DOE/NV/10162-21
UC-703

**A TWO-DIMENSIONAL SIMULATION OF
TRITIUM TRANSPORT IN THE VADOSE
ZONE AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE**

by

Wyn C. Ross
Stephen W. Wheatcraft

September 1994

Publication #45098

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Department of Energy, nor any of 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. Reference herein to any specific commercial project, process, or service by trade name, mark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831; prices available from (615) 576-8401.

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161.

A TWO-DIMENSIONAL SIMULATION OF TRITIUM TRANSPORT IN THE VADOSE ZONE AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE

by

Wyn C. Ross
Stephen W. Wheatcraft

Water Resources Center
Desert Research Institute
University and Community College System of Nevada

Publication #45098

prepared for

Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Las Vegas, Nevada

September 1994

The work upon which this report is based was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract #DE-AC08-80NV10162.

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
General	1
Objective	4
HYDROGEOLOGY	10
Location	10
Geology	10
Hydrology	10
CANAL INFILTRATION MODEL	15
The SATURN Model	15
SATURN Input Requirements	15
Parameter Estimation	15
Laboratory Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity Determination	16
Unsaturated Properties of the Porous Medium	16
Instantaneous Profile Test	19
Introduction	19
Theory	19
Experimental Design	20
Data Collection	22
In-Situ Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity Determination	22
Soil Moisture Characteristic Curves	23
Unsaturated Hydraulic Conductivity Determination	23
Model Definition	32
MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION	39
Governing Equations--Flow	39
Governing Equations--Transport	40
GROUNDWATER FLOW SIMULATION	42
TRITIUM TRANSPORT SIMULATION	48
INFILTRATION OF CONSERVATIVE TRACER AT RNM CANAL	52
Tracer Test Lysimeter Installation	52
Tracer Test	52
CONCLUSIONS	58
REFERENCES	59

APPENDICES

63

- A: Neutron Data
- B: Tensiometer Data
- C: Instantaneous Profile Test Flow Data
- D: Plots of Moisture Content Versus Time
- E: Plots of Hydraulic Head Versus Depth
- F: Soil Moisture Characteristic Curves - van Genuchten Model
- G: Plots of Hydraulic Conductivity Versus Moisture Content - Mualem Model
- H: Plots of Hydraulic Conductivity Versus Degree of Saturation - Field Measured
- I: Simulated Moisture Distribution
- J: Simulated Velocity Field
- K: Sensitivity of Solution to Changes in Dispersivity
- L: Sensitivity of Solution to Changes in Molecular Diffusion Coefficient
- M: Simulated Distribution of Tritium
- N: Contour Plots of Simulated Tritium Concentration

FIGURES

1. Cross Section Showing RNM-2S and the Cambic Detonation Point.	2
2. Map of West-Central Frenchman Flat Showing Location of RNM Site.	3
3. Cambic Site of the Radionuclide Migration Program.	5
4. RNM Canal Transmission Losses.	6
5. Tritium Concentration (corrected to Cambic Zero Time) at RNM-2S versus Time.	7
6. Tritium Concentration (corrected to Cambic Zero Time) at RNM-2S versus Volume Pumped.	7
7. Plot Showing Concentration versus Volume Pumped. Tritium Data are Corrected to Shot Time.	9
8. Geologic Section at RNM Site.	11
9. Location of Section Line A-A'.	12
10. Map of Frenchman Flat Showing the Locations of Drill Holes.	14
11. Results of Permeameter Tests on Cores from US1 and US2.	17
12. Instantaneous Profile Test Site.	21
13. Depth of Ponding versus Time.	24
14. Hydraulic Conductivity versus Moisture Content, Hole N1.	30
15. Hydraulic Conductivity versus Moisture Content, Hole N2.	31
16. Original Sample Space Discretization into Nodes and Elements.	34
17. Location of Elements.	36
18. Location of Nodes.	37
19. Discretization of Sample Space Showing Boundary Conditions.	38
20. Graphical Representation of Numerical Instabilities.	44
21. Effect of Anisotropy on Solution Stability.	45
22. Simulated Steady-State Element Saturation Values (%).	46
23. Qualitative Representation of the Vertical and Horizontal Components of the Simulated Steady-State Flow Field. Dots Represent Velocity Components Less than 1 cm/day.	47

24. Solution Sensitivity to Changes in Longitudinal Dispersivity.	49
25. Contour Plots of Simulated Tritium Concentration at Selected Time Steps.	50
26. Tracer Test Site.	53
27. Suction Lysimeter Installation.	54
28. Plot Showing Simulated and Observed Bromide Concentration.	56

TABLES

1. Porosity and Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity of Samples from Drill Holes US1 and US2.	18
2. Comparison of Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity Estimates.	25
3. Calculation of Soil Moisture Flux--N1 (instantaneous profile test).	26
4. Calculation of Soil Moisture Flux--N2 (instantaneous profile test).	27
5. Calculation of Hydraulic Conductivity--N1 (instantaneous profile test).	28
6. Calculation of Hydraulic Conductivity--N2 (instantaneous profile test).	29
7. RNM Canal Model Input Data.	33
8. Results of Lysimeter Sampling.	55

ABSTRACT

The site of a 0.75-kiloton underground nuclear explosion, the Cambric event, was selected for the study of radionuclide transport in the hydrologic environment. Water samples from RNM-2S, a well located 91 m from Cambric, have been analyzed for tritium and other radionuclides since the initiation of pumping. Water from RNM-2S flows to Frenchman Lake via an unlined canal. Flume data indicate canal transmission losses of approximately 2 m³/day/meter of canal. To determine if infiltrating canal water might be recirculated by RNM-2S, and therefore provide an additional radionuclide input to water samples collected at RNM-2S, a two-dimensional variably saturated solute transport computer model (SATURN, Huyakorn et al., 1983) was used to simulate the movement of tritium from the canal to the water table. Results indicate that recirculated canal water has not had a significant effect on the breakthrough of tritium at RNM-2S.

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL

The Radionuclide Migration (RNM) Program was initiated in 1974 by the Nevada Operations Office of the Department of Energy to study the distribution of radionuclides around an underground nuclear cavity. The goals of the RNM Program were to determine the rates of migration of radionuclides in a variety of underground media at the Nevada Test Site (NTS) and to determine the potential for radionuclide migration, both on and off the NTS, from underground nuclear explosions. The possible contamination of water supplies was of particular concern.

The site of a 0.75-kiloton underground nuclear test, the Cambric event, was selected for the study. The Cambric test was conducted on May 14, 1965, in the tuffaceous alluvium of Frenchman Flat. The detonation point was 73 m below the water table, at a depth from the surface of 294 m.

The Cambric site was selected for the following reasons:

- The event took place within the NTS Area 5 water supply aquifer.
- Sufficient time had elapsed since the detonation for water in the cavity and rubble chimney to return to the preshot level.
- The site was far from areas of active nuclear testing.
- The detonation point was fairly close to the ground surface making re-entry drilling and sampling less difficult and expensive.
- The highly permeable alluvium with its lack of fractures would make a good medium for hydrologic studies.
- The chimney region contained uranium, plutonium, and fission products.
- Sufficient tritium was present to constitute an excellent tracer for water from the cavity region.

A re-entry well (RNM-1) was completed in May 1974 and samples were taken to determine the radionuclide content of the water and the postshot debris. A second well (RNM-2S) was positioned 91 m from the Cambric cavity (Figure 1). Pumping of RNM-2S was initiated in October 1975 to induce a hydraulic gradient from the Cambric cavity and provide an opportunity to study radionuclide migration under field conditions. Water from RNM-2S is piped to an unlined canal which runs approximately 1.6 km to the north end of Frenchman Lake, where the water discharges to a bermed area near the playa. Figure 2 is a map of west-central Frenchman Flat.

RNM-2S was pumped almost continuously from 1975 until August 1991. In August 1991, the pump was turned off permanently, although it may be pumped on an infrequent basis in the future for occasional samples (Duncan, 1992). Water samples from RNM-2S were analyzed for

Figure 1. Cross Section Showing RNM-2S and the Cambric Detonation Point.

Figure 2. Map of West-Central Frenchman Flat Showing Location of RNM Site (after Hoffman et al., 1977).

tritium and other radionuclides at weekly or biweekly intervals from the initiation of pumping until the pump was turned off in 1991.

Three Parshall flumes were installed along the canal at the positions shown in Figure 3. Data from these flumes indicate that there is significant transmission loss along the canal (Figure 4). If the infiltrating canal water is captured by RNM-2S, it would constitute an additional source of tritium to the well, thereby affecting the tritium breakthrough. The purpose of this report is to quantify the flow of water and transport of tritium from the canal to the water table. An unsaturated groundwater flow and solute transport computer model, SATURN, was used to simulate 1,500 days of infiltration through the vadose zone beneath the RNM canal.

In this study, many assumptions were made regarding the hydraulic properties of the media, and the physical and chemical properties of, and interactions between, the various components of the system: water, air, solute, and soil. The utility of the simulation results are limited by the accuracy of the parameter estimates, and the validity of the model assumptions.

The applicability of this study can only be evaluated if there is an understanding of the assumptions and the data limitations that were involved. For this reason, the description of the geology and hydrology of Frenchman Flat is followed by a thorough discussion of the model data requirements, and the field and laboratory experiments involved in their estimation. Next, a brief derivation of the governing equations is given followed by a description of the solution domain discretization and the assignment of initial and boundary conditions. Finally, the results of the groundwater flow and tritium transport simulations are presented.

OBJECTIVE

The initial pumping rate of RNM-2S was $0.94 - 1.14 \text{ m}^3/\text{min}$. At this rate, tritium from the cavity region was expected to arrive at the well after about $9.5 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^3$ had been pumped. This estimate was based on the volume of water contained in a sphere with a radius of 91 m, and a porosity of 0.3:

$$V = \frac{4}{3} \pi r^3 n = \frac{4}{3} \pi 91^3 0.3 = 9.5 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^3 \quad (1)$$

By August 1977, more than $1.14 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ had been pumped from RNM-2S without detection of Cambrian tritium. In October 1977, a higher capacity pump was installed and pumping was resumed at a rate of about $2.3 \text{ m}^3/\text{min}$. After $2 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ had been pumped, significant amounts of tritium finally reached RNM-2S (Figures 5 and 6). Theories to explain the late arrival of tritium at RNM-2S include: inhomogeneities in the aquifer; diffusion of tritium into stagnant, immobile regions in the flow path; exchange of tritium with structural water; and adsorption of tritium on the surface of clay particles. Recirculation of water infiltrating from the discharge canal might also have had an effect on tritium breakthrough at RNM-2S.

A three-dimensional solute transport model was used to simulate tritium and chlorine-36 breakthrough at RNM-2S (Burbey, 1984). A good match between simulated and observed

Figure 3. Cambric Site of the Radionuclide Migration Program.

Figure 4. RNM Canal Transmission Losses.

Figure 5. Tritium Concentration (corrected to Cambric Zero Time) at RNM-2S versus Time (after Daniels, 1981).

Figure 6. Tritium Concentration (corrected to Cambric Zero Time) at RNM-2S versus Volume Pumped (after Daniels, 1981).

tritium breakthrough at RNM-2S was achieved by incorporating a low permeability layer (presumed to be playa type sediments) between the pump intake and the cavity region, and by assuming a distribution coefficient for tritium of 0.8 ml/g (Figure 7). Burbey and Wheatcraft (1986) also required the limited sorption for tritium in their studies at the Cambric site.

Distribution coefficients represent the partitioning of a contaminant between the solution and the solids, in this case, the water and the aquifer material. The distribution coefficient can be represented as

$$K_d = \frac{\text{mass of solute on the solid phase per unit mass of solid phase}}{\text{concentration of solute in solution}} \quad (2)$$

A high distribution coefficient indicates a strong tendency for sorption.

The goal of this study was to describe the flow of water and the transport of Cambric tritium to the water table beneath the RNM canal. The fairly complete record of the radionuclide input to the canal, together with detailed data on the canal transmission losses, provides a unique opportunity for study of transport processes in the thick, unsaturated alluvial deposits, characteristic of much of the arid southwest. This study will, hopefully, contribute to our general understanding of flow and transport in this environment. In addition, this report will demonstrate the problems and limitations inherent in numerical simulation of recharge through deep, variably saturated media. If the simulation results indicate that the recirculation of canal tritium may have significantly affected the breakthrough at RNM-2S, the results of this modeling effort could be used as input to a three-dimensional saturated transport model to simulate the arrival of Cambric tritium at RNM-2S, incorporating this additional tritium source.

Figure 7. Plot Showing Concentration versus Volume Pumped. Tritium Data are Corrected to Shot Time (after Burbey, 1984).

HYDROGEOLOGY

LOCATION

The Nevada Test Site, an area of about 3,600 km², is located approximately 104 km northwest of Las Vegas in the Nevada desert. This area is in the southernmost part of the Great Basin section of the Basin and Range physiographic province defined by Fenneman (1931). Frenchman Flat, the site of the Cambrian event, is in the southeast portion of the NTS.

Frenchman Flat is a gently sloping (10 to 12 m/km) closed basin with interior surface drainage to a normally dry playa, Frenchman Lake. Well-defined drainage channels in the mountainous areas and upper alluvial slopes become braided as they approach the lower desert floor. All channels are ephemeral, flowing only in response to precipitation. Runoff, rapidly lost to infiltration and evaporation, rarely reaches Frenchman Lake.

The study area lies in the most arid part of Nevada, the most arid State in the Union (Winograd et al., 1971). The average annual precipitation on Frenchman Flat is only about 15 cm. The potential annual evaporation from lake and reservoir surfaces in this area has been estimated to range from 152 to 208 cm (Meyers and Nodenson, 1962).

GEOLOGY

Frenchman Flat lies in the transitional zone between the Tertiary volcanic rocks of south-central Nevada and the Paleozoic rocks, primarily carbonates, that characterize eastern Nevada. Mountain ranges to the south, southeast, and east of Frenchman Flat consist of lower Paleozoic limestone, dolomite, and quartzite. Tertiary volcanics, mostly tuffs, compose the hills to the north and west.

Erosion and sedimentation have filled the valley with alluvium and playa sediments. In central Frenchman Flat, the alluvium is at least 500 m thick and probably reaches a maximum thickness of 700 to 800 m (Hoffman et al., 1977). Figure 8 shows a cross section of the geology at the Cambrian site along the section indicated in Figure 9 (the depths to Tertiary and Paleozoic rocks are speculative). For detailed information on the geology of the NTS, the reader is referred to Winograd et al. (1971) and Carr (1975).

HYDROLOGY

Frenchman Flat lies within the Ash Meadows groundwater system, an 11,500 km² area in which water flows in a southwesterly direction to discharge at Ash Meadows in the Amargosa Desert.

Winograd et al. (1971) grouped the numerous geologic formations and members of the NTS region into units of hydrologic significance. The resulting 10 hydrogeologic units in order of decreasing age are: lower clastic aquitard; lower carbonate aquifer; upper clastic aquitard; upper carbonate aquifer; tuff aquitard; lava-flow aquitard; bedded tuff aquifer; welded tuff

Figure 8. Geologic Section at RNM Site (after Hoffman et al., 1977). See Figure 10 for the Location of Section Line A-A'.

Figure 9. Location of Section Line A-A' (Figure 8) (after Hoffman et al., 1977).

aquifer; lava-flow aquifer; and valley-fill aquifer. This study considers flow only in the valley-fill aquifer. See Winograd et al. (1971) for detailed description of the other hydrogeologic units.

Alluvial fan, fluvial, fanglomerate, lake bed, and mudflow deposits compose the valley fill (Winograd et al., 1971). It is the major water supply aquifer in Frenchman Flat, western Emigrant Valley, and the Amargosa Desert. The valley fill is at least 570 m thick beneath central Yucca Flat and at least 366 m thick beneath central Frenchman Flat. Well data at the Cambrian site (RNM-1, RNM-2, UE5N) indicate that the alluvial fill in the vicinity of the RNM site is remarkably uniform (Hoffman et al., 1977). Medium to coarse sand is the dominant grain size. Pebbles were found in most samples and cuttings, and gravel and cobble beds were observed in the upper 200 m. The sand particles and pebbles were derived mainly from Tertiary volcanics.

The static water table at the RNM site is 221 m below the land surface. The saturated hydraulic conductivity of RNM-1 sidewall samples was estimated from particle-size distribution to be about 4 m/day (although this value might be too high due to a loss of fines). Tests of wells RNM-2S, U5B, and U5C yielded values of saturated hydraulic conductivity of 1.5, 1.4, and 0.2 m/day, respectively. Figure 10 shows the locations of the wells in the vicinity of the Cambrian site.

Figure 10. Map of Frenchman Flat Showing the Locations of Drill Holes (after Ramspott, 1977).

CANAL INFILTRATION MODEL

THE SATURN MODEL

A variably saturated groundwater flow and solute transport numerical model, SATURN (Huyakorn et al., 1983), was used to simulate the flow of water and the transport of tritium from the RNM canal, through the thick unsaturated alluvial sediments to the water table. The two-dimensional model domain consisted of a vertical plane, normal to the canal, extending vertically from the ground surface to a depth of 225 m (approximately 4 m below the precanal water table), and laterally from the center of the canal to a distance of 200 m. Only flow on one side of the canal was simulated, exploiting the symmetry of the flow system. For reasons discussed later, flow beneath the canal is believed to have been at steady state prior to the arrival of Cambic tritium at RNM-2S, allowing the flow and transport simulations to be conducted sequentially. A total of 1,500 days of tritium transport were simulated, beginning when Cambic tritium was first detected at RNM-2S.

SATURN INPUT REQUIREMENTS

Input data for SATURN include the following:

1. Flow Simulation--porous media properties.
Saturated hydraulic conductivity components, K_{xx} , K_{zz} , K_{xz}
Saturated specific storage
Effective porosity
Tabulated data of, or parameters of analytical expressions for;
unsaturated hydraulic conductivity versus moisture content
matric suction versus moisture content
2. Transport Simulation.
 - A. Porous media properties
Longitudinal dispersivity
Transverse dispersivity
Molecular diffusion coefficients, D_{xx} and D_{zz}
Effective porosity
 - B. Properties of the solute species
Retardation coefficient
Initial inventory

PARAMETER ESTIMATION

Input data for the porous media properties were based on field and laboratory tests and on the literature. Input data regarding properties of water and tritium were from the literature. Saturated hydraulic conductivity was measured both in the field and in the laboratory, and compared to values from the literature. The unsaturated hydraulic conductivity function and the

soil moisture characteristic were measured in situ by the instantaneous profile method (Hillel et al., 1972). Values of parameters in the analytical expressions relating matric suction and unsaturated hydraulic conductivity to moisture content were then determined by regression analysis (van Genuchten, 1978), and compared with the field measurements.

