of the various sediment horizons which make up the vertical profile. An instrumented cable of thermocouple psychrometers (TCP) and diode temperature transducers (DTT) was installed at specific intervals in the well hole. These instruments will provide the additional information on water potentials and temperatures necessary to use the energy approach. The psychrometers will measure the ψ_s and ψ_m components of the total water potential (Equation 1). The osmotic potentials should be small since the soils in question are nonsaline. Thus for ease of discussion, the psychrometer readings will be considered a direct measurement of the matric potential. The other component of the total water potential (ψ_g) can be readily determined if the elevation of the psychrometer with respect to a given datum (usually mean sea level) is known. A more detailed discussion of water potential is contained in Appendix A.

Once reliable data are obtained from the above system, the direction of net moisture movement at any depth can be calculated and subsequently used to infer the percolation depth of precipitation water. Since installation, the instrumented cable has been monitored twice weekly; the monthly averages are reported in this document.

CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA

Climatological data used in this research are based on records compiled by the Hanford Meteorology Station from 1945-1970, supplemented with precipitation and temperature data of the United States Weather Bureau cooperative observers at a nearby site from 1912 to 1944.

The Hanford Meteorology Station operated by Battelle-Northwest is situated on a plateau in south central Washington about 5 miles northwest of the instrument site. The plateau slopes down toward the Columbia River about 10 miles north of the station and up to the foothills of Rattlesnake Mountain about 10 miles south of the station. Elevation of the station is 733 feet, which is roughly 300 feet above the Columbia River.

Since the Hanford Reservation is in the rain shadow of the Cascade Mountains, precipitation totals only 6.25 inches annually. The three months of November through January contribute 42 percent of this total, while the three months of July through September contribute only 10 percent. There are only two occurrences per year of 24-hour amounts of 0.50 inch or more. About 45 percent of all precipitation during the months of December through February is in the form of snow. There have been 81 consecutive days without measurable rain (June 22 - September 10, 1967), 139 days with only 0.18 inch (June 22 - November 7, 1967), and 172 days with only 0.32 inch (February 24 - August 13, 1968).

By serving as a source of cold air drainage, the Cascade Mountains also have a considerable effect on the wind regime at Hanford. This drainage (gravity) wind, plus topographic channeling, causes a considerable diurnal range of wind speed during the summer. In July, hourly average speeds range from a low of 5.2 mph from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. to a high of 13.0 mph from 9:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. In contrast, the corresponding speeds for January are 5.5 and 6.3 mph.

Temperatures at the Hanford Reservation are colder in winter and warmer in summer than they would be without the Cascade Mountains. However, other mountain ranges shield the area from many of the arctic air mass surges. Hanford experiences many warm, cloudless days and as a result the solar radiation is consistently high.

Although winter temperature minima have varied from -27°F to +22°F, summer maxima have varied only from 100°F to 115°F. However, there is considerable variation in the frequency of such maxima.

Weather data during the experimental period are reported in Tables 1, 2 and 3. Table 1 shows monthly precipitation and relative humidity data, which are average for this period.

Table 1. WEATHER DATA DURING THE STUDY

February 1971 to April 1972

	PRECIPITATION (IN.)						RELATIVE HUMIDITY (%)		
	Month	Total	Departure	Greatest in 24 Hours	Date	Snow, Ice Pellets		Average	Departure
						Total	Departure		
1971	J	0.78	-0.20	0.53	16	2.0	-3.3	72	-4
	F	0.10	-0.53	0.06	9	T	-1.8	62	-8
	M	1.02	+0.54	0.51	25-26	0.6	+0.1	56	0
	A	0.07	-0.30	0.06	24	0	0	43	-4
	M	0.56	+0.06	0.36	30-31	0	0	37	-5
	J	0.71	+0.14	0.39	2-3	0	0	41	+1
	J	0.13	-0.01	0.13	9	0	0	27	-5
	A	0.09	-0.10	0.09	22	0	0	30	-5
	S	1.13	+0.83	0.52	1-2	0	0	45	+4
	O	0.18	-0.40	0.16	29-30	0.6	+0.6	51	-7
	N	0.46	-0.39	0.12	11-12	T	-1.1	73	0
	D	1.07	+0.21	0.32	8	8.1	+4.0	78	-2
1971		6.30	-0.15	0.53	Jan 16	11.3	-1.5	51	-3.5
1972	J	0.19	-0.78	0.09	23-24	4.9		69.8	
	F	0.27	-0.31	0.09	4-5	1.4		75.4	
	M	0.58	+0.20	0.22	12	0.1		61.3	
	A	0.10	-0.34	0.08	11.1	T		43.0	

Table 2 shows the temperature and mean sky cover for the test period which again is near the long-term average.

Table 2. TEMPERATURE AND MEAN SKY COVER

February 1971 to April 1972

	Month	TEMPERATURE (°F)								MEAN SKY COVER ¹ (Tenths)	
		Averages				Extreme				Average	Depar- ture
		Daily Maximum	Daily Minimum	Monthly	Depar- ture	Highest	Date	Lowest	Date		
1971	J	45.0	26.0	35.8	+6.2	72	31	8	4	8.1	+0.3
	F	49.7	28.5	39.1	+3.6	66	13	15	6	7.0	-0.4
	M	52.1	29.3	40.7	-3.7	65	29	15	2+	7.1	+0.4
	A	65.4	38.6	52.0	-1.4	76	6	27	1	6.7	+0.3
	M	77.9	50.2	64.0	+1.7	92	12	36	20	6.0	+0.2
	J	78.7	51.8	65.3	-4.1	99	22	44	8	6.6	+1.4
	J	94.6	62.7	78.7	+2.3	111	31	44	6	2.5	-0.2
	A	96.6	64.3	80.5	+6.3	112	9	51	23	2.1	-1.2
	S	75.4	47.6	61.5	-3.7	91	5	38	21	3.5	-0.6
	O	64.6	38.8	51.7	-1.4	85	4	13	29	5.8	-0.1
	N	49.3	31.5	40.4	+0.4	64	3	21	5	7.4	-0.1
	D	38.0	23.2	30.6	-2.0	50	21+	5	29	8.5	+0.4
1972		65.6	41.1	53.4	+0.3	112	Aug 9	5	Dec 29	5.9	+0.4
	J	39.2	21.8	30.5	+1.1	59	20	-4	28	7.8	
	F	44.0	25.7	34.8	-2.6	68	27	-1	3	8.2	
	M	59.5	34.4	47.0	+2.8	76	16-17	24	25	7.5	
	A	7.8	2.7	49.6	-2.9	78	27	26	3	6.3	

Table 3 shows the solar radiation and wind activity over the test period. Departure from the average solar radiation is on the high side with winds near normal except for peak gusts.

