# **Hydrogeological Investigation Report of Findings Norborne, Missouri**









*Collector Wells International, Inc. 6360 Huntley Road Columbus, Ohio*

*August 24, 2006* 

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**



### List of Figures (rear of report)



- Figure 2 Test Boring Location Map
- Figure 3 Generalized Geologic Cross Section A-A'
- Figure 4 Background Period Hydrographs
- Figure 5 Multiple-Rate Step Test Hydrographs
- Figure 6 Multiple-Rate Step Test Semi-Log Time-Drawdown Plots

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**

- Figure 7 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Period Hydrographs Observed Water Elevations Wells PW, TB-06-1, TB-06-2, TB-06-4, TB-06-5, TB-06-6 and River
- Figure 8 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Period Hydrographs Observed Water Elevations Wells TB-06-1, TB-06-2, TB-06-3, TB-06-4, TB-06-5, TB-06-6, TB-06-7, Supply Well, and River
- Figure 9 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Period Hydrographs Water Elevations Adjusted for River Level Changes, Wells TB-06-1, TB-06-2, TB-06-3, TB-06-4, TB-06-5, TB-06-6, TB-06-7, Supply Well and River
- Figure 10 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Semi-Log Time-Drawdown Plots Observed Drawdown
- Figure 11 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Semi-Log Time-Drawdown Plots Drawdown Adjusted for River Level Changes
- Figure 12 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Semi-Log Distance-Drawdown Plots
- Figure 13 End of Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Observed Drawdown Map
- Figure 14 Missouri River Daily Stream Flow Statistics for the US Geological Survey Gage Station at Waverly, Missouri
- Figure 15 Estimated Yield from Horizontal Collector Well
- Figure 16– Model Estimated Drawdown-One Collector Well, Summer Average River **Conditions**
- Figure 17– Model Estimated Drawdown-One Collector Well, Winter Low River Conditions
- Figure 18 Model Estimated Drawdown-Two Collector Wells, Summer Low River Conditions

#### List of Tables (rear of report)

- Table 1 Test Boring Information
- Table 2 Sieve Analysis Results
- Table 3 Hydraulic Interval Test Results
- Table 4 Multiple-Rate Step Test Results
- Table 5 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Results
- Table 6 Aquifer Test Analysis Results
- Table 7 Field Water Quality Results
- Table 8 Laboratory Water Quality Results

#### List of Appendices (rear of report)

- Appendix A Test Boring/Well Logs
- Appendix B Sieve Analysis Data
- Appendix C Hydraulic Interval Test Data
- Appendix D Background Water Level Data
- Appendix E Multiple-Rate Step Test Data

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**

Appendix F – Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Data

Appendix G – Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Analysis

Appendix H – Laboratory Water Quality Results

Appendix I – Project Photographs

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Collector Wells International, Inc. (CWI) was contracted by Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc. (AEC), to conduct a hydrogeological evaluation of the feasibility of utilizing horizontal collector well technology and riverbank filtration (RBF) to provide a water supply for a proposed new generating facility. AEC has proposed construction of a new coal-powered generating facility to be located in the Missouri River Valley near Norborne, Missouri. Water requirements are estimated to average 5,600 gallons per minute (gpm), peaking to 7,400 gpm during the summer. The study for the plant's water supply was conducted on a site located about 7 miles south of the proposed plant and adjacent to the Missouri River (Figure 1).

The scope of this project consisted of three (3) tasks including: Task 1 – Exploratory Test Borings; Task 2 – Detailed Aquifer Testing; and Task 3 – Data Analyses, Conceptual Design and Reporting. Task 1 involved drilling three (3) test borings and conducting a hydraulic interval test in one of the borings. Task 2 included the installation of a test well capable of pumping at least 1,000 gpm and four (4) additional observation wells (Figure 2), and conducting a 72-hour constant rate aquifer test. Task 3 included the compilation and analysis of the data collected in Tasks 1 and 2 to determine the feasibility and preliminary design of a collector well or wells at the proposed site.

The test borings indicated that the project site is underlain by an unconsolidated aquifer that contains variable sequences of sand and gravel and is overlain by clay, silt and fine sand. The bedrock surface was encountered at depths of 71 to 75 feet below the ground surface in the borings, and the lower 30 feet of the borings above the bedrock was generally comprised of sand and gravel (Figure 3). The results of the Task 1 field activities indicated that the site had the potential for the development of a ground water supply, and the Task 2 activities were conducted to quantify the potential ground water yield.

The results of the Task 2 aquifer testing indicate that the aquifer in the vicinity of the test pumping well is permeable, having a transmissivity of approximately 129,000 gallons per day per foot (gpd/ft) under the test conditions. It also appears that the aquifer is in reasonably good hydraulic connection with the river, which provides a source of recharge. The aquifer properties and the proximity to the river allows for the potential development of a RBF system utilizing one or more collector wells.

Based on the testing results, it is estimated that a collector well located near the test pumping well location could yield in excess of the desired 7,400 gpm under average summer conditions. Under the assumed low river level, low water temperature conditions as would be expected in winter months, it is estimated that a collector well near the test pumping well could yield approximately 4,700 gpm.

An analytic element ground water flow model was used to estimate the effects on the aquifer when pumping the desired yield. A model simulation was run with a single collector well near the test pumping well pumping 7,400 gpm under assumed average summer conditions. This simulation shows that there would be approximately 2 feet or more drawdown extending approximately 1,200 feet north of the site property boundaries, and an area with a projected drawdown of approximately 0.5 feet or more would extend to approximately 1.5 miles north of the site. A simulation was run with two collector wells with each pumping 3,700 gpm for a total of 7,400 gpm under assumed winter low river conditions. This simulation shows that there would be approximately 5 feet or more drawdown extending nearly to the property boundaries of the project site, and an area that would have a projected drawdown of approximately 0.5 feet or more extending to approximately 2.2 miles north of the project site. An additional simulation was run with low river levels during the summer. This simulation produced results intermediate between the simulation for the summer average conditions and the winter low river conditions.

Because a single collector well at the test pumping well site is unlikely to be capable of yielding 7,400 under low river conditions, it would be necessary to install two collector wells at the site to ensure an adequate supply under the low flow conditions and to provide a backup supply under average conditions. If AEC determines that a single collector well located near the test pumping well is a viable option to meet the projected water supply requirements, the recommended location for the collector well caisson is approximately 25 feet to the east of the test pumping well. Alternatively, if it is determined that two collector wells are required to ensure that 7,400 gpm can be obtained on a year-round basis, then the recommended locations are approximately

200 feet east of the west property line and approximately 200 feet west of the east property line.

The preliminary design for the proposed collector well(s) includes a 16-foot diameter (ID) caisson to allow sufficient room for pumping equipment. The top of the caisson should extend to an elevation at or above the 500-year flood level. To ensure adequate mechanical capacity and low screen entrance velocities, the preliminary design also includes six (6) laterals with an approximate length of 200 feet each. The laterals would be comprised of 12-inch diameter stainless-steel well screen, and the six laterals would be installed in a radial pattern on a 175-degree arc on the river side of the caisson.

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Collector Wells International, Inc. (CWI) was contracted by Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc. (AEC), to conduct a hydrogeological evaluation of the feasibility of utilizing horizontal collector well technology to provide a water supply for a proposed new generating facility to be located near Norborne, Missouri. The project was conducted in accordance with AEC purchase order number HQ504633 dated March 15, 2006 as specified in the CWI proposal dated March 8, 2006.

#### **1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SCOPE**

AEC has proposed construction of a new coal-powered generating facility to be located in the Missouri River Valley near Norborne, Missouri. Water requirements are estimated to average 5,600 gallons per minute (gpm), peaking to 7,400 gpm during the summer. Preliminary investigations indicated that the desired yield could not be obtained from ground water near the proposed plant site. Consequently, AEC decided to direct the study for the plant's water supply to a site located about 7 miles south of the proposed plant and adjacent to the Missouri River (Figure 1). This investigation focused on riverbank filtration (RBF) using a horizontal collector well(s). The investigation is designed to meet the objectives of Specification A-7213, i.e., collect the necessary data to determine the quantity and anticipated quality of water available from the test site, develop a conceptual design of a RBF system to yield the desired quantity and evaluate potential impacts (if any) on other nearby ground water users.

The study area lies within the valley of the Missouri River. Available data indicate that the areas under consideration are underlain by an unconsolidated glacial-fluvial aquifer up to 100 feet thick that contains variable sequences of clays, silts, sand and gravel. However, detailed testing (the subject of this report) is required to confirm aquifer hydraulics and recharge and develop site-specific design components.

The scope of this project consisted of three (3) tasks including:

 Task 1 – Exploratory Test Borings Task 2 – Detailed Aquifer Testing Task 3 – Data Analyses, Conceptual Design and Reporting Task 1 involved drilling test borings and conducting hydraulic interval tests in selected borings. Based on the preliminary estimates of aquifer properties and logistical considerations, the TB-06-2 site (Figure 2) was selected for detailed aquifer testing.

The scope for Task 2 included the installation of a test well capable of pumping at least 1,000 gpm, and three additional observation wells. A fourth observation well was installed as part of Task 2 at AEC's request. Task 2 also included conducting a 72-hour constant rate aquifer test.

The scope for Task 3 included the compilation and analysis of the data collected in Tasks 1 and 2 to determine the feasibility and preliminary design of a collector well or wells at the proposed site. This report represents the results of the Task 1 and Task 2 activities and the Task 3 analysis.

# **1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION**

The material in the report is presented in the following sections:

Executive Summary Section 1.0 – Introduction Section 2.0 – Field Activities Section 3.0 – Hydrogeological Setting and Testing Results Section 4.0 – Horizontal Collector Well Feasibility Section 5.0 – Conclusion and Recommendations Section 6.0 – References Section 7.0 – Glossary

# **1.3 LIMITATIONS**

This report was prepared for the exclusive use of the Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc., for the specific application and purposes identified herein. Conclusions reached in this report are based on the objective data available at the time of performing the analysis and the accuracy of the report depends upon the accuracy of these data. Every effort has been made to evaluate the available information by the methods generally recognized to constitute accepted standard practices for water supply investigations at the time of rendering the report and the conclusions reached therein to represent our opinions. CWI cannot be responsible for actual conditions proved to be materially at variance with the data collected or supplied to us, upon which our opinions are based.

### **2.0 FIELD ACTIVITIES**

The field activities conducted for this investigation were outlined as part of Tasks 1 and 2 of the proposal. Task 1 included drilling test borings, conducting hydraulic interval testing and converting selected borings to observation wells. Task 2 included drilling and installation of additional observation wells and a test pumping well and conducting aquifer testing.

# **2.1 TASK 1 TEST DRILLING**

Three (3) test borings were drilled for Task 1 of this project at the locations along the north bank of the Missouri River as indicated on Figure 2. Test boring TB-06-1 was drilled approximately 200 feet east of the southwest corner of the property. Boring TB-06-2 was drilled at about the middle of the south side of the property, 400 feet east of TB-06-1; and boring TB-06-3 was drilled about 200 feet west of the east property line.

Task 1 drilling activities were initiated on April 18, 2006 and completed on April 20, 2006. The drilling activities were directed by a CWI hydrogeologist experienced in collector well evaluations who made the necessary decisions as to boring depth and hydraulic interval testing. Logs for the test borings are presented in Appendix A. A summary of information on the test borings is presented in Table 1.

The test borings were drilled by Bowser Morner of Dayton, Ohio with a truck-mounted drilling rig using rotasonic drilling methods. In the rotasonic drilling method, a drill casing is advanced into the ground using rotary/vibrasonic techniques. This method does not require the use of drilling mud, so there is no mud to dispose of, and disturbance of the ground surface is minimal. The rotasonic drilling method produces nearly continuous 4-inch diameter samples of the materials penetrated by the sample tube, and the method produces representative samples from unconsolidated, granular deposits.