Laboratory Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity Determination

Core samples from holes US1 and US2 (Figure 3) were used to determine the saturated hydraulic conductivity of the alluvium. At three-meter intervals, one meter of 10-cm-diameter core was taken, where possible. The core was collected in brass sample sleeves, in 7.6-cm and 15.2-cm sections. Each section was separated with a knife and sealed with plastic end caps in the field.

The grain-size distribution of sidewall samples from RNM-1 was used to calculate an average hydraulic conductivity for the alluvium of about 4 m/day, although this estimate may be too high due to loss of fines. Tests of wells RNM-2S, U5B, and U5C yielded conductivities of 1.5 m/day, 1.4 m/day, and 0.2 m/day, respectfully (Hoffman et al., 1977). Klute (1965) suggests a constant head permeameter be used for samples with conductivities greater than approximately 0.14 m/day, and falling head methods for samples with lower conductivities.

A constant head permeameter was constructed for the testing. A pair of end caps were equipped with inflow and outflow fittings, allowing the cores to be tested in the sample sleeves, thus minimizing the disturbance of the sample and preserving as much of the soil structure as possible. Blocking of sample pores by air can result in sizable error in permeameter measurements. The entrapment of air in a sample during saturation will result in a falsely low measured conductivity. To avoid this, interstitial air in the cores was displaced with carbon dioxide prior to saturation. Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is far more soluble in water than air. For example, at 25°C, 759 ml of CO_2 can be absorbed by one liter of water (this is the volume of gas when reduced to 0°C and 760 mm Hg). Under similar conditions, only about 17 ml of air can be dissolved in the same volume of water. In addition, the samples were saturated under a vacuum, from the bottom. To prevent any gas from coming out of solution during testing, degassed water was used. The results of the permeameter testing are given in Figure 11. After the permeameter testing, the saturated soil cores were weighed and oven dried at 105°C to determine the porosity. Porosity and saturated hydraulic conductivity data are presented in Table 1.

Unsaturated Properties of the Porous Medium

Quantitative description of unsaturated flow requires a knowledge of the water retention characteristics of the soil involved, and the functional dependence of hydraulic conductivity on moisture content or matric suction.

The difficulties associated with the direct measurement of unsaturated hydraulic conductivity have created substantial interest in methods of determining the hydraulic conductivity of an unsaturated soil from characteristics that are more easily quantified. According to Mualem (1976), these methods are of two types. The first relates the hydraulic

Figure 11. Results of Permeameter Tests on Cores from US1 and US2.

TABLE 1. POROSITY AND SATURATED HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY OF SAMPLES FROM DRILL HOLES US1 AND US2.

Depth (m)	Porosity	Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (m/day)
2.50	0.32	3.54×10^{-1}
7.14	0.33	1.96
10.18	0.33	2.35×10^{-1}
13.39	0.33	9.42×10^{-1}
16.43	0.33	3.24×10^{-1}
18.04	0.36	2.19×10^{-1}
22.86	0.36	2.51×10^{-1}
31.60	0.36	4.84×10^{-2}

conductivity to the soil characteristic (Childs and Collis-George, 1950; Marshall, 1958; Millington and Quirk, 1961; Jackson et al., 1965; Kunze et al., 1968; Farrell and Larson, 1972). The second method assumes that the hydraulic conductivity is a power function of the effective saturation (Brooks and Corey, 1964; Brutsaert, 1967; Jones and Wagenet, 1984).

SATURN assumes the following relationship between relative hydraulic conductivity, k_r , and dimensionless moisture content, $\hat{\theta}$:

$$k_r = \frac{k(\theta)}{k_{sat}} = \hat{\theta}^n \quad (3)$$

where

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{\theta - \theta_r}{\theta_s - \theta_r} \quad (4)$$

where θ , θ_s , and θ_r are the actual, saturated, and residual water contents, respectively. To assess the validity of the above assumption, measured hydraulic conductivity values were needed.

Klute (1972) surveyed the various methods for measuring the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated soils. The methods are grouped into two types: steady-state and unsteady. In steady-state methods, the hydraulic gradient and volumetric flux are measured in a one-dimensional steady-state flow system. The hydraulic conductivity at the existing moisture content is then obtained from the Darcy equation.

Transient methods use the time dependence of some property of the flow system to determine the hydraulic conductivity. These methods can be classified as outflow-inflow

methods, or instantaneous profile methods. A variety of outflow-inflow methods have been proposed (Gardner, 1956; Miller and Elrick, 1958; Rijtema, 1959; Kunze and Kirkham, 1962; Bruce and Klute, 1956; Jackson et al., 1963; Doering, 1965; Peek, 1966). Many investigators have applied forms of the instantaneous profile method to determine unsaturated hydraulic conductivity in the laboratory (Richards and Weeks, 1953; Watson, 1966; Vachaud, 1967; Weeks and Richards, 1967; Flocher et al., 1968; Cassel et al., 1968; Rogers and Klute, 1971; Vachaud and Thony, 1971); and in the field (Richards et al., 1956; Ogata and Richards, 1957; Nielson et al., 1962; Rose et al., 1965; van Bavel et al., 1968a, 1968b; Davidson et al., 1969; Gardner, 1970). The instantaneous profile method used to determine the hydraulic conductivity function of the soil at the RNM site is outlined by Hillel et al. (1972).

Instantaneous Profile Test

Introduction

Unsaturated hydraulic conductivity as a function of moisture content was determined by the instantaneous profile technique (Hillel et al., 1972). This method, based upon monitoring the internal drainage of a soil profile, requires the frequent and simultaneous measurement of moisture content and matric suction. From these measurements, the soil moisture characteristic, and instantaneous head gradients and moisture fluxes can be determined. The hydraulic conductivity is then obtained as the ratio of the flux to the head gradient. The instantaneous profile technique is an unsteady method that, when applied to a field soil, eliminates the problems associated with laboratory techniques, such as compaction or disaggregation of the sample, loss of soil structure, nonrepresentative sampling, or a change in sample orientation. According to Watson (1966), one attraction to this approach is that unlike steady-state methods where the dynamic effects present in unsteady flow are assumed to have a negligible effect on the 'steady-state' hydraulic conductivity, the instantaneous profile method determines conductivities at a particular instance in time.

Theory

Darcy's law for unsaturated vertical flow can be written as:

$$q = -K(\Theta) \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \quad (5)$$

where q is the fluid flux, $K(\Theta)$ is the unsaturated hydraulic conductivity as a function of moisture content, H is the hydraulic head, and z is the vertical dimension.

The general equation of continuity for flow through porous media is

$$\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot q \quad (6)$$

where t is time.

For one-dimensional vertical flow, equation (6) can be written

$$\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial t} = - \frac{\partial q}{\partial z} \quad (7)$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[K(\Theta) \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \right] \quad (8)$$

Integrating, we obtain

$$\int_0^z \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial t} dz = q = \left[K(\Theta) \frac{\partial H}{\partial z} \right]_z \quad (9)$$

The integral can be evaluated from the moisture data, and an instantaneous flux obtained. The hydraulic head gradient is calculated from tensiometer measurements. Finally,

$$K(\Theta) = \frac{q}{\partial H / \partial z} \quad (10)$$

Experimental Design

The site selected for the instantaneous profile test is located approximately 50 m northwest of flume 2 (Figure 3). An area of about 3 m x 4 m was excavated to a depth of 15 cm, and was enclosed by a 20-cm soil berm. The plot was designed to be large enough so that only vertical infiltration occurred in the vicinity of the neutron tubes and tensiometers.

Two holes (designated N1 and N2 in Figure 12) for neutron access tubes were hand augered to a depth of 250 cm. The bottoms of the tubes were stoppered to prevent the entry of water. 5.08-cm I.D. aluminum neutron access tubes were installed and backfilled with a slurry made from the cuttings.

Two tensiometer arrays--five tensiometers each--were installed in the positions shown, with the shallowest tensiometer at 26 cm, the deepest at 214 cm. The porous tips were packed with mud made of fines from the auger cuttings. The holes were then backfilled with a slurry also made from the cuttings. The exposed tubing and gauges were covered with thick fiberglass insulation to prevent freezing.

A single temperature probe was installed at the position indicated, at a depth of 60 cm to detect the advancing wetting front. A staff gauge was placed in the plot for water depth measurement. Figure 12 shows the locations of the instruments at the test plot.

Two outflow tubes were installed on the southeast corner of the plot to prevent erosion of the berm when the inflow exceeded the infiltration rate during the initial wetting of the profile. An inflow tube was positioned near the center of the plot with a slotted PVC diffuser attached to the end to prevent scour of the plot bottom.

Figure 12. Instantaneous Profile Test Site.

Data Collection

Prior to flooding the plot, both neutron tubes were logged at 0.3-m intervals and all tensiometer readings were recorded. Water for the test was pumped from the RNM canal to the plot, a distance of about 40 m. By keeping the inflow slightly greater than the infiltration rate, a constant head of approximately 10 cm was maintained at the level of the outflow tubes. Soil moisture and matric suction were monitored to determine when the profile was saturated.

After about three days, the tensiometer and neutron readings had stabilized, indicating that infiltration through the profile had reached steady state. The steady-state infiltration rate was determined by two methods. In the first method, the inflow-outflow rates were measured and the difference attributed to infiltration. In the second method, the pump was shut off and the depth of water on the plot was measured as a function of time, and an average flux obtained. Both methods ignore evaporation, considered to be negligible compared to the inflow-outflow rates and considering the relatively short period of the experiment.

As soon as the water level reached the soil surface, the plot was covered with black plastic and frequent and concurrent measurements of soil wetness and matric suction were taken. Neutron moisture meter data and tensiometer data are listed in Appendices A and B, respectively. Only N1 was logged for the first 1.5 hours. The time between measurements increased as the plot drained and changes in soil moisture and suction occurred less rapidly.

Twenty-three days after cessation of pumping, three soil samples were taken for calibration of the neutron probe. Core barrels (5-cm I.D.) were driven from 50 cm to 60 cm below the plot bottom at a distance of 15 cm from N2. N2 was then logged at this interval.

In-Situ Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity Determination

After the neutron and tensiometer readings had stabilized, inflow and outflow were measured to determine the infiltration flux. Three measurements at the inflow tube, and three at each outflow tube were made and are listed in Appendix C. The measurements at each tube were averaged and the flux of infiltration computed as

$$\begin{aligned} q &= \frac{\bar{I} - \bar{O}_1 - \bar{O}_2}{A} \\ &= \frac{\left(8.914 \times 10^2 \frac{\text{cm}^3}{\text{sec}}\right) - \left(3.709 \times 10^2 \frac{\text{cm}^3}{\text{sec}}\right) - \left(1.495 \times 10^2 \frac{\text{cm}^3}{\text{sec}}\right)}{1.93 \times 10^5 \text{ cm}^2} \\ &= 1.92 \times 10^{-3} \frac{\text{cm}}{\text{sec}} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where q is the infiltration flux (neglecting evaporation), $\bar{I}$ is the average inflow, $\bar{O}_1$ is the average outflow at tube 1, $\bar{O}_2$ is the average outflow at tube 2, and A is the area of the plot.

A second measurement of the infiltration flux was made by recording the rate at which the water level dropped on the plot after the pump was turned off (data are listed in Appendix C).

The water level dropped 4.27 cm in 3,540 seconds for an average flux of 1.21×10^{-3} cm/sec, again ignoring evaporation.

For saturated vertical flow in a free-draining medium, if the ponding depth is negligible, a unit hydraulic gradient will exist, and the fluid flux will equal the saturated hydraulic conductivity (Black et al., 1969; Davidson et al., 1969; Hillel, 1971). As can be seen by Figure 13, the infiltration rate is independent of the depth of ponding, which can be considered negligible, and the infiltration fluxes can be used as estimates of the saturated hydraulic conductivity. Conductivities, thus obtained, agree fairly well with values from other methods (Table 2).

Soil Moisture Characteristic Curves

Soil moisture characteristic curves were produced for each depth at which moisture content was measured. Moisture values from N1 and N2 were averaged. Where data from N2 were not available (the first three hours after the pump was turned off), data from N1 were used. Matric suctions for these depths were obtained by averaging data from the two tensiometer arrays and then interpolating to the neutron log depths.

The curves indicate considerable variability in hydraulic properties with depth. A nonlinear, least squares, curve-fitting algorithm (van Genuchten, 1978) was used to obtain equations for the curves of the form:

$$\Theta = (n - \Theta_r) \left\{ \frac{1}{1 + (\alpha\psi - \psi_a)^\beta} \right\}^\gamma + \Theta_r \quad (12)$$

where Θ is the moisture content, α , β , and γ are parameters to be determined by the curve-fitting algorithm, ψ is the pressure head, ψ_a is the air-entry pressure head, n is the porosity, and Θ_r is the residual moisture content.

Unsaturated Hydraulic Conductivity Determination

Appendix D contains plots of volumetric moisture content (Θ) versus time, for each depth. The flux through each depth increment (dz) is determined by integrating the moisture versus time curve with respect to depth (Tables 3 and 4). Values of $\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial t}$ were obtained by fitting a smooth curve to the data and measuring the tangents to the curves at $t = 1, 2, 5, 10$, and 20 days.

Appendix E contains plots of total head (H) versus depth (z) for 1, 2, 5, 10, and 20 days. The total head is calculated as

$$H = \bar{\Psi} + z$$

Figure 13. Depth of Ponding versus Time.

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF SATURATED HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY ESTIMATES.

Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity (m/day)			
Canal	Inst. Profile	Permeameter	Literature
5.43×10^{-1} (1)	1.66 (2)	3.54×10^{-1} (4)	4.0 (5)
—	1.05 (3)	1.96	1.5 (6)
—	—	2.35×10^{-1}	1.4 (7)
—	—	9.42×10^{-1}	2.0×10^{-1} (8)
—	—	3.24×10^{-1}	—
—	—	2.19×10^{-1}	—
—	—	2.51×10^{-1}	—
—	—	4.84×10^{-2}	—

1. (Canal transmission loss)/(Area of canal bottom).
2. (Inflow – outflow)/(Area of plot).
3. (Water level drop)/(Unit time).
4. Constant-head permeameter tests on samples from US1 and US2.
5. RNM-1 sidewall samples (Hoffman et al., 1977).
6. Test of well RNM-2S (Hoffman et al., 1977).
7. Test of well 5B (Hoffman et al., 1977).
8. Test of well 5C (Hoffman et al., 1977).

where $\bar{\Psi}$ is the average matric suction of the two tensiometer arrays. Matric suctions at 1, 2, 5, 10, and 20 days were interpolated from data taken at times which were, in part, determined by technician availability. The hydraulic gradients, $\frac{\partial H}{\partial z}$, are obtained from these plots.

Hydraulic conductivity as a function of moisture content, $K(\Theta)$, for each depth is calculated by dividing the fluxes by the corresponding hydraulic gradient (Tables 5 and 6). Figures 14 and 15 are plots of $K(\Theta)$ versus Θ , for N1 and N2, respectively. Again, vertical heterogeneities are very apparent.

The SATURN code requires specification of the functional dependence of saturation on pressure, and that of relative permeability on saturation or pressure. The saturated hydraulic conductivity and soil moisture characteristic data obtained in the instantaneous profile test were used as input for SOHYP (van Genuchten, 1978), a computer model for calculating the soil hydraulic properties from soil moisture retention data. SOHYP utilizes a nonlinear, least squares, curve-fitting algorithm to obtain an equation of the soil moisture characteristic curve. The resulting equation is substituted in the predictive conductivity model of Mualem (1976). The equation relating relative hydraulic conductivity, k_r , to dimensionless moisture content, $\hat{\Theta}$, is

TABLE 3. CALCULATION OF SOIL MOISTURE FLUX--N1 (instantaneous profile test).

Time (days)	z (cm)	$\frac{\delta\theta}{\delta t}$ (hr ⁻¹)	$dz\left(\frac{\delta\theta}{\delta t}\right)$ (cm/hrs)	$q = \sum dz\left(\frac{\delta\theta}{\delta t}\right)$ (cm/hrs)
1 day	0-15	7.55×10^{-4}	1.13×10^{-2}	1.13×10^{-2}
	15-45	7.55×10^{-4}	2.26×10^{-2}	3.40×10^{-2}
	45-75	1.39×10^{-3}	4.18×10^{-2}	7.58×10^{-2}
	75-105	6.16×10^{-4}	1.85×10^{-2}	9.42×10^{-2}
	105-135	1.09×10^{-3}	3.26×10^{-2}	1.27×10^{-1}
	135-165	1.01×10^{-3}	3.02×10^{-2}	1.57×10^{-1}
	165-195	1.36×10^{-3}	4.08×10^{-2}	1.98×10^{-1}
2 days	0-15	2.59×10^{-4}	3.88×10^{-3}	3.88×10^{-3}
	15-45	2.59×10^{-4}	7.77×10^{-3}	1.17×10^{-2}
	45-75	4.00×10^{-4}	1.20×10^{-2}	2.37×10^{-2}
	75-105	3.35×10^{-4}	1.01×10^{-2}	3.37×10^{-2}
	105-135	6.95×10^{-4}	2.09×10^{-2}	5.46×10^{-2}
	135-165	3.68×10^{-4}	1.10×10^{-2}	6.56×10^{-2}
	165-195	5.11×10^{-4}	1.53×10^{-2}	8.09×10^{-2}
5 days	0-15	1.57×10^{-4}	2.36×10^{-3}	2.36×10^{-3}
	15-45	1.57×10^{-4}	4.72×10^{-3}	7.08×10^{-3}
	45-75	1.50×10^{-4}	4.50×10^{-3}	1.16×10^{-2}
	75-105	1.17×10^{-4}	3.51×10^{-3}	1.51×10^{-2}
	105-135	3.98×10^{-4}	1.19×10^{-2}	2.70×10^{-2}
	135-165	2.33×10^{-4}	6.98×10^{-3}	3.40×10^{-2}
	165-195	1.75×10^{-4}	5.25×10^{-3}	3.93×10^{-2}
10 days	0-15	1.70×10^{-5}	2.50×10^{-4}	2.50×10^{-4}
	15-45	1.70×10^{-5}	5.00×10^{-4}	7.50×10^{-4}
	45-75	5.80×10^{-5}	1.75×10^{-3}	2.50×10^{-3}
	75-105	6.70×10^{-5}	2.00×10^{-3}	4.50×10^{-3}
	105-135	2.10×10^{-5}	6.25×10^{-4}	5.12×10^{-3}
	135-165	3.30×10^{-5}	1.00×10^{-3}	6.12×10^{-3}
	165-195	5.80×10^{-5}	1.75×10^{-3}	7.88×10^{-3}
20 days	0-15	0.0	0.0	0.0
	15-45	0.0	0.0	0.0
	45-75	0.0	0.0	0.0
	75-105	1.10×10^{-5}	3.13×10^{-4}	3.13×10^{-4}
	105-135	6.00×10^{-6}	1.88×10^{-4}	5.00×10^{-4}
	135-165	0.0	0.0	5.00×10^{-4}
	165-195	3.10×10^{-5}	9.37×10^{-4}	1.44×10^{-3}

TABLE 4. CALCULATION OF SOIL MOISTURE FLUX--N2 (instantaneous profile test).

