RAS 5623 72-22-ISFSI-State Exhibit 159-Recd 4/24/02

CONDENSED TRANSCRIPT

DOCKETED USNRC

TED RC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2003 JAN 31 PM 1:55

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

OFFICE OF THE SEURL FARY RULEMAKINGS AND ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Matter of

) Docket No. 72-22
) ASLPB No. 97-732-02-ISFSI
PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE

) DEPOSITION OF:
(Private Fuel Storage
Facility)

) GEORGE H. C. LIANG
(Utah Contention O)

Tuesday, April 17, 2001 - 9:14 a.m.

Location: Heber Wells Building

160 East 300 South

Salt Lake City, Utah

Reporter: Vicky McDaniel

Notary Public in and for the State of Utah



State's Exhibit 159

50 South Main, Suite 920 Salt Lake City, Utah 84144

801.532.3441

TOLL FREE 877.532.3441

FAX 801.532.3414

PAGE 3 PAGE 1 SHEET 1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 3 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS 1 Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Docket No. 72-22 GEORGE H. C. LIANG, In the Matter of 2 ASLPB No. 97-732-02-ISFSI having first been duly sworn to tell the truth, 3 PRIVATE FUEL STORAGE DEPOSITION OF was examined and testified as follows: L.L.C. 4 5 EXAMINATION GEORGE H. C. LIANG (Private Fuel Storage 6 Facility) BY MR. SEEL: (Utah Contention O) 7 We're here today in the matter of Private Tuesday, April 17, 2001 - 9:14 a.m. Location: Heber Wells Building Fuel Storage, LLC before the Atomic Safety Licensing 8 160 East 300 South Salt Lake City, Utah 9 Board in a matter to license a nuclear fuel storage Reporter: Vicky McDaniel facility in Skull Valley. 10 Notary Public in and for the State of Utah Would you please state your name and 11 0. 12 address. My name is George H.C. Liang. My business 13 address is 100 Technology Drive Center, Stoughton, 14 15 Massachusetts. 16. My name is Kurt Seel. I'm an assistant attorney general for the State of Utah, and I will be 17 taking your deposition today in the matter of Utah 18 Contention O. Are you familiar with Contention O? 19 20 -A. And it's my understanding you've been named 21 as an expert witness in regards to Contention O. 22 23 A. Mr. Liang, have you been deposed before? 24 Have you been deposed before? Have you had your PAGE 2 4 APPEARANCES 1 deposition taken previously? KURT E. SEEL, ESQ. For the Intervenor: No. 2 A. DENISE CHANCELLOR, ESQ. 3 3 0. Ever? ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL Office of the Attorney General 4 4 No -- yes. Ever? I never have a deposition 160 East 300 South, 5th Floor Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0873 PAUL A GAUKLER, ESQ. 5 before. For the Applicant: In this or any other matter? 6 0. ERNEST L. BLAKE, ESQ. Yeah. 7 A. SHAW PITTMAN 7 2300 N Street, NW In that case, let me explain a little bit of 8 Washington, D.C. 20037-1128 В 9 a background. Do you understand how the deposition (202) 663-8304 procedure works? I will be giving you a series of 10 For the NRC: ROBERT M WEISMAN, ESQ. questions for you to answer. 11 U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION 10 Washington, D.C. 20555 12 A. Yes. 11 13 If there's any ambiguity or if you don't Also Present: 12 understand the question --14 INDEX Uh-huh. Page 15 A. 13 The Witness GEORGE H. C. LIANG 16 -- please ask me to clarify the question. Examination by Mr. Seel Otherwise, I will assume that you understand what's 17 65 Examination by Mr. Weisman Examination by Mr. Gaukler 67 16 being asked. 18 68 Further Examination by Mr. Seel 19 A. Okav. 17 If you want to take a break, please go ahead 20 18 21 and ask to take a break, and we will take breaks 19 22 periodically. Only thing I ask is that you don't take a break while there's a question on the table. In other 23 words, if I ask a question, I ask that you answer that 24 before you ask to take a break.