The test borings were advanced until bedrock was encountered. Lithologic samples were obtained every five (5) feet and at each change in formation materials from the ground surface to the completion depth. Lithologic samples were placed in suitable containers, plainly identified as to date of collection, hole number, and depth of stratum. Upon completion of the drilling

activities, the lithologic samples were turned over to AEC. Additional lithologic samples were selected from the lower portions of each boring for sieve analysis. The sieve analyses were performed to help characterize the aquifer materials and help evaluate the aquifer hydraulic conductivity. The sieve analysis results are presented in Appendix B and summarized in Table 2.

Upon completion of the drilling, borings TB-06-1, TB-06-2 and TB-06-3 were converted to observation wells to be utilized in the Task 2 aquifer testing. The observation wells were constructed with 2-inch diameter slotted PVC well screen attached to 2-inch diameter flushthreaded PVC casing. The PVC casing in the observation wells extends to approximately 3 feet above the ground surface. The top of the PVC casing on each of the observation wells was provided with a watertight plug and is covered with a 4-inch square steel tubing protective casing with a lockable lid. The formation materials around the well screens were allowed to collapse as the temporary steel drill casing was removed. The remaining open portion of the annulus was sealed with bentonite, and the protective casings were set in place in bentonite. Following installation, the observation wells were developed by air-lifting to assure openness of the well screen to the aquifer.

# **2.2 TASK 1 HYDRAULIC INTERVAL TESTING**

Prior to conversion to an observation well, a hydraulic interval test was conducted in a temporary pumping well installed in the TB-06-2 test boring. The purpose of interval testing is to determine the hydraulic conductivity of the selected intervals and evaluate ground water quality. The data from the interval test are presented in Appendix C and summarized in Table 3.

The interval to be tested was selected by the Hydrogeologist on the basis of the drilling and sampling results. Upon reaching the total completion depth of the test borings, the 6-inch steel casing was pulled back to the bottom of the interval to be tested. A temporary test well was constructed in the boring by installing a nominal 4-inch diameter, wire-wrapped well screen in the selected interval using the pull back method. Development of the temporary test well was accomplished by airlifting and pumping until the water produced was visibly clear and contained little or no sediment. Development time was approximately two (2) hours. Response of the well to development pumping was noted so that pumping rates for the hydraulic interval testing could be estimated. The temporary test well was equipped with a submersible pump capable of pumping a minimum of 100 gpm. The pumping rates were determined using an in-line flow meter. The selected interval was pumped for a minimum of two (2) hours. The pumping period was divided into four (4) steps of at least thirty (30) minutes duration. During each step, the pumping was maintained at a constant rate. The pumping rate was varied between steps so that the steps were run at approximately 40%, 60%, 80% and 100% of the maximum achievable pumping rate. The pumping rate was adjusted and stabilized as quickly as possible between steps.

Depths to water were measured to the nearest 0.01 foot in the test boring prior to and during the pumping period. The elapsed time of pumping to the nearest minute associated with each water level measurement was recorded along with the pumping rates. During each step of the pumping period, water level measurements in the test boring were made on approximately the following schedule:

- Every 1 minute for 0 to 6 minutes from the start of the step;
- Every 2 minutes for 6 to 12 minutes from the start of the step:
- Every 5 minutes after 15 minutes from the start of the step.

At the end of the test pumping period, water levels in the test boring were monitored on the same schedule until the water level recovered to nearly the pre-pumping level. During the pumping period water quality was monitored in the field for pH, conductivity, iron and hardness. A water sample was collected near the end of the test for laboratory analysis of the general water quality parameters, selected metals and volatile organics.

# **2.3 TASK 2 TEST DRILLING AND PUMPING WELL INSTALLATION**

At the completion of Task 1, a location for detailed aquifer testing was selected with the concurrence of AEC. The site selected for the test pumping well (PW) was adjacent to boring TB-06-2.

Task 2 included the drilling and installation of four (4) additional observation wells for sampling subsurface materials, monitoring water levels and for conducting detailed aquifer testing. The

four additional observation wells (TB-06-4, TB-06-5, TB-06-6 and TB-06-7) were positioned in a pattern around the test pumping well at appropriate locations and distances selected to facilitate the data analysis. The Task 2 observation wells were installed between April 20 and April 22, 2006. The observation wells were drilled using the same rotasonic drilling and sampling methods as were used in the Task 1 borings. Selected formation samples from the lower portions of the borings were submitted for sieve analyses to determine optimum well screen design for the test pumping well and to help evaluate the hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer. Following completion of drilling, each of the borings was converted an observation well. The observation wells were constructed from 2-inch internal diameter (ID) PVC pipe well casing with a 20-foot length of slotted PVC well screen placed in the lower portion of the formation in each well. Following installation, the wells were developed by air lifting to assure openness to the aquifer.

Following installation of the observation wells, a 12-inch ID steel cased temporary production well (PW) was drilled using reverse rotary methods. The well was installed by Brotcke Well and Pump, Inc., of Fenton, Missouri. The well was equipped with approximately 20 feet of nominal 12-inch continuous-slot wire-wound well screen. The screen slot size (0.080-inch) was selected based on the grain size distribution of the lithologic samples from the adjacent observation wells. The screen was installed with a gravel pack in a nominal 24-inch diameter borehole. Following installation, the well was thoroughly developed using air-lift techniques and equipped with an electrical pump capable of producing a minimum of 1,000 gpm. A log for the test pumping well is included in Appendix A. A temporary water supply well was drilled to provide water during the drilling of the test pumping well. This well was located about 25 feet east of TB-06-4 and was equipped with 20 feet of 6-inch ID machine slotted PVC well screen set from 39 to 59 feet below the ground surface.

Following installation of the wells, the necessary piping and controls were installed at the test pumping well. Discharge from the pump was measured using a circular free-discharge pipe orifice weir with water conveyed to the Missouri River, with the necessary controls to minimize erosion.

To determine the elevation of the river water level at the site and to track changes in the river water level during the testing period, two temporary river staff gages were installed at the site (Figure 2). The staff gages consisted of 5-foot lengths of slotted 2-inch ID PVC pipe that were attached to metal fence posts driven into the riverbed.

Once the pumping and observation wells and river staff gages were installed, the measuring point elevations and horizontal coordinates for the wells and staff gages were surveyed by M & M Land Surveying Service, Inc., of Richmond, Missouri. M & M Land Surveying Service also determined measuring point elevations and horizontal coordinates for two offsite irrigation wells that were monitored during the testing period.

# **2.4 TASK 2 AQUIFER TESTING**

The Task 2 aquifer testing included the following:

- A four-hour multiple rate step drawdown test
- A recovery/background period
- A constant-rate aquifer test.
- A recovery monitoring period.

During the testing period, water levels in the wells and river were monitored using computer assisted data acquisition units (e.g. In-Situ 3000 and In-Situ Trolls), which utilize pressure transducers. Prior to the start of the pumping tests, transducers were set in the test pumping well, the observation wells and the river. Water level measurements were measured to the nearest 0.01 foot, with the transducers programmed to collect data at least every ten (10) minutes. Manual measurements in the wells were also collected periodically throughout the testing to the nearest 0.01 foot using direct read electronic water level meters. These measurements were used to calibrate the transducers and confirm that the automated units were functioning correctly. Measurements collected using electronic water meters were recorded on standardized data forms.

The first portion of the test pumping involved a multiple-rate performance test. This consisted of a four (4) hour test conducted in one-hour steps at increasing rates of discharge to the maximum capacity of the pump. The test results were evaluated to determine the discharge rate for the

subsequent constant-rate test, and confirm the operation of the test equipment. The multiple-rate test was a step drawdown type pumping test in which pumping rates were approximately as follows:



During the multiple-rate test, water levels were measured at approximately the following frequencies (at a minimum) at the following monitoring points.

• Test pumping well

Every 1 minute for the first 6 minutes from the start of each step; Every 2 minutes for 6 to 12 minutes from the start of the step; Every 5 minutes after 15 minutes from the start of the step;

- Observation Wells (with transducers) Every 1 minute throughout the testing period.
- Missouri River (with transducer) Every 5 minutes

Following the shut down of the pump, water level measurements were collected at the same frequency noted above for 1 hour. Additionally, water levels were measured periodically at two offsite irrigation wells: the Durham well, located about 2.6 miles northwest of the test site; and the Gibson well, located about 4.0 miles north-northwest of the test site (Figure 1).

Following the multiple-rate pumping test, the test pumping well was allowed to recover for approximately 12 hours, before the constant rate-pumping test was started. During this period, water levels were collected in the wells with transducers at least every 10 minutes.

The constant-rate test had a pumping period of approximately 72-hours in duration. During the test, discharge from the pumping well was maintained at a constant rate, with flow monitored by the orifice weir. Based upon the results from the multiple-rate pumping test, the pumping rate was set at approximately 1,000 gpm. At the conclusion of the test, the pump was shut off and the recovery of water levels was monitored for approximately 24-hours. During the constant rate test, water level measurements were collected at the following frequencies at the following monitoring points:

• Test pumping well

Every 1 minute for the first 6 minutes from the start of the test; Every 2 minutes for 6 to 16 minutes from the start of the test; Every 5 minutes for 20 to 30 minutes from the start of the test; Every 10 minutes for 30 to 1 hour from the start of the test; Every 15 minutes for 1 to 2 hours from the start of the test; Every 30 minutes for 2 to 4 hours from the start of the test; Every 60 minutes for 4 hours to the end of the pumping period;

- On-Site Observation Wells (with transducers) At least every 10 minutes throughout the testing period; At least 6 times a day with an electronic meter
- Missouri River Every 5 minutes (with transducer) At least 3 times a day with an electronic meter

In addition, the discharge rate was checked periodically and recorded on the data sheets.

Temperature of the pumped discharge water and the Missouri River were periodically measured during the constant-rate test using a hand-held thermometer. Also, water levels were manually measured periodically at two offsite irrigation wells, the Durham well and the Gibson well, and transducers were placed in these wells to continuously monitor water levels during the testing period.

During the constant-rate test, water quality from the test pumping well and the river was monitored in the field for pH, conductivity, iron, hardness and temperature. The test pumping well discharge was monitored in the field three times per day and the river quality was monitored in the field twice per day during the constant-rate test pumping period. Additionally, water samples from the test pumping well were collected after approximately 24 hours and 72 hours from the start of the pumping period and submitted for laboratory analysis of the general water quality parameters, selected inorganic compounds and metals.

#### **3.0 HYDROGEOLOGIC SETTING AND TESTING RESULTS**

This section presents general background information on the hydrogeologic setting of the testing site along with the detailed findings of the Task 1 and Task 2 field activities.

### **3.1 AREA SETTING AND HYDROGEOLOGY**

The project is located in Section 19 of Township 51 North, Range 25 West (T51N, R25W) of Carroll County, Missouri on the north side of the Missouri River. In the area of the test site, the Missouri River occupies a broad valley that is nearly eight miles wide. The test site is near the southern margin of the valley. The Missouri River Valley is filled with unconsolidated sediments that generally comprise a fining upward sequence. The unconsolidated deposits are underlain by Pennsylvanian-aged sedimentary rock. The bedrock typically consists of shale or sandstone and generally yields very limited quantities of poor quality water (MDNR, 1997). In the vicinity of the project site, the unconsolidated sediments typically consist of three zones including 1) a lower layer of coarse-grained sand and gravel, and in some cases boulders (rock fragments greater than 10 inches in diameter) overlying bedrock; 2) an intermediate layer of relatively fine sand or silty sand; and 3) a surficial layer of silt, fine sand and clay. Sand-sized to cobble-sized (2.5 to 10 inch) pieces of lignite coal are common in the sand and gravel deposits. A generalized geologic cross-section for the project site is depicted in Figure 3. It should be noted that because the unconsolidated materials were deposited by a meandering stream over long periods of time, the nature and sequence of the deposits could vary both horizontally and vertically over short distances.