Time (days)	z (cm)	$\frac{\delta\theta}{\delta t}$ (hr ⁻¹)	$dz\left(\frac{\delta\theta}{\delta t}\right)$ (cm/hrs)	$q = \sum dz\left(\frac{\delta\theta}{\delta t}\right)$ (cm/hrs)
1 day	0-15	1.75x10 ⁻³	2.63x10 ⁻²	2.63x10 ⁻²
	15-45	1.75x10 ⁻³	5.25x10 ⁻²	7.88x10 ⁻²
	45-75	2.09x10 ⁻³	6.27x10 ⁻²	1.42x10 ⁻¹
	75-105	1.39x10 ⁻³	4.18x10 ⁻²	1.83x10 ⁻¹
	105-135	1.04x10 ⁻³	3.12x10 ⁻²	2.15x10 ⁻¹
	135-165	1.16x10 ⁻³	3.47x10 ⁻²	2.49x10 ⁻¹
	165-195	1.18x10 ⁻³	3.54x10 ⁻²	2.85x10 ⁻¹
2 days	0-15	6.71x10 ⁻⁴	1.01x10 ⁻²	1.01x10 ⁻²
	15-45	6.71x10 ⁻⁴	2.01x10 ⁻²	3.02x10 ⁻²
	45-75	5.90x10 ⁻⁴	1.77x10 ⁻²	4.79x10 ⁻²
	75-105	8.48x10 ⁻⁴	2.54x10 ⁻²	7.33x10 ⁻²
	105-135	4.47x10 ⁻⁴	1.34x10 ⁻²	8.68x10 ⁻²
	135-165	6.25x10 ⁻⁴	1.88x10 ⁻²	1.06x10 ⁻¹
	165-195	5.94x10 ⁻⁴	1.78x10 ⁻²	1.23x10 ⁻¹
5 days	0-15	9.40x10 ⁻⁵	1.41x10 ⁻³	1.41x10 ⁻³
	15-45	9.40x10 ⁻⁵	2.81x10 ⁻³	4.22x10 ⁻³
	45-75	1.58x10 ⁻⁴	4.75x10 ⁻³	8.97x10 ⁻³
	75-105	1.15x10 ⁻⁴	3.44x10 ⁻³	1.24x10 ⁻²
	105-135	7.10x10 ⁻⁵	2.12x10 ⁻³	1.45x10 ⁻²
	135-165	2.90x10 ⁻⁵	8.75x10 ⁻⁴	1.54x10 ⁻²
	165-195	9.21x10 ⁻⁵	2.75x10 ⁻³	1.82x10 ⁻²
10 days	0-15	4.60x10 ⁻⁵	6.87x10 ⁻⁴	6.87x10 ⁻⁴
	15-45	4.60x10 ⁻⁵	1.38x10 ⁻³	2.06x10 ⁻³
	45-75	6.20x10 ⁻⁵	1.88x10 ⁻³	3.94x10 ⁻³
	75-105	1.90x10 ⁻⁵	5.62x10 ⁻⁴	4.50x10 ⁻³
	105-135	7.10x10 ⁻⁵	2.12x10 ⁻³	6.62x10 ⁻³
	135-165	2.90x10 ⁻⁵	8.75x10 ⁻⁴	7.50x10 ⁻³
	165-195	4.00x10 ⁻⁵	1.19x10 ⁻³	8.69x10 ⁻³
20 days	0-15	0.0	0.0	0.0
	15-45	0.0	0.0	0.0
	45-75	2.70x10 ⁻⁵	8.12x10 ⁻⁴	8.12x10 ⁻⁴
	75-105	4.00x10 ⁻⁶	1.25x10 ⁻⁴	9.37x10 ⁻⁴
	105-135	0.0	0.0	9.37x10 ⁻⁴
	135-165	2.90x10 ⁻⁵	8.75x10 ⁻⁴	1.81x10 ⁻³
	165-195	4.00x10 ⁻⁵	1.19x10 ⁻³	3.00x10 ⁻³

TABLE 5. CALCULATION OF HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY--N1 (instantaneous profile test).

z (cm)	q (cm/hr)	$\frac{\delta H}{\delta z}$ (cm/cm)	K (cm/hr)	Θ (%)
15	1.13×10^{-2}	0.50	2.26×10^{-2}	18.80
	2.36×10^{-3}	0.26	9.08×10^{-3}	16.70
	2.50×10^{-4}	0.65	3.80×10^{-4}	15.80
45	3.40×10^{-2}	0.50	6.79×10^{-2}	18.80
	7.08×10^{-3}	0.26	2.72×10^{-2}	16.70
	7.50×10^{-4}	0.65	1.15×10^{-3}	15.80
75	7.58×10^{-2}	0.48	1.58×10^{-1}	22.50
	2.37×10^{-2}	0.40	5.91×10^{-2}	20.70
	1.16×10^{-2}	0.40	2.90×10^{-2}	19.20
	2.50×10^{-3}	0.31	8.06×10^{-3}	18.10
105	9.42×10^{-2}	0.51	1.85×10^{-1}	21.30
	3.37×10^{-2}	0.75	4.49×10^{-2}	19.80
	1.51×10^{-2}	0.45	3.35×10^{-2}	18.50
	4.50×10^{-3}	0.41	1.10×10^{-2}	17.50
	3.13×10^{-4}	0.19	1.65×10^{-3}	16.70
135	1.27×10^{-1}	0.77	1.65×10^{-1}	14.40
	5.46×10^{-2}	0.87	6.26×10^{-2}	13.40
	2.70×10^{-2}	0.81	3.34×10^{-2}	12.00
	5.12×10^{-3}	0.76	6.74×10^{-3}	11.20
	5.00×10^{-4}	0.75	6.70×10^{-4}	10.90
165	1.57×10^{-1}	0.77	2.04×10^{-1}	12.70
	6.56×10^{-2}	0.87	7.54×10^{-2}	12.20
	3.40×10^{-2}	0.81	4.20×10^{-2}	11.60
	6.12×10^{-3}	0.76	8.06×10^{-3}	10.90
	5.00×10^{-4}	0.75	6.70×10^{-4}	10.90
195	1.98×10^{-1}	0.77	2.57×10^{-1}	18.60
	8.09×10^{-2}	0.87	9.30×10^{-2}	17.90
	3.93×10^{-2}	0.81	4.85×10^{-2}	16.60
	7.88×10^{-3}	0.76	1.04×10^{-2}	15.50
	1.44×10^{-3}	0.75	1.92×10^{-3}	14.80

TABLE 6. CALCULATION OF HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY--N2 (instantaneous profile test).

z (cm)	q (cm/hr)	$\frac{\delta H}{\delta z}$ (cm/cm)	K (cm/hr)	Θ (%)
15	2.63×10^{-2}	0.50	5.26×10^{-2}	19.30
	1.41×10^{-3}	0.26	5.41×10^{-3}	16.10
	6.87×10^{-4}	0.65	1.06×10^{-3}	15.60
45	7.88×10^{-2}	0.50	1.58×10^{-1}	19.30
	4.22×10^{-3}	0.26	1.62×10^{-2}	16.10
	2.06×10^{-3}	0.65	3.17×10^{-3}	15.60
75	1.42×10^{-1}	0.48	2.95×10^{-1}	22.50
	4.79×10^{-2}	0.40	1.20×10^{-1}	20.90
	8.97×10^{-3}	0.40	2.24×10^{-2}	19.10
	3.94×10^{-3}	0.31	1.27×10^{-2}	17.80
	8.12×10^{-4}	0.42	1.93×10^{-3}	16.90
105	1.83×10^{-1}	0.51	3.96×10^{-1}	20.40
	7.33×10^{-2}	0.75	9.78×10^{-2}	18.80
	1.24×10^{-2}	0.45	2.76×10^{-2}	17.60
	4.50×10^{-3}	0.41	1.10×10^{-2}	17.00
	9.37×10^{-4}	0.19	4.93×10^{-3}	16.70
135	2.15×10^{-1}	0.77	2.79×10^{-1}	16.50
	8.68×10^{-2}	0.87	9.97×10^{-2}	15.00
	1.45×10^{-2}	0.81	1.79×10^{-2}	14.60
	6.62×10^{-3}	0.76	8.72×10^{-3}	13.80
	9.37×10^{-4}	0.75	1.25×10^{-3}	13.20
165	2.49×10^{-1}	0.77	3.24×10^{-1}	17.30
	1.06×10^{-1}	0.87	1.21×10^{-1}	15.90
	1.54×10^{-2}	0.81	1.90×10^{-2}	15.20
	7.50×10^{-3}	0.76	9.87×10^{-3}	14.60
	1.81×10^{-3}	0.75	2.42×10^{-3}	14.10
195	2.85×10^{-1}	0.77	3.70×10^{-1}	19.70
	1.23×10^{-1}	0.87	1.42×10^{-1}	18.50
	1.82×10^{-2}	0.81	2.42×10^{-2}	18.00
	8.69×10^{-3}	0.76	1.43×10^{-2}	17.00
	3.00×10^{-3}	0.75	4.00×10^{-3}	16.10

Figure 14. Hydraulic Conductivity versus Moisture Content, Hole N1.

Figure 15. Hydraulic Conductivity versus Moisture Content, Hole N2.

$$k_r(\hat{\Theta}) = \hat{\Theta}^{1/2} \left\{ 1 - \left\{ 1 - \hat{\Theta}^{1/\gamma} \right\}^\gamma \right\}^2 \quad (13)$$

and

$$\hat{\Theta} = \frac{\Theta - \Theta_r}{\Theta_s - \Theta_r} = \left\{ \frac{1}{1 + (\alpha h\psi - \psi_a)^\beta} \right\}^\gamma \quad (14)$$

where α , β , and γ are parameters to be determined by the curve-fitting algorithm, ψ is the pressure head, ψ_a is the air-entry pressure head, Θ , Θ_s , and Θ_r are the actual, saturated, and residual moisture contents, respectively. Detailed derivations of these equations can be found in van Genuchten (1978) and Mualem (1976). SATURN uses equation (14) to relate moisture content to matric suction, and equation (3) to relate hydraulic conductivity to moisture content.

The range of moisture values observed in the instantaneous profile test was fairly small: 12 percent to 33 percent. To aid in the curve fitting process, a point at the dry, high tension end of the curve was taken from NTS soil moisture retention data assembled by Romney et al. (1973). The data selected were from a soil sample collected 3 km southwest of the RNM site at approximately the same elevation on Frenchman Flat as the instantaneous profile test site. Since most of the transport in this study occurred at relatively high moisture content, the shape of the characteristic curve at high tensions should have little affect on the numerical solutions of SATURN.

The soil moisture characteristic curves generated by the van Genuchten model are presented together with the field data in Appendix F. Although the water retention curve fit was consistently good, the hydraulic conductivity curves generated with equation (13) generally poorly matched the field data. Appendix G contains plots comparing hydraulic conductivities measured by the instantaneous profile test with those generated by equation (13).

Appendix H shows unsaturated hydraulic conductivity as a function of degree of saturation as determined by the instantaneous profile test, together with curves generated by equation (3) using values for the parameter n of 3 to 8. The slopes of the generated curves are consistently less than the slopes of lines fit to the field data, regardless of the choice of n .

One possible solution to this problem would be to use a different function to relate hydraulic conductivity to saturation. Many such equations can be found in the literature (Sisson et al., 1980; Mualem, 1976). However, only the binary code was available for use in this investigation making any program modifications impossible. Table 7 lists the SATURN input requirements, and the values used for the canal simulations.

Model Definition

The original solution domain was a rectangular grid in the x-z plane consisting of 551 rectangular elements defined by 600 nodes (Figure 16). Only one side of the canal was modeled,

TABLE 7. RNM CANAL MODEL INPUT DATA.

Parameter	Value
Number of nodes	780
Number of elements	711
Time-step type	Central difference
Saturated hydraulic conductivity component K_{xx} , material 1	0.543 m/day
Saturated hydraulic conductivity component K_{zz} , material 1	0.543 m/day
Saturated hydraulic conductivity component K_{xz} , material 1	0 m/day
Saturated hydraulic conductivity component K_{xx} , material 2	0.543 m/day
Saturated hydraulic conductivity component K_{zz} , material 2	0.543 m/day
Saturated hydraulic conductivity component K_{xz} , material 2	0 m/day
Effective porosity	0.33
Residual water phase saturation	0.284
Functional coefficient n (1)	4.0
Functional coefficient α (2)	0.0181
Functional coefficient β (2)	2.36
Functional coefficient γ (2)	0.577
Decay coefficient	$1.55 \times 10^{-4} \text{ day}^{-1}$
Retardation coefficient, R_o	0.8
Longitudinal dispersivity, α_L	10 m
Transverse dispersivity, α_T	3 m
Molecular diffusion component, D_{xx}^o	$1.0 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2/\text{day}$
Molecular diffusion component, D_{zz}^o	$1.0 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2/\text{day}$

$$(1) K_{rw} = \frac{(S_w - S_{wr})^n}{(1 - S_{wr})^n}$$

$$(2) S_w - S_{wr} = \frac{(1 - S_{wr})}{[1 + (\alpha |h_p - \psi_a|)^\beta]^\gamma}$$

NODES

20	40	60	80	100	120	140	160	180	200	220	240	260	280	300	320	340	360	380	400	420	440	460	480	500	520	540	560	580	600
19	39	59	79	99	119	139	159	179	199	219	239	259	279	299	319	339	359	379	399	419	439	459	479	499	519	539	559	579	599
18	38	58	78	98	118	138	158	178	198	218	238	258	278	298	318	338	358	378	398	418	438	458	478	498	518	538	558	578	598
17	37	57	77	97	117	137	157	177	197	217	237	257	277	297	317	337	357	377	397	417	437	457	477	497	517	537	557	577	597
16	36	56	76	96	116	136	156	176	196	216	236	256	276	296	316	336	356	376	396	416	436	456	476	496	516	536	556	576	596
15	35	55	75	95	115	135	155	175	195	215	235	255	275	295	315	335	355	375	395	415	435	455	475	495	515	535	555	575	595
14	34	54	74	94	114	134	154	174	194	214	234	254	274	294	314	334	354	374	394	414	434	454	474	494	514	534	554	574	594
13	33	53	73	93	113	133	153	173	193	213	233	253	273	293	313	333	353	373	393	413	433	453	473	493	513	533	553	573	593
12	32	52	72	92	112	132	152	172	192	212	232	252	272	292	312	332	352	372	392	412	432	452	472	492	512	532	552	572	592
11	31	51	71	91	111	131	151	171	191	211	231	251	271	291	311	331	351	371	391	411	431	451	471	491	511	531	551	571	591
10	30	50	70	90	110	130	150	170	190	210	230	250	270	290	310	330	350	370	390	410	430	450	470	490	510	530	550	570	590
9	29	49	69	89	109	129	149	169	189	209	229	249	269	289	309	329	349	369	389	409	429	449	469	489	509	529	549	569	589
8	28	48	68	88	108	128	148	168	188	208	228	248	268	288	308	328	348	368	388	408	428	448	468	488	508	528	548	568	588
7	27	47	67	87	107	127	147	167	187	207	227	247	267	287	307	327	347	367	387	407	427	447	467	487	507	527	547	567	587
6	26	46	66	86	106	126	146	166	186	206	226	246	266	286	306	326	346	366	386	406	426	446	466	486	506	526	546	566	586
5	25	45	65	85	105	125	145	165	185	205	225	245	265	285	305	325	345	365	385	405	425	445	465	485	505	525	545	565	585
4	24	44	64	84	104	124	144	164	184	204	224	244	264	284	304	324	344	364	384	404	424	444	464	484	504	524	544	564	584
3	23	43	63	83	103	123	143	163	183	203	223	243	263	283	303	323	343	363	383	403	423	443	463	483	503	523	543	563	583
2	22	42	62	82	102	122	142	162	182	202	222	242	262	282	302	322	342	362	382	402	422	442	462	482	502	522	542	562	582
1	21	41	61	81	101	121	141	161	181	201	221	241	261	281	301	321	341	361	381	401	421	441	461	481	501	521	541	561	581

ELEMENTS

19	38	57	76	95	114	133	152	171	190	209	228	247	266	285	304	323	342	361	380	399	418	437	456	475	494	513	532	551
18	37	56	75	94	113	132	151	170	189	208	227	246	265	284	303	322	341	360	379	398	417	436	455	474	493	512	531	550
17	36	55	74	93	112	131	150	169	188	207	226	245	264	283	302	321	340	359	378	397	416	435	454	473	492	511	530	549
16	35	54	73	92	111	130	149	168	187	206	225	244	263	282	301	320	339	358	377	396	415	434	453	472	491	510	529	548
15	34	53	72	91	110	129	148	167	186	205	224	243	262	281	300	319	338	357	376	395	414	433	452	471	490	509	528	547
14	33	52	71	90	109	128	147	166	185	204	223	242	261	280	299	318	337	356	375	394	413	432	451	470	489	508	527	546
13	32	51	70	89	108	127	146	165	184	203	222	241	260	279	298	317	336	355	374	393	412	431	450	469	488	507	526	545
12	31	50	69	88	107	126	145	164	183	202	221	240	259	278	297	316	335	354	373	392	411	430	449	468	487	506	525	544
11	30	49	68	87	106	125	144	163	182	201	220	239	258	277	296	315	334	353	372	391	410	429	448	467	486	505	524	543
10	29	48	67	86	105	124	143	162	181	200	219	238	257	276	295	314	333	352	371	390	409	428	447	466	485	504	523	542
9	28	47	66	85	104	123	142	161	180	199	218	237	256	275	294	313	332	351	370	389	408	427	446	465	484	503	522	541
8	27	46	65	84	103	122	141	160	179	198	217	236	255	274	293	312	331	350	369	388	407	426	445	464	483	502	521	540
7	26	45	64	83	102	121	140	159	178	197	216	235	254	273	292	311	330	349	368	387	406	425	444	463	482	501	520	539
6	25	44	63	82	101	120	139	158	177	196	215	234	253	272	291	310	329	348	367	386	405	424	443	462	481	500	519	538
5	24	43	62	81	100	119	138	157	176	195	214	233	252	271	290	309	328	347	366	385	404	423	442	461	480	499	518	537
4	23	42	61	80	99	118	137	156	175	194	213	232	251	270	289	308	327	346	365	384	403	422	441	460	479	498	517	536
3	22	41	60	79	98	117	136	155	174	193	212	231	250	269	288	307	326	345	364	383	402	421	440	459	478	497	516	535
2	21	40	59	78	97	116	135	154	173	192	211	230	249	268	287	306	325	344	363	382	401	420	439	458	477	496	515	534
1	20	39	58	77	96	115	134	153	172	191	210	229	248	267	286	305	324	343	362	381	400	419	438	457	476	495	514	533

Figure 16. Original Sample Space Discretization into Nodes and Elements.

exploiting the symmetry of the flow system. The grid extended to a depth of 270 m (50 m below the water table) and to a distance of 1,000 m in the horizontal direction. Node spacing increased with depth and with horizontal distance from the canal. Element size ranged from 0.5 m x 0.5 m at the canal to 50 m x 200 m for elements furthest from the canal.