Table 3. SOLAR RADIATION AND WIND ACTIVITY

February 1971 to April 1972

SOLAR RADIATION (LANGLEYS)							WIND (mph)				
Month	Average Daily Total	Departure	Greatest Daily Total	Date	Least Daily Total	Date	Average Speed	Departure	PEAK GUST		
									Max. Min. Speed	Direction	Date
J	114	-4	239	31	16	16	8.0	+1.7	59	WSW	9
F	211	+11	329	28	54	9	8.6	+1.6	65	SW	24
M	325	-15	514	31	82	10	8.9	+0.5	62	SSW	26
A	488	+18	681	26	153	24	8.4	-0.6	50	WSW	11
M	589	+18	755	28	156	31	10.1	+1.3	54	SSW	12
J	619	-7	821	14	220	3	8.4	-0.8	39	WSW	13
J	686	+27	802	2	253	9	8.3	-0.3	36	NW	4
A	602	+51	703	3	242	22	7.8	-0.2	37	SW	30
S	448	+30	573	4	121	28	8.0	+0.5	40	NNE	19+
O	286	+24	430	1	58	30	7.2	+0.5	41	SSW	19
N	148	+13	295	1	44	26	5.4	-0.8	44	SW	4
D	96	+5	185	7	37	2	6.8	+0.8	45	SSW	13
	385	+171	821	June 14	16	Jan 16	8.0	+0.4	65	SW	Feb 24
J	134	+16	249	29	50	20	10.3	+4.0	80	SW	11
F	207	+7	368	29	76	18	7.3	+0.3	64	SW	27
M	343	+3	536	26-29	47	1	7.5	-0.9	61	SW	5
A	528	+58	704	28	300	5	11.1	+2.1	73	SSW	5

REFERENCE NOTES: +Also on earlier dates: ¹Sunrise
to sunset. ²Calories/sq. cm.
³visibility six miles or less.

INSTRUMENTED CABLE INSTALLATION

ASSEMBLY OF THE INSTRUMENTED CABLE

A porous cup type soil thermocouple psychrometer (TCP) was soldered to a shielded Beldon cable #8640 (two conductor #26 solid copper, color-coded vinyl jacket). The diode temperature transducer (DTT) was soldered to a Beldon coaxial cable (RG 174-U type, 50 ohms, 26 AWG strands). All TCP and DTT cables were bundled and taped together into one string with a stainless steel cable 1/6 inch in diameter. The stainless steel cable carried the entire cable weight during installation. The positions of the individual sensors on the cable are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. SOIL MOISTURE (PSYCHROMETER) AND TEMPERATURE PROBE INSTALLATION

<u>Depth (in. or ft.)</u>	<u>Active Temperature Thermocouple</u>	<u>Active Moisture Psychrometer</u>	<u>Depth (ft.)</u>	<u>Active Temperature Thermocouple</u>	<u>Active Moisture Psychrometer</u>
3"	Yes	Yes	40'	Not Working	Yes
6"	Yes	Yes	45'	Not Working	Not Working
9"	Yes	Yes	50'	Not Working	Yes
1'	Yes	Yes	55'	Yes	Not Working
1-1/2'	Yes	Yes	60'	Yes	Yes
2'	Yes	Yes	65'	Not Working	Not Working
2-1/2'	Yes	Yes	70'	Not Working	Yes
3'	Yes	Yes	80'	Yes	Yes
3-1/2'	Yes	Yes	90'	Yes	Yes
4'	Yes	Yes	100'	Yes	Yes
4-1/2'	Yes	Yes	110'	Yes	Not Working
5'	Yes	Yes	120'	Yes	Yes
5-1/2'	Yes	Yes	130'	Yes	Yes
6'	Yes	Yes	140'	Yes	Yes
7'	Yes	Yes	150'	Yes	Yes
8'	Yes	Yes	160'	Yes	Yes
9'	Yes	Yes	170'	Yes	Yes
10'	Yes	Yes	180'	Yes	Yes
11'	Yes	Yes	190'	Yes	Yes
12'	Yes	Yes	200'	Yes	Yes
13'	Yes	Yes	210'	Yes	Yes
14'	Yes	Yes	220'	Yes	Yes
15'	Yes	Yes	230'	Yes	Yes
17-1/2'	Yes	Yes	240'	Yes	Yes
20'	Yes	Yes	250'	Yes	Yes
22-1/2'	Yes	Yes	260'	Yes	Yes
25'	Yes	Yes	270'	Not Working	Yes
27-1/2'	Yes	Yes	280'	Yes	Yes
30'	Yes	Yes	290'	Yes	Yes
32-1/2'	Yes	Yes	300'	Yes	Yes
35'	Yes	Yes	310'	Yes	Yes

INSTALLATION OF THE INSTRUMENTED CABLE

The predominant vegetative cover in the vicinity of the well site is sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata) and cheatgrass (Bromus tectorum L). The soil is a relatively uniform sand to loamy sand containing a small amount of gravel throughout the soil profile with the water table approximately 310 feet below the surface.

The well was drilled using a dry core barrel. Stagger casing was used, as shown in Figure 1, to reduce skin friction between the casing wall and soil so that it would be possible to remove the casing. The soil material removed during the drilling process was labeled as to depth, stored in PVC bags, and sealed in metal cans to prevent the loss of soil water.