In the Missouri Valley, the water levels in the sand and gravel aquifer are affected by the river levels, and consequently can show a substantial amount of variability. In areas where finegrained materials with relatively low permeability overly the aquifer materials, the aquifer can be under confined conditions when the water levels are high and under unconfined conditions when the water levels are low. At the test site, the ground water levels were above the top of the of the more permeable sand and gravel deposits during the testing period, and consequently the aquifer was under confined or semi-confined conditions.

# **3.2 TEST DRILLING RESULTS**

For the Task 1 drilling activities, three (3) test borings were installed, and for the Task 2 activities four (4) additional observation wells and a test pumping well were drilled at the locations indicated in Figure 2. Logs for the borings are presented in Appendix A, and a summary of information about the borings is presented in Table 1. The results of sieve analyses performed on selected samples from the borings are presented in Appendix B and summarized in Table 2.

# **3.2.1 Boring TB-06-1 Drilling Results**

Boring TB-06-1 was drilled to a total depth of 79 feet below the ground surface on April 18, 2006 as part of the Task 1 test drilling. The lithologic materials encountered in TB-06-1 were as follows:

- 0 to 12 feet Silt and Silty Sand
- 12 to 22 feet Clay and Silty Clay
- 22 to 35 feet Silty Sand
- $\bullet$  35 to 44 feet Sand
- 44 to 45.5 feet Silty Clay
- 45.5 to 59 feet Sand and Gravel
- 59 to 67 feet Sand
- $67$  to 74.5 feet Sand and Gravel
- 74.5 to 79 feet Shale

Sieve analysis of the samples from 50 to 55 feet and 55 to 65 feet indicated these zones consisted of about 83% to 93% sand, 7% to 17% gravel, and less than 1% silt and/or clay. Sieve analysis of the sample from 65 to 75 feet indicated that this interval was substantially coarser and consisted of about 48% sand, 51% gravel, and less than 1% silt and/or clay.

After drilling, the boring was converted to a 2-inch diameter observation well with the well screen set at a depth of 55 to 75 feet.

# **3.2.2 Borings TB-06-2**

Boring TB-06-2 was drilled to a total depth of 78 feet below the ground surface on April 18, 2006 as part of the Task 1 test drilling. The lithologic materials encountered in TB-06-2 were as follows:

- 0 to 12 feet Silt and Silty Sand
- 12 to 14 feet Clay and Silty Clay
- 14 to 43 feet Silty Sand to Sand
- 43 to 73 feet Sand and Gravel
- 73 to 78 feet Shale

Sieve analysis of the samples from 49 to 54 feet, 54 to 59 feet, 64 to 69 feet and 69 to 73 feet indicated these zones were relatively coarse and consisted of about 50% to 68% sand, 30% to 49% gravel, and about 1% or less silt and/or clay. Sieve analysis of the sample from 59 to 64 feet indicated that this interval was finer grained and consisted of about 83% sand, 17% gravel, and less than 1% silt and/or clay.

After drilling, a temporary pumping well was installed in the TB-06-2 boring, and a hydraulic interval test was conducted. Following this, the boring was converted to a 2-inch diameter observation well with the well screen set at a depth of 50.2 to 70.2 feet.

# **3.2.3 Boring TB-06-3 Drilling Results**

Boring TB-06-3 was drilled to a total depth of 76 feet below the ground surface on April 19, 2006 as part of the Task 1 test drilling. The lithologic materials encountered in TB-06-3 were as follows:

- 0 to 4 feet Sandy Clayey Silt
- $\bullet$  4 to 10 feet Sandy Silt
- 10 to 16 feet Silty Clay to Clayey Silt
- 16 to 23 feet Silty Sand
- 23 to 25 feet Sand and Gravel
- 25 to 29 feet Silty Sand
- 29 to 44 feet Sand
- 44 to 74 feet Sand and Gravel or Sand
- 74 to 76 feet Shale

Sieve analysis of the samples from 54 to 59 feet, 65 to 69 feet and 69 to 74 feet indicated these zones were relatively coarse and consisted of about 59% to 82% sand, 18% to 42% gravel, and less than 1% silt and/or clay. Sieve analysis of the samples from 52 to 54 feet and 59 to 65 feet indicated that these intervals were finer grained and consisted of about 94% to 96% sand, about 4% gravel, and less than 1% to slightly more than 1% silt and/or clay.

After drilling, the boring was converted to a 2-inch diameter observation well with the well screen set at a depth of 50 to 70 feet.

### **3.2.4 Boring TB-06-4 Drilling Results**

Boring TB-06-4 was drilled to a total depth of 79 feet below the ground surface on April 20, 2006 as part of the Task 2 test drilling. The lithologic materials encountered in TB-06-4 were as follows:

- 0 to 9 feet Sandy Silt to Silty Sand
- 9 to 14 feet Silty Clay to Clayey Silt
- $\bullet$  14 to 19 feet Sandy Silt
- 19 to 43 feet Silty Sand
- 43 to 46 feet Sand and Gravel
- 46 to 52 feet Silty Sand
- 52 to 73 feet Sand and Gravel
- 73 to 79 feet Shale

Sieve analysis of the samples from 52 to 59 feet, 59 to 64 feet and 64 to 69 feet indicated these zones were relatively coarse and consisted of about 58% to 75% sand, 25% to 41% gravel, and less than 1% silt and/or clay. The sieve analysis of the material from 69 to 73 feet indicated that this interval consisted of 15% sand, 84% gravel and 1% silt and/or clay. Sieve analysis of the sample from 49 to 52 feet indicated that this interval was finer grained and consisted of about 99% sand, and 1% silt and/or clay.

After drilling, the boring was converted to a 2-inch diameter observation well with the well screen set at a depth of 53 to 73 feet.

# **3.2.5 Boring TB-06-5 Drilling Results**

Boring TB-06-5 was drilled to a total depth of 73 feet below the ground surface on April 20, 2006 as part of the Task 2 test drilling. The lithologic materials encountered in TB-06-5 were as follows:

- $\bullet$  0 to 9 feet Sandy Silt
- 9 to 16 feet Silty Clay to Clayey Silt
- $\bullet$  16 to 19 feet Sandy Silt
- 19 to 46 feet Silty Sand
- 46 to 71 feet Sand and Gravel or Sand

• 71 to 73 feet – Sandstone

Sieve analysis of the samples from 46 to 49 feet, 57 to 59 feet and 59 to 64 feet indicated these zones were relatively coarse and consisted of about 67% to 77% sand, 23% to 33% gravel, and less than 1% silt and/or clay. The sieve analysis of the material from 67 to 69 feet indicated that this interval consisted of 44% sand, 56% gravel and less than 1% silt and/or clay. Sieve analysis of the samples from 53 to 57 and 64 to 67 feet indicated that these intervals were finer grained and consisted of about 92 to 99% sand, 0% to 6% gravel and less than 1% to 2% silt and/or clay.

After drilling, the boring was converted to a 2-inch diameter observation well with the well screen set at a depth of 50 to 70 feet.

# **3.2.6 Boring TB-06-6 Drilling Results**

Boring TB-06-6 was drilled to a total depth of 79 feet below the ground surface on April 21, 2006 as part of the Task 2 test drilling. The lithologic materials encountered in TB-06-6 were as follows:

- 0 to 10 feet Sandy Silt to Sandy Silt
- 10 to 21 feet Silty Clay to Clayey Silt
- 21 to 39 feet Silty Sand
- 39 to 49 feet Interbedded Silty Clay, Sand and Gravel
- 49 to 53 feet Silty Sand and Silty Clay
- 53 to 73 feet Sand and Gravel
- 73 to 79 feet Shale

Sieve analysis of the samples from 53 to 56 feet, 59 to 64 feet and 64 to 69 feet indicated these zones were relatively coarse and consisted of about 59% to 76% sand, 24% to 40% gravel, and less than 1% silt and/or clay. The sieve analysis of the material from 69 to 73 feet indicated that this interval consisted of 29% sand, 71% gravel and less than 1% silt and/or clay. Sieve analysis of the sample from 49 to 52 feet indicated that this interval was finer grained and consisted of about 97% sand, 1% gravel and 2% silt and/or clay.

After drilling, the boring was converted to a 2-inch diameter observation well with the well screen set at a depth of 53 to 73 feet.

# **3.2.7 Boring TB-06-7 Drilling Results**

Boring TB-06-7 was drilled to a total depth of 75 feet below the ground surface on April 21, 2006 as part of the Task 2 activities. The lithologic materials encountered in TB-06-7 were as follows:

- 0 to 4 feet Clayey Silt
- 4 to 9 feet Sandy Silt to Silty Sand
- 9 to 19 feet Silty Clay to Clayey Silt
- 19 to 29 feet Silty Sand
- 29 to 32 feet Sand
- 32 to 72 feet Sand and Gravel or Sand
- 72 to 75 feet Shale

Sieve analysis of the samples from 49 to 55 feet and 63 to 65 feet indicated these zones were relatively coarse and consisted of about 61% to 62% sand, 37% to 39% gravel, and less than 1% silt and/or clay. The sieve analysis of the material from 69 to 72 feet indicated that this interval consisted of 45% sand, 54% gravel and less than 1% silt and/or clay. Sieve analysis of the samples from 55 to 59 feet and 59 to 63 feet indicated that these intervals were finer grained and consisted of about 90% sand, 9% to 10% gravel and less than 1% silt and/or clay.

After drilling, the boring was converted to a 2-inch diameter observation well with the well screen set at a depth of 50 to 70 feet.

# **3.2.8 Test Well PW Drilling Results**

Test well PW was drilled to a total depth of 72 feet below existing ground surface on May 19, 2006. The well was drilled with reverse rotary methods with a nominal 24-inch diameter drill bit. The lithologic materials encountered in the borehole included the following:

- 0 to 11 feet Silt to Sandy Silt
- 11 to 14 feet Silty Clay
- 14 to 29 feet Silty Sand
- 29 to 43 feet Sand
- 43 to 72 feet Sand and Gravel

No bedrock material was recovered from the borehole, but the change in drilling indicated that the bedrock surface was at or just below the total drilled depth. Because of the different drilling method used, the lithologic samples collected may not be fully representative of the formation materials, and consequently, no sieve analyses were performed on the lithologic samples from the PW boring.

After drilling to the total depth, a 0.080-inch slot, wire-wrapped steel well screen was installed in the borehole. The annulus was back filled around the screen with graded filter pack material. The remaining annulus above the screen was sealed using granular bentonite. The well was developed for approximately 1.5 hours by air-lifting.

# **3.3 HYDRAULIC INTERVAL TESTING RESULTS**

As indicated in Section 3.2, a hydraulic interval test was conducted in boring TB-06-2. The results of the hydraulic interval test are summarized in Table 3 and the data are included in Appendix C.

The hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer can be estimated from data collected during the interval tests. Transmissivity of an aquifer can be estimated from specific capacity using the following equation (Driscoll, 1986):

$$
T = 2000 * Q/s
$$



Hydraulic conductivity is related to transmissivity by the following equation:

 $K = T/b$ 

Where:  $K = \text{hydraulic conductivity, gpd/ft}^2$  $b = a$ quifer thickness, feet

The base of the alluvial aquifer at the boring locations is considered to be at the elevation where bedrock was encountered. Defining the top of the aquifer is somewhat arbitrary because at most of the boring locations there is a gradual transition from fine-grained to coarse-grained materials. The top of the aquifer at most of the boring locations was estimated to be at the shallowest depth where the drilling results indicated that the materials were predominantly sand. The static water levels in the borings were generally above the depths that were determined to be the top of the

aquifer, and consequently, the aquifer was considered to be under semi-confined or confined conditions during the testing.