At the canal, pressure heads were held constant at +20 cm. Initial hydraulic heads at and below the water table were hydrostatic. All other nodes were initially -100 cm (approximately 60 percent saturated). Although this degree of saturation is unrealistically high, a lower value of initial saturation caused numerical instabilities in the program and, regardless of the time-step size, nonconvergence.

The vertical boundary beneath the canal ($x=0$) was treated as a no-flow boundary because of the symmetry of the flow system. Vertical flow through the lower boundary was ignored; therefore, a no-flow boundary was assigned at the bottom of the model domain. It was assumed that any groundwater mound that might develop below the canal would not extend 1,000 m to the right boundary, thus nodes at and below the water table on the right boundary were held constant at hydrostatic pressure. Assuming only vertical flow in the unsaturated zone at $x = 1,000$ m, the remainder of the right boundary was treated as a no-flow boundary. In light of the low annual precipitation on Frenchman Flat, and ignoring evapotranspiration, the ground surface to the right of the canal was treated as a no-flow boundary.

At the beginning of the simulation, with the wetting front in the small elements, solution convergence was rapid. As the front moved into progressively larger elements, more iterations were required at each time step for convergence. When the vertical spacing of nodes at the wetting front exceeded 10 m, the solution became unstable and the program failed to converge. Decreasing the time-step size had little effect on solution stability. To resolve the problem, a new grid with a maximum node spacing of 10 m was developed.

Execution time required for each iteration is roughly proportional to the number of nodes in the grid. To maintain about the same number of nodes (thereby keeping execution time at a reasonable level), while greatly increasing overall node density, the size of the solution domain had to be reduced. This was accomplished in two ways: 1) the horizontal extent of the grid was reduced from 1,000 m to 200 m; and 2) rather than a rectangular sample space, the upper-right portion of the grid was eliminated, leaving a stair-stepped boundary on the right (Figure 17). The new grid consists of 711 elements and 780 nodes (Figures 17 and 18). As in the original grid, node spacing increased with depth and horizontal distance from the canal; however, in the new grid, node spacing is reduced as the water table is approached. This is to aid in the numerical handling of the range of pressures and hydraulic conductivities encountered at the saturated-unsaturated interface. Figure 19 shows the elements (to scale) with the model boundary conditions.

Boundary and initial conditions for the new grid are essentially the same as those for the old grid, with the exception of the initial saturation of the nodes above the water table. These nodes were given a hydrostatic pressure ($\frac{p}{\rho g} = -$ distance above the water table) up to a maximum suction of -100 cm.

DEPTH (m)																														
0	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711																					
.5	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702																					
1.	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693																					
1.5	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684																					
2	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675																					
3	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666																					
4	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657																					
5	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648																	
6	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635																	
8	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622																	
10	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609																	
12	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596																	
15	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583																	
20	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570																	
25	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557													
30	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540													
35	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523													
45	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506													
55	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489													
65	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472													
75	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455													
85	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438									
95	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417									
105	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396									
115	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375									
125	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354									
135	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333									
145	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312									
155	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287									
165	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262									
175	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237									
185	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212									
195	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187									
205	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162									
210	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137									
215	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108									
217	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79									
219	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50									
220	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21									
x(m)	0	.5	1	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200

Figure 17. Location of Elements.

[illegible]

Figure 19. Discretization of Sample Space Showing Boundary Conditions.

MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION

GOVERNING EQUATIONS--FLOW

Combining the continuity equation and Darcy's law written for variably saturated soil in two dimensions yields:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left\{ \rho_w k_{ij} k_{rw} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_j} + e_j \right) \right\} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho_w \phi S_w) - \rho_w q \quad (15)$$

where ρ_w is the density of water, ψ is the pressure head, k_{ij} is the saturated hydraulic conductivity tensor, k_{rw} is the relative permeability with respect to the water phase, x_i ($i = 1, 2$) are spatial coordinates, t is elapsed time, e_j is the unit vector in the direction of the x_2 axis (assumed to be vertically upward), S_w is water saturation, ϕ is the effective porosity, and q is the volumetric flow rate via sources or sinks per unit volume of the porous medium.

For a slightly compressible fluid ($\frac{\partial \rho_w}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial \rho_w}{\partial t} = 0$), equation (15) can be written:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left\{ k_{ij} k_{rw} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_j} + e_j \right) \right\} = \left(S_w S_s + \phi \frac{\partial S_w}{\partial \psi} \right) \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - q \quad (16)$$

or

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left\{ k_{ij} k_{rw} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_j} + e_j \right) \right\} = \eta \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} - q \quad (17)$$

where

$$\eta = S_w S_s + \phi \frac{dS_w}{d\psi} \quad (18)$$

and S_s = the specific storage = $\rho_w g (\phi \beta + \alpha)$, where g is the gravitational constant and α and β are coefficients of compressibility of the porous medium and water, respectively.

The boundary and initial conditions of the variably saturated flow problem can be expressed as:

$$\psi(x_i, 0) = \psi_0(x_i) \quad (19)$$

$$\psi(x_i, t) = \hat{\psi} \text{ on } B_1 \quad (20)$$

and

$$v_i n_i = v_n \text{ on } B_2 \quad (21)$$

where ψ_0 is the initial head value, B_1 is the portion of the flow boundary where ψ is prescribed as $\hat{\psi}$, B_2 is the portion of the flow boundary where the outward fluid flux is prescribed as v_n , and n_i is the outward unit normal vector on B_2 .

SATURN solves equation (17) by the Galerkin finite element method subject to equations (19) to (21). The Darcy velocity components are then calculated from:

$$q_i = -K_{ij} k_{rw} \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_j} + e_j \right) \quad (22)$$

GOVERNING EQUATIONS--TRANSPORT

The governing equation for two-dimensional transport of a nonconservative solute in a variably saturated medium can be written:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(D_{ij} \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_j} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (v_i c) = \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} [\phi S_w c + \rho_s (1 - \phi) c_s] - q c^* + \lambda [\phi S_w c + \rho_s (1 - \phi) c_s] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where D_{ij} is the apparent hydrodynamic dispersion tensor, c is the solute concentration in the fluid, v_i is the Darcy velocity, ρ_s is the density of the solid grains, c_s is the adsorbed concentration, λ is the first-order decay coefficient, and c^* is the solute concentration of the injected fluid.

If the adsorption relationship can be described by a linear equilibrium isotherm, equation (23) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(D_{ij} \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_j} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (v_i c) = \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left\{ \phi S_w \left(1 + \frac{\rho_s (1 - \phi) k_d}{\phi S_w} \right) c \right\} + \lambda \phi S_w \left\{ 1 + \frac{\rho_s (1 - \phi) k_d}{\phi S_w} \right\} c - q c^* \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where k_d is the equilibrium constant.

Equation (24) can be written:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(D_{ij} \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_j} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (v_i c) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\phi S_w R c) + \lambda \phi S_w R c - q c^* \quad (25)$$

where R is the retention factor defined as:

$$R = 1 + \frac{\rho_s (1 - \phi) k_d}{\phi S_w} = 1 + \frac{\rho_b k_d}{\phi S_w} \quad (26)$$

and Q_b is the bulk density, $(1 - \phi) Q_s$.

Expanding equation (25), and using equation (26), assuming $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(Q_b k_d) = 0$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(D_{ij} \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_j} - v_i \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_i} \right) = \phi S_w R \left(\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + \lambda c \right) + q(c - c^*) \quad (27)$$

SATURN approximates equation (27) using the upstream weighted residual finite-element technique of Huyakorn and Nilkuha (1979). The initial and boundary conditions of equation (27) can be written:

$$c(x_1, x_2, 0) = c_0 \quad (28)$$

$$c(x_1, x_2, t) = \hat{c} \text{ on } B'_1 \quad (29)$$

$$D_{ij} \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_j} n_i = q_c^D \text{ on } B'_2 \quad (30)$$

$$D_{ij} \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_j} n_i - v_i n_i c = q_c^T \text{ on } B'_3 \quad (31)$$

where B'_1 is the portion of the boundary where the concentration is prescribed as $\hat{c}$, and B'_2 and B'_3 are portions of the boundary where the dispersive and total solute mass fluxes are prescribed as q_c^D and q_c^T , respectively.

GROUNDWATER FLOW SIMULATION

Prior to simulating infiltration from the canal, the applicability of the SATURN code to the hydrologic conditions at the RNM site (i.e., line infiltration through 200 m of unsaturated alluvium) was assessed with test simulations. In the first simulation attempts, the medium was considered dry and the nodes representing the line source were assigned a specified flux equal to the observed canal transmission loss. When the solution failed to converge, the time-step size was reduced. When further reduction in time-step size was no longer practical, the moisture content of the medium was raised. All combinations of time-step size and moisture content resulted in nonconvergence when the line source was represented by specified flux nodes.

The line source nodes were then assigned a slight positive hydraulic head (+20 cm) and the medium was again assumed dry. As before, the solution did not converge. It appeared that the sharp saturated/unsaturated interface was the source of the numerical problem. The moisture content was raised to 20 percent (approximately $2/3$ saturated) and convergence was rapid.

As a result of these test runs, the simulation strategy for the RNM canal was to represent the canal by constant head nodes. The initial moisture content of the alluvium was 20 percent and allowed to drain to approximately a steady-state condition.

The RNM canal transmission loss is approximately $0.2 \text{ cm}^3/\text{sec}/\text{cm}$. Cambrian tritium did not arrive at RNM-2S for approximately 1,050 days after pumping was initiated. If the soil beneath the canal had a uniform porosity of 0.3 and was initially dry, it would only take about 380 days to completely saturate a column soil 10 m wide from the canal to the water table at the observed canal infiltration rate. For this reason, it is assumed that the flow system had reached steady-state prior to the arrival of Cambrian tritium at RNM-2S.

Three indicators were used to determine when steady state in the model was reached:

- No change in the moisture contents with time.
- No change in the velocity field with time.
- No change in storage (a net boundary flux close to 0).

At steady state, and for all but the first few days of simulation, the flow at the constant head nodes representing the canal totaled $1.0 \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^3/\text{day}/\text{cm}$. Because only one side of the canal was represented by the solution domain, the flow for each cm of canal is then $2.0 \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^3/\text{day}/\text{cm}$. The distance between flumes 1 and 3 is 1,100 m. If the transmission losses were uniform between the flumes, the total loss for this section of canal would be $2 \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^3/\text{day}$ ($2.3 \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^3/\text{sec}$). Although slightly higher than the mean loss, this value lies within the observed values of the canal transmission losses as measured by the flume data (Figure 4).

At the beginning of the flow simulation, the solution domain was assumed to consist of a single, isotropic material with the hydraulic properties given earlier in this report. This assumption proved unsatisfactory as water rapidly accumulated in the system and a large groundwater mound soon developed beneath the canal. The net boundary flux was consistently positive indicating a net increase in storage. As the saturated-unsaturated interface rose into the

larger elements, the solution became unstable and more iterations were required for convergence at each time step (Figure 20).

By increasing horizontal hydraulic conductivity of the bottom three rows of nodes from 6.29×10^{-4} cm/sec to 6.29×10^{-3} cm/sec, ($k_{xx}/k_{zz} = 10$) the net boundary flux became negative, and the groundwater mound beneath the canal began to lower. As the saturated-unsaturated interface dropped, the solution instability rapidly decreased as seen in Figure 21.

Once the groundwater mound had been reduced to near the initial water level, the horizontal hydraulic conductivity in the bottom three rows of nodes was adjusted to bring the net boundary flux to near 0. This occurred when $k_{xx}/k_{zz} = 4.79$. When the net boundary flux was within 0.1 percent, the flow simulation was terminated. The steady-state moisture contents and velocity field were then used as input to the transport simulation. Figures 22 and 23 show the steady-state saturation values and velocity field, respectively. Appendix I contains element saturation values at selected time steps. Appendix J contains graphical representations of the velocity field at selected time steps.

At the time these simulations were run, it took several weeks of computer time to go from initial to steady-state conditions for the flow. As a result, it was impractical to conduct sensitivity analysis on any of the material or unsaturated hydraulic properties with regard to the flow solution. The steady-state flow solution shown in Figures 22 and 23 was used for all of the solute transport runs.

Figure 20. Graphical Representation of Numerical Instabilities.

Figure 21. Effect of Anisotropy on Solution Stability.

Figure 22. Simulated Steady-State Element Saturation Values (%).

Figure 23. Qualitative Representation of the Vertical and Horizontal Components of the Simulated Steady-State Flow Field. Dots Represent Velocity Components Less than 1 cm/day.

TRITIUM TRANSPORT SIMULATION

The flow field was assumed to be at steady state during the transport portion of the simulation. Element velocity components and water saturation data, determined in the last step of the flow simulation, defined the steady-state condition for the transport simulation.

Dispersivity values were estimated from the literature. A longitudinal dispersivity of 10 m and a transverse dispersivity of 3 m were assumed. According to Gelhar (1986) and Walton (1984), these values are reasonable for the simulated medium and the scale of the experiment. Values of longitudinal dispersivity ranging from 1 m to 100 m, and transverse dispersivity ranging from 0.1 m to 30 m, were simulated in sensitivity analyses. The sensitivity of the solution to changes in longitudinal dispersivity can be seen in Figure 24. The plots show simulated tritium concentration versus depth below ground surface for $x = 0$ (directly beneath the center of the canal) at $T = 251$ days (since first detection of Cambrian tritium at RNM-2S). Relative to other input parameters (e.g., hydraulic conductivity), variations in longitudinal dispersivity had little effect on simulation results. Appendix K contains plots showing the complete distribution of tritium in the solution domain for different values of longitudinal and transverse dispersivity at selected time steps.

Diffusion coefficients were also taken from the literature. The medium was assumed to be isotropic with respect to diffusion. A value of $1.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{ cm}^2/\text{day}$ was selected for both the D_{xx} and D_{zz} components of molecular diffusion. Values of molecular diffusion from $10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2/\text{day}$ to $10^{-1} \text{ cm}^2/\text{day}$ were simulated in the sensitivity analyses. As expected, with water velocities as high as those in the simulations, the system is insensitive to changes in molecular diffusion coefficients (Appendix L).

The initial tritium concentration was assumed to be zero throughout the profile. At the canal nodes, the tritium concentration was specified at each time step. Tritium data, collected at irregular time intervals at RNM-2S (Figure 5), were interpolated to the simulation time steps, and input to the system at the canal nodes.

Fifteen hundred days of tritium transport were simulated. The first time step corresponds to the first detection of Cambrian tritium at RNM-2S (July 1978); the last to August 1982. Figure 25 shows contour plots of simulated tritium concentration at selected times. The plots show a fairly smooth transition from low tritium concentrations to high, both in the horizontal and vertical directions, reflecting the smooth breakthrough at RNM-2S and the numerical stability of the solution. It took approximately 550 days for Cambrian tritium to arrive at the water table. Once infiltrating canal water reaches the saturated zone, flow is primarily horizontal, away from the canal with concentrations increasing with depth at about the same gradient as the horizontal concentration gradient in the unsaturated zone. Appendix M contains tritium concentrations at selected times. Appendix N contains contour plots of simulated tritium concentrations.

Figure 24. Solution Sensitivity to Changes in Longitudinal Dispersivity.

Figure 25. Contour Plots of Simulated Tritium Concentration at Selected Time Steps.

Figure 25. Contour Plots of Simulated Tritium Concentration at Selected Time Steps (continued).

INFILTRATION OF CONSERVATIVE TRACER AT RNM CANAL

At the time of the flow and transport simulations, few data were available for calibration of the model. From flume data, an estimate of the canal transmission loss was calculated. The instantaneous profile test yielded an approximation of the bulk, near-surface unsaturated hydraulic properties. Substantial information about the tritium content of the infiltrating canal water was obtained from analysis of water samples collected at RNM-2S. Laboratory tests on soil cores taken from drill holes US1 and US2 provided porosity and saturated hydraulic conductivity data and some indication of the spatial (vertical) variability of the near-surface alluvium at the canal. Data collected by other researchers from nearby drill holes also contributed to the parameter estimation process.

These limited data, from either the near surface or nearby drill holes, were used to determine the hydraulic and chemical parameters of the model. Heterogeneities, incorporated in early model runs, led to numerical instabilities and, in light of the sparsity of data from the deep alluvium, were subsequently removed. The result was a single, homogeneous solution domain with hydraulic properties determined from mostly near-surface observations. A simulation conducted under these constraints would, at best, yield a rough approximation of the hydrologic conditions beneath the RNM canal.

A tracer test (March 22, 1986) provided an opportunity to evaluate the simulation results. A solution of sodium bromide and low-tritium water was introduced into the canal channel and recovered at a lysimeter installation 30 m below the ground surface, 28.9 m south of the canal (Figure 26). The event was simulated with SATURN using the steady-state flow field employed in the tritium transport model. Simulated and observed breakthrough curves were then developed.

