

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1. Definition sketch for applying Fox and Baxter (1996) theory to API hydraulic conductivity tests	9
Figure 2-2. Plan view sketch of 3D model used by Eiben et al. (1994)	19
Figure 2-3. Histograms from Barvenik and Ayres (1987) case history	29
Figure 2-4. Histograms from Hayward Baker (1988) case history	30, 31
Figure 2-5. Histograms from Koelling et al. (1997) case history	32
Figure 2-6. Histograms from Zamojski et al. (1995) case history	33
Figure 3-1. Plan view of SBTF	37
Figure 3-2. Section A-A view of SBTF	38
Figure 3-3. Section B-B view of SBTF	39
Figure 4-1. Compaction curves for Washout material used for CCL in pilot-scale experiments	46
Figure 4-2. Compaction characteristics of Washout material from three different compaction methods	47
Figure 4-3. CCL and LCS geometry for W1	49
Figure 4-4. CCL and LCS geometry for W2	50
Figure 4-5. CCL and LCS geometry for W3	51
Figure 4-6. The finished CCL for W1 and compacting the LCS for W1	52
Figure 4-7. Aquifer and soil-bentonite base soil grain size distributions	54
Figure 4-8. Soil-bentonite mix design: hydraulic conductivities of Bedding Sand mixed with three different bentonite contents	57
Figure 4-9. Consolidation tests on soil-bentonite grab samples from W1	58
Figure 4-10. Schematic diagram of Rantec plastic mixing eductor	59
Figure 4-11. Soil-bentonite mixing	61

Figure 4-12. Excavating the trench for W1 using bioslurry for excavation support.....	66
Figure 4-13. Predicted stresses in pilot-scale cutoff walls from arching theory.....	71
Figure 4-14. Destructive evaluation of W1	73
Figure 4-15a and b. Destructive evaluation of W2.....	75, 76
Figure 4-16. Degradation of bioslurry viscosity.....	78
Figure 4-17. Filter cake in part of W3 excavated in Stage 2	80
Figure 4-18. Filter cake thickness between soil-bentonite and LCS – W3.....	81
Figure 4-19. Destructive evaluation of W3	83
Figure 5-1. API filter press apparatus.....	86
Figure 5-2. Use of monitoring wells in the barrier pit to control water levels and measure the flow rate through pilot-scale cutoff walls.....	90
Figure 5-3. Sketch of W2 showing Layers A – D and the water level pairs used for evaluating the average hydraulic conductivity of the wall	94
Figure 5-4. Flow model 1 of flow rate through pilot-scale cutoff wall	96
Figure 5-5. Shape factors, s , for Flow models 1 and 2	97
Figure 5-6a. SEEP2D finite element mesh used for Flow model 2	100
Figure 5-6b. SEEP2D flow net for mesh shown in 5-6a.....	101
Figure 5-7a. SEEP2D mesh used to investigate influence of k_{CCL} on flow rate through cutoff wall	103
Figure 5-7b. Increase in flow rate through W3 due to flow through CCL	104
Figure 5-8a. Orthogonal view of MODFLOW grid used for Flow model 3, W2, Water level pair 4	106

Figure 5-8b. View of MODFLOW grid for W2, Water level pair 4, in y-direction.....	107
Figure 5-8c. View of Column 16 of MODFLOW grid in x-direction	108
Figure 5-8d. View of Column 16 MODFLOW solution	109
Figure 5-8e. View of Layer 10 of MODFLOW grid in z-direction.....	110
Figure 5-9. Orthogonal view of MODFLOW grid used for Flow model 3, W2, Water level pair 1	111
Figure 5-10. Modeling the constant head trench-wall boundary condition in MODFLOW	112
Figure 5-11. Geonor M206 piezometer	115
Figure 5-12. Flow nets for Teeter and Clemence (1986) correction factor for piezometer tests in cutoff walls	117
Figure 5-13a. Orthogonal view of the 3D finite difference MODFLOW grid used to evaluate shape factors for a piezometer in a cutoff wall ($B/D = 43.4$, $L/D = 15.7$).....	119
Figure 5-13b. Close up view of the simulated piezometer	120
Figure 5-13c. Top view of the 3D finite difference MODFLOW grid ($B/D = 43.4$, $L/D = 15.7$) at a layer in the middle of the piezometer filter	121
Figure 5-13d. Side view of the 3D finite difference MODFLOW grid ($B/D = 43.4$, $L/D = 15.7$).....	122
Figure 5-13e. Close up of the piezometer filter circled in Fig. 5-13d	123
Figure 5-13f. Equipotential surfaces for the model shown in Fig. 5-13a	124
Figure 5-13g. Side view and top view of equipotential lines	125
Figure 5-14. Shape factors for piezometer tests in cutoff wall from 3-D MODFLOW model	126
Figure 5-15a. Two-dimensional finite element mesh used for shape factor evaluation of a well in a cutoff wall with filter cakes	129