PAGE 7

PAGE 5 Okav. A. Do you have any questions at this time as to how this is going to proceed? A. I'm now going to ask you a series of questions that relate to you being an expert and the topics for which you have been put forth as an expert in this matter. What I'm trying to do is find out where you're an expert and then put boundaries on where you're going to be giving expert opinions in this matter, and so that's the purpose behind a lot of these questions. What is your educational background? My education background, I did my undergrad A. in Taiwan, National Taiwan University. My major is in civil engineering. Then I did my graduate study at the University of Connecticut at the time where my focus is in the flow mechanics area, and that including hydrology, some other area like groundwater. Then I did my Ph.D. at the University of Connecticut. Focus mainly is wind and wave. I did my thesis in a laboratory wind tunnel 55 feet and then bring wind over the water surface, observe what's the mechanism between the air and the wave and the water. Since you graduated from University of

because so many projects going on, they want some personal resource. I was asked a number of times to look into this so-called monitoring well. Ground well -- at the groundwater well, there was monitoring, and then give some technical input to the specification and so on.

- Q. Do you usually look at -- you don't put in the well, or put in the wells yourself --
 - A. No.
- Q. -- but you look at the well logs?
 - A. No.
 - Q. You don't look at the well logs?
 - A. Oh, yeah, I review well log. I have some there that come in. I do -- I did.
 - Q. Okay. And so you're experienced in well logs, well construction, and pump tests, or other types of aquifer tests?
 - A. Yes, I involved in -- when I worked with the Stone Webster, yeah. As a matter of fact, I -- most, on this one I also give some supervision to the engineer under me to prepare that kind of spec, like scope of survey and so on.
 - Q. There is a pump test, a test well in this matter that was installed at the site?
 - A. Yes.

have you worked on, generally speaking?

21 .

PAGE 6

A. Oh, since then I've been working with Stone & Webster Engineer Corporation in Boston. Over the years I involve a lot of the project. In the early day, in the '70, '80, mostly in the nuclear project area, which I participate in my amended report including hydrology area, modeling of groundwater. And give you an example, in the Millstone 3 Nuclear Power Station there's one study which I participate is, what happen if a tank rupture in the building area, and then a scenario that hit the ground and the groundwater, how that will disperse into the nearest water body.

Connecticut with your Ph.D., what hydrology related jobs

And over the years, other nuclear power station also involved, too, like the Shorehan project, Nine Mile 2. And some other, even the fossil plant. Most recent three, four years I'm involved a lot with the siting study of the fossil plant which all involve hydrology -- what happens if a storm come in to runoff, how are we going to control the water quality of the storm runoff before it leaves, and so on.

- Q. So are you involved in siting monitoring wells and production wells, things like that?
- A. Not really, but at one point we -- Stone & Webster is very diverse company. Not only in the power plant, we also have environmental cleanup. Sometimes

PAGE 8

Q. And a pump test was done -- or I shouldn't say a pump test. Actually it was a static level test --

A. Right.

- \mathbb{Q} . -- that was performed on the site. Are you familiar with that well?
- A. I reviewed the result. But the actual supervision of that pump test is under my coworkers at Stone Webster.
- Q. Do you consider yourself an expert in test well analysis? Is this an area of your expertise that you would -- assuming the data came to you that you could look at it and give an expert opinion on test data from a well?
- A. Yes, I consider myself in that -- if it have something, data in -- show me, I review it, yeah.
- Q. Are you familiar with different types of geologic formations?
- A. Geologic formation area is not my area, because that -- in Stone Webster we have another group of people, geotechnical group. They will do a lot of geological investigation, study, collect data and so on.
- Q. For purposes of Contention O, subsurface hydrology, would you consider yourself an expert, then, in which types of formations would produce water in amounts that would be useful to PFS on the site?