In order to estimate the transmissivity of the aquifer, the specific capacity data from the interval test was adjusted for well loss and the effects of partial penetration effects using an equation by Kozeny (1933), such that:

$$
T = \frac{2000 \cdot \frac{Q}{s}}{X \cdot E}
$$

$$
X = L \cdot \left[1 + 7 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{r}{2 \cdot b \cdot L}} \cdot \cos\left(\frac{\pi \cdot L}{2}\right)\right]
$$



The TB-06-2 hydraulic interval test was conducted on April 19, 2006. A 0.040-inch slot screen was set in the temporary test well from 59.8 to 69.8 feet below the ground surface. The well was pumped at rates of approximately 35, 58, 82 and 120 gpm. The observed drawdown at the end of the last step was 6.1 feet giving an observed specific capacity of 19.5 gallons per minute per foot of drawdown (gpm/ft). Using the equations given above, the estimated aquifer transmissivity at this location is approximately 90,000 gallons per day per foot (gpd/ft). Assuming a saturated aquifer thickness at this location of 30 feet at the time of the testing gives an estimated hydraulic conductivity of 3000 gallons per day per square foot (gpd/ $ft<sup>2</sup>$ ).

The short interval test results should be considered only an estimate of aquifer hydraulics. It is possible that stratification, well inefficiencies and partial penetration may have resulted in estimated transmissivity and hydraulic conductivity values that differ significantly from the actual values.

### **3.4 AQUIFER TEST RESULTS AND ANALYSIS**

# **3.4.1 Background Period Observations**

The scope for the Task 2 activities did not include a formal background water level monitoring period. However, water level measurements were made in the observation wells prior to conducting the aquifer testing to establish background trends and evaluate the response of the aquifer to river level changes. Hydrographs depicting the water levels in selected wells during the background period are presented in Figure 4. River level readings were obtained from the river gages, which were installed on May 17, 2006. For comparison purposes, river level data were also obtained from the US Geological Survey (USGS) gage station at Waverly, Missouri, which is approximately 12 miles east (downstream) of the project site. The Waverly river gage data are also depicted in Figure 4.

The background monitoring confirms that water level changes in the aquifer generally correspond to water level changes in the river level. Under non-pumping conditions during the field activities, the water elevations in the onsite observation wells were slightly above the adjacent river water elevations, and the water elevations in the observation wells parallel to the riverbank generally decreased from west to east corresponding to the downstream direction of the river gradient. In wells located in a line roughly perpendicular to the riverbank (TB-06-2, TB-06-6, and TB-06-7), the water elevations decreased toward the river under non-pumping conditions during the field activities.

# **3.4.2 Multiple-Rate Step Drawdown Test**

The multiple-rate step drawdown test using well PW at the Norborne site was conducted on May 22, 2006. The test data are presented in Appendix E, and the test results are summarized in Table 4. Hydrographs for the test pumping period are depicted in Figure 5, and a semi-log plot of the drawdown in PW with respect to the elapsed pumping time is presented in Figure 6. As indicated in Table 4, well PW was pumped in steps of approximately one-hour at rates of 340, 580, 780 and 1,100 gpm. At the end of each of the four steps the resulting observed drawdown in PW was 4.05, 7.46, 10.07 and 14.48 feet, respectively. The observed specific capacity at the end of the last pumping step was 76.2 gpm/ft. The step test results indicated that PW was acceptably efficient and that the observation wells were functioning correctly.

### **3.4.3 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test**

The pumping period for the constant-rate aquifer test was started on May 23, 2006 at 8:21 AM and ended on May 26, 2006 at 8:33 AM. The pumping rate was held at a constant rate of approximately 1,010 gpm through the pumping period. The constant-rate test data are presented in Appendix F and summarized in Table 5. Hydrographs depicting the observed water level changes in the pumping well, observation wells and the river are presented in Figures 7 and 8. During the constant-rate test, water levels in the wells appeared to stabilize with respect to pumping of PW in about 24 hours from the start of the test. At the end of the constant-rate test pumping period, the observed water level changes in the observation wells ranging from a drop of 6.0 feet at TB-06-2 (34 feet from PW) to a drop of 1.3 feet at TB-06-3 (448 feet from PW). The observed water level change in PW at the end of the constant-rate test was a decline of 13.5 feet below the static level prior to the start of pumping. There were no observable water level changes in the offsite irrigation wells (Durham and Gibson) that were due to the PW constantrate test pumping.

The ground water level changes observed in the pumping well and observation wells include the effects of the river level changes during the test pumping period. The river level showed a net drop of 0.4 feet over the constant-rate pumping period. In order to analyze the pumping effects, the water level data from the observation wells were adjusted to remove the effects of the river level changes. To adjust the data, river efficiency values (i.e. the ratio of water level change in the ground water corresponding to a given water level change of the river) were estimated for the observation wells adjacent to the pumping well. The river efficiency values that were used were 0.85 for well TB-06-7; 0.9 for wells TB-06-1 and TB-06-3; and 0.95 for the remaining wells. Hydrographs of the water levels adjusted to remove the river level changes apparent in observation wells during the constant-rate test pumping period are depicted in Figure 9.

The constant-rate test data were analyzed to determine the aquifer parameters of transmissivity, hydraulic conductivity and storativity. Transmissivity is the rate at which water is transmitted through a unit width of an aquifer under a unit hydraulic gradient and is expressed in units of gallons per day per foot (gpd/ft). Storativity is the volume of water entering or released from storage per unit surface area of the aquifer per unit change in head and is unitless. Hydraulic

conductivity represents the rate that water will flow through a unit cross section of an aquifer under unit hydraulic gradient and is expressed as gallons per day per square foot (gpd/ $ft<sup>2</sup>$ ) or feet per day (ft/day). The aquifer test analyses were performed using the software package Aquifer Test for Windows, Version 2.5.7 from Waterloo Hydrogeologic, Inc (Waterloo Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1999). The aquifer test analysis plots for the Norborne site are included in Appendix G. Semi-log drawdown versus time plots for the observation wells with the observed drawdown and drawdown adjusted for the river level changes are presented in Figures 10 and 11, respectively. A semi-log drawdown versus distance plot of the observation well data at the end of the pumping period is depicted in Figure 12. A map depicting the observed drawdown at the end of the pumping period is depicted in Figure 13.

The time-drawdown data were analyzed using the Cooper-Jacob straight-line method and the curve-matching technique for developed by Theis (Lohman, 1972). The time-recovery data and distance-drawdown data were analyzed using the straight-line method of Jacob (Lohman, 1972) to check the values of transmissivity obtained from the time-drawdown analysis. The straightline method uses the trend of semi-logarithmic time-drawdown plots. The Theis method matches a log-log time-drawdown plot against a standard type curve. The distance-drawdown data from the end of the pumping period were analyzed using the Cooper-Jacob straight-line method, and the method developed Rorabaugh to evaluate the recharge boundary represented by the river (Rorabaugh, 1956). The drawdown values adjusted for the river level changes were used for the time-drawdown and distance-drawdown analyses methods.

The results of the aquifer analysis are presented in Table 6. Because of the influence of the recharge boundary represented by the river, the time-drawdown and time-recovery analysis methods could only be applied to a few of the observation wells. The Cooper-Jacob method was applied to the portions of the semi-log time-drawdown curves at the beginning of the pumping period for observation well TB-06-2. The Cooper-Jacob time-drawdown analysis transmissivity result for TB-06-2 is 151,000 gpd/ft and the storativity result is 0.0002. The time-recovery method was applied to the data from wells PW, TB-06-2, and TB-06-6. The results of the timerecovery analysis for these wells range from 116,000 gpd/ft to 162,000 gpd/ft. The result of the Theis analysis for transmissivity from TB-06-2 is 129,000 gpd/ft and the storativity value is

0.0004. The Cooper-Jacob distance-drawdown analysis transmissivity result for the observation wells located parallel to the river bank using the adjusted drawdown values at the end of the pumping period is 128,000 gpd/ft.

Rorabaugh (1956) developed equations based on image well theory that can be used to estimate the effective distance to a line source of recharge and the aquifer transmissivity. When using this method, it is assumed that effects such as stream partial penetration and aquifer stratification are integrated into the estimate of the effective distance (Walton, 1987). The following equation is applicable to observation wells located on a line through the pumping well parallel to the recharge boundary after pumping has continued to the point that drawdowns have stabilized:

$$
T = \frac{Q \cdot \ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{4 \cdot a^2 + r^2 - 4 \cdot a \cdot r \cdot \cos(\theta)}}{r}\right)}{2 \cdot \pi \cdot s}
$$

Where:  $T =$  transmissivity of the aquifer, gal/day/ft

- $Q =$  production well pumping rate, gal/day
- $r =$  distance from the pumping well to the observation well, feet
- $s =$  drawdown in the observation well at distance r, feet
- $\theta$  = angle between pumping well and observation well and pumping well and image well, radians
- a = effective distance to line source of recharge, feet

Using the graphical solution to the Rorabaugh equation presented by Schaefer and Kaser (1965) for wells located parallel to the river bank and using the adjusted drawdown at the end of the pumping period the transmissivity result is 129,000 gpd/ft and the effective distance to a line source of recharge (a-distance) result is 330 feet. This indicates that there is a reasonably good hydraulic connection between the aquifer and the river, which will allow the river to act as a source of induced infiltration.

Because the early time-drawdown response may be affected by factors such as fluctuations in the pumping rate, casing storage in the pumping well and the proximity to the recharge boundary, the distance-drawdown results are considered to give the more reliable estimates of the transmissivity. Based on the distance-drawdown analysis results, a transmissivity value of

129,000 gpd/ft is considered representative of the aquifer at the site for the purposes of estimating potential collector well yield. This value of transmissivity, which equates to an average hydraulic conductivity of 4,300 gpd/ $\text{ft}^2$  with a saturated aquifer thickness of 30 feet and a ground water temperature of  $58^{\circ}$  F, is applicable to the test conditions and will vary with changes in saturated thickness and water temperature in the aquifer.

# **3.5 WATER QUALITY RESULTS**

Water quality was evaluated in the field during the hydraulic interval testing and the test pumping of well PW. Additionally, water quality samples were collected at the end of the interval test and during the constant-rate test and submitted for laboratory analysis. The field water quality results are presented in Table 7. The laboratory testing results are summarized in Table 8, and the laboratory reports are presented in Appendix H.

# **3.5.1 Field Water Quality**

Field water quality parameters of pH, specific conductance, total hardness and iron content were measured during the hydraulic interval test, the multiple-rate step test and the constant-rate test, and water temperature was measured during the multiple-rate step test and the constant-rate test. The specific conductance values (which are roughly correlated with the total dissolved concentration of ionic constituents) from the TB-06-2 interval test had an average of about 540 microsiemens per centimeter  $(\mu S/cm)$ . The field hardness values from the TB-06-2 interval test had an average of about 380 milligrams per liter  $(mg/l)$  as  $CaCO<sub>3</sub>$ . The field measurements of pH from the interval test had an average of 7.4 standard units (S.U.) and the field determinations of the iron concentration in the water discharged during the interval test had and average of 6 mg/l.

The discharge temperature readings from PW during the multiple-rate and constant-rate tests averaged about 58°F with no apparent trends in the temperature during the pumping periods. The specific conductance readings from the PW field samples had an average of 570  $\mu$ S/cm. The field hardness values from the PW samples had an average of about  $440 \text{ mg/l}$  as  $CaCO<sub>3</sub>$ . The field measurements of pH from the PW samples had and average of 7.7 S.U, and the field determinations of the iron concentration from the PW samples averaged of about 7 mg/l.