Figure 5-15b. Equipotential lines and flow lines for the two-dimensional finite element mesh with $B/D = 12$ and $\phi_{sb} / \phi_{fc} = 1.67$	130
Figure 5-16a. Single-well test shape factors that account for filter cakes	132
Figure 5-16b. Chart for evaluating k_{eq} from single-well test k_{sb} (evaluated assuming no filter cakes) and estimate of filter cake permittivity	133
Figure 5-17. Effect of position of well in wall on shape factor	136
Figure 5-18. Effect of formation soil hydraulic conductivity on boundary condition assumption.....	138
Figure 5-19. Results of piezometer hydraulic fracture tests and predictions for W1 and W2	141
Figure 5-20. Pushing the piezocone into W1.....	148
Figure 5-21. Obtaining and testing undisturbed samples from the cutoff walls.....	151
Figure 6-1. API hydraulic conductivity tests on grab samples – W1	156
Figure 6-2. Hydraulic conductivity measurement locations, W1	158
Figure 6-3. Variable head piezometer test results, L2D2, W1	161
Figure 6-4. Effect of flow direction in variable head piezometer tests, W1	162
Figure 6-5. Comparison of variable and constant head piezometer test results, W1	165
Figure 6-6. Comparison of variable head piezometer test results from Hvorslev-type and Cooper et al. analyses, W1	167
Figure 6-7. Piezocone soundings	
a) P1 in W1	168
b) P2 in W1	169
c) P3 in W1	170
d) P4 in W1	171
e) P5 in W1	172
f) P6 in W1.....	173
g) P7 in compacted LCS	174
Figure 6-8. Dissipation test data for P6 in W1	177

Figure 6-9. API hydraulic conductivity tests on grab samples – W2	182
Figure 6-10. Hydraulic conductivity test locations, W2.....	184
Figure 6-11. API hydraulic conductivity tests on grab samples – W3	191
Figure 6-12a. Measurement of background flow rates for W3 (i = 0).....	193
Figure 6-12b. Global measurement of average hydraulic conductivity of W3 (i = 1)	194
Figure 6-13. Results of SEEP2D flow rate computations with filter cakes modeled	196
Figure 6-14. Hydraulic conductivity test locations, W3.....	198
Figure 6-15. Influence of sample volume on soil-bentonite hydraulic conductivity for W3.....	207
Figure 6-16. Comparison of k_{sb} and k_{eq} as a function of sample volume for W3	210
Figure 7-1. Schematic diagram of breakthrough experiment	216
Figure 7-2. Theoretical steady state concentration profiles in the breakthrough experiment.....	218
Figure 7-3. Results of breakthrough experiment and analysis.....	220
Figure 7-4. Diffusion test results	225
Figure 7-5. Definition sketch for analysis of breakthrough experiment.....	226
Figure 7-6. Solution procedure for evaluating the influence of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the flux through a barrier	234
Figure 7-7. Effect of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the flux through a cutoff wall, negative values of mean P_e	237
Figure 7-8. Breakthrough curves for the case of $P_e < 0$	238, 239
Figure 7-9. Effect of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the breakthrough time through a cutoff wall, negative values of mean P_e	241

Figure 7-10. Effect of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the flux through a cutoff wall, positive values of mean P_e	243
Figure 7-11. Breakthrough curves for the case of $P_e > 0$	244
Figure 7-12. Effect of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the breakthrough time through a cutoff wall, positive values of mean P_e	245
Figures A-1 through A-37. Variable and Constant head piezometer test results for all tests shown in Tables 6-1 (W1), 6-8 (W2), and 6-11 (W3)	272 – 308
Figure B-1. Dissipation test data for P1 in W1	310
Figure B-2. Dissipation test data for P2 in W1	311
Figure B-3. Dissipation test data for P3 in W1	312
Figure B-4. Dissipation test data for P5 in W1	313
Figure C-1. Batch equilibrium tests	315
Figure D-1. Soil-bentonite/NaCl compatibility tests	317