George H. C. Liang * April 17, 2001 PAGE 11 SHEET 2 PAGE 9 11 groundwater or surface water. I'm not in that area, no. 1 Yeah. As a matter of fact, this is one of Surface water modeling? 2 0. the -- when we prepare project report, no matter if it 3 is nuclear or fossil, within Stone Webster scope of Do you do surface water modeling? 0. 4 work, usually after modeling the ultimate goal is to A lot. 5 A. evaluate what the impact in the environment, because Okay. That would be --6 0. this is always required by federal regulation or NRC But I have to qualify here, because 7 A. quidelines to prepare ER. So modeling is the first step sometimes if our project required -- I mean, we still -to prepare, but the evaluation impact is the ultimate not the latest project. We will formulate our Stone 9 Webster model, but sometimes we using federal government objective. 10 ready available model, surface model and render modeling Let me continue on that vein. When PFS 11 0. 11 decided to go out and study the potential environment 12 using. 12 impacts from its proposed facility, what is the general But you consider yourself an expert --13 0. 13 format for doing it? Is it structure? Does it scope 14 Oh, yeah. 14 A. out a whole universe of potential environmental impacts 15 -- in the operation of those government 15 0. 16 and then decide to go out and collect data on each of models? 16 17 those? Or does it take some other approach? You 17 A. Oh, yeah. mentioned that modeling was the first step in the 18 Okay. Were you involved in preparing or 18 Q. process. Isn't there -- are there other steps prior to supervising the environmental report for PFS in this 19 19 20 modeling? How do you decide what it is to model? matter? 20 Let me answer your question. First, when I 21 On section, surface hydrology section, yes, A. 21 say those step is not saying that -- of course, you also 22 in the amended report and Safety Analysis Report. 22 You also helped prepare or supervise the have to go to the PFS project. But answer your 23 23 question, say, specific for this, I was bring on board Safety Analysis Report? 24 24 before that process, so those consideration, the Hydrology section. A. PAGE 12 PAGE 10 12 10 boundary to this and how it is determined, I did not Hydrology section? 0. 1 participate in that decision for this project, Private 2 Yeah. A. Fuel Storage project. Are you familiar with Contention 0? 3 3 0. So if I understand your answer correctly, 4 4 A. the initial scoping as to potential environmental 5 And Contention O has many aspects to it 5 regarding environmental impacts. Are you familiar with impacts from this project was not something you were 6 6 involved with? the environmental impacts analysis that PFS performed? 7 7 8 A. Yes. Yeah. A. 8 Okay. What areas -- what specific What I want to do next is put some 9 0. 9 environmental impacts were you involved in analyzing? 10 boundaries on where you are an expert in this matter. From what you've told me, sounds like you are an expert For this project? Α. 11 11 For this project. on surface water modeling. 12 ٥. 12 I was brought on board when the question 13 Uh-huh. 13 A. from NRC about the PMF, which also the state have some 14 Is that correct? 0. 14 contention on that subject, PMF. 15 Uh-huh. 15 A. I'm sorry. What did you say after that? I 16 You are an expert in groundwater modeling? 16 Yes. As a matter of fact, I wrote an 17 just didn't hear you. 17 article on that and presented in a symposium. That in Oh. I was brought on board to work on this 18 18 project when we received NRC question on the PMF on the my resume on the publication. On the groundwater model 19 to use remediation of hazardous waste site, compare 20 Private Fuel Storage site. 20 Were you involved in any analysis as far as 21 21 different model. determining contaminant pathways from the applicant's 22 What about areas of environmental impact as 22 far as degradation of surface or groundwater quality? sewer or wastewater system? 23

24

25

Will you repeat the question?

Were you involved in analyzing any potential

What do you mean by that, degradation?

Adversely affecting the water quality of

24

25

A.

Q.