Additionally during the constant-rate test, water samples from the Missouri River water were monitored for field determinations of temperature, pH, conductivity, total hardness and iron content. The daytime river water temperature readings varied between about  $70^{\circ}$  and  $76^{\circ}$  F during the test period. The specific conductance readings from the river water samples had an average of about 670 µS/cm. The field hardness values from the river samples had and average of 340 mg/l as  $CaCO<sub>3</sub>$ . The field measurements of pH from the river samples averaged about 8.1 S.U, and the field determinations of the iron concentration from the river samples averaged of about 0.5 mg/l.

### **3.5.2 Laboratory Water Quality Results**

Water samples for laboratory analysis were collected at the end of the TB-06-2 hydraulic interval test, and were submitted to National Testing Laboratories, Inc., of Ypsilanti, Michigan. Water samples were also collected from test well PW during the constant-rate test pumping period. One set of samples collected from PW on the second day of the constant-rate test, and a second set was collected just before the end of the pumping period. Both sets of samples from PW were submitted to Blue Valley Laboratories, Inc., of Kansas City, Missouri. The results of the analyses from the interval tests and from the PW constant-rate test are summarized in Table 8.

The laboratory results indicate that the ground water quality at TB-06-2 and PW are generally similar. The laboratory result for total dissolved solids (TDS) from the TB-06-2 interval test sample was 320 mg/l, and the results from the two samples from PW were 291 and 292 mg/l. The sulfate concentration from TB-06-2 was 17 mg/l. The sulfate concentrations from the PW samples were 13 and 19 mg/l. The manganese result from TB-06-2 was 0.22 mg/l, while the manganese results for PW averaged 0.41 mg/l. The laboratory result for total hardness for TB-06-2 was 290 mg/l as CaCO<sub>3</sub>. Hardness was not directly analyzed for the samples from PW, but hardness can be calculated from the reported calcium, magnesium, iron, and manganese results. The calculated hardness values for the PW samples were 371 and 354 mg/l.

The sodium concentration from TB-06-2 was 9 mg/l, while both samples from PW had sodium concentrations of 8.4 mg/l. The chloride concentration from TB-06-2 was 8 mg/l, and the chloride concentrations from PW were both 12 mg/l. The iron concentration was 6.8 mg/l from TB-06-2. The iron concentration from the PW samples had an average of 8.2 mg/l.

There were no detections of the volatile organic compounds tested for in the samples from the PW-06-2 interval test. Nitrate was detected in the samples from PW at concentrations of 0.07 and 0.21 mg/l as Nitrogen. The total suspended solids (TSS) result had a result of 10 mg/l. The TSS analysis was run from an unpreserved sample and the results could have been affected by oxidized iron precipitating out of solution. This is also true of the turbidity results in the laboratory report for TB-06-2. The samples were visibly clear at the time of collection.

#### **4.0 HORIZONTAL COLLECTOR WELL YIELD**

The results of the detailed aquifer testing allow the estimation of potential collector well yield under conditions that vary from those of the test conditions. The testing results indicate that the site of the test pumping well PW is favorable for the installation of a collector well or wells. For planning purposes, yield estimates were made for a collector well located near the test pumping well location. Additionally, a ground water flow model was used to evaluate the effects that one collector well located near well PW under summer average conditions or two collector wells located near TB-06-1 and TB-06-3 under winter and summer low river conditions would have on the ground water levels.

#### **4.1 POTENTIAL YIELD OF A COLLECTOR LOCATED NEAR WELL PW**

Using the recent testing results, an estimate for the yield of a horizontal collector well located near the PW location can be calculated. The theoretical drawdown under steady-state pumping conditions in a collector well near a stream in a confined aquifer is calculated using the following equation developed by Hantush and Papadopulos (1962):

$$
s_{cs} \geq \left(\frac{Q}{2\pi Kb}\right) \operatorname{Ln} \left(\frac{\Gamma^{\Gamma}}{\varepsilon^{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\left(\frac{b}{\pi r_w}\right)^2}{2\left(1 - \cos\frac{\pi}{b}\left(2z_i + r_w\right)\right)}\right)^{\frac{b}{41}}\right)
$$

where:  $s_{cs}$  = Drawdown in collector well, ft  $Q =$  Yield of collector, gal/day K = Hydraulic Conductivity, gal/day/ $\text{ft}^2$  $b =$  Saturated thickness of aquifer, ft  $Γ = (2 (a - r_c))/l$  $a =$  Effective distance to a line of recharge, ft  $l =$  Average length of laterals, ft  $r_c$  = Radius of collector caisson, ft ε =  $(2a - r_c - 1)/1$  $r_w$  = Effective radius of each lateral, ft  $z_i$  = Depth of lateral below static water level, ft

Using a variation of the above equation, the potential yield of a collector well near test well PW was estimated using the following assumptions:



The preliminary collector design for the horizontal collector well consists of a total of six (6) laterals placed in one tier. In order to maintain adequate spacing the laterals should be installed 35° apart over a 175-degree arc oriented toward the river. The proposed average lateral length of 200 feet and design (12-inch ID stainless steel wire-wrapped continuous slot screen) will result in low entrance velocities. Based upon the sieve analyses, screen slot sizes for the laterals will probably vary between 0.020 inches and 0.080 inches. Assuming that the laterals will be constructed with ten feet of blank pipe at the caisson wall and an average slot size of 0.060 inches, the resulting average entrance velocity of the water entering the screens would be about 0.8 feet per minute (assuming no blockage) when pumping 7,400 gpm (10.6 million gallons per day (MGD)). At this pumping rate the approach velocity would be about 0.22 feet per minute. Average in-line velocity in the laterals would be 3.5 feet per second  $(ft/s)$  at the design maximum pumping rate of 7,400 gpm.

The static water level at the proposed collector well site will vary due to changes in the level of the Missouri River. To evaluate the potential changes in the river level, stream flow records were obtained from the USGS Missouri River stream gage station closest to the project site, which is the gage station at Waverly, Missouri (USGS, 2006). Daily statistical values for the

stream flows were obtained from the beginning of the record period for the gage, October 1928, through September 2005. To compare the this historical data set with the more recent behavior of the river, daily stream flow statistics were also obtained for the ten-year period from October 1994 through September 2005. Selected daily stream flow statistics from the gage data are depicted in Figure 14. Shown on Figure 14 are the median daily flow values, i.e. the flow that is equaled or exceeded for 50% of the records for a given day of the year, and also shown are the flow values that are equaled or exceeded for 90% of the records for a given day of the year. These records indicate that the lowest stream flows on this stretch of the Missouri River typically occur during the winter months. For the purposes of estimating the potential collector well yield, the winter low flow conditions were assumed to be represented by the daily flows during the months of December and January that are equaled or exceeded for 90% of the records at the Waverly gage. For the purposes of estimating the potential collector well yield, the average late summer flow conditions were assumed to be represented by the median daily flows during the months of August and September at the Waverly gage.

The observed river water level at the project site at was approximately 668.4 feet at the end of the constant-rate test pumping period. Assuming that the river levels at the project site vary similarly with changes in flow as do the river levels at the Waverly gage, it is estimated that the river level during the assumed winter low flow conditions would be approximately 8 feet lower at the site than the river level was at the time of the aquifer test. Consequently, the static water level representing winter low flow conditions was assumed to be an elevation of 660.4 feet at the site. Also, based on the information from the USGS gage station, it estimated that the median summer river elevation at the site is approximately 1 foot higher than the conditions observed during the testing period. Consequently, under average late summer stream flow conditions, it is estimated that the river would be at an elevation of approximately 669.4 feet.

Due to the increase in water viscosity with temperature, a lower water temperature than observed during the testing would result in a lower hydraulic conductivity for the aquifer, and a higher ground water temperature would result in a higher hydraulic conductivity for the aquifer. Based on information on other sites along the Missouri River, it is estimated that the river water temperature varies from just above freezing in the winter to over  $80^{\circ}$  F in the summer. Under the influence of induced filtration of river water, the ground water temperature near the proposed collector well could range from a low temperature of approximately  $45^{\circ}$  F to a high temperature of about  $70^{\circ}$  F. The ground water temperature of  $58^{\circ}$  during the constant-rate test is probably close to average conditions. The least favorable water supply conditions would occur if extreme low river levels coincide with low winter water temperatures.

One of the most important factors that determines well yield for RBF applications is the amount of recharge that can be obtained from the river through induced infiltration. This is controlled by properties such as the permeability and thickness of the streambed deposits, the width and depth of the stream, the slope of the streambed and the distance from the well to the stream bank. To make the problem of estimating the recharge amenable to mathematical treatment, the recharge to a well from a stream can be simulated by an imaginary well or "image" well that adds recharge to the aquifer at the same rate as the real pumping well extracts water (Walton, 1987). Using this mathematical approach, all of the properties that affect the amount of recharge can be simulated by a single value that represents half of the distance between the real well and the image well. This value is the considered to be effective distance to a line source of recharge or recharge boundary. Because of the factors that affect the amount of recharge available other than the physical distance between a production well and a stream, the effective distance to a recharge boundary will always be greater that the actual distance from the well to the stream bank. For the purposes of estimating the potential collector well yield at the project site, the effective distance to the recharge boundary represented by the river was set at 500 feet under average conditions and 700 feet under low flow conditions. These values were chosen to give conservative estimates of the potential collector well yield. The effective distance to the source of recharge may vary seasonally with changes in river level, water temperature and streambed conditions.

To ensure that the full length of all of the laterals remains below the water level, the recommended minimum pumping level in the collector caisson is specified as 10 feet above the centerline of the laterals. Based on the assumed collector well design with the centerline of the laterals approximately seven (7) feet above the bottom of the aquifer (assumed to be at an elevation of 612 feet), the design centerline of the laterals is at an elevation of 619 feet, and the
recommended minimum pumping level is at an elevation of 629 feet.

The potential collector well yield was estimated for three assumed conditions: 1) Summer with average river levels; 2) Winter with low river levels; and 3) Summer with low river levels. The estimated water levels in a collector well caisson at different pumping rates under the assumed conditions for the PW location are depicted in Figure 15. Using the above equation and assumptions, it is calculated that a horizontal collector well constructed near the PW location could yield up to 8,700 gpm (12.5 MGD) under average summer conditions with the river at an elevation of 669.4 feet and the ground water temperature at  $58^{\circ}$  F. Under the assumed low river level (elevation 660.4 feet), low water temperature  $(45^{\circ} \text{ F})$  winter conditions, it is estimated that the proposed collector well could yield 4,700 gpm (6.7 MGD). Under the assumed low river level (elevation 660.4 feet) summer conditions with the ground water temperature at  $65^{\circ}$  F, it is estimated that the proposed collector well could yield 6,300 gpm (9.1 MGD). Actual collector well yields will depend on how well the aquifer conditions match the assumed conditions, and will vary with changes in river level and ground water temperature. As indicated in Figure 14, with the current regulation of flows in the Missouri River it would be very unusual for very low river levels to occur during the summer. Based on the recent river data from the site and from the USGS gage at Waverly, it is estimated that the river level at the project site will rarely drop below an elevation of approximately 663 feet. At this river level a collector well at the PW site would be capable of yielding up to 6,300 gpm (10.3 MGD) with the ground water temperature at  $58^{\circ}$  F.

## **4.3 POTENTIAL PUMPING EFFECTS AND GROUND WATER QUALITY CHANGES**

In order to estimate the potential pumping effects from the proposed collector well, a ground water flow model was developed using the software package GFLOW Version 2.1.1. This is an analytic element ground water flow model that allows simulation of 2-dimensional ground water flow under steady-state conditions.