FIGURE 1. Stagger Well Casing Method

To protect the instruments during the backfilling process a PVC pipe was first lowered into the hole, and the instrumented cable, with soil thermocouple psychrometers and diode temperature transducers, was lowered inside the plastic pipe. As the well was backfilled the plastic pipe and well casing were gradually removed, leaving the instruments in place. The hole was carefully backfilled with the material previously removed. Satisfactory backfilling is a tedious and difficult process and additional work is required to improve the technique.

DATA ANALYSIS

Table 4 summarized instrument locations and operational status at the time the psychrometers and temperature probes were placed in the soil profile. Several instruments were lost between the 40 and 70 foot levels when the clasp holding the instruments was caught during removal of the casing. Future installations of this type will use a different holding method to eliminate the possibility of severing instruments in this manner.

Table 5 gives the soil composition at depths along the soil profile. The transducers were read periodically to determine when the soil reached equilibrium with the undisturbed soil. Figure 2 shows a nearly stable temperature profile. The temperature transducers were calibrated on an absolute scale to $\pm 0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ and had a sensitivity of $\pm 0.1^{\circ}\text{C}$. This temperature precision is more than adequate for use in temperature correction of the psychrometric measurements. Future installations should use a more rugged cable on the temperature transducers to reduce their loss.

Water content measurements were made on the soil samples taken throughout the soil profile during the drilling of the well. Figure 3 shows a plot of these data.

Figure 4 shows sets of the matric potential readings taken to observe the rate of stabilization. The data presented in this figure should not be used to evaluate water movement since the system has not stabilized. Figure 5 shows the time rate of stabilization of two thermocouple psychrometers. From these data it was projected that 90 percent of equilibrium will be reached in 200 to 250 days after installation.

Table 5. SOIL SEPARATES FOR PROFILE AT INSTRUMENT INSTALLATION

Depth		% Sand	% Silt	% Clay
Meters	Feet			
1.5	5	95.1	3.3	1.6
3.0	10	98.6	0.2	1.6
4.6	15	92.3	4.6	3.1
6.1	20	81.9	16.7	1.4
7.6	25	89.2	9.4	1.4
9.2	30	90.2	8.4	1.4
10.7	35	90.7	7.9	1.4
12.2	40	90.9	6.7	2.4
13.7	45	83.7	12.8	3.5
15.3	50	78.9	18.6	2.5
16.8	55	90.6	6.9	2.5
18.3	60	67.6	28.4	4.0
19.8	65	83.6	12.9	3.5
20.4	70	82.4	13.8	3.8
23.9	75	73.8	21.2	5.0
24.4	80	93.7	4.7	1.6
26.0	85	84.4	12.8	2.8
27.5	90	92.9	5.3	1.8
29.0	95	94.2	12.0	3.8
30.5	100	89.5	8.7	1.8
32.1	105	86.4	10.7	2.9
33.6	110	90.5	7.6	1.9
35.1	115	84.7	12.0	3.3
36.6	120	91.2	7.0	1.8
38.1	125	85.6	11.7	2.7
39.6	130	90.9	6.8	2.3
41.2	135	83.9	13.9	2.3
42.7	140	80.0	15.6	4.4
44.2	145	84.9	12.6	2.5
46.8	150	89.3	8.5	2.2
47.3	155	84.3	13.0	2.7
48.8	160	84.5	12.8	2.7
50.3	165	89.6	8.2	2.2
51.8	170	89.0	8.8	2.2
53.4	175	85.0	12.5	2.5
54.9	180	84.8	12.5	2.7
56.4	185	86.8	10.3	2.9
58.0	190	92.8	5.7	1.5
59.5	195	90.0	7.5	2.5
61.0	200	91.9	6.7	1.4
62.5	205	80.4	14.7	4.9
64.0	210	61.8	33.1	5.1
65.6	215	81.8	14.3	3.9
67.1	220	86.0	12.5	1.5
68.6	225	85.5	11.0	3.5
70.2	230	89.5	9.1	1.4
71.7	235	55.9	35.9	8.2
73.2	240	92.9	5.4	1.7

FIGURE 2. Soil Temperature Profile October 13, 1970

FIGURE 3. Water Content by Weight of Original Soil Profile

FIGURE 4. Water Potential as a Function of Soil Depth

FIGURE 5. Projected Equilibrium Curve for the Soil Psychrometers at 50 and 240 Feet

SOIL MOISTURE TREND ANALYSIS

The psychrometer data from February 1971 to May 1972 were averaged for each month and plotted by depth. A typical plot of matric potential in bars plotted against depth in feet is shown in Figure 6. In order to separate the curves, time-spaced months were selected for plotting together. The complete set of graphs of these data are shown in Appendix B. The rugged curve reflects the water content in the original profile. The highly fluctuating values in the curves seem to be real since similar results were obtained by different means as described below.

FIGURE 6. Matric Potential Versus Depth for Selected Month

The matric potential in a soil system is decreased by the attraction of solutes to the soil particles (adsorption forces). For a nonsaline soil such as that under study the capillary potential is the major component of the matric potential in an isothermal condition. The soil water matric potential curve was derived from the desorption curves using a pressure-membrane and pressure-plate apparatus for a series of soil samples obtained at various depths from Well 699-19-47B, located 6 miles southeast of the 200 East Area. The matric potential profile (Figure 7) was obtained by referring the field moisture contents of the soil samples to their corresponding desorption curves, assuming the osmotic, temperature, and hysteresis effects to be negligible. The general shape of this matric water potential profile was very similar to the matric potential profile obtained from the soil psychrometers. The lowest matric potential (driest region) occurred at about 45 feet beneath the ground surface.

FIGURE 7. Soil Water Matric Potential as a Function of Depth in Well 699-19-47B

A time-based trend analysis for these data required that data for each psychrometer depth be plotted as a function of time. To obtain less erratic data only the monthly averaged readings were plotted. Figure 8 is a typical plot of the average matric potential as a function of time. Fifteen months of data are plotted from 0 to 14, starting with February 1971, in Figures C-1 through C-17. The widely spaced depths on the graph are used to separate the curves on the plots.