TRACER TEST LYSIMETER INSTALLATION

On May 6, 1985, a suction lysimeter was installed in US2 at a depth of 28.9 m (Figure 26). Additional lysimeters were installed in US2 at shallower depths, but were damaged during installation. A sand pack and bentonite seals were trimmed into the positions shown in Figure 27. The samples were obtained by applying a 0.5 bar suction to the system. Samples were then pushed to the surface with 50 psi of nitrogen.

TRACER TEST

The tracer test was initiated on March 22, 1986. Water for the tracer solution was obtained from an NTS Area 6 well and contained 0.15 mg/l bromide. Sodium bromide was added to the water, raising the bromide concentration to 231 mg/l. Analyses of canal water, sampled immediately prior to the tracer test, reported bromide concentrations of 0.11 mg/l. The canal was dammed and diverted around the tracer test site through a plastic tube, and back into the canal channel at the location shown in Figure 26. Standing water was then allowed to infiltrate. Two additional dams were constructed to assure an even distribution of tracer over the desired length.

Figure 26. Tracer Test Site.

Figure 27. Suction Lysimeter Installation.

When nearly all of the standing water had infiltrated, approximately 3,800 l of tracer solution was introduced into the canal sections. Each of the three sections received about one third of tracer solution. After 5.5 hours, nearly all of the tracer solution had infiltrated, and the canal was undammed and flow was returned to the channel.

Lysimeter samples were collected at the times listed in Table 8 and analyzed for bromide.

Bromide breakthrough at the lysimeter is plotted in Figure 28.

The tracer test was simulated by setting the bromide concentration at the canal nodes to 230 mg/l for the appropriate number of time steps, and by specifying node 583, which is in the same location (in the finite element grid) as the lysimeter, as an observation node.

Although the simulated breakthrough curve has the same basic shape and maximum concentration as the observed data, the model predicted a much earlier breakthrough than was observed. Perhaps the most likely explanation for the delayed arrival of the bromide, was the model assumption that the upper portion of solution domain consisted of a single homogeneous, isotropic material with hydraulic properties observed in surface deposits.

With the fluxes and moisture contents likely to be present beneath the canal, a horizontal, fine-grained layer, similar to those observed in drill holes throughout Frenchman Flat, would form a barrier to the downward movement of fluid resulting in an increase in the horizontal component of flow. Although this type of layering was not observed in visual inspections of US1 and US2 cuttings and cores, or reflected in permeameter tests conducted on the cores, if present between the canal and the lysimeter installation, a delayed breakthrough of bromide at the lysimeter would occur.

TABLE 8. RESULTS OF LYSIMETER SAMPLING.

Date	Days Since Injection	Bromide Concentration (mg/l)
3-26-86	0	0.15
3-31-86	5	0.15
4-10-86	15	0.15
4-21-86	26	0.17
4-28-86	33	0.15
5-15-86	50	0.17
6-09-86	75	0.27
6-17-86	83	0.32
6-26-86	92	0.34
7-07-86	103	0.32
7-22-86	118	0.27
8-04-86	131	0.23
9-03-86	161	0.20
9-10-86	168	0.16

Figure 28. Plot Showing Simulated and Observed Bromide Concentration.

The 3,800 l of tracer solution took approximately 5.5 hours to infiltrate. This is 25 percent longer than calculations based on the average canal transmission loss would predict, and therefore longer than the model would predict, and is possibly a result of a lower than average hydraulic conductivity in that stretch of canal. This too may be partly responsible for the delayed breakthrough.

Increased lateral spreading of infiltrating canal water would occur if the horizontal components of the hydraulic conductivity tensor were greater than the vertical component. Such anisotropy, although common in alluvial environments, was not incorporated into the upper portion of the solution domain.

An improperly installed lysimeter could also have affected the breakthrough. If the diameter or the depth of the drill hole was significantly different from the values used to calculate the sand pack and grout locations and volumes, or if bends in the lysimeter tubes resulted in an improper placement of the lysimeter, the porous cup might not be in contact with the sand pack and might even be grouted off from the formation. Bridging in the drill hole could also result in an improper placement of the grout and sand pack. Although, it is unlikely that faulty lysimeter installation is entirely responsible for the delayed breakthrough, it could have been a factor.

As discussed in the previous chapter, only one steady-state flow solution was used as input to the solute transport runs, due to the large amount of time needed to produce even one flow solution (several weeks of computer time). If further modeling efforts were to be undertaken in the future, considerably more computer power is currently available, which would make it feasible to produce a better, more accurate flow solution, based in part on the results of the tracer test.

CONCLUSIONS

As can be seen in Appendix N, according to the simulation results, it would take approximately 550 days for Cambrian tritium to travel from the canal to the water table. The perforations of RNM-2S are at approximately 100 m below the static water level (230 m below ground surface). Assuming a porosity of 0.3, the volume of water in a saturated sphere of radius 100 m would be

$$(0.3) \frac{4}{3} \pi (100\text{m})^3 = 1.26 \times 10^6 \text{m}^3 \quad (32)$$

At the pumping rates of RNM-2S ($2 \text{ m}^3/\text{min}$), $1.82 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ would be pumped in 550 days. Cambrian tritium was first detected at RNM-2S after $2.3 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ had been pumped. If the simulation results were accurate, and if the saturated zone in the vicinity of RNM-2S was homogeneous and isotropic with a porosity of 0.3, then the first arrival of recirculated tritium at RNM-2S would occur after approximately $5 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ had been pumped. As can be seen in Figure 7, this is coincident with the peak in observed tritium concentration at RNM-2S.

This estimate assumes transport in a homogeneous, isotropic medium. Any departure from this assumption would increase the arrival time of recirculated tritium at RNM-2S. Results of the tracer test and observations made throughout Frenchman Flat (and alluvial basins in general) support the existence of heterogeneities in the flow system. In light of the above calculations, it appears unlikely that Cambrian tritium, infiltrating from the RNM canal and recaptured by RNM-2S, had a significant effect on the breakthrough of tritium at RNM-2S.

Beyond providing a basis for evaluating the potential impact of infiltrating canal water in tritium breakthrough at RNM-2S, these simulations will hopefully contribute to the general understanding of flow and transport processes in the unsaturated zone at the RNM site. If the model assumptions were valid (the canal is underlain by a single homogeneous, isotropic medium with the hydraulic characteristics selected for the model; the stated initial and boundary conditions accurately describe the physical system; flow is steady state; the governing equations of flow and solute transport used in the numerical model are valid), the model would correctly simulate the movement of water and tritium beneath the RNM canal.

Understanding that the above assumptions are not entirely valid, the simulations provide a point of reference from which estimates of the behavior of water and solutes in more realistic (and hence more complicated) systems can be made.

REFERENCES

- Black, T.A., W.R. Gardner and G.W. Thurtell, 1969. The Prediction of Evaporation, Drainage and Soil Water Storage for a Bare Soil. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 33, pp. 655-660.
- Brooks, R.H. and A.T. Corey, 1964. Hydraulic Properties of Porous Media. *Hydrol. Pap.* 3, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
- Bruce, R.R. and A. Klute, 1956. The Measurement of Soil Moisture Diffusivity. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 20, pp. 458-462.
- Brutsaert, W., 1967. Some Methods of Calculating Unsaturated Permeability. *Trans. ASAE* 10, pp. 400-404.
- Burbey, T.J., 1984. Numerical Simulation of Tritium and Chloride-36 Migration. Master's Thesis, University of Nevada, Reno.
- Burbey, T.J. and S.W. Wheatcraft, 1986. Tritium and Chlorine-36 Migration from a Nuclear Explosion Cavity, Desert Research Institute, Publication No. 45050.
- Carr, W.J., G.D. Bath, D.L. Healey and R.M. Hazelwood, 1975. Geology of Northern Frenchman Flat, Nevada Test Site. U.S. Geological Survey, USGS-474-216.
- Cassel, D.K., A.W. Warrick, D.R. Nielson and J.W. Biggar, 1968. Soil Water Diffusivity Values Based Upon Time Dependent Soil Water Content Distributions. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 32, pp. 774-777.
- Childs, E.C. and N. Collis-George, 1950. The Permeability of Porous Materials. *Proc. Roy. Soc., Ser. A* 201, pp. 392-405.
- Daniels, W.R. (ed.), 1981. Laboratory and Field Studies Related to the Radionuclide Migration Project, October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980. Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, LA-8670-PR.
- Davidson, J.M., L.R. Stone, D.R. Nielson and M.E. Larue, 1969. Field Measurement and Use of Soil Properties. *Water Resources Res.* 5, pp. 1312-1321.
- Doering, E.J., 1965. Soil Water Diffusivity by the One-Step Method. *J. Soil Sci.* 99, pp. 322-326.
- Duncan, D. W., 1992. Personal Communication.
- Farrell, D.A. and W.E. Larson, 1972. Modeling the Pore Structure of Porous Media. *Water Resources Res.* 8, pp. 699-706.
- Fenneman, N.M., 1931. *Physiography of Western United States*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Flocher, W.J., M. Yamaguchi and D.R. Nielson, 1968. Capillary Conductivity and Soil Water Diffusivity Values from Vertical Soil Columns. *Agron. J.* 60, pp. 605-610.

- Gardner, W.R., 1956. Calculation of Capillary Conductivity from Pressure Plate Outflow Data. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. 20, pp. 317-320.
- Gardner, W.R., 1970. Field Measurement of Soil Water Diffusivity. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. 20, pp. 832-833.
- Gelhar, L.W., 1986. Stochastic Subsurface Hydrology from Theory to Applications. Water Resources Res. 22, pp. 135S-145S.
- Hillel, D., 1971. Soil and Water: Physical Principles and Processes. Academic Press, Inc., New York.
- Hillel, D., V.D. Krentos and Y. Stylianou, 1972. Procedure and Test of an Internal Drainage Method for Measuring Soil Hydraulic Characteristics In Situ. J. Soil Sci. 114, pp. 395-400.
- Hoffman, D.C., R. Stone and W.W. Dudley, 1977. Radioactivity in the Underground Environment of the Cambrian Nuclear Explosion at the Nevada Test Site. Rep. LA-6877-MS, Los Alamos Scientific Lab., Los Alamos, New Mexico.
- Huyakorn, P.S. and K. Nilkuha, 1979. Solution of Transient Transport Equation Using an Upstream Finite Element Scheme. Appl. Math. Modeling 3, pp. 7-17.
- Huyakorn, P.S., S.D. Thomas, J.W. Mercer and B.H. Lester, 1983. SATURN: A Finite Element Model for Simulating Saturated-Unsaturated Flow and Radionuclide Transport. Technical Report by GeoTrans Inc., Reston, Virginia.
- Jackson, R.D., R.F. Reginato and C.H.M. van Bavel, 1963. Examination of the Pressure Plate Outflow Method for Measuring Capillary Conductivity. J. Soil Sci. 96, pp. 249-265.
- Jackson, R.D., R.F. Reginato and C.H.N. van Bavel, 1965. Comparison of Measured and Calculated Hydraulic Conductivities of Unsaturated Soils. Water Resources Res. 1, pp. 375-380.
- Jones, A.J. and R.J. Wagenet, 1984. In-Situ Estimation of Hydraulic Conductivity Using Simplified Methods. Water Resources Res. 20, pp. 1620-1626.
- Klute, A. and C. Dirksen, 1986. Hydraulic Conductivity and Diffusivity: Laboratory Methods, in Methods of Soil Analysis, Part I, Physical and Mineralogical Methods, A. Klute (ed.), pp. 687-734.
- Klute, A., 1972. The Determination of the Hydraulic Conductivity and Diffusivity of Unsaturated Soils. J. Soil Sci. 113, pp. 264-276.
- Kunze, R.J. and D. Kirkham, 1962. Simplified Accounting for Membrane Impedance in Capillary Conductivity Determinations. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. 26, pp. 421-426.
- Kunze, R.J., G. Uehara and K. Graham, 1968. Factors Important in the Calculation of Hydraulic Conductivity. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. 32, pp. 760-765.

- Marshall, T.J., 1958. A Relation between Permeability and Size Distribution of Pores. *J. Soil Sci.* 9, pp. 1-8.
- Meyers, J.S., 1962. Evaporation from the 17 Western States, *with a section on Evaporation Rates*, by T.J. Nordenson, U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 272-D.
- Miller, E.E. and D.E. Elrick, 1958. Dynamic Determination of Capillary Conductivity Extended for Non-negligible Membrane Impedance. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 22, pp. 483-486.
- Millington, R.J. and J.P. Quirk, 1961. Permeability of Porous Solids. *Trans. Faraday Soc.* 57, pp. 1200-1206.
- Mualem, Y., 1976. A New Model for Predicting the Hydraulic Conductivity of Unsaturated Porous Media. *Water Resources Res.* 12, pp. 513-522.
- Nielson, D.R., J.M. Davidson, J.W. Biggar and R.J. Miller, 1962. Water Movement Through Panoche Clay Loam Soil. *Hilgardia* 35, pp. 491-506.
- Ogata, G. and L.A. Richards, 1957. Water Content Changes Following Irrigation of Bare Field Soil that is Protected from Evaporation. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 21, pp. 355-356.
- Peek, A.J., 1966. Diffusivity Determination by a New Outflow Method. In: *Water in the Unsaturated Zone*, Vol. I, Publ. No. 82, Int. Assoc. Sci. Hydrol., pp. 191-202.
- Ramspott, L.D. and R.D. McArthur, 1977. Results of Exploratory Drill Hole Ue5n, Frenchman Flat, Nevada Test Site. Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Report UCID-17392.
- Richards, L.A., W.R. Gardner and G. Ogata, 1956. Physical Processes Determining Water Loss from Soil. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 20, pp. 310-314.
- Richards, S.J. and L.V. Weeks, 1953. Capillary Conductivity Values from Moisture Yield and Tension Measurements on Soil Columns. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 17, pp. 206-209.
- Rijtema, P.E., 1959. Calculation of Capillary Conductivity from Pressure Plate Outflow Data with Non-negligible Membrane Impedance. *Netherlands J. Agric. Sci.* 7, pp. 209-215.
- Rogers, J.S. and A. Klute, 1971. The Hydraulic Conductivity Water Content Relationship During Non-steady Flow through a Sand Column. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 35, pp. 695-700.
- Romney, E.M., V.Q. Hale, A. Wallace, O.R. Hunt, G.V. Alexander, J.E. Kinnear and T.L. Ackerman, 1973. Some Characteristics of Soil and Perennial Vegetation in Northern Mojave Desert Areas of the Nevada Test Site. Rep. UCLA#12-916, UCLA, Los Angeles, California.
- Rose, C.W., W.R. Stern and J.E. Drummond, 1965. Determination of Hydraulic Conductivity as a Function of Depth and Water Content for Soil In Situ. *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 3, pp. 1-9.

- Sisson, J.B., A.H. Ferguson and M.Th. van Genuchten, 1980. Simple Method for Predicting Drainage from Field Plots. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. J.* 44, pp. 1147-1152.
- Vachaud, G., 1967. Determination of the Hydraulic Conductivity of Unsaturated Soils from an Analysis of Transient Flow Data. *Water Resources Res.* 3, pp. 697-705.
- Vachaud, G. and Jean-Louis Thony, 1971. Hysteresis During Infiltration and Redistribution in a Soil Column at Different Initial Water Contents. *Water Resources Res.* 7, pp. 111-127.
- van Bavel, C.H.M., G.B. Stirk and K.J. Brust, 1968a. Hydraulic Properties of a Clay-Loam Soil and the Field Measurement of Water Uptaken by Roots. I: Interpretation of Water Content and Pressure Profiles. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 32, pp. 310-317.
- van Bavel, C.H.M., K.J. Brust and G.B. Stirk, 1968b. Hydraulic Properties of a Clay-Loam Soil and the Field Measurement of Water Uptaken by Roots. II: The Water Balance of the Root Zone. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 32, pp. 317-321.
- van Genuchten, R., 1978. Calculating the Unsaturated Hydraulic Conductivity with a New, Closed Form Analytical Model. *Dep. Civ. Eng., Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, Water Resources Prog. Rep.* 78-WR-08, 63 pp.
- Walton, W.C., 1984. Practical Aspects of Groundwater Modeling. *National Water Well Association.*
- Watson, K.K., 1966. An Instantaneous Profile Method for Determining the Unsaturated Hydraulic Conductivity of Porous Materials. *Water Resources Res.* 2, pp. 709-715.
- Weeks, L.V. and S.J. Richards, 1967. Soil Water Properties Computed from Transient Flow Data. *Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 31, pp. 721-725.
- Winograd, I.J., W. Thordarson and R.A. Young, 1971. Hydrology of the Nevada Test Site and Vicinity, Southeastern Nevada. *U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report.*

Appendix A

Neutron data

Neutron Hole N1										
Time (hrs.)	Depth (cm)									
	45	75	105	135	165	195	225	255	300	320
0.	0.639	0.668	0.615	0.468	0.398	0.618	0.678	0.573	-	0.657
0.50	0.675	0.671	0.595	0.463	0.389	0.610	0.657	0.571	-	0.642
1.00	0.678	0.650	0.596	0.446	0.370	0.610	0.657	0.574	-	0.666
1.42	0.666	0.648	0.582	0.436	0.381	0.599	0.641	0.552	0.551	0.622
2.50	0.659	0.653	0.586	0.437	0.379	0.588	0.657	0.553	-	0.617
3.50	0.639	0.640	0.585	0.442	0.370	0.576	0.629	0.569	0.553	0.594
6.00	0.615	0.638	0.575	0.413	0.369	0.556	0.620	0.545	0.531	0.571
10.00	0.557	0.620	0.556	0.391	0.341	0.541	0.574	0.525	0.533	0.566
20.00	0.480	0.578	0.527	0.368	0.223	0.500	0.539	0.528	0.506	0.527
24.25	0.474	0.558	0.531	0.371	0.334	0.467	0.528	0.514	0.515	0.511
30.50	0.487	0.552	0.525	0.359	0.223	0.482	0.524	0.523	0.503	0.505
43.50	0.463	0.521	0.500	0.352	0.222	0.454	0.513	0.510	0.495	0.493
75.00	0.441	0.500	0.479	0.322	0.317	0.440	0.488	0.506	0.460	0.473
169.00	0.407	0.465	0.453	0.302	0.298	0.403	0.417	0.472	-	0.428
336.50	0.399	0.444	0.428	0.294	0.283	0.392	0.403	0.453	-	0.394
552.00	0.398	0.446	0.422	0.290	0.296	0.377	0.392	0.441	0.390	0.396