GFLOW simulations were conducted for the test conditions at the start of the PW constant-rate test in order to check the model input values. The aquifer parameters were assumed to be uniform throughout the modeled area. The model input parameters were based on the aquifer

testing results with the following values used for the simulations:



Constant head boundaries were set in the model at upgradient and downgradient locations across the width of the aquifer to act as the limits of the model area. The limits of the aquifer along the margins of the river valley were simulated by no-flow boundaries. The constant head boundaries and stream heads were set to simulate the river gradient observed between the on-site stream gages and the USGS gage at Waverly at the time of the aquifer testing.

The simulation of the test conditions generated modeled drawdown values that were very close to the drawdown values in the observation wells at the end of the testing period adjusted for changes in the river levels. This result indicates that the model is a reasonable approximation of the aquifer conditions at least in the immediate vicinity of the PW location.

To simulate the potential effects that the proposed collector well(s) would have on the aquifer, model simulations were run under assumed average summer conditions, assumed low flow winter conditions, and assumed low flow summer conditions. The model run under assumed average summer conditions was performed to simulate the effects of one collector well near the PW location pumping at 7,400 gpm. Because the yield calculations indicated that a single collector well could not yield 7,400 gpm under the assumed low river conditions for winter or summer, the simulations for these conditions included two collector wells pumping at 3,700 gpm, each.

Figure 16 depicts the results of the simulation run with the collector well near the PW site pumping 7,400 gpm under assumed average summer conditions. This simulation shows that there would be approximately 2 feet or more drawdown extending approximately 1,200 feet to the north of the site property boundaries. An area that has a projected drawdown of approximately 0.5 feet or more extends to approximately 1.5 miles north of the site.

Figure 17 depicts the results of the simulation run with collector wells near TB-06-1 and TB-06-3 with each pumping 3,700 gpm for a total of 7,400 gpm under assumed winter low river conditions. This simulation shows that there would be approximately 2 feet of drawdown extending 2,200 feet to the north of the site and about 5 feet of drawdown extending nearly to the property boundaries of the project site. An area that has a projected drawdown of approximately 0.5 feet or more extends to approximately 2.1 miles to the north of the project site. This simulation probably over-estimates the drawdown on the landward side of the collector wells because the hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer is assigned a uniform low value in the model to account for the low temperature river water entering the aquifer near the collector wells. However, in reality, the infiltration of the river water would lower the ground water temperature only in the portion of the aquifer near the river. The ground water in the areas of the aquifer farther inland would have minimal temperature change and consequently the hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer would not be as low as the value used in the model.

Figure 18 depicts the model estimated drawdown with collector wells near TB-06-1 and TB-06-3 with each pumping 3,700 gpm under assumed summer low river conditions. This simulation shows that there would be approximately 2 feet of drawdown extending 1,400 feet to the north of the site and about 5 feet of drawdown extending nearly to the property boundaries of the project site. An area that has a projected drawdown of approximately 0.5 feet or more extends to approximately 1.6 miles to the north of the project site. Because this simulation uses the low river levels assumed for the winter low flow conditions, but the higher aquifer hydraulic conductivity assumed for the summer average conditions, the results are intermediate between the results for the summer average simulation and the winter low river simulation.

The flow model was used to estimate the induced recharge and its potential effect on the ground water quality. The estimates were made for the assumed average conditions for a collector well at the PW site pumping at 7,400 gpm. The flow model results indicate that after 30 days of pumping, water entering the aquifer from the stream would reach a collector well at the PW location from distances of approximately 1,200 feet upstream of and 1,200 feet downstream of the collector well under average conditions. It is estimated that approximately 70% of the discharge from the collector well would be derived from induced infiltration of the stream at this time. Parameters such as TDS and hardness tend to follow simple mixing relationships under the influence of induced infiltration. Based on the analytical results from the samples collected from well PW, it is estimated that the average ground water TDS at the PW site is about 290 mg/l, and the average hardness is about 350 mg/l. Based on USGS records for the Missouri River at St. Joseph, Missouri, the average TDS of the river water is about 300 mg/l and the average hardness is about 240 mg/l. Based on this, induced infiltration will cause minimal change in the TDS because the ground water and surface water TDS are nearly the same. For the hardness, simple mixing of 70% river water and 30% ground water would result in a hardness value of approximately 270 mg/l in the water from the well. Parameters such as iron, which typically has relatively low concentrations in surface water, would also show reductions in concentration in the water produced from the well due to the influence of induced infiltration. However, iron tends to be involved in biochemical and oxidation-reduction reactions within the riverbed and aquifer and consequently does not tend to show simple mixing relationships due to the influence of induced infiltration.

#### **5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Collector Wells International, Inc. completed a test drilling and aquifer testing program to evaluate the feasibility of installing a horizontal collector well or wells for the water supply system for the proposed AEC power plant to be located near Norborne, Missouri. The test site is located on a property to the south of Norborne and situated along the north bank of the Missouri River. Three test borings were drilled, and a hydraulic interval test was performed in one of these borings as part of the Task 1 activities. An additional four borings were drilled for observation wells and a test pumping well was installed for the Task 2 activities. The test well was used to conduct a multiple-rate test and a constant-rate aquifer test. The results of the testing were used to predict the potential yields of a collector well located near the test pumping well.

## **5.1 CONCLUSIONS**

The test borings conducted by CWI indicate that the aquifer conditions are favorable for the development of a ground water supply at the test site. The aquifer properties and the proximity to the river allows for the potential development of a riverbank filtration (RBF) system utilizing a collector well or wells.

At the location of the test borings, the favorable aquifer materials are up to 30 feet thick. The aquifer testing indicates that the aquifer in the vicinity of PW is permeable, having a transmissivity of approximately 129,000 gpd/ft under the test conditions. It also appears that the aquifer is in reasonably good hydraulic connection with the river, which provides a source of recharge.

The water quality testing indicates that the ground water in the vicinity of the test well PW is hard and has elevated concentrations of iron and manganese.

Based on the testing results, it is estimated that the proposed collector well located near the PW location could yield in excess of the desired 7,400 gpm under average summer conditions. Under the assumed low river level, low water temperature conditions, it is estimated that a collector well near PW could yield approximately 4,700 gpm.

As indicated from the yield estimates, a single collector well at the PW site is unlikely to be capable of yielding 7,400 under low river conditions. Also, it should be recognized that the capacity of any well will decrease with time as clogging of the well screens and aquifer materials adjacent to the well screens takes place. Consequently, it would be desirable to install a second collector well at the site to augment the supply under low river conditions and provide a backup supply under average river conditions.

## **5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

If AEC determines that a collector well located near test well PW is a viable option to meet the projected water supply requirements, the recommended location for the collector well caisson is approximately 25 feet to the east of the test well PW. Alternatively, if it is determined that two collector wells are required to ensure that 7,400 gpm can be obtained on a year-round basis, then the recommended locations are approximately 25 feet east of TB-06-1 and approximately 25 feet west of TB-06-3 (Figure 17). If two collector wells are installed, the same general designs could be used for both.

The preliminary design for the proposed collector well(s) includes a 16-foot diameter (ID) caisson to allow sufficient room for pumping equipment. The top of the caisson should extend to an elevation at or above the 500-year flood level. To ensure adequate mechanical capacity and low screen entrance velocities, the preliminary design also includes six (6) laterals with an approximate length of 200 feet each. The laterals would be comprised of 12-inch diameter stainless-steel well screen, and the six laterals would be installed in a radial pattern on a 175-degree arc on the river side of the caisson.

The test pumping well PW should be left in place to serve as a water supply source during the collector well installation. The observation wells installed during the Tasks 1 and 2 activities should be left in place until completion of construction and testing of the collector well(s). After construction is completed selected observation wells should be converted to permanent monitoring wells by installing concrete pads around the protective surface casings. Observation wells that are deemed unnecessary for monitoring the collector well(s) should be properly abandoned once initial testing of the collector well(s) is completed.

#### **6.0 REFERENCES**

- **Bruin, J. and H. E. Hudson, Jr., 1955.** Selected Methods for Pump Test Analysis, Illinois State Water Survey, Report of Investigations, No. 25.
- **Driscoll, F. G., 1986.** *Groundwater and Wells, 2nd Edition.* Johnson Division, St. Paul, MN.
- **Hantush, M. S. and I. S. Papadopulos, 1962**.Flow of Ground Water to Collector Wells, Proceedings Am. Society Civil Eng., Hydraulics Div. Journal., p. 221- 244.
- **Kozeny, J., 1933.** Theorie and Berechung der Brunnen. Wassarkraftu. Wasser Wirtschaft, Vol. 29, 101 p.
- **Lohman, S. W., 1972**. Ground-Water Hydraulics, Geological Survey Professional Paper 708, Second Printing, 1975, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- **Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), 1997.** *Ground Water Resources of Missouri*, Water Resources Report Number 46, Missouri State Water Plan Series, Volume II, Missouri Department of Natural Resources Division of Geology and Land Survey, Rolla, Missouri.
- **Rorabaugh, M. I., 1956.** *Ground Water in Louisville and Northeastern Kentucky with Reference to Induced Infiltration*, U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 1360-B.
- **US Geological Survey (USGS), 2006.** Data for USGS Stream Gage Station Number 06895500 Missouri River at Waverly, MO, National Water Information System: Web Interface, http://waterdata.usgs.gov/mo/nwis/nwisman/?site\_no=06895500&agency\_cd=USGS, Internet web site accessed May 31, 2006.
- **Walton, W. C., 1987.** *Groundwater Pumping Tests Design and Analysis*, Lewis Publishers, Chelsea, Michigan.
- **Waterloo Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1999.** Aquifer Test User's Manual, Waterloo Hydrogeologic, Inc., Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

#### **7.0 GLOSSARY**

**Aquifer** – a layer of earth materials that can yield a usable quantity of water to wells.

**Alluvial** – pertaining to sediments deposited by modern streams or rivers.

**Collector Well –** a well consisting of a hollow cylindrical concrete caisson that is sunk into the ground from which horizontal well screen laterals project into the surrounding aquifer that allow water to enter the well.

**Drawdown** – the change in ground water level that results from pumping. It is determined from the difference between the depth to the ground water surface at a given time after pumping has started and the depth to the ground water surface prior to the start of pumping.

**Glacial-Fluvial Deposits** – earth materials that have been deposited or formed by either by the action of glaciers or by streams or rivers, or sediments formed by glaciers and re-deposited by streams.

**Hydraulic Conductivity** – a measure of the permeability of a porous media. Specifically it is defined as the volume of water that can flow through a unit cross section of a media under a unit hydraulic gradient. It has units of a velocity and can be expressed in terms of feet per day  $(\text{ft/day})$  or in gallons per day per square foot  $(\text{gpd/ft}^2)$ .

**Pressure Transducer** – a device that generates an electrical signal that varies in proportion to the amount of pressure that the device is exposed to. The electrical signal can be converted to a digital signal that can be stored on a computer as a record of the pressures that the transducer is exposed to, such as head pressures (ground water levels) within a well.

**Specific Capacity** – a measure of the productivity of a well. It is determined by dividing the pumping rate of a well by the amount of drawdown. It is typically expressed in units of gallons per minute per foot of drawdown (gpm/ft).

**Specific Conductance** – a measure of the ability of water to conduct electricity. It roughly correlates to the total dissolved concentration of ionic constituents (chemicals that form charged particles when dissolved) in the water, and is thus a general indicator of water quality. Pure water has very low specific conductance. As the amount of ionic constituents dissolved in the water increases, the specific conductance increases. It is expressed in units of microsiemens per centimeter ( $\mu$ S/cm) or the equivalent unit micromhos per centimeter ( $\mu$ mhos/cm)

**Storativity** – a measure of an aquifer's ability to store water. Specifically it is the volume of water that an aquifer stores or releases per unit surface area of the aquifer per unit change in hydraulic head. Storativity is a unitless value.