The matric potentials in the upper soil profile show a yearly cycle. The matric potential at the surface is influenced strongly by weather conditions such as precipitation, evapotranspiration, and temperature. For example, the 0.25 foot depth has the greatest negative matric potential for the month of August which corresponds to the maximum air temperatures. For the lower soil depths the negative maximum is less and shows a time lag. Somewhere below the 12 foot depth the yearly cycle vanishes.

To determine trends in the soil moisture content a best fit straight line was visually drawn through the mean monthly water potentials. The matric potentials for February 1971 and April 1972, as determined from the best fit line, were used as the initial and final values, respectively, in the trend analysis. The ratio of these two values was used to determine trends in the soil moisture content. Arbitrarily it was assumed that no significant change occurred for ratios between 0.75 and 1.25. The results are summarized in Table 6. Of the 34 soil depths studied, the moisture content is considered unchanged at 15 depths, drier at 14 depths, and wetter at only 4 depths indicating that the water potential of the soil profile as a whole did not change very much. If there is any significant trend at all, it is a slight drying of the soil. The driest region is between 20 feet and 60 feet.

TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENTS

Simultaneously with the psychrometer readings, temperature measurements were made and recorded from the temperature transducers. These data are necessary for determining the temperature gradient and its effect on soil moisture.

Figure 9 is a typical plot showing the averaged monthly temperature profile over the depth in feet; Figures D-1 through D-5 show additional profiles. The seasonal cycling is seen by the whip-like action of the curve above 20 feet. Below this level the variation in the curve seems to be due to instrument noise variation. Even with this noise, the earth's thermal gradient is easily identified.

FIGURE 8. Average Monthly Matrix Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

Table 6. THE TREND OF MATRIC POTENTIAL VALUES AT VARIOUS SOIL DEPTHS FROM THE SOIL SURFACE

Soil Depth Feet	Matric Potential Bars		Ratio	Unchanged	Matric Potential Trend to Become	
	Initial	Final			Drier	Wetter
13	0.8	0.9	0.9	0		
14	1.3	1.1	1.2	0		
15	2.2	0.6	3.7			+
17.5	0.8	0.8	1.0	0		
20	4.3	5.8	0.7		-	
22.5	2.4	2.4	1.0	0		
25	3.5	5.3	0.7		-	
27.5	6.7	6.8	1.0	0		
30	2.8	4.6	0.6		-	
32.5	5.9	6.4	0.9	0		
35	5.4	7.3	0.7		-	
50	7.3	6.5	1.1	0		
60	0.7	2.8	0.3		-	
80	0.9	1.9	0.5		-	
90	2.1	1.6	1.3			+
100	3.5	3.1	1.1	0		
120	4.8	4.9	1.0	0		
130	2.9	2.3	1.3			+
140	1.0	1.7	0.6		-	
160	1.2	1.9	0.6		-	
180	0.6	1.5	0.4		-	
190	1.3	1.5	0.9	0		
200	1.4	1.5	0.9	0		
210	1.7	1.6	1.1	0		
220	1.7	1.9	0.9	0		
230	1.5	1.4	1.1	0		
240	2.9	1.5	1.9			+
250	1.0	1.3	0.7		-	
260	0.8	1.1	0.7		-	
270	0.9	1.2	0.7		-	
280	1.2	1.7	0.7		-	
290	1.5	1.5	1.0	0		
300	0.7	?	?			
310	0.5	1.1	0.5		-	
TOTAL				15	14	4

FIGURE 9. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature as a Function of Depth for Selected Month

Because of the difficulty of determining long-term trends, the data were replotted as average temperature versus the time for months from February 1971 to April 1972; these plots are shown in Figure 10 and in Figures D-6 through D-23. The seasonal cycling in the upper level curves and the time lag of thermal transfer is easily seen from these curves. Below the 20 foot level the curves show essentially no seasonal or long-term trends. Small seasonal rises in all curves of about 1°C have been attributed to the ambient temperature of the recording equipment.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the results to date do not permit a definite conclusion as to whether precipitation water will eventually reach the groundwater table. The matric potentials seem to indicate that the soil is becoming drier and that the water flux is extremely small. If any flow at all existed, this minute flow decreased further during the study period.

FIGURE 10. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) Versus Time for Selected Depths

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Harvey Huber for his assistance in constructing and installing the instruments and his faithful gathering of the data herein. Richard Buchanan reduced the voluminous data to computer plots.

This research was sponsored by the Advanced Technology Development Section, Research and Development Department, Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company. The authors are grateful for the assistance and direction provided D. J. Brown, Staff Geologist and R. E. Isaacson, Manager of the Advanced Technology Development Section of Atlantic Richfield Hanford Company.

APPENDIX A

BASIC SOIL-WATER RELATIONSHIPS

APPENDIX A

Soil water in a natural condition is dynamic. It is almost always moving from one location to another in response to driving forces created by infiltration, evaporation, rainfall, temperature, plant use, etc., and these driving forces are changing in space and time. When information concerning the movement of water in the soil is desired, it is best to describe the soil water in terms of soil moisture potential because the movement rate is strongly related to the change in energy of the mass moisture moved, i.e., water potential.

A standard terminology does not exist which is acceptable and meaningful to all workers in this field. Of the many available terms, water potential seems most satisfactory because it is consistent with the basic concepts of thermodynamics. Furthermore, the use of the word potential enables one to isolate and evaluate the various components such as the osmotic, capillary, and gravitational forces which affect the total potential of water in various parts of the system.

The Gibbs free energy of a system is an expression of the system's capacity to do work. This depends on the mean free energy of a particle as well as the concentration of particles (mole fraction) of the substance under consideration. The free energy of soil water in a given condition, with temperature and pressure held constant, can be expressed as a chemical potential.