In the Matter of Private Fuel Storage

	George H. C. Lian		April 17, 2001
	PAGE 13		PAGE 15
١.	13		15
	environmental effects from the applicant's sewer or	1	7 F Fare and anticuted
2	wastewater system?	2	<u>.</u>
3	A. Not analyzing, no.	3	A. I need to specifically what area?
4	Q. How would you portray your involvement in	4	Environmental covers so many section, so many area.
5	that?	5	And your question say, do I have to prepare my own
6	A. I was involved when they when we received	6	report. I cannot answer. All I can only answer, say I
7	the question on the contaminant pathway, then I reviewed	7	prepare hydrology section of the environmental report.
8	the ER, SAR to that subject, what the environmental	8	Q. So you helped prepare the hydrologic section
9	impact would be.	9	of the ER?
10	Q. So your involvement in that analysis was	10	A. Yes.
11	reviewing existing documents that had been prepared by	11	Q. Did you rely on other documents or other
12	someone else?	12	information to prepare that section of the ER?
13	A. Yes.	13	A. We used reference, and based on the scope of
14	Q. Is that true as well for Utah's contention	14	what required on the ER, which has NRC Reg guideline, we
15	regarding contaminant pathways from PFS's retention	15	started to provide input data from the site or from
16	pond?	16	existing literature, and then we decide which model to
17	A. Yes.	17	use. And then after running these all number required
18 19	Q. You reviewed existing documents regarding	18	by all the information resulting, required by the
20	that, but you did not actually help prepare those	19	NRC, we prepared the section.
21	underlying documents? A. Yes.	20	Q. When you were preparing that section of the
22	Q. Is that true as well for Utah's Contention O	21	ER, were you doing it to comply with the NRC regulation?
23	regarding potential for groundwater and surface water	22	A. Yes.
24	contamination?	23	Q. Was that NRC regulation
25	A. Yes.	24	A. 4.2, Reg Guide 4.2, Environmental Report.
	PAGE 14	_1.	That's the reg guide guideline give you what should be
	14		16
1	Q. Is that true as well for Utah's Contention O	1	included in that hydrology section or other section.
2	regarding effects of applicant's water usage on other	2	Very detailed, what you should be use and so on. Reg
3	well users and on the aquifer?	3	Guide 4.2 of NRC for all nuclear facility.
4	A. Yes.	4	Q. In PFS's, Applicant's Responses to Requests
5	Q. And that's true as well for Utah's	5	for Admissions No. 119 of Contention O, PFS has taken
6	Contention O regarding impact of potential groundwater	6	the position, it appears, that there was a lack of a
7	contamination on downgrading hydrological resources?	7	direct hydrological link between groundwater and the
8	A. Yes.	8	surface at the PFS site. Are you familiar with that
9	Q. So if I understand correctly, your expert	9	position?
10	testimony today on Utah's Contention O would be based	10	A. Yes.
11	upon data and information provided in reports which you	11	Q. PFS's position that there is a lack of a
12	didn't prepare or supervise?	12	direct hydrologic link between groundwater and the
13	MR. GAUKLER: Objection. You may go ahead	13	surface?
14	and answer the question. The objection is unclear. I	14	A. Yes, I'm familiar with that.
15 16	don't think he testified to that, so	15	Q. Are you able as an expert opinion to respond
17	MR. SEEL: Okay. I'm trying to find out	16	and answer questions regarding that issue?
18	what it is that he can testify to today, and my	17	A. Yes.
19	understanding is he's relying on documents that he didn't help prepare but merely reviewed.	18	Q. Can you please explain in general terms how
20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19	PFS reached the conclusion that there was no direct
21	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) Mr. Liang, I'm trying to put some boundaries on what it is you know and what you've	20	hydrologic link?
22	done so we can figure out where you're an expert and we	21	A. At the site?
23	can expect you to provide expert testimony, and where	22	Q. At the proposed site.
24	you're not an expert and you won't be providing expert	23 24	A. Yeah. The reason for that is, we during
25	testimony on this matter.	ı	the preparation year we did an evaluation and survey,
1 4 7	cenermony on enth matter.	25	and we haven't found, or only few perennial stream, but