**Transmissivity** – a measure of an aquifer's ability to transmit water. Specifically it is defined as the volume of water that can flow through a vertical cross section of an aquifer of unit width under a unit hydraulic gradient. It is the product of the hydraulic conductivity of an aquifer and

the saturated thickness of the aquifer. It is expressed in terms of gallons per day per foot  $(gpd/ft)$ .

**Unconsolidated Materials** – earth materials such as soil that are not cemented or compacted together. Rock would generally be considered a consolidated material.

**Well Development** – the process of removing fine-grained materials from around a well screen to ensure that the screen is open to the aquifer and to maximize the well's performance. Well development is typically accomplished by pumping or surging the well. Pumping for development can be accomplished by air-lifting, a method in which a pipe is installing into the well through which compressed air is injected. The air forces water up out of the well casing carrying the fine-grained materials that can pass through well screen along with it.

**Well Screen** – part of a well in an unconsolidated aquifer that is designed to maximize the amount of water that enters the well while minimizing the amount of sand or fine-grained materials that can enter the well. A well screen can be simply pipe with numerous slots cut through it. Wire-wrapped well screen provides the maximum amount of open area. It is constructed from a number of metal rods running the length of the screen around which a wire is wrapped and attached by welding. A gap is left between successive wraps of the wire to form a continuous slot that allows the entrance of water into the screen. For either cut slot or wirewrapped well screen, the size of the slot opening is selected based on the grain-size distribution of the aquifer materials.

### **Grain Size Classifications**

The grain size classifications used in this report follow the Wentworth Scale as indicated below (Source: *Manual of Field Geology*, by R. Compton, 1962):



# **FIGURES**









**FIGURE 4 Background Period Hydrographs – Observed Water Elevations AEC - Norborne, Missouri**





**FIGURE 5**

**FIGURE 6 PW Multiple-Rate Step Test Semi-Log Time-Drawdown Plots AEC - Norborne, Missouri**



**FIGURE 7 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Period Hydrographs – Observed Water Elevations AEC - Norborne, Missouri**



**FIGURE 8 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Period Hydrographs – Observed Water Elevations AEC - Norborne, Missouri**







**FIGURE 10 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Semi-Log Time-Drawdown Plots Observed Drawdown**



**FIGURE 11 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Semi-Log Time-Drawdown Plots Drawdown Adjusted for River Level Changes**

**FIGURE 12 Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Semi-Log Distance-Drawdown Plots AEC - Norborne, Missouri**







**FIGURE 14Missouri River Daily Stream Flow Statistics**

*File: Missouri River at Waverly dvstat.xls Print Date: 08/21/06*

680.0 Water Elevation in Collector Well Caisson (feet) **Water Elevation in Collector Well Caisson (feet)** 670.0 660.0 650.0 640.0630.0  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  $\blacksquare$ ю 620.0  $\blacksquare$ 610.00 1000 2000 3000 4000 5000 6000 7000 8000 9000**Pumping Rate (gpm)** Estimated Summer Average Conditions — **E** Estimated Summer Low Flow Conditions — **O** Estimated Winter Low Flow Conditions Recommended Minimum Pumping Level - Centerline of Laterals

**FIGURE 15Estimated Yield from Horizontal Collector Well at the PW LocationAEC - Norborne, Missouri**











# **TABLES**

## TABLE 1 Test Boring and Monitoring Point Information Summary

Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC - Norborne, Missouri



1) Approximate coordinates, determined with hand-held GPS receiver, UTM NAD 1983 Zone 15.

2) Site coordinates provided by M&M Land Surveying Service, Inc. - Coordinate System assumed

3) Elevations provided by M&M Land Surveying Service, Inc. - Vertical Datum NGVD1929

## TABLE 2 Sieve Analysis Results Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC - Norborne, Missouri



1) Effective grain size values represent diameter at percent passing fraction, e.g.  $D_{10}$  = grain diameter at 10% passing size.

## TABLE 3 Hydraulic Interval Test Summary Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC - Norborne, Missouri



1) Laminar Flow Loss estimated based on analysis using the methods of Bruin and Hudson, 1955.

# TABLE 4 Multiple-Rate Step Test Results Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC - Norborne, Missouri



1) Well PW depth to water measuring point was top of 12-inch steel casing 1.4 feet above grade.

Well PW multiple-rate step pumping test conducted on May 22, 2006

#### TABLE 5

#### Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Results Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC - Norborne, Missouri



1) Reference Elevations provided by M&M Land Surveying Service, Inc. - Vertical Datum NGVD1929

- 2) Depths to water referenced from top of 2-inch casings in the observation wells, the top of the 12-inch steel casing in PW, and the tops of the 2-inch PVC pipe on the river staff gages.
- 3) Observed change values are positive depths to water greater than static (drawdown), and are negative for depths to water less than static.
- 4) Observed change values adjusted for changes in river level from start of pumping and estimated river efficiency values at the respective wells.

Average Discharge Rate from Well PW was 1010 gpm during the pumping period. Pumping period started May 23, 2006 at 08:21 and ended May 26, 2006 at 08:33.

# TABLE 6

# Aquifer Test Analysis Results Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC - Norborne, Missouri

#### **Cooper and Jacob Time-Drawdown Method (Semi-log straight-line matching)**



#### **Theis Method (Log-log plot curve matching)**



#### **Theis and Jacob Recovery Method (Semi-log straight-line matching)**



#### **Cooper and Jacob Distance-Drawdown Method (Semi-log straight-line matching)**



#### **Schaefer and Kaser Distance-Drawdown Method (Semi-log straight-line matching)**



1) Assumes an aquifer thickness of 30 feet

## TABLE 7

# Field Water Quality Results Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC - Norborne, Missouri


# TABLE 7

# Field Water Quality Results Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC - Norborne, Missouri



# TABLE 8 Laboratory Water Quality Analysis Results Hydrogeological Evaluation, AEC Norborne, Missouri



\* The MCL (Maximum Contaminant Level) or SMCL (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level)

 has been exceeded for this parameter. SMCL values are based on aesthetic concerns and are not related to health affects.

ND - The contaminant was not detected at or above the stated detection limit.

n/a - Not Analyzed

**APPENDIX A Test Boring/Well Logs** 































- F

п.



# **APPENDIX B Sieve Analysis Data**



*File: AEC TB-06-1 Sieve Analyses.xls Print Date: 7/18/2006* Page 1 of 1



**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-1 **Depth Interval:** 50-55



**Boring ID:** TB-06-1 **Depth Interval:** 55-65







**Job No.** 106-294





(mm) 0.552 1.603 2.084 2.900 14.005 5.3

(inches) 0.022 0.063 0.082 0.114 0.551



*File: AEC TB-06-2 Sieve Analyses.xls Print Date: 7/18/2006* Page 1 of 1



**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-2 Depth Interval: 49-54



**Boring ID:** TB-06-2<br>th Interval: 54-59 **Depth Interval:** 







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-2 **Depth Interval:** 59-64



**Boring ID:** TB-06-2<br>**th Interval:** 64-69 **Depth Interval:** 







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-2 **Depth Interval:** 69-73





*File: AEC TB-06-3 Sieve Analyses.xls Print Date: 7/18/2006* Page 1 of 1



**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-3 Depth Interval: 52-54



**Boring ID:** TB-06-3 **Depth Interval:** 54-59







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-3 **Depth Interval:** 59-65



**Boring ID:** TB-06-3<br>**th Interval:** 65-69 **Depth Interval:** 







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-3 **Depth Interval:** 69-74





*File: AEC TB-06-4 Sieve Analyses.xls Print Date: 7/18/2006* Page 1 of 1



**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-4 Depth Interval: 49-52



**Boring ID:** TB-06-4 **Depth Interval:** 52-59







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-4 **Depth Interval:** 59-64



**Boring ID:** TB-06-4<br>**th Interval:** 64-69 **Depth Interval:** 







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-4 **Depth Interval:** 69-73





*File: AEC TB-06-5 Sieve Analyses.xls Print Date: 7/18/2006* Page 1 of 1








**Boring ID:** TB-06-5<br>**th Interval:** 53-57 **Depth Interval:** 













**Boring ID:** TB-06-5<br>**th Interval:** 59-64 **Depth Interval:** 







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-5 **Depth Interval:** 64-67





**Boring ID:** TB-06-5<br>th Interval: 67-69 **Depth Interval:** 



(mm) 0.518 1.762 2.333 3.183 13.790 6.1

(inches) 0.020 0.069 0.092 0.125 0.543



*File: AEC TB-06-6 Sieve Analyses.xls Print Date: 7/18/2006* Page 1 of 1



**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-6 Depth Interval: 49-52



**Boring ID:** TB-06-6 **Depth Interval:** 53-56







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-6 **Depth Interval:** 59-64



**Boring ID:** TB-06-6<br>**th Interval:** 64-69 **Depth Interval:** 







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-6 **Depth Interval:** 69-73





*File: AEC TB-06-7 Sieve Analyses.xls Print Date: 7/18/2006* Page 1 of 1



**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-7 Depth Interval: 49-55



**Boring ID:** TB-06-7<br>**th Interval:** 55-59 Depth Interval:







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-7 **Depth Interval:** 59-63



**Boring ID:** TB-06-7 **Depth Interval:** 63-65







**Job No.** 106-294

**Boring ID:** TB-06-7 **Depth Interval:** 69-72



**APPENDIX C Hydraulic Interval Test Data** 

#### **Well ID:** TB-06-2 **Date:** 4/19/2006 **Job No.:** 105-278

**Client:** AEC - Norborne, Missouri **Location:** Approximately 400 feet east of TB-06-1 and 600 feet east of the SW property corner.<br>**Well Information:** Temporary 0.040-inch slot wire-wrapped screen set from 59.8 to 69.8 f **Well Information:** Temporary 0.040-inch slot wire-wrapped screen set from 59.8 to 69.8 feet below grade<br> **Test Information:** Multiple-rate Hydraulic Interval Step Test with 30 minute steps **Test Information:** Multiple-rate Hydraulic Interval Step Test with 30 minute steps<br>**Measuring Point:** Top of temporary 6-inch casing, approximately 1.2 feet above g Top of temporary 6-inch casing, approximately 1.2 feet above grade.



**Well ID:** TB-06-2 **Date:** 4/19/2006

# **Job No.:** 105-278

**Client:** AEC - Norborne, Missouri **Location:** Approximately 400 feet east of TB-06-1 and 600 feet east of the SW property corner.<br>**Well Information:** Temporary 0.040-inch slot wire-wrapped screen set from 59.8 to 69.8 f **Well Information:** Temporary 0.040-inch slot wire-wrapped screen set from 59.8 to 69.8 feet below grade<br> **Test Information:** Multiple-rate Hydraulic Interval Step Test with 30 minute steps **Test Information:** Multiple-rate Hydraulic Interval Step Test with 30 minute steps<br>**Measuring Point:** Top of temporary 6-inch casing, approximately 1.2 feet above g Top of temporary 6-inch casing, approximately 1.2 feet above grade.