The net potential of the water in a soil system (μ_w) is equal to the chemical potential of a pure, free water (μ_w°) adjusted for the various effects of those forces in the system which change its chemical potential. If the effects of all these forces can be expressed through their influence on vapor pressure, then:

$$\mu_w = \mu_w^\circ + RT \ln e/e^\circ$$

or

$$\mu_w - \mu_w^\circ = RT \ln e/e^\circ \quad (1)$$

where

R = ideal gas constant (erg/mole/dyne)

T = the absolute temperature (°K)

e = vapor pressure of water in the system at temperature T

e° = the vapor pressure of pure, free water at the same temperature T.

The e/e° is the relative humidity and its value is less than one. Therefore, $\ln e/e^\circ$ is a negative number. The resulting net water potential is thus a negative number; i.e., the soil water potential energy is less than that of pure free water.

The unit of chemical energy is ergs/mole and it is convenient to convert to more familiar pressure units by dividing both sides of Equation 1 by the partial molal volume of water, V_w .

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mu_w - \mu_w^\circ}{V_w} &= \frac{RT \ln e/e^\circ}{V_w} \\ &= \frac{RT}{V_w} \ln e/e^\circ \\ &= \psi_w = \text{water potential} \quad (2)\end{aligned}$$

Now:

$$\frac{\text{erg/mole}}{\text{cm}^3/\text{mole}} = \frac{\text{erg}}{\text{cm}^3} = \frac{\text{dyne} \times \text{cm}}{\text{cm}^3} = \text{dyne/cm}^2$$

= a unit of pressure

and 1 bar = 0.987 atm. = 10^6 dyne/cm² or 10^6 erg/cm³.

Equation 2 indicates that ψ_w is equivalent to the difference in free energy per unit molal volume of water between water in the system and pure free water.

Water potential is decreased by the addition of solutes, by the matric or capillary force which is the adhesive force originating from soil particles and their arrangements, by the negative ambient atmospheric pressure, and by gravity force. This relationship under isothermal conditions can be expressed as

$$\psi_{\text{water}} = \psi_s + \psi_p + \psi_m + \psi_g$$

where potential energies are due to solute (ψ_s), pressure (ψ_p), matric or capillary force (ψ_m), and gravity force (ψ_g), respectively.

In regard to the physical measurements of the above potential energies, soil psychrometers will measure ψ_s , ψ_p and ψ_m . The gravity force ψ_g can be readily determined by knowing the elevation with respect to a given reference (usually mean sea level). The difference between the pressure plate measurements (ψ_m) and the psychrometer measurements (ψ_s , ψ_p and ψ_m) provides a quantitative measure of the solute and pressure forces.

The above water potential (ψ_w) is for isothermal, bulk liquid flow. If the temperature distribution as determined by temperature transducers is known, the contribution of the nonisothermal component to the bulk liquid movement and of the vapor flux can be calculated.

APPENDIX B

MATRIC POTENTIAL VERSUS DEPTH PLOTTED
FOR SELECTED MONTHS

FIGURE B-1. Matric Potential Versus Depth for Selected Months

FIGURE B-2. Matric Potential Versus Depth for Selected Months

FIGURE B-3. Matric Potential Versus Depth for Selected Months

FIGURE B-4. Matrix Potential Versus Depth for Selected Months

FIGURE B-5. Matric Potential Versus Depth for Selected Months

APPENDIX C

AVERAGE MONTHLY MATRIC POTENTIALS
FOR SELECTED PSYCHROMETER DEPTHS

FIGURE C-1. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-2. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-3. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-4. Average Monthly Matrix Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-5. Average Monthly Matrix Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-6. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

C-7

FIGURE C-7. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-8. Average Monthly Matrix Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-9. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-10. Average Monthly Matrix Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-11. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-12. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-13. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-14. Average Monthly Matrix Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-15. Average Monthly Matrix Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-16. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

FIGURE C-17. Average Monthly Matric Potential Versus Time for Selected Psychrometer Depths

APPENDIX D

AVERAGE MEASURED MONTHLY SOIL TEMPERATURES
FOR SELECTED DEPTHS

FIGURE D-1. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature as a Function of Depth for Selected Month

FIGURE D-2. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature as a Function of Depth for Selected Month

FIGURE D-3. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature as a Function of Depth for Selected Month

FIGURE D-4. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature as a Function of Depth for Selected Month

FIGURE D-5. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature as a Function of Depth for Selected Month

FIGURE D-6. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) Versus Time for Selected Depths

D-7

FIGURE D-7. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-8. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-9. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-10. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-11. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-12. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-13. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-14. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-15. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-16. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-17. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-18. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-19. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-20. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) Versus Time for Selected Depths

FIGURE D-21. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

D-22

FIGURE D-22. Average Measured Monthly Soil Temperature (°C) Versus Time for Selected Depths

DISTRIBUTION

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Off-Site</u>
1	<u>AEC Chicago Patent Group</u> G. H. Lee
201	<u>AEC Technical Information Center</u>
2	<u>Atomic Energy Commission Headquarters</u> <u>Waste Management and Transportation</u> Germantown, Maryland 20767 Owen P. Gornley Chief, Waste Facilities Branch Robert W. Ramsey, Jr. Chief, Development Branch
2	<u>Atomic Energy Commission Site Safety</u> <u>Division</u> Directorate of Regulation 7920 Norfolk Avenue Bethesda, Maryland 20014 Ronald L. Bullard Chief, Environmental Specialist Branch W. Gamill Chief, Site Analysis Branch
2	<u>Atomic Energy Commission</u> <u>Division of Production & Material Management</u> Washington, D. C. 20545 William L. Lennemann Chief, Chemical Process James W. Pollock
2	<u>Atomic Energy Commission</u> <u>Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401</u> Dr. Adrian H. Dahl Chief, Environmental Science Branch B. L. Schmalz