	George H. C. Liang		April 17, 2001
	SHEET 3 PAGE 17	1	PAGE 19 19
	17	١,	that permeability is I remember is .142 feet per day.
1	very none at the site.		
2	And also we did some soil investigation by	2	Q. Is that the permeability of the surface
3	geotechnical group and found out that mostly is silt or	3	soil, or is that the permeability of the soil in the
4	clay or silty clay. Because there's no surface water at	4	screened area of the well?
5	the site, there's hardly any interconnection between	5	 At the screened area of the area, yeah.
6	the link between these two, the surface water and	6	Q. And I understand that PFS is proposing to
7	groundwater area. That's my conclusion.	7	use a well or series of wells to obtain water for under
8	O. So as I understand your answer, your	8	the site?
وا	conclusions or your expert opinions on that are based on	9	A. Yes, that's what I understand.
10	two things: low amounts of precipitation and the	10	Q. And that this 0.142 was it feet per day?
11	permeability of the soils at the site?	11	A. Uh-huh.
	A. Yeah.	12	Q permeability is sufficient to provide
12	a it the factors that might have	13	water to the site?
13		14	A. Without calculation I cannot answer your
14	gone into that decision? A. Also we think the five-mile radius of the	15	question.
15		16	
16	site. We haven't found any permanent water body. The	1	Q. I'm sorry? A. Without calculation.
17	only thing we have found is more reservoir or pond for	17	
18	the irrigation purpose.	18	Q. Well, I guess would you consider that
19	Q. We're talking about a hydrologic connection	19	permeable enough to water that you would consider using
20	between the surface	20	it as a production well?
21	A. And the groundwater.	21	A. I believe so. But I want to add to it: also
22	Q and the groundwater?	22	depend on how much water you're going to pump from the
23	A. Right.	23	well. They are related.
24	Q. Is depth to groundwater a factor that went	24	Q. So the permeability that we were discussing
25	into your	25	is at the base of the test well CBT-5?
1 20	into your	1	
	PAGE 18	<u> 1</u>	PAGE 20
		<u> 1</u>	20
1	PAGE 18 18 . Yes.	1	A. Uh-huh.
	PAGE 18 A. Yes. Q conclusion?	1 2	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface
1	PAGE 18 A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes.	1	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding?
1 2	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground	1 2 3 4	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True.
1 2 3	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of	1 2 3 4 5	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these
1 2 3 4	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of	1 2 3 4	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface
1 2 3 4 5	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of the soils?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures. Q. Would you please describe to me the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of the soils? A. The permeability of soil, we have a monitor	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures. Q. Would you please describe to me the formations on there that you believe were going to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of the soils? A. The permeability of soil, we have a monitor well, CBT No. 5, which we install a casing two inches,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures. Q. Would you please describe to me the formations on there that you believe were going to prevent downward migration of surface waters?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of the soils? A. The permeability of soil, we have a monitor well, CBT No. 5, which we install a casing two inches, become a monitoring well. The reason that this spot is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures. Q. Would you please describe to me the formations on there that you believe were going to prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Oh, that's easy, because on the clay, as we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of the soils? A. The permeability of soil, we have a monitor well, CBT No. 5, which we install a casing two inches, become a monitoring well. The reason that this spot is a boring hole, but later on we decide to install a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures. Q. Would you please describe to me the formations on there that you believe were going to prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Oh, that's easy, because on the clay, as we present in the SAR and ER and also in the Safety
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of the soils? A. The permeability of soil, we have a monitor well, CBT No. 5, which we install a casing two inches, become a monitoring well. The reason that this spot is a boring hole, but later on we decide to install a monitoring well, two-inch diameter. And our geology	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures. Q. Would you please describe to me the formations on there that you believe were going to prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Oh, that's easy, because on the clay, as we present in the SAR and ER and also in the Safety Evaluation Report prepared by NRC, saying in the Skull
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of the soils? A. The permeability of soil, we have a monitor well, CBT No. 5, which we install a casing two inches, become a monitoring well. The reason that this spot is a boring hole, but later on we decide to install a monitoring well, two-inch diameter. And our geologygeotechnical group do a so-called constant head pumping	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures. Q. Would you please describe to me the formations on there that you believe were going to prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Oh, that's easy, because on the clay, as we present in the SAR and ER and also in the Safety Evaluation Report prepared by NRC, saying in the Skull Valley the silt permeability is .2 to .6 inch per hour.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes. Q conclusion? A. Yes. Q. Okay. There was factors: depth to ground water, the permeability of the soils, and the amount of precipitation at the site? A. Yes. Q. Based on those three factors, you came to the conclusion that there was no direct hydrological link? A. Yes. Q. To use those factors, I assume you had to collect some data of some kind on those three factors? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you please explain to me the data that was collected regarding the permeability of the soils? A. The permeability of soil, we have a monitor well, CBT No. 5, which we install a casing two inches, become a monitoring well. The reason that this spot is a boring hole, but later on we decide to install a monitoring well, two-inch diameter. And our geology	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Uh-huh. Q. It's not the permeability of the surface soils. Is that my understanding? A. True. Q. And my understanding, getting back to these three factors, is that the permeability of the surface soils or the permeability of the soils under the site will prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Uh-huh. Q. I have a figure here entitled Figure 2.6-23, entitled Canister Transfer Building Foundation Profile 3-3, looking east. It is from the Safety Analysis Report. Would you please take a look at that. A. Yeah, uh-huh. Q. Do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I have seen the figures. Q. Would you please describe to me the formations on there that you believe were going to prevent downward migration of surface waters? A. Oh, that's easy, because on the clay, as we present in the SAR and ER and also in the Safety Evaluation Report prepared by NRC, saying in the Skull