**APPENDIX D Background Water Level Data** 

#### **Background Water Level Measurements**

**Client:** Associated Electric Coop **Job No.:** 106-294 **Location:** Norborne, Missouri Site



#### **Background Water Level Measurements**

**Client:** Associated Electric Coop **Job No.:** 106-294 **Location:** Norborne, Missouri Site



#### **Background Water Level Measurements**

**Client:** Associated Electric Coop **Job No.:** 106-294 **Location:** Norborne, Missouri Site



**APPENDIX E Multiple-Rate Step Test Data**  **Well ID:** PW **Job No.:** 106-294 **Client:** Associated Electric Coop

**Location: Well Information:** Test pumping well with 0.080-inch slot wire-wrapped screen set from 51.5 to 71.5 feet below grade **Test Information:** Multiple-rate Step Drawdown Test with 1-hour steps

 $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$ 

**Measuring Point:** Top of 12-inch steel casing, approx. 2.0 feet above grade. 686.38 Measuring Point Elevation

 $-\overline{}$ 

The Series

 $\overline{\mathsf{T}}$ 

**Orifice Pipe Diameter:** 6 **Orifice Dia.:** 5 **Orifice Constant:** 0.791

╤

 $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ 

 $\overline{\mathsf{T}}$ 



**Well ID:** PW **Job No.:** 106-294 **Client:** Associated Electric Coop **Location: Well Information:** Test pumping well with 0.080-inch slot wire-wrapped screen set from 51.5 to 71.5 feet below grade **Test Information:** Multiple-rate Step Drawdown Test with 1-hour steps **Measuring Point:** Top of 12-inch steel casing, approx. 2.0 feet above grade. 686.38 Measuring Point Elevation

**Orifice Pipe Diameter:** 6 **Orifice Dia.:** 5 **Orifice Constant:** 0.791



















05/22/06 13:51 20 57.68 18.191




















**APPENDIX F Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Data**  **Well ID:** PW **Job No.:** 106-294 **Client:** Associated Electric Coop Location: Norborne, Missouri Site **Well Information:** Test pumping well with 0.080-inch slot wire-wrapped screen set from 51.5 to 71.5 feet below grade **Test Information:** 72-Hour Constant-rate aquifer test **Measuring Point:** Top of 12-inch steel casing, approx. 2.0 feet above grade. 686.38 Measuring Point Elevation

**Orifice Pipe Diameter:** 6 **Orifice Dia.:** 5 **Orifice Constant:** 0.791

 $\overline{\mathsf{r}}$ 

 $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 





**Orifice Pipe Diameter:** 6 **Orifice Dia.:** 5 **Orifice Constant:** 0.791





















































 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 



 $\equiv$ 





















 $78 - 06 - 1$ 

 $IWC - 4/99$ 



 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}$ -06-1 nvc-4/99



 $TB - 06 - 2$ 

IWC - 4/99



 $TB - 06 - 2$ 

 $IWC - 4/99$ 



 $\frac{1}{18-06-2}$  WC-4/99
### $\begin{array}{ll} \textbf{AQUIFER TEST DATA SHEET}\\ \textbf{OBSERVATION WELL} \end{array}$



b

¥,



 $TB-06-3$ 



 $TB-06-4$  IWC-4/99

#### AQUIFER TEST DATA SHEET OBSERVATION WELL



 $TB - 06 - 4$ 

#### AQUIFER TEST DATA SHEET OBSERVATION WELL



 $\overline{18}-06-4$ 

### AQUIFER TEST DATA SHEET OBSERVATION WELL





 $7B - 06 - 5$ 



1632  $170$ 

 $TB - 06 - 6$  NVC-4/99



 $T8-06-6$ 





 $TB-06-7$ 



<sup>1</sup> Hoght

 $\sqrt{(100 - 4/99)}$ 



Reading

#### AQUIFER TEST DATA SHEET OBSERVATION WELL



 $\overline{DT\omega/8}$ tage

Downstream Staff Goge WC-4/99











Du, hen

IWC - 4/99

 $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n$ 









#### AQUIFER TEST DATA SHEET OBSERVATION WELL

 $\sim$ 



#### **APPENDIX G Constant-Rate Aquifer Test Analysis**















#### **APPENDIX H Laboratory Water Quality Results**



 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{1/2}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{1/2}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  ,  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  ,  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  ,  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\sim$ 



We certify that the analyses performed for this report are accurate, and that the laboratory tests were conducted by<br>methods approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or variations of these EPA methods.

These test results are intended to be used for informational purposes only and may not be used for regulatory compliance.

National Testing Laboratories Ltd.

NATIONAL TESTING LABORATORIES LTD.

OTO JI TACOO

**IU-IUITUUJLUU** 

Collected\_By Client

Contact Fax (614) 888-9208

است است و ا



Blue Valley Laboratories, Inc. Water Treatment Professionals Since 1973

East 16th Street Kenses City, MO 64108<br>Phone (810) 471-4719 Pax (816) 471-0200 814 East 16th Street

**Report of Analysis** 

BVL ID No: BVL10270

**Collector Wells Int.** 

Collector Wells Int. Brad Gamble 6360 Huntley Rd.

Columbus OH 43229



Corrected Report 7/18/06. Result for Fluoride was corrected. Wife Submitted by: Paul Myers, Laboratory Director (Jau

The reported analytical results relate only to the sample submitted.<br>This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval by Blue Valley Labs, Inc.

7/18/06

Page 1

**Collector Wells Int.** 

г.

 $r \cdot 372$ 

#### **Blue Valley Laboratories, Inc.**

**Report of Analysis** 

The Common

BVL ID No BVL10270

**Contract Contract** 

Page 2



г.

#### Blue Valley Laboratories, Inc. Report of Analysis Page 3

**Collector Wells Int.** 

 $\overbrace{\hspace{25mm}}$ 

BVL ID No BVL10270


۳.

### **Blue Valley Laboratories, Inc.**

**Collector Wells Int.** 

**Report of Analysis** 

BVL ID No BVL10270

Page 4



**9104110509** 

Blue Valley Laboratories, Inc.<br>Water Treatment Professionals Since 1973

Kansas City, MO 64108 814 East 16th Street Phone (816) 471-4719 Fax (816) 471-0268

## **Report of Analysis**

**Collector Wells Int.** 

Collector Wells Int. Brad Gamble 6360 Huntley Rd.

Columbus OH 43229



Corrected Report 7/18/06. The results for Barlum and Chioride were corrected.

Submitted by: Paul Myers, Laboratory Director ()

by: Paul Myers, Laboratory Director<br>The reported analytical results relate only to the sample submitted.<br>This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval by Blue Valley Labs, Inc.

7/18/06

Page 1



Contact Fax (614) 888-9208

 $\cdots$  cont Co

۳.

## **Blue Valley Laboratories, Inc.**

**Collector Wells Int.** 

# Report of Analysis Page 2

 $+$ 

BVL ID No BVL10275

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



# Blue Valley Laboratories, Inc. Report of Analysis

Collector Wells Int.



Page 3



# **APPENDIX I Project Photographs**



Rotasonic drilling rig set up at the first test boring TB-06-1



Rotasonic drilling rig set up at the first test boring TB-06-1



Drillers extracting soil samples from the rotasonic core barrel.



Drillers laying out extracted soil samples.



Hydrogeologist logging soil samples from the test boring.



Soil samples from boring TB-06-1



Conducting hydraulic interval pumping test at boring TB-06-2



Top of temporary well for the hydraulic interval test and water level meter.



Temporary supply well for water to drill the test pumping well.



Setting up the reverse rotary drilling rig at the test pumping site.



Reverse rotary drilling rig set up to drill the test pumping well.



Drill bit for reverse rotary drilling rig.



Lowering the drill bit assembly into the borehole.



Hydrogeologist collecting drill cutting samples from test pumping well boring.



Rocks from the test pumping well drill cuttings.



Well screen being installed in the test pumping well.



Protective casing on top of one of the observation wells.



Temporary river staff gage.



Test pumping well set up with temporary generator to power pump.



Top of the test pumping well.



Top of observation well showing the top of the PVC well casing and the cable from the pressure transducer set in the well to measure the water levels.



Water level data recorder that is connected to the cables from the pressure transducers installed in the pumping well and observation wells.



Orifice weir used to measure the pumping rate for the aquifer pumping test.



One of the irrigation wells in which water levels were monitoring during the aquifer test.



Missouri River at the project site.

#### **ADDENDUM 1**

Hydrogeological Investigation Report of Findings - Norborne, Missouri Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc.

September 27, 2006

#### **Potential Pumping Impacts on Off-Site Wells**

As presented in the Section 4.3 of the report, a ground water flow model was used to simulate the amount of drawdown that could be expected due to the operation of one or two collector wells under different conditions. Figure 16 depicts the model-estimated drawdown for one collector well operated at 7,400 gallons per minute (gpm) under average summer conditions. Figure 17 depicts the model-estimated drawdown for two collector wells operated at 3,700 gpm each under winter, low flow conditions. Figure 18 depicts the model-estimated drawdown for two collector wells operated at 3,700 gpm each under summer, low river flow conditions.

The water level in any well that is pumped will drop in response to the pumping. Drawdown between wells is additive, so that the net drawdown due to more than one well pumping will be the direct sum of the drawdown caused by the individual wells pumping alone. Consequently, the simulated drawdown values predicted by the ground water flow model represents the amount of additional drawdown that would occur in an offsite well located within the radius of influence of the proposed collector well(s). For example, a well located in the area between the 1 foot and 2 foot drawdown contours lines depicted in Figures 16-18, would be expected to have an increase of 1 to 2 feet of drawdown in addition to the amount of drawdown caused by its own pumping.

The amount of impact to off-site wells resulting from pumping of collector well(s) at the project site would be dependent on the depth, construction, ground water levels, pumping equipment and capacity of the of the off-site wells. Several feet of additional drawdown could be detrimental to a shallow well equipped with a suction pump that is operating near the limits of its capacity. Conversely, several feet of additional drawdown might go unnoticed in a deep high capacity well equipped with a submersible pump.

The aquifer conditions in the vicinity of the project site are generally favorable, and it is likely that the aquifer properties improve to the north of the project site. Domestic wells in the area probably have low amounts of drawdown under normal use. The natural variation in the ground water levels seasonally and with changes in the river level and recharge are likely to be larger than the amount of drawdown resulting from pumping of collector well(s) at the project site except in the area less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile from the proposed collector well(s). As such, the existing wells in the vicinity of the project site have probably experienced larger changes in water level under normal conditions, than would be caused by the proposed collector well(s).

Typically, a suction pump can lift water no more than about 25 feet. Consequently, if the water level in a well using a suction pump drops to more than a depth of about 25 feet below the pump, the pump will not be able to produce water. The depth from which submersible pumps can raise water is dependent on the pump capacity and power rating of the pump motor. In general, increasing the depth to water by a few feet in a well equipped with a submersible pump will not appreciably change the amount of water the pump can yield.

Lowering the water level in the vicinity of a well would decrease its maximum yield by decreasing the amount of available drawdown, i.e. the amount that that the water level can drop in the well due to its own pumping before the water level reaches the pump intake. Well capacity is generally expressed in terms of its specific capacity, which is the ratio of the pumping rate of the well to the amount of drawdown in the well due to the pumping. Lowering the water level at a well with a low specific capacity will cause more decrease in the potential yield than would lowering the water level by the same amount at a well with a high specific capacity.

In general, off-site wells located in the areas depicted in Figures 16-18 as having an estimated drawdown from the collector well(s) of 0.5 to 1.0 feet would probably have negligible impact from the collector well pumping. Wells in the areas depicted in Figures 16-18 as having an estimated drawdown from the collector well(s) of 1.0 to 2.0 feet would probably have slight decreases in capacity due to the collector well pumping. Wells in the areas depicted in Figures 16-18 as having an estimated drawdown from the collector well(s) in excess of 2.0 feet would

probably have some decrease in yield due to the collector well pumping, and shallow low capacity wells would have the potential for the most impact. Decreases in yield would generally not be substantial in areas that did not have at least 3 feet of additional drawdown due to the pumping of the proposed collector well(s). At present, there are no houses or existing off-site wells in the areas where the ground water models predict 2 feet or more of drawdown from the proposed collector well(s).