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Off-Site</u>
3	<u>U. S. Geological Survey</u> 2100 M. Street Washington, D. C. 20037 George Debuchananne, Director M. K. Hubbert Research Geophysicist Dallas Peck
1	<u>U. S. Geological Survey</u> <u>Menlo Park, California</u> 94025 Jacob Rubin
1	<u>U. S. Geological Survey</u> <u>Groundwater Branch</u> Denver, Colorado R. W. Stallman
1	<u>U. S. Geological Survey</u> <u>Water Resources Division</u> Bldg. 53, Room H-2910 Lakewood, Colorado 80225 J. D. Bredehoeft
1	<u>U. S. Geological Survey</u> <u>Water Resources Division</u> P.O. Box 917 Council Bluffs, Iowa 51501 O. J. Ramsvick Supervisory Hydrologist
1	<u>U. S. Geological Survey</u> <u>Albuquerque, New Mexico</u> Dr. C. V. Theis
1	<u>U. S. Geological Survey</u> <u>Water Resources Division</u> P.O. Box 2857 Raleigh, North Carolina Ralph C. Heath District Chief

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

2

U. S. Bureau of Mines
4800 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

George Evans

Robert W. Van Dolah

3

U. S. Bureau of Mines
Spokane Mining Research Laboratory
N. 1430 Washington St.
Spokane, Washington 99201

Robert C. Bates

Dan Keeley

Michael M. McDonald

1

U. S. Forestry Service
Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment
Station
Boise, Idaho 83702

Dr. Walter F. Meghan
Research Hydrologist

1

Environmental Protection Agency
Crystal Mall
Washington, D. C. 20460

Arnold Joseph

1

Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research & Monitoring
Edison Water Quality Office
Edison, New Jersey 08817

Richard Field

1

National Water Commission
800 N. Quincy
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Dr. John S. Gladwell

1

USDA-ARS
U. S. Water Conservation Laboratory
4331 East Broadway
Phoenix, Arizona 85040

Dr. Herman Bouwer
Hydraulic Engineer

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

1	<u>USDA-ARS</u> U. S. Salinity Laboratory P.O. Box 672 Riverside, California 92502 Dr. Jan Van Schilfgaarde, Director
1	<u>USDA-ARS</u> Engineering Research Center CSU Foothills Campus Fort Collis, Colorado 80521 Dr. David A. Woolhiser Hydraulic Engineer
1	<u>USDA-ARS</u> Northwest Watershed Research Center P.O. Box 2700 Boise, Idaho 83701 Walter J. Rawls, Hydrologist
1	<u>USDA-ARS</u> P.O. Box 1096 Boise, Idaho 83701 J. L. Robins
1	<u>USDA-ARS</u> Twin Falls, Idaho M. E. Jensen
1	<u>USDA-ARS</u> Snake River Conservation Research Center Route 1, Box 186 Kimberly, Idaho 83341 Dr. Marvin E. Jensen, Director
1	<u>USDA Hydrograph Laboratory</u> Plant Industry Station Soils Building Beltsville, Maryland 20705 H. N. Holton, Director
1	<u>USDA-ARS</u> Plant Industry Station Beltsville, Maryland 20705

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

Dr. Donald L. Brakensick
Chief Engineer

1 USDA Sedimentation Laboratory
P.O. Box 30
Oxford, Mississippi 38655

A. R. Robinson, Director

1 USDA-ARS
Southern Region
Stoneville, Mississippi 38776

John C. Stephens, Director

1 USDA-ARS
North Central Watershed Research Center
P.O. Box 916
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Dr. C. R. Amerman
Hydraulic Engineer

1 USDA-ARS
North Appalachian Experimental Watershed
Coshocton, Ohio 43812

Dr. W. M. Edwards
Soil Scientist

1 USDA
P.O. Box 400
Chickasha, Oklahoma 73018

Harry B. Pionke

1 USDA-ARS
Northeast Watershed Research Center
Pennsylvania State University
111 Research Building 3
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Dr. A. S. Rogowski
Soil Scientist

1 National Academy of Science
U. S. National Committee for the IHD
2101 Constitution Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20418

Dr. Leo Heindl
Executive Secretary

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

1	<u>National Academy of Science</u> Committee on Radioactive Waste Management National Research Council 2101 Constitution Avenue Washington, D. C. 20418 Dr. Cyrus Klingsberg Technical Secretary
1	<u>National Science Foundation</u> Division of Advanced Technology Application 1800 6th Street N.W. Washington, D. C. 20530 Ray Zahradnik
1	<u>U. S. Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory</u> Port Hueneme, California 93043 Dr. James J. Der
2	<u>Robert S. Kerr Water Research Center</u> P.O. Box 1198 Ada, Oklahoma 74820 Dr. J. W. Keeley Marion R. Scalf
1	<u>Alabama Geologic Survey</u> P.O. Drawer O University, Alabama 35486 Phil Lammereaux State Geologist
1	<u>Southwest Rangeland Watershed Research Center</u> 442 E. Seventh Street Tucson, Arizona 85705 Dr. R. Smith
1	<u>California Dept. of Water Resources</u> Sacramento, California Helen J. Peters

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

1	<u>Idaho Bureau of Mines & Geology</u> <u>University of Idaho</u> Moscow, Idaho 83843 Dr. Roy E. Williams
1	<u>Idaho Dept. of Water Administration</u> <u>State House, Annex 2</u> Boise, Idaho 83707 Keith R. Higginson, Director
1	<u>Idaho Water Resources Board</u> <u>Boise, Idaho</u> R. R. Lee
1	<u>Illinois State Water Survey</u> <u>P.O. Box 232</u> Urbana, Illinois 61801 Keros Cartwright
1	<u>State Geological Survey of Kansas</u> <u>University of Kansas</u> Lawrence, Kansas 66044 Dr. John C. Halepaska Chief, Water Resources Section
1	<u>State of Maine</u> <u>Environmental Improvement Commission</u> Augusta, Maine 04330 Steven D. Freedman
1	<u>St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Laboratory</u> <u>Mississippi River at 3rd Avenue East</u> Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414 Professor C. Edward Bowers
2	<u>Desert Research Institute</u> <u>Center for Water Resources Research</u> Reno, Nevada Dr. Clinton Case G. B. Maxey