Neutron Hole N2										
Time (hrs.)	Depth (cm)									
	45	75	105	135	165	195	225	255	300	320
1.42	0.729	0.715	0.634	0.505	0.520	0.599	0.553	0.510	-	0.640
3.67	0.704	0.680	0.613	0.475	0.513	0.571	0.549	0.511	0.512	0.619
6.00	0.641	0.673	0.586	0.468	0.502	0.553	0.541	0.495	0.499	0.587
10.00	0.565	0.634	0.565	0.450	0.479	0.529	0.520	0.489	0.497	0.548
20.00	0.467	0.578	0.532	0.414	0.440	0.518	0.499	0.457	0.462	0.502
24.25	0.484	0.557	0.509	0.420	0.439	0.493	0.502	0.465	0.451	0.515
30.50	0.493	0.581	0.515	0.407	0.418	0.505	0.487	0.452	0.455	0.491
43.50	0.466	0.524	0.475	0.387	0.406	0.467	0.477	0.423	0.415	0.460
75.00	0.414	0.501	0.455	0.385	0.402	0.470	0.443	0.418	0.410	0.443
169.00	0.407	0.457	0.435	0.369	0.378	0.439	0.427	0.385	-	0.414
336.00	0.389	0.439	0.428	0.345	0.375	0.423	0.395	0.370	-	0.400
552.00	0.390	0.425	0.424	0.343	0.361	0.406	0.402	0.372	0.338	0.386

Appendix B
Tensiometer data

Time (hrs.)	Tensiometer Data (cm)									
	Array 1					Array 2				
	Tensiometer Depths (cm)									
	26	56	85	144	214	26	56	85	144	214
	Tensiometer Lengths (cm)									
35	65	95	156	250	35	65	95	156	250	
.25	5.50	5.50	8.50	15.50	24.00	4.50	6.00	12.00	17.00	24.00
.75	8.00	8.50	10.50	16.00	24.00	8.00	8.50	13.50	18.00	24.00
1.25	9.00	9.00	11.00	16.00	24.00	8.50	9.50	14.00	18.00	24.00
1.75	10.00	10.00	11.50	17.00	25.00	10.00	10.00	14.00	18.50	25.00
2.75	10.00	10.00	12.00	17.50	25.50	10.00	11.00	14.50	18.00	25.50
3.75	10.00	10.50	11.50	18.00	25.50	10.00	11.00	15.50	19.00	25.50
6.25	11.00	10.00	11.50	18.50	26.00	12.00	13.00	15.50	19.00	26.00
10.25	12.00	11.00	11.50	18.50	26.50	12.50	14.00	17.00	19.50	26.50
20.25	14.00	12.00	12.00	20.00	28.00	14.00	15.00	18.00	20.00	28.00
24.5	14.00	15.50	15.50	20.00	28.00	14.00	16.00	19.00	20.50	28.00
32.75	14.00	14.00	14.00	20.00	28.00	15.00	16.50	18.00	21.00	28.00
45.75	15.00	12.00	12.00	20.00	29.00	15.00	17.00	19.50	21.00	29.00
77.25	16.00	16.50	16.50	21.00	30.00	16.50	18.00	21.00	22.00	30.00
171.25	18.00	17.00	17.00	22.00	30.00	18.00	20.00	22.00	23.00	30.00
338.75	14.00	20.00	20.00	24.00	32.00	20.00	22.00	24.00	24.00	32.00
554.75	20.00	22.00	23.00	25.00	32.00	21.00	22.00	24.00	24.00	32.00

Appendix C

Instantaneous profile test flow data

Flow rates (cc/sec)		
inflow	Outflow tube 1	Outflow tube 2
943.4	368.8	150.2
857.9	372.7	150.1
877.0	370.5	149.0

Rate of Water Level Drop on Plot			
stage (cm)	time (min)	stage (cm)	time (min)
7.31	9	4.57	41
6.40	18	4.26	45
6.09	23	3.96	48
5.79	28	3.65	52
5.48	31	3.35	56
5.18	34	3.04	59
4.87	38	2.74	64

Appendix D

Plots of moisture content vs time

Hole N1 15cm-45cm

Hole N1 45cm-75cm

Hole N1 75cm-105cm

Hole N1 105cm-135cm

Hole N1 135cm-165cm

Hole N1 165cm-195cm

Hole N1 195cm-225cm

Hole N1 225cm-255cm

Hole N1 255cm-285cm

Hole N1 285cm-315cm

Hole N2 15cm-45cm

Hole N2 45cm-75cm

Hole N2 75cm-105cm

Hole N2 105cm-135cm

Hole N2 135cm-165cm

Hole N2 165cm-195cm

Hole N2 195cm-225cm

Hole N2 225cm-255cm

hole N2 255cm-285cm

hole N2 285cm-315cm

Appendix E

Plots of hydraulic head vs depth

TIME = 1 DAY

TIME = 2 DAYS

TIME = 5 DAYS

TIME = 10 DAYS

TIME = 20 DAYS

Appendix F
Soil moisture characteristic curves -
van Genuchten model

Depth = 45 cm, WCR = 0.0936
ALPHA = 0.018092, N = 2.3648

Depth = 75 cm, WCR = 0.0569

Alpha = 0.028307, N = 1.5702

Depth = 105 cm, WCR = 0.0175

Alpha = 0.084398, N = 1.3049

Depth = 135 cm, WCR = 0.0834

Alpha = 0.277296, N = 1.5119

Depth = 165 cm, WCR = 0.0990

Alpha = 0.325138, N = 1.6339

Depth = 195 cm, WCR = 0.0124

Alpha = 0.434308, N = 1.2130

Appendix G

Plots of hydraulic conductivity vs moisture content -

Mualem model

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HIR)

Depth = 45 cm, WCR = 0.0936
ALPHA = 0.018092, N = 2.3648

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 45 cm, WCR = 0.0936
ALPHA = 0.018092, N = 2.3648

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 75 cm, WCR = 0.0569
Alpha = 0.028307, N = 1.5702

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 75 cm, WCR = 0.0569
Alpha = 0.028307, N = 1.5702

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 105 cm, WCR = 0.0175

Alpha = 0.084398, N = 1.3049

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 105 cm, WCR = 0.0175
Alpha = 0.084398, N = 1.3049

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 135 cm, WCR = 0.0834
Alpha = 0.277296, N = 1.5119

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 165 cm, WCR = 0.0990
Alpha = 0.325138, N = 1.6339

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 165 cm, WCR = 0.0990

Alpha = 0.325138, N = 1.6339

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 195 cm, WCR = 0.0124

Alpha = 0.434308, N = 1.2130

HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY (CM/HR)

Depth = 195 cm, WCR = 0.0124

Alpha = 0.434308, N = 1.2130

Appendix H

**Plots of hydraulic conductivity vs degree of saturation -
field measured**

1

DEPTH = 105 CM

DEPTH = 135 CM

DEPTH = 165 CM

H-7

Appendix I

Simulated moisture distribution

[illegible]

Aug 6 12:33 1966 (about Page 1

132

THE WALL

[illegible]

I-4

[illegible]

[illegible]

I-5

9-1

[illegible]

X(m) 0. 0.5 1.0 1.5 2. 3. 5. 7. 10. 15. 20. 25. 30. 40. 50. 60. 70. 80. 90. 100. 110. 120. 130. 140. 150. 160. 170. 180. 190. 200.

[illegible]

**RU
TIME VALUE = 202.00 (days)**

[illegible]

TIME VALUE = 259.00 (days)

[illegible]

$x(m)$ 0. 0.5 1.0 1.5 2. 3. 5. 7. 10. 15. 20. 25. 30. 40. 50. 60. 70. 80. 90. 100. 110. 120. 130. 140. 150. 160. 170. 180. 190. 200.

01-1

r.10

3

3

I-11

i-12

Z (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	8.0	10.0	12.0	15.0	20.0	25.0	30.0	35.0	40.0	45.0	50.0	60.0	70.0	80.0	90.0	100.0	110.0	120.0	130.0	140.0	150.0	160.0	170.0	180.0	190.0	200.0				
0.	98	97	96	95	94	93	92	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60
0.5	97	96	95	94	93	92	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60	
1.0	96	95	94	93	92	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60		
1.5	95	94	93	92	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60			
2.0	94	93	92	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60				
3.0	93	92	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60					
4.0	92	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60						
5.0	91	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60							
6.0	90	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60								
8.0	89	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60									
10.0	88	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60										
12.0	87	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60											
15.0	86	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60												
20.0	85	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60													
25.0	84	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63	62	61	60														
30.0	83	82	81	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66	65	64	63																		

[illegible]

X (m) 0, 0.5 1.0 1.5 2. 3. 5. 7. 10. 15. 20. 25. 30. 40. 50. 60. 70. 80. 90. 100. 110. 120. 130. 140. 150. 160. 170. 180. 190. 200.

rk
TIME VALUE = 860.00 (days)

[illegible]

Oct 12 14:30 1906 About Page 1

**IF
TIME VALUE: = 930.00 (days)**

[illegible]

[illegible]

X (m) 0. 0.5 1.0 1.5 2. 3. 5. 7. 10. 15. 20. 25. 30. 40. 50. 60. 70. 80. 90. 100. 110. 120. 130. 140. 150. 160. 170. 180. 190. 200.

I-17

TIME VALUE = 1101.00 (days)

Z (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	8.0	10.0	12.0	15.0	20.0	25.0	30.0	35.0	45.0	55.0	65.0	75.0	85.0	95.0	105.0	115.0	125.0	135.0	145.0	155.0	165.0	175.0	185.0	195.0	205.0	210.0	215.0	217.0	219.0	220.0			
0.	90	97	97	98	97	96	95	95	93	93	90	88	87	86	85	84	82	83	80	82	81	80	79	77	76	79	79	79	74	78	73	78	78	78	71	71	92	92	92	92	92	92
0.5	80	87	87	88	87	86	85	83	83	82	80	78	77	76	75	74	72	73	70	72	71	70	69	67	66	69	69	69	64	68	63	68	68	68	61	61	82	82	82	82	82	82
1.0	70	77	77	78	77	76	75	73	73	72	70	68	67	66	65	64	62	63	60	62	61	60	59	57	56	59	59	59	54	58	53	58	58	51	51	72	72	72	72	72	72	
1.5	60	67	67	68	67	66	65	63	63	62	60	58	57	56	55	54	52	53	50	52	51	50	49	47	46	49	49	49	44	48	43	48	48	41	41	62	62	62	62	62	62	
2.0	50	57	57	58	57	56	55	53	53	52	50	48	47	46	45	44	42	43	40	42	41	40	39	37	36	39	39	39	34	38	33	38	38	31	31	52	52	52	52	52	52	
3.0	40	47	47	48	47	46	45	43	43	42	40	38	37	36	35	34	32	33	30	32	31	30	29	27	26	29	29	29	24	28	23	28	28	21	21	42	42	42	42	42	42	
4.0	30	37	37	38	37	36	35	33	33	32	30	28	27	26	25	24	22	23	20	22	21	20	19	17	16	19	19	19	14	18	13	18	18	11	11	32	32	32	32	32	32	
5.0	20	27	27	28	27	26	25	23	23	22	20	18	17	16	15	14	12	13	10	12	11	10	9	7	6	9	9	9	8	12	7	12	12	5	5	22	22	22	22	22	22	
6.0	10	17	17	18	17	16	15	13	13	12	10	8	7	6	5	4	2	3	0	2	1	0	-1	-3	-4	-3	-3	-3	-2	2	-3	-2	-1	-1	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10
8.0	0	7	7	8	7	6	5	3	3	2	0	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-4	-5	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	0	1	1	10	10	10	10	10	10		
10.0	0	7	7	8	7	6	5	3	3	2	0	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-4	-5	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	0	1	1	10	10	10	10	10	10		
12.0	0	7	7	8	7	6	5	3	3	2	0	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-4	-5	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	0	1	1	10	10	10	10	10	10		
15.0	0	7	7	8	7	6	5	3	3	2	0	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-4	-5	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	0	1	1	10	10	10	10	10			

X (m) 0. 0.5 1.0 1.5 2. 3. 5. 7. 10. 15. 20. 25. 30. 40. 50. 60. 70. 80. 90. 100. 110. 120. 130. 140. 150. 160. 170. 180. 190. 200.

**flow, final
TIME VALUE = 1222.00 (days)**

I-18

Appendix J
Simulated velocity field

Fig. 5.2.11.136, vol. 1, f. 1

TIME	VALUE	401.60 days	Horizontal conductivity = 1.0000 cm/day	Vertical conductivity = 1.0000 cm/day
00	V	V	V	V
01	V	V	V	V
02	V	V	V	V
03	V	V	V	V
04	V	V	V	V
05	V	V	V	V
06	V	V	V	V
07	V	V	V	V
08	V	V	V	V
09	V	V	V	V
10	V	V	V	V
11	V	V	V	V
12	V	V	V	V
13	V	V	V	V
14	V	V	V	V
15	V	V	V	V
16	V	V	V	V
17	V	V	V	V
18	V	V	V	V
19	V	V	V	V
20	V	V	V	V
21	V	V	V	V
22	V	V	V	V
23	V	V	V	V
24	V	V	V	V
25	V	V	V	V
26	V	V	V	V
27	V	V	V	V
28	V	V	V	V
29	V	V	V	V
30	V	V	V	V
31	V	V	V	V
32	V	V	V	V
33	V	V	V	V
34	V	V	V	V
35	V	V	V	V
36	V	V	V	V
37	V	V	V	V
38	V	V	V	V
39	V	V	V	V
40	V	V	V	V
41	V	V	V	V
42	V	V	V	V
43	V	V	V	V
44	V	V	V	V
45	V	V	V	V
46	V	V	V	V
47	V	V	V	V
48	V	V	V	V
49	V	V	V	V
50	V	V	V	V
51	V	V	V	V
52	V	V	V	V
53	V	V	V	V
54	V	V	V	V
55	V	V	V	V
56	V	V	V	V
57	V	V	V	V
58	V	V	V	V
59	V	V	V	V
60	V	V	V	V
61	V	V	V	V
62	V	V	V	V
63	V	V	V	V
64	V	V	V	V
65	V	V	V	V
66	V	V	V	V
67	V	V	V	V
68	V	V	V	V
69	V	V	V	V
70	V	V	V	V
71	V	V	V	V
72	V	V	V	V
73	V	V	V	V
74	V	V	V	V
75	V	V	V	V
76	V	V	V	V
77	V	V	V	V
78	V	V	V	V
79	V	V	V	V
80	V	V	V	V
81	V	V	V	V
82	V	V	V	V
83	V	V	V	V
84	V	V	V	V
85	V	V	V	V
86	V	V	V	V
87	V	V	V	V
88	V	V	V	V
89	V	V	V	V
90	V	V	V	V
91	V	V	V	V
92	V	V	V	V
93	V	V	V	V
94	V	V	V	V
95	V	V	V	V
96	V	V	V	V
97	V	V	V	V
98	V	V	V	V
99	V	V	V	V
100	V	V	V	V

1.00
 TIME VALUE = 516.00 days
 Horizontal conductivity = 1.0000 cm/day
 Vertical conductivity = 1.0000 cm/day
 20 20 20 20

TIME VALUE = 651.00 days
Horizontal growth rate = 1.0000 cm/day
Vertical growth rate = 1.0000 cm/day

TIME VALUE = 600.00 days
 Horizontal controllability = 1.0000 cm/day
 Vertical controllability = 1.0000 cm/day
 20 20 20 20

[illegible]


```

1 V1
TOTAL VALUE = 1010.00 days
Horizontal connectivity = 1.0000 cm/day
Vertical connectivity = 1.0000 cm/day
20 20 20 20 20

```

A large grid of 100 rows and 100 columns of small black dots, forming a solid black square. The dots are arranged in a regular, repeating pattern across the entire area.

15
TIME VALUE = 1101.00 days
Hot front conductivity = 1.0000 cm/day
Hot front conductivity = 1.0000 cm/day
20 20 20 20

A large grid of small, stylized black and white icons arranged in a pattern that resembles a staircase or a series of steps, with the icons becoming more sparse as they move from the top-left towards the bottom-right.