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Off-Site</u>
1	<u>State of North Carolina</u> <u>Groundwater Division</u> Water and Air Resources Raleigh, North Carolina 27611 Harry M. Peek, Chief
1	<u>Water Quality Management Laboratory</u> <u>Rt. 2, Box 322A</u> Durant, Oklahoma 74701 V. L. Hauser
1	<u>State of Oregon</u> <u>516 Public Service Bldg.</u> Salem, Oregon 97310 Chris Wheeler State Engineer
1	<u>Texas Water Development Board</u> <u>Systems Engineering Division</u> P.O. Box 13087 Austin, Texas 78711 Lial F. Tischler
1	<u>Agencies for Environmental Conservation</u> <u>Montpelier, Vermont 05602</u> Dr. Martin L. Johnson Secretary
1	<u>State of Washington</u> <u>Department of Ecology</u> P.O. Box 829 Olympia, Washington 98504 John R. Raymond
1	<u>Washington State Water Research Center</u> <u>Pullman, Washington 99163</u> James Crosby, III Geologist
1	<u>Atomic Industrial Forum, Inc.</u> <u>475 Park Avenue South</u> New York, New York 10016 Gerald V. Halvorsen Environmental Projects Manager

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Off-Site</u>
1	<u>Computer Sciences Corp.</u> Federal Building Richland, Washington 99352 R. W. Nelson
1	<u>Sandia Laboratories</u> Division 5166 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115 Fred Norwood
1	Arthur M. Piper #3 Sonoma Lane Carmel, California 93921
1	<u>Alyeska Pipeline Service Co.</u> 2100 Travis Street Houston, Texas 77002 Dr. Maurice D. Veatch
1	<u>E. I. duPont deNemours & Co., Inc.</u> Savannah River, South Carolina J. C. Corey
1	<u>University of Arizona</u> <u>Office of Arid Lands Studies</u> 1201 East Speedway Blvd. Tucson, Arizona 95719 Dr. Ken Faster
1	<u>University of Arizona</u> <u>Dept. of Agriculture Chemistry and Soils</u> Tucson, Arizona 85721 Dr. Gordon Dutt
2	<u>University of Arizona</u> <u>Dept. of Hydrology and Water Resources</u> 200-E Old Psychology Tucson, Arizona 95721 Dr. A. K. Tyagi Dr. Chester C. Kisiel

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

2	<u>University of Arizona</u> <u>Tucson, Arizona 95721</u> E. S. Simpson A. W. Warrick
2	<u>University of California</u> <u>Berkeley, California 94720</u> Dr. Warren Kauffman P. A. Witherspoon Dept. of Civil Engineering
3	<u>University of California at Davis</u> <u>Dept. of Water Sciences and Engineering</u> <u>Davis, California 95616</u> J. N. Luthin Don Nielson Dr. Verne H. Scott
1	<u>University of California at Riverside</u> <u>College of Biological & Agricultural</u> <u>Sciences</u> <u>Riverside, California 92507</u> Dr. N. T. Coleman
3	<u>Stanford University</u> <u>Department of Civil Engineering</u> <u>Stanford, California 94305</u> Paul Kruger Henry J. Ramey J. B. Franzini
1	<u>Stanford University</u> <u>School of Earth Sciences</u> <u>Dept. of Geology</u> <u>Stanford, California 94305</u> E. Aguado

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Off-Site</u>
1	<u>Georgia Institute of Technology</u> <u>School of Civil Engineering</u> Atlanta, Georgia 30332 Dr. J. R. Wallace
1	<u>University of Idaho</u> <u>Moscow, Idaho 83843</u> Dr. Delbert Fitzsimmons Head, Agricultural Engineering
2	<u>University of Illinois</u> <u>Urbana, Illinois 61801</u> A. Klute Professor Ven Te Chow Hydrosystems Laboratories
1	<u>Purdue University</u> <u>Dept. of Agricultural Engineering</u> Wast LaFayette, Indiana 47907 Emru D. Millette
1	<u>Iowa State University</u> <u>Ames, Iowa</u> D. Kirkham
1	<u>University of Kansas</u> <u>Water Resources Institute</u> Lawrence, Kansas 66044 Don W. Green
1	<u>University of Kentucky</u> <u>Department of Mechanical Engineering</u> Lexington, Kentucky 40506 C. T. Hahn
1	<u>Harvard University</u> <u>School of Public Health</u> Boston, Massachusetts 02138 Dr. D. W. Moeller

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

1	<u>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</u> 77 Massachusetts Avenue Room 48-263 Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 Dr. Donald Harleman
1	<u>University of Minnesota</u> Department of Geology and Geophysics 2D Pillsbury Hall Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 Hans Olaf Pfannkuch
1	<u>University of Minnesota</u> Department of Civil Engineering Minneapolis, Minnesota 55418 H. Steforn
2	<u>University of Nebraska</u> School of Civil Engineering Lincoln, Nebraska 68503 Mark J. Hammer Warren Viessman, Jr.
1	<u>Princeton University</u> School of Engineering/Applied Science Department of Civil and Geological Engineering Princeton, New Jersey 08540 Dr. Robert W. Cleary
2	<u>Princeton University</u> Department of Civil & Geological Engineering Princeton, New Jersey 08540 R. J. M. DeWiest G. F. Pinder
1	<u>New Mexico State University</u> Department of Agronomy P.O. Box 3Q Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001 P. J. Wierenga

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

1	<u>State University of New York at Buffalo</u> <u>Dept. of Mechanical Engineering</u> Buffalo, New York 14214 Ralph T. Cheng
1	<u>State University of New York</u> <u>Dept. of Civil Engineering</u> Buffalo, New York 14214 Dr. Ralph Rumer
2	<u>Cornell University</u> <u>School of Civil Engineering</u> B22 Bailey Hall Ithaca, New York 14850 W. H. Brutsaert Winton Covey
2	<u>Oregon State University</u> <u>Corvallis, Oregon 97331</u> Dr. Larry Boersma Professor of Soils Dr. Royal H. Brooks Professor of Agricultural Engineering
1	<u>Drexel Institute of Technology</u> <u>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104</u> Irwin Remson
1	<u>Vanderbilt University</u> <u>Nashville, Tennessee 37203</u> Dr. Frank L. Parker
1	<u>Utah State University</u> <u>College of Engineering</u> <u>Dept. of Agriculture and Irrigation</u> <u>Engineering</u> Logan, Utah 84321 Dr. L. G. King

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Off-Site</u>
1	<u>Utah State University</u> <u>Utah Water Research Laboratory</u> <u>College of Engineering</u> Logan, Utah 84321 J. Paul Riley
1	<u>Utah State University</u> <u>Logan, Utah 84321</u> Dr. Roland W. Jeppson Associate Prof. of Civil Engineering
1	<u>Utah State University</u> <u>Logan, Utah 84321</u> C. G. Clyde
1	<u>University of Wyoming</u> <u>Laramie, Wyoming 82070</u> Dr. Paul A. Rechard Director, Water Resources Research Institute
2	<u>Washington State University</u> <u>Dept. of Civil Engineering</u> 148 Sloan Hall Pullman, Washington 99163 Dr. Donald L. Bender Dr. David Higgins
2	<u>Washington State University</u> <u>Dept. of Agronomy & Soils</u> Pullman, Washington 99163 Dr. Walter H. Gardner Dr. Eugene Thompson
1	<u>Washington State University</u> <u>Albrook Hydraulic Laboratory</u> Pullman, Washington 99163 Dr. John F. Orsborn, Head

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

1	<u>University of Washington</u> Department of Geology Seattle, Washington 98105 Dr. Howard Coombs
2	<u>University of Wisconsin</u> Department of Soil Science Madison, Wisconsin 53706 W. R. Gardner P. Saffigna
1	<u>Water Conservation and Irrigation Commission</u> P.O. Box 220R Royal Exchange Sydney, 2000, Australia Frans R. Kalf
1	<u>University of New South Wales</u> School of Civil Engineering Sydney, Australia Dr. K. K. Watson
1	<u>Institut für Geophysik</u> Technische Hochschule Karlsplatz 13 A-1040 WIEN Österreich Austria A. E. Scheidegger
1	<u>University of British Columbia</u> Vancouver, B. C., Canada Dr. Allen Freeze
1	<u>Dept. of Mines and Natural Resources</u> Water Resources Branch 693 Taylor Avenue Winnipeg 9, Manitoba, Canada Frank W. Render

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Off-Site</u>
1	<u>University of Waterloo</u> Department of Earth Science Waterloo, Ontario, Canada Richard G. Jackson
1	<u>University of Waterloo</u> Department of Civil Engineering Faculty of Engineering Waterloo, Ontario, Canada John F. Pickens
1	<u>McMaster University</u> Department of Civil Engineering Hamilton, Ontario, Canada Dr. William James
2	<u>Ontario Water Resources Commission</u> 135 St. Clair Avenue West Toronto 7, Ontario, Canada Donald N. Jeffs Bob Ostry
1	<u>Department of the Environment</u> 4905 Dufferin Street Downsview, Ontario, Canada Dr. Aloysius K. Lo
2	<u>Department of the Environment</u> C-244, No. 8 Temporary Bldg. Inland Waters Branch Ottawa, Canada R. E. Jackson Dennis Lawson
1	<u>Institut de Mecanique (I.M.G.)</u> Domaine Universitaire B. P. 53 Centre de Tri 38041 Grenoble-Cedex, France Georges Vachaud

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Off-Site</u>
1	<u>M. R. Engineering College</u> <u>Jaipur-302004, India</u> Dr. R. D. Verma Prof. of Civil Engineering
1	<u>University College</u> <u>Upper Merrion Street</u> <u>Dublin, 2 Ireland</u> Dr. James C. I. Dooge Professor of Civil Engineering
1	<u>Department of Mechanical Engineers,</u> <u>I.I.T. Kharagkur,</u> <u>S.E. Ry, India</u> R. G. Mokadom
3	<u>Technion-Israel Institute of Technology</u> <u>Haifa, Israel</u> J. Bear Shragga Irmay Dan Zaslavsky
1	<u>Agricultural Research Organization</u> <u>The Volcani Center</u> The Institute of Soils and Water P.O.B. 6 Bet Dagan, Israel Shlomo P. Neuman
1	<u>Food & Agriculture Organization of the UN</u> <u>Land and Water Development Division</u> Water Resources & Development Service Via Delle Terme Dl Caracalla 00100-Rome, Italy R. G. Thomas
1	<u>Kyoto University</u> <u>Kyoto, Japan</u> Yoriteru Inoue

No. of
Copies

Off-Site

1 Explorade En Produktie Laboratorium
 c/o Koninklijke/Shell
 Volmerlaan 6
 Ritswijk (Z.H.), The Netherlands

A. M. Schaaps

1 University of Canterbury, N.Z.
 Dept. of Civil Engineering
 Christ Church 1, New Zealand

Bruce W. Hunt

On-Site Hanford

1 AEC/R1 Patent Attorney

R. M. Poteat

7 AEC Richland Operations Office

O. J. Elgert
J. L. Rhoades
P. J. Holsted (2)
E. B. Jackson
P. G. Rhoades
R. B. Goranson
B. J. Melton

69 Atlantic Richfield Hanford Co.

G. E. Backman
G. L. Borsheim
D. J. Brown
L. E. Bruns
M. H. Campbell
W. M. Harty
R. E. Isaacson (2)
L. M. Knights
C. W. Malody
B. J. McMurray
M. C. Metz
H. P. Shaw
A. E. Smith
P. W. Smith
W. J. Van Slyke
ARHCO File
G. A. Nicholson

No. of
Copies

On-Site Hanford

3

Westinghouse Hanford Co. HEDL

R. B. Hall

29

Battelle-Northwest

D. B. Cearlock
J. P. Corley
J. R. Eliason
K. L. Kipp
D. E. Olesen
A. E. Reisenauer
D. D. Tillson
R. C. Routson
R. J. Serne
D. R. Friedrichs
S. W. Ahlstrom
R. G. Baca
A. Brandstetter
R. D. Mudd
R. W. Wallace
J. J. Fuquay
A. J. Shuckrow
L. E. Addison
Tech. Information
Tech. Pubs.

8

United Nuclear, Inc.

C. D. Corbit
F. E. Owen