Nov 2 11:04 AM: volent. Page 1

Flow final
TIME VALUE = 1273.00 days
Horizontal conductivity = 1.0000 cm/day
Vertical conductivity = 1.0000 cm/day

Appendix K

Sensitivity of solution to changes in dispersivity

Dec 8 13:54 1986 cont Page 1

Longitudinal Dispersivity (m) = 1.0

Transverse Dispersivity (m) = 0.1

Time Since Pumping Began = 965. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian Tritium at RHM-2S = 126. days

pICu/ml * 10.0

x (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
0.	892	892	892	865	803	421	0	24	0	0																				
1.	886	886	884	875	836	595	0	33	0	0																				
1.	880	880	877	868	843	676	0	29	0	0																				
2.	873	873	870	861	839	713	0	18	0	0																				
2.	867	866	862	854	834	727	0	0	0	0																				
3.	853	851	847	838	820	730	97	0	0	0																				
4.	838	836	831	822	803	723	193	0	10	0																				
5.	822	820	815	805	786	712	261	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0														
6.	805	803	798	787	768	701	315	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0													
8.	771	769	763	752	733	672	353	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0												
10.	737	735	728	717	699	643	371	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
12.	702	700	693	681	664	606	363	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
15.	648	646	639	628	611	555	350	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
20.	559	557	551	539	522	470	301	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
25.	474	472	466	456	441	395	256	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.	399	397	391	381	367	327	211	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35.	324	323	318	309	297	264	171	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45.	212	210	207	201	192	168	108	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55.	129	128	125	122	116	102	67	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
65.	76	76	75	72	69	62	43	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
75.	49	49	48	47	45	41	30	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
85.	35	35	35	34	33	29	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
95.	23	23	22	22	21	18	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
105.	11	11	11	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
115.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
135.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
145.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
155.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
165.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
175.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
185.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
195.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
205.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
210.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
215.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
217.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
219.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
220.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
225.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

x (m) 0. 0.5 1.0 1.5 2 3 5 7 10 15 20 25 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110 120 130 140 150 160 170 180 190 200

Transverse Dispersivity (m) = 0.1

Time Since Pumping Began ≈ 1090 . days

Time Since Arrival of Candric Tritium at RMN-2S = 251.days

p1Cu/ml = 1.0

z (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
0.	868	868	868	865	852	675	0	35	0	3																				
1.	868	868	868	867	862	775	0	31	0	3																				
1.	868	868	868	867	864	814	0	13	0	1																				
2.	868	868	868	867	865	829	39	0	2	0																				
2.	868	868	868	867	865	835	156	0	8	0																				
3.	869	869	869	868	865	839	319	0	16	0																				
4.	870	870	869	868	864	839	432	0	20	0																				
5.	870	869	868	866	861	836	506	0	18	0	1	0	0	0	0															
6.	869	868	867	864	858	833	559	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0														
8.	862	862	859	855	848	822	600	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0													
10.	852	851	848	843	836	809	621	103	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0												
12.	838	837	834	829	820	791	619	168	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
15.	815	814	811	805	796	765	614	253	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
20.	771	770	766	759	749	714	575	282	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
25.	722	720	716	709	698	664	535	296	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.	670	669	664	657	645	611	408	281	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35.	616	614	610	602	591	557	414	267	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45.	509	507	503	495	485	454	357	214	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55.	409	408	404	397	388	361	280	166	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
65.	321	320	316	310	302	279	210	121	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
75.	239	238	236	231	224	205	151	85	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
85.	172	171	168	164	159	144	104	57	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
95.	116	115	113	110	107	96	68	37	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
105.	75	75	73	71	69	61	42	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
115.	45	45	44	43	41	36	25	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125.	26	26	25	25	23	21	14	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
135.	14	14	13	13	12	11	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
145.	7	7	7	7	7	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
155.	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
165.	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
175.	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
185.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
195.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
205.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
210.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
215.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
217.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
219.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
220.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
225.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
x (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200

Longitudinal Dispersivity (m) = 5.0

Transverse Dispersivity (m) = 1.0

Time Since Pumping Began # 965. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian Trilobite at R104-2S = 126. days

pIC₅₀/ml = 10.0

[illegible]

pICu/ml = 1.0

z (m)	868	868	868	865	861	830	0	14	0	1	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
1.	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.65	0.62	0.44	81	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.	0.65	0.65	0.64	0.61	0.18	250	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	0.63	0.63	0.62	0.61	0.60	0.50	392	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	0.61	0.61	0.60	0.59	0.58	0.49	501	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.	0.57	0.57	0.56	0.55	0.53	0.46	621	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.50	0.48	0.41	683	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.	0.47	0.47	0.46	0.44	0.42	0.35	715	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.	0.41	0.41	0.40	0.38	0.36	0.28	733	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	0.27	0.26	0.25	0.21	0.21	0.11	738	301	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	0.10	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.02	731	427	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12.	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.02	714	492	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15.	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.01	708	540	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20.	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	698	524	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	636	617	574	168	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	572	568	556	516	443	198	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	512	508	497	460	396	220	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	404	399	389	358	307																				

Longitudinal Dispersivity (α_L) = 10.0

Transverse Dispersivity (α_t) = 1.0

Time Since Pumping Began = 965. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian Trilium at RIM-29 = 126.days

pH Cu/ml = 10.0

[illegible]

1.0

[illegible]

Dec 8 14:02 1986 conout Page 1

Longitudinal Dispersionity (m) = 100.0

Transverse Dispersionity (m) = 10.0

Time Since Pumping Began = 965. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian Trilium at RM4-2S = 126. days

picu/ml * 10.0

z (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
0.	892	892	892	881	872	835	393	0	18	0																				
1.	885	885	883	881	872	816	517	0	18	0																				
1.	877	877	876	874	869	819	607	0	10	0																				
2.	870	870	869	867	863	818	665	0	0	0																				
2.	863	862	861	859	856	814	704	50	0	0																				
3.	848	847	847	845	842	831	739	177	0	23																				
4.	833	833	832	830	828	821	752	299	0	33																				
5.	819	818	817	816	814	808	751	401	0	32																				
6.	804	804	803	802	800	794	751	481	0	26																				
8.	776	776	775	774	772	767	734	564	0	11																				
10.	748	748	747	746	744	740	714	602	41	0																				
12.	721	721	720	719	718	713	690	608	131	0																				
15.	682	681	681	680	678	671	655	601	262	0	16																			
20.	619	619	618	617	616	612	596	559	348	0	17																			
25.	561	560	560	559	558	554	541	513	382	0	10																			
30.	506	506	506	505	504	500	488	465	372	0	0																			
35.	456	456	456	455	454	451	440	420	355	28	0																			
45.	368	368	368	367	366	363	355	339	297	71	0																			
55.	294	294	294	293	292	290	283	272	243	95	0																			
65.	234	234	234	233	233	231	225	216	193	93	0																			
75.	184	184	184	183	183	182	177	170	153	86	0																			
85.	145	145	145	144	144	143	139	133	120	72	10																			
95.	113	113	113	112	112	111	108	104	94	60	13																			
105.	88	88	88	88	87	87	84	81	73	48	13																			
115.	68	68	68	68	67	67	65	62	56	39	13																			
125.	52	52	52	52	52	52	50	48	43	30	11																			
135.	40	40	40	40	40	40	39	38	37	33	24	10																		
145.	31	31	31	31	30	30	29	28	25	18	0																			
155.	23	23	23	23	23	23	22	21	19	14	0																			
165.	18	18	18	18	17	17	17	16	14	10	0																			
175.	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	12	11	0	0																			
185.	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0																			
195.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																			
205.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																			
210.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																			
215.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																			
217.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																			
219.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																			
220.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																			
225.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																			
x (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200

Transverse Dispersionity (η) = 10.0

Time Since Pumping Began = 1090. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RIM-2S = 251.days

p1Cu/ml * 1.0

[illegible]

10.0

[illegible]

Transverse Dispersivity (m) = 30.0

Time Since Pumping Began = 1090. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S = 251 days

p(Cu/mol) = 1.0

z (m)	0.	1.	1.	2.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	8.	10.	12.	15.	20.	25.	30.	35.	45.	55.	65.	75.	85.	95.	105.	115.	125.	135.	145.	155.	165.	175.	185.	195.	205.	210.	215.	217.	219.	220.	225.						
	860	868	868	863	861	853	750	11	0	2																																				
	864	864	863	862	859	853	781	92	0	10																																				
	860	860	860	859	857	852	801	199	0	19																																				
	856	856	856	855	854	850	813	303	0	25																																				
	852	852	852	851	850	817	819	397	0	29																																				
	845	845	844	841	843	811	821	536	0	27																																				
	837	837	836	836	835	814	819	631	0	15																																				
	829	829	829	828	828	827	815	693	34	0	0	0	0	0	0																															
	821	821	821	820	820	819	810	731	108	0	5	0	0	0	0																															
	805	805	805	805	804	803	797	756	259	0	9	0	0	0	0																															
	789	789	789	789	788	787	782	758	396	0	10	0	0	0	0																															
	773	773	773	772	772	771	767	749	499	0	8	0	0	0	0																															
	748	748	748	748	747	747	743	731	593	0	1	0	0	0	0																															
	707	707	707	706	706	705	702	693	621	64	0	0	0	0	0																															
	665	665	665	664	664	663	660	653	610	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	623	623	623	623	623	622	618	612	581	232	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	582	582	582	582	582	581	577	571	549	295	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	504	504	504	504	503	502	499	491	478	323	49	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	431	431	431	431	431	430	427	423	411	316	82	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	367	367	367	366	366	365	363	359	349	283	105	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	309	309	309	309	308	308	306	302	294	249	118	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	259	259	259	259	259	258	256	253	246	211	116	30	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	215	215	215	215	215	214	213	211	204	179	110	35	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	178	178	178	178	178	178	176	174	169	148	96	36	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	146	146	146	146	146	146	145	143	139	123	85	36	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	120	120	120	120	120	119	118	117	113	100	72	32	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	97	97	97	97	97	97	96	95	92	82	61	29	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	79	79	79	78	78	78	77	76	74	66	49	25	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	61	59	53	40	21	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	50	50	50	50	50	50	49	49	47	42	32	18	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	39	39	39	39	39	39	38	38	37	33	26	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	30	29	26	20	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	22	19	16	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	17	16	14	12	8	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	16	16	16	16	16	15	15	15	14	13	10	8	6	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	11	10	8	6	4	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	12	12	10	9	8	6	4	3	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11	10	9	8	6	5	3	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11	10	9	7	6	5	3	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	10	10	9	8	7	7	5	4	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
x (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200																

Appendix L
Sensitivity of solution to changes in
molecular diffusion coefficient

Time Since Pumping Began = 1090. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Trillium at RM-25 = 251.days

plCu/ml = 1.0

z (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
0.	868	868	868	864	862	818	231	0	10	0																				
1.	865	865	864	864	861	850	359	0	16	0																				
1.	862	862	862	861	859	851	406	0	21	0																				
2.	859	859	859	858	856	850	508	0	22	0																				
2.	856	856	855	855	853	818	667	0	19	0																				
3.	849	849	849	848	847	813	711	0	2	0																				
4.	842	842	842	841	840	836	761	97	0	11																				
5.	835	835	834	833	832	829	775	231	0	17	0	1	0	0																
6.	827	826	826	825	824	821	718	363	0	20	0	1	0	0																
8.	809	809	808	808	806	802	770	513	0	22	0	1	0	0																
10.	790	789	789	788	786	782	755	593	0	13	0	0	0	0																
12.	768	768	768	767	765	760	734	623	9	0	0	0	0	0																
15.	734	734	733	732	730	725	701	629	145	0	9	0	0	0																
20.	673	673	672	671	669	663	641	589	271	0	16	0	0	0																
25.	611	610	610	608	606	601	581	540	339	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0												
30.	549	549	548	547	545	540	521	485	346	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
35.	490	489	489	487	486	481	464	432	339	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
45.	383	382	382	381	379	375	361	337	277	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
55.	291	290	290	289	288	285	274	256	214	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
65.	216	216	216	215	214	211	203	189	158	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
75.	156	156	156	155	154	152	146	136	114	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
85.	111	110	110	110	109	108	103	95	79	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
95.	76	76	75	75	75	74	70	65	54	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
105.	51	51	51	51	50	50	47	43	36	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
115.	33	33	33	33	33	32	30	28	23	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125.	21	21	21	21	21	20	19	18	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
135.	13	13	13	13	13	12	12	11	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
145.	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
155.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
165.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
175.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
185.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
195.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
205.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
210.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
215.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
217.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
219.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
220.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
225.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
x (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200

Dec 9 11:43 1986 contant Page 1

Dxx = Dyy = 1.0 e-02

Time Since Pumping Began = 965. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambaic Tritium at RHM-25 = 126. days

p(Cu/ml) * 10.0

z (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
0.	892	892	892	878	865	796	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.	882	882	879	876	863	814	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.	871	871	869	865	858	821	229	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	860	860	858	854	849	822	352	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	849	849	847	844	838	817	417	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.	827	827	825	822	817	802	553	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	805	805	803	800	796	783	606	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.	783	783	781	778	774	763	629	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.	761	761	759	756	752	741	638	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	718	717	716	713	709	699	625	276	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	675	674	673	670	667	656	601	366	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12.	633	633	631	629	625	615	567	405	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15.	573	572	571	569	566	556	517	417	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20.	480	480	479	477	474	465	431	369	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25.	398	398	397	395	393	385	361	314	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.	327	326	325	324	322	316	295	259	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35.	265	264	264	262	261	256	239	210	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45.	172	172	171	170	169	166	155	137	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55.	108	108	108	107	107	105	98	87	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
65.	68	68	67	67	67	65	61	55	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
75.	41	41	41	41	41	40	38	34	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
85.	25	25	25	25	25	25	23	21	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
95.	15	15	15	15	15	15	14	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
105.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
115.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
125.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
135.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
145.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
155.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
165.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
175.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
185.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
195.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
205.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
210.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
215.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
217.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
219.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
220.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
225.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
x (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200

L-5

Time Since Pumping Began = 1090, days

Time Since Arrival of Canbriic Tritium at RI04-2S = 251 days

pl(Cu/ml) = 1.0

z (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
0.	868	868	868	864	862	818	230	0	10	0																				
1.	865	865	864	864	861	850	359	0	17	0																				
1.	862	862	862	861	859	851	497	0	22	0																				
2.	859	859	859	858	857	850	599	0	23	0																				
2.	856	856	855	855	853	818	667	0	19	0																				
3.	849	849	849	848	847	813	735	0	3	0																				
4.	812	842	842	841	840	836	764	96	0	11																				
5.	815	835	834	833	832	829	775	230	0	17	0	1	0	0																
6.	827	827	826	825	824	821	770	363	0	20	0	1	0	0																
8.	809	809	808	808	806	802	770	513	0	22	0	1	0	0																
10.	790	789	789	788	786	782	755	593	0	13	0	0	0	0																
12.	768	768	768	767	765	760	734	623	9	0	0	0	0	0																
15.	734	734	733	732	730	725	701	629	144	0	9	0	0	0																
20.	673	673	672	671	669	663	641	589	271	0	16	0	0	0																
25.	611	610	610	608	606	601	581	540	339	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0												
30.	549	549	548	547	545	510	521	485	346	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
35.	490	489	489	487	486	431	464	432	339	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
45.	383	382	382	381	379	375	361	337	277	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
55.	291	290	290	289	288	265	274	256	214	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
65.	216	216	216	215	214	211	203	189	158	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
75.	156	156	156	155	154	152	146	136	114	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
85.	111	110	110	110	109	108	103	95	79	31	0	0	0	0																

[illegible]

[illegible]

$$1)_{xx} = D_{yy} = 1.0 \times 10^{-5}$$

Time Since Pumping Began = 965. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian Tiltum at RIM-2S = 126. days

10.0

[illegible]

z (m)	860	868	868	864	862	818	229	0	10	0																				x (m)
0.	860	868	868	864	862	818	229	0	10	0																				0.
1.	865	865	864	864	861	850	358	0	17	0																				0.
1.	862	862	862	861	859	851	497	0	22	0																				0.
2.	859	859	859	858	857	850	599	0	23	0																				0.
2.	856	856	855	855	853	848	668	0	19	0																				0.
3.	849	849	849	848	847	843	735	0	3	0																				0.
4.	842	842	842	841	840	836	764	95	0	11																				0.
5.	835	835	834	833	832	829	775	230	0	17																				0.
6.	827	827	826	825	824	821	778	363	0	20																				0.
8.	809	809	808	808	806	802	770	513	0	22																				0.
10.	790	789	789	788	786	782	755	593	0	13																				0.
12.	768	768	768	767	765	760	734	623	9	0																				0.
15.	734	734	733	732	730	725	701	629	144	0																				0.
20.	673	673	672	671	669	663	641	589	271	0																				0.
25.	611	610	610	608	606	601	581	540	339	0																				0.
30.	549	549	548	547	545	540	521	485	346	0																				0.
35.	490	489	489	487	486	481	464	432	339	0																				0.
45.	383	382	382	381	379	375	361	337	277	10																				0.
55.	291	290	290	289	288	285	274	256	214	37																				0.
65.	216	216	215	214	211	203	189	158	41	0																				0.
75.	156	156	156	155	154	152	146	136	114	39																				0.
85.	111	110	110	110	109	108	103	95	79	31																				0.
95.	76	76	75	75	75	74	70	65	54	23																				0.
105.	51	51	51	51	50	50	47	43	36	16																				0.
115.	31	31	31	31	31	32	30	28	23	10																				0.
125.	21	21	21	21	20	19	18	14	7	0																				0.
135.	13	13	13	13	13	12	12	11	9	4																				0.
145.	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	6	5	2																				0.
155.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1																				0.
165.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1																				0.
175.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1																				0.
185.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
195.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
205.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
210.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
215.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
217.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
219.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
220.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
225.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
230.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																				0.
235.																														

Appendix M
Simulated distribution of tritium

piCu/ml * 10.0

M-3

[illegible]

plCu/ml * 10.0

[illegible]

Run = tp1

Time Since Pumping Began = 940. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian T₂ at RM2-S 101.days

p1Cu/ml • 10.0

[illegible]

M-8

Time Since Pumping Began = 1015. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambric Tritium at RNM2-S 176.days

pH Cu/ml 1.0

[illegible]

Run = tpl

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian Tritium at RM2-S 201.days

1.0 pICu/ml

[illegible]

M-10

Time since Pumping Began = 1090. days

Time Since Arrival of Canbrie Tritium at RMH-5 251.days

picu/101 1.0

[illegible]

M-12

Time Since Pumping Began = 1115. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RMH-2S 276.days

plCu/ml * 0.1

[illegible]

Time Since Pumping Began = 1140. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S 301.days

plCu/ml = 0.1

z (m)	0.	1.	1.	2.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	8.	10.	12.	15.	20.	25.	30.	35.	45.	55.	65.	75.	85.	95.	105.	115.	125.	135.	145.	155.	165.	175.	185.	195.	205.	210.	215.	217.	219.	220.	225.					
0.	135	135	135	134	134	130	53	0	2	0																																			
1.	135	135	135	134	134	131	69	0	3	0																																			
1.	134	134	134	134	133	131	86	0	3	0																																			
2.	133	133	133	133	133	131	98	0	3	0																																			
2.	133	133	133	133	132	131	107	0	2	0																																			
3.	132	132	132	131	131	130	115	6	0	0																																			
4.	130	130	130	130	130	129	119	27	0	3																																			
5.	129	129	129	129	129	128	120	49	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0																													
6.	128	128	128	128	128	127	121	68	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0																													
8.	125	125	125	125	125	124	120	88	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0																													
10.	123	123	123	123	122	122	118	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																													
12.	120	120	120	120	120	119	116	102	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																													
15.	116	116	116	115	115	115	112	103	34	0	2	0	0	0	0	0																													
20.	108	108	108	108	108	107	104	98	56	0	3	0	0	0	0	0																													
25.	101	101	101	100	100	100	97	92	66	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
30.	93	93	93	93	93	92	90	85	67	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
35.	86	86	86	86	85	85	83	79	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
45.	72	72	72	71	71	71	69	65	56	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
55.	58	58	58	58	58	58	56	53	46	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
65.	47	47	47	46	46	46	44	42	36	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
75.	36	36	36	36	36	35	34	32	28	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
85.	27	27	27	27	27	27	26	24	21	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
95.	20	20	20	20	20	20	19	18	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
105.	14	14	14	14	14	14	13	13	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
115.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
125.	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
135.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
145.	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
155.	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
165.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
175.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
185.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
195.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
205.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
210.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
215.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
217.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
219.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
220.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
225.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
x (m)	0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200															

Time Since Pumping Began =1165. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S 326.days

pIC₅₀/ml 0.1

[illegible]

x (m)	0	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
225.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
220.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
219.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
217.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
215.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
210.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
205.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
195.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
185.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
175.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
165.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
155.	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
145.	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
135.	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
125.	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
115.	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
105.	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
95.	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
85.	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
75.	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66
65.	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81	81
55.	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
45.	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
35.	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133	133
30.	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142	142
25.	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151	151
20.	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159	159
15.	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167
12.	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171	171
10.	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174	174
8.	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176	176
6.	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178	178
5.	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179	179
4.	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180
3.	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180
2.	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181
2.	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181	181
1.	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
0.	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
z (m)	0	93	0	4	0	4	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	5

p(Cu/ml) * 0.1

Time Since Arrival of Carbonic Tryptum at RHM-25 351.days

Time Since Pumping Began =1190. days

Run = tp2

Nov 13 17:59 1986 conout Page 1

Time Since Pumping Began = 1215. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S 376.days

plCu/ml Δ 0.1

[illegible]

pH Cu/ml * 0.1

M-17

[illegible]

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian Tritium at RNM-2S 426.days

p1Cu/ml = 0.1

z (m)	0.	1.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	8.	10.	12.	15.	20.	30.	35.	45.	55.	65.	75.	85.	95.	105.	115.	125.	135.	145.	155.	165.	175.	185.	195.	205.	215.	217.	219.	220.	225.	
	238	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230	226	219	203	194	177	159	141	123	105	88	73	59	47	36	28	21	15	11	8	5	3	3	3	1	1	1	0
	237	237	237	237	237	236	236	235	234	232	230																											

M-19

Time Since Pumping Began = 1290. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S 451.days

plCu/ml * 0.1

z (m)	0.	1.	1.	2.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	8.	10.	12.	15.	20.	25.	30.	35.	45.	55.	65.	75.	85.	95.	105.	115.	125.	135.	145.	155.	165.	175.	185.	195.	205.	210.	215.	217.	219.	220.	225.								
0.	270	270	270	269	269	264	173	0	7	0																																						
1.	270	270	269	269	268	265	191	0	7	0																																						
1.	269	269	269	268	268	265	211	0	5	0																																						
2.	268	268	268	268	267	265	225	0	0	0																																						
2.	267	267	267	267	267	265	234	17	0	2																																						
3.	266	266	266	266	265	264	244	69	0	7																																						
4.	264	264	264	264	264	263	249	118	0	11																																						
5.	263	263	263	262	262	261	251	157	0	10																																						
6.	261	261	261	261	261	260	252	186	0	7																																						
8.	258	258	258	258	257	257	251	213	0	1																																						
10.	255	255	255	255	254	254	249	225	31	0																																						
12.	252	252	252	251	251	250	247	230	74	0																																						
15.	247	247	247	247	246	246	242	232	133	0																																						
20.	239	239	239	238	238	237	234	227	172	0																																						
25.	231	231	230	230	230	229	227	221	188	0																																						
30.	222	222	222	222	222	221	218	213	189	4																																						
35.	214	214	214	214	213	213																																										

Run = tp2

Time Since Pumping Began = 1315. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambrian Trilobites at RNM-2S 476 days

pIC₅₀/mM = 0.1

[illegible]

z (m)	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	8
-------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Run = tp3

Time Since Pumping Began = 1365. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S 526.days

plCu/mi = 0.1

[illegible]

Nov 14 10:47 1986 conout Page 1

Run = tp3

Time Since Pumping Began =1390. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S 551.days

plCu/ml * 0.1

z (m)		345	345	345	344	344	339	245	0	9	0	x (m)																			
0.		345	345	344	344	343	340	267	0	7	0	0	0																		
1.		344	344	344	343	341	289	0	2	0	0	0	0																		
1.		343	343	343	343	341	305	15	0	2	0	0	0																		
2.		343	343	343	342	341	315	52	0	6	0	0	0																		
3.		341	341	341	341	340	324	122	0	12	0	0	0																		
4.		340	340	340	340	339	328	181	0	15	0	0	0																		
5.		339	339	339	338	338	330	226	0	12	0	0	0																		
6.		338	338	337	337	337	331	259	0	7	0	0	0																		
8.		335	335	335	335	334	330	290	14	0	1	0	0																		
10.		333	333	333	332	332	328	305	71	0	4	0	0																		
12.		330	330	330	330	329	326	310	129	0	7	0	0																		
15.		326	326	326	326	325	322	312	200	0	8	0	0																		
20.		319	319	318	318	317	314	307	244	0	4	0	0																		
25.		310	310	310	310	309	306	300	261	0	0	0	0																		
30.		301	301	301	301	300	297	291	263	31	0	0	0																		
35.		292	292	292	291	291	288	282	262	73	0	0	0																		
45.		273	273	273	272	272	269	264	248	115	0	0	0																		
55.		254	254	254	253	253	250	245	233	140	0	0	0																		
65.		235	235	235	235	234	231	227	215	145	9	0	0																		
75.		216	216	216	215	215	212	208	197	142	23	0	0																		
85.		197	197	197	197	196	193	189	179	132	32	0	0																		
95.		178	178	177	177	176	174	170	160	121	39	0	0																		
105.		159	159	159	158	157	155	151	142	108	39	1	0																		
115.		140	140	140	139	138	136	133	124	95	39	2	0																		
125.		122	122	122	121	121	118	115	107	81	36	3	0																		
135.		104	104	104	104	103	101	98	91	69	33	3	0																		
145.		88	88	88	88	87	86	83	76	57	27	3	0																		
155.		73	73	73	73	72	71	68	63	47	23	4	0																		
165.		61	60	60	60	60	58	56	51	38	19	3	0																		
175.		48	48	48	48	48	46	45	41	30	15	3	0																		
185.		39	39	39	39	38	37	35	32	23	11	2	0																		
195.		29	29	29	29	29	28	27	24	18	9	2	0																		
205.		22	22	22	21	21	19	17	13	8	2	0	0																		
210.		17	17	17	17	17	16	15	12	8	4	2	1																		
215.		13	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	10	8	5	3																		
217.		12	12	12	12	12	12	11	10	9	7	5	4																		
219.		11	11	11	11	11	10	10	9	8	7	5	4																		
220.		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	8	6	5	4																		
225.		7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	5	4	3	2																		
x (m)		0.	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200

Time Since Pumping Began = 1415. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S 576.days

plCu/ml * 0.1

[illegible]

MI-25

Time Since Pumping Began = 1440. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambric Tritium at RNM-2S 601.days

plCu/ml * 0.1

z (m)	0.	1.	1.	2.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	8.	10.	12.	15.	20.	25.	30.	35.	45.	55.	65.	75.	85.	95.	105.	115.	125.	135.	145.	155.	165.	175.	185.	195.	205.	210.	215.	217.	219.	220.	225.								
0.	398	398	398	396	395	388	286	0	10	0																																						
1.	397	397	396	396	395	390	309	0	7	0																																						
1.	396	396	395	395	394	390	332	0	1	0																																						
2.	395	395	394	394	393	391	347	29	0	3																																						
2.	394	394	393	393	392	390	358	73	0	8																																						
3.	392	392	391	391	391	389	368	151	0	15																																						
4.	390	390	389	389	389	388	372	216	0	17																																						
5.	388	388	388	387	387	386	375	265	0	13	0	1	0	0																																		
6.	386	386	386	386	385	384	376	301	0	6	0	0	0	0	0																																	
8.	382	382	382	382	382	381	375	334	26	0	2	0	0	0	0																																	
10.	379	379	379	379	379	378	373	349	93	0	5	0	0	0	0																																	
12.	376	376	376	376	375	374	371	354	159	0	8	0	0	0	0																																	
15.	371	371	371	371	371	370	367	356	237	0	9	0	0	0	0																																	
20.	363	363	363	363	363	362	359	351	285	0	4	0	0	0	0																																	
25.	355	355	355	355	354	354	351	345	304	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
30.	346	346	346	346	346	345	342	336	307	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
35.	337	337	337	337	336	336	333	327	305	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
45.	317	317	317	317	317	316	313	307	290	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
55.	296	296	296	296	296	295	292	287	273	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
65.	276	276	275	275	275	274	271	266	254	177	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
75.	255	255	255	254	254	253	250	246	234	175	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
85.	234	234	234	234	234	233	230	226	214	164	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
95.	214	214	213	213	213	212	210	205	195	153	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
105.	194	194	194	193	193	192	190	186	176	138	57	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
115.	174	174	174	173	173	172	170	166	157	124	58	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
125.	155	155	155	154	154	153	151	147	138	109	53	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
135.	136	136	136	135	135	134	132	129	121	96	50	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
145.	118	118	118	118	118	117	115	112	104	82	43	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
155.	101	101	101	101	100	100	98	95	88	69	38	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0</									

M-26

M-27

Time Since Pumping Began = 1615. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritons at RMH-2S 776.days

pH Cu/ml = 0.1

[illegible]

$x(n)$	0	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	3	5	7	10	15	20	25	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200
--------	---	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

M-28

Time Since Pumping Began = 1640. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambic Tritium at RNM-2S 801.days

ptCu/ml • 0.1

[illegible]

M-29

z (m)		x (m)	
0	678	0	0
1	678	678	678
2	678	678	678
3	678	678	678
4	678	678	678
5	678	678	678
6	678	678	678
7	678	678	678
8	678	678	678
9	678	678	678
10	678	678	678
11	678	678	678
12	678	678	678
13	678	678	678
14	678	678	678
15	678	678	678
16	678	678	678
17	678	678	678
18	678	678	678
19	678	678	678
20	678	678	678
21	678	678	678
22	678	678	678
23	678	678	678
24	678	678	678
25	678	678	678
26	678	678	678
27	678	678	678
28	678	678	678
29	678	678	678
30	678	678	678
31	678	678	678
32	678	678	678
33	678	678	678
34	678	678	678
35	678	678	678
36	678	678	678
37	678	678	678
38	678	678	678
39	678	678	678
40	678	678	678
41	678	678	678
42	678	678	678
43	678	678	678
44	678	678	678
45	678	678	678
46	678	678	678
47	678	678	678
48	678	678	678
49	678	678	678
50	678	678	678
51	678	678	678
52	678	678	678
53	678	678	678
54	678	678	678
55	678	678	678
56	678	678	678
57	678	678	678
58	678	678	678
59	678	678	678
60	678	678	678
61	678	678	678
62	678	678	678
63	678	678	678
64	678	678	678
65	678	678	678
66	678	678	678
67	678	678	678
68	678	678	678
69	678	678	678
70	678	678	678
71	678	678	678
72	678	678	678
73	678	678	678
74	678	678	678
75	678	678	678
76	678	678	678
77	678	678	678
78	678	678	678
79	678	678	678
80	678	678	678
81	678	678	678
82	678	678	678
83	678	678	678
84	678	678	678
85	678	678	678
86	678	678	678
87	678	678	678
88	678	678	678
89	678	678	678
90	678	678	678
91	678	678	678
92	678	678	678
93	678	678	678
94	678	678	678
95	678	678	678
96	678	678	678
97	678	678	678
98	678	678	678
99	678	678	678
100	678	678	678
101	678	678	678
102	678	678	678
103	678	678	678
104	678	678	678
105	678	678	678
106	678	678	678
107	678	678	678
108	678	678	678
109	678	678	678
110	678	678	678
111	678	678	678
112	678	678	678
113	678	678	678
114	678	678	678
115	678	678	678
116	678	678	678
117	678	678	678
118	678	678	678
119	678	678	678
120	678	678	678
121	678	678	678
122	678	678	678
123	678	678	678
124	678	678	678
125	678	678	678
126	678	678	678
127	678	678	678
128	678	678	678
129	678	678	678
130	678	678	678
131	678	678	678
132	678	678	678
133	678	678	678
134	678	678	678
135	678	678	678
136	678	678	678
137	678	678	678
138	678	678	678
139	678	678	678
140	678	678	678
141	678	678	678
142	678	678	678
143	678	678	678
144	678	678	678
145	678	678	678
146	678	678	678
147	678	678	678
148	678	678	678
149	678	678	678
150	678	678	678
151	678	678	678
152	678	678	678
153	678	678	678
154	678	678	678
155	678	678	678
156	678	678	678
157	678	678	678
158	678	678	678
159	678	678	678
160	678	678	678
161	678	678	678
162	678	678	678
163	678	678	678
164	678	678	678
165	678	678	678
166	678	678	678
167	678	678	678
168	678	678	678
169	678	678	678
170	678	678	678
171	678	678	678
172	678	678	678
173	678	678	678
174	678	678	678
175	678	678	678
176	678	678	678
177	678	678	678
178	678	678	678
179	678	678	678
180	678	678	678
181	678	678	678
182	678	678	678
183	678	678	678
184	678	678	678
185	678	678	678
186	678	678	678
187	678	678	678
188	678	678	678
189	678	678	678
190	678	678	678
191	678	678	678
192	678	678	678
193	678	678	678
194	678	678	678
195	678	678	678
196	678	678	678
197	678	678	678
198	678	678	678
199	678	678	678
200	678	678	678

p(Cu/ml) = 0.1

Time Since Arrival of Contaminant at RHM-251076: days

Time Since Pumping Began = 1915: days

Run = 194.5

Nov 15 20:20 1986 contout Page 1

Run = 178.9

The Since Pumping began 1015. days

Time Since Arrival of Cambiologic Titulum at RNM-2521'6, days

0.1 ml Cu/ml

[illegible]

M-33

Time Since Pumping Began = 3515. days

p1Cu/ml * 0.1

[illegible]

Appendix N

Contour plots of simulated tritium concentration

26.DAYS

51.DAYS

76.DAYS

N-2

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF CAMBRIC TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

101.DAYS

126.DAYS

151.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

176.DAYS

201.DAYS

226.DAYS

N-4

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

251.DAYS

276.DAYS

301.DAYS

N-5

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

326.DAYS

351.DAYS

376.DAYS

N-6

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

401.DAYS

426.DAYS

451.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

476.DAYS

501.DAYS

526.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

601.DAYS

576.DAYS

551.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

676.DAYS

651.DAYS

626.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

701.DAYS

726.DAYS

751.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

776.DAYS

801.DAYS

826.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

926.DAYS

951.DAYS

976.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1001.DAYS

1026.DAYS

1051.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1151.DAYS

1176.DAYS

1201.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1226.DAYS

1251.DAYS

1276.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1301.DAYS

1326.DAYS

1351.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1426.DAYS

1401.DAYS

1376.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1451.DAYS

1476.DAYS

1501.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1826.DAYS

1801.DAYS

1776.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-25. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1851.DAYS

1876.DAYS

1901.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

1976.DAYS

1951.DAYS

1926.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

2076.DAYS

2101.DAYS

2126.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

2151.DAYS

2176.DAYS

2201.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF CAMBRIC TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

2276.DAYS

2251.DAYS

2226.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF CAMBRIC TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

2301.DAYS

2326.DAYS

2351.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF CAMBRIC TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

2426.DAYS

2401.DAYS

2376.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF CAMBRIC TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

2451.DAYS

2476.DAYS

2501.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF CAMBRIC TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

2601.DAYS

2576.DAYS

2551.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF CAMBRIC TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

2651.DAYS

4354.DAYS

TIMES ARE SINCE DETECTION OF CAMBRIC TRITIUM AT RNM-2S. CONCENTRATIONS ARE IN pCi/ml. DISTANCES ARE IN METERS.

DISTRIBUTION

U.S. Department of Energy

Gylan Allen
Test Operations Division
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Doug Duncan
Hydrology Program Manager
Office of Environmental Restoration & Waste
Management
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Don Elle, Director
Environmental Protection Division
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Joseph N. Fiore, Acting Asst. Mgr.
Office of Environmental Restoration & Waste
Management
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Joseph H. Kitchen
Technology and Program Management Division
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Steve Lawrence
Environmental Restoration Division
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

John S. Ledbetter
Contracts Division
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518, MS 505
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Steve Leedom
Test Operations Division
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Steve Mellington, Director
Environmental Restoration Division
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Technical Information Resource Center
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

Richard Pearl
Environmental Protection Division
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

U.S. Department of Defense

David Bedsun
Defense Nuclear Agency
U.S. Department of Defense
P.O. Box 98539
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8539

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

Lee Davisson
Nuclear Chemistry Division
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
P.O. Box 808, MS L237
Livermore, CA 94550

Greg Nimz
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
P.O. Box 808, MS L233
Livermore, CA 94550

Los Alamos National Laboratory

Joe Thompson
Los Alamos National Laboratory
INC-11, MS J514
P.O. Box 1663
Los Alamos, NM 87545

U.S. Geological Survey

Virginia Glanzman
U.S. Geological Survey
Box 2506, MS 913
Denver Federal Center
Denver, CO 80225

Randy Laczniaik
U.S. Geological Survey
Water Resources Division
6770 S. Paradise Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Paul Orkild
U.S. Geological Survey
Box 2506, MS 913
Denver Federal Center
Denver, CO 80225

Doug Trudeau
U.S. Geological Survey
Water Resources Division
6770 S. Paradise Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Desert Research Institute

Roger Jacobson
Desert Research Institute
Water Resources Center
P.O. Box 19040
Las Vegas, NV 89132-0040

Marjory Jones
Desert Research Institute
Water Resources Center
P.O. Box 60220
Reno, NV 89506-0220

Paul Seaber
Desert Research Institute
Water Resources Center
P.O. Box 19040
Las Vegas, NV 89132-0040

Reynolds Electrical & Engineering Co.

Martha DeMarre
Chief, Document Research Section
Health Protection Dept.
Reynolds Electrical & Engineering Co.
P.O. Box 98521
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8521

Brian Dozier
Reynolds Electrical & Engineering Co.
2501 Wyandotte
Mercury, NV 89102

State of Nevada

Larry Franks
Nevada State Health Department
Radiological Health Section
620 Belrose Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89158

LIBRARIES

Archives
Getchell Library
University of Nevada, Reno

Beverly Carter
MacKay School of Mines Library
University of Nevada, Reno

Stead Library
Desert Research Institute
Reno, Nevada

Southern Nevada Science Center
Water Resources Center, Library
P.O. Box 19040
Las Vegas, NV 89132-0040

Document Section, Library
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154

Annie Kelley
State Documents Department
Nevada State Library
Capitol Complex
Carson City, NV 89710

Water Resources Research Archives
University of California
Room 40, North Gate Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720

International Technology Corp.

Rick Waddell
Geotrans
c/o IT
4330 Valley View
Suite 112
MS-439
Las Vegas, NV 89103

Joe Yeasted
International Technology Corp.
4330 S. Valley View, Ste. 114
Las Vegas, NV 89103

COPIES
11/15/79
11/15/79
11/15/79