	George H. C. Lian	g *	April 17, 2001
	PAGE 21		PAGE 23
١,	They are live the sail at the Shall Walley	١.	23
	They analyze the soil at the Skull Valley.	1	Q. So this is a heterogeneity in the aquifers?
2	On the categories, this so-called soil group	2	The permeability in the three dimensions differs?
3	classification is clay, silty clay and so on. That	3	A. No. The permeability is vertical, the
4	permeability, in my expert opinion, is very, very low.	4	transmittability horizontal, coefficient. An aquifer
5	Q. And that was in the Safety Analysis Report?	5	is how much water you can do is not only
6	A. Page 2-23, prepared by NRC. Also presented	6	permeability. You have other coefficient also affect
7	in our I believe in ER.	7	the production of the well is the transmittability
8	Q. What was the permeability in the screened	8	coefficient.
9	area of the test well?	9	Q. Are you saying the permeability of the
10	A. Is .142 feet per day.	10	surface soils
11	Q. And the permeability of the surface soils	111	A. Uh-huh.
12	were I believe you said 0.2 to 0.6 inches per hour?	12	Q does not determine the ability of it to
13	A2 to .6 inch per hour.	13	transmit water?
14	Q. How do those two permeabilities compare to	14	A. I didn't say that.
15	each other?	15	Q. Well, let me ask this question, then. What
16	A. That is the soil test result. The other one	16	is the difference between permeability and hydraulic
17	is, if you someone make the unit the same, then you	17	conductivity?
18	can compare. I haven't done that.	18	A. I don't know that.
19	Q. It's just a conversion of units?	19	Q. Are you familiar with the term 'hydraulic
20	A. Right.	20	conductivity"?
21	Q. Could you do the conversion for me?	21	A. I would say no.
22	A. Yeah. I need a pen and paper.	22	Q. I have a document here which is page 5 of
23	So the clay permeability is from .4 feet per	23	Stone and Webster Engineering Corporation calculation
24	day to 1.2 feet per day, the permeability of clay, in	24	sheet entitled Determination of Aquifer Permeability
	comparison with .142 feet per day at 120 feet down.	25	
25	comparison with .its feet per day at isy feet down.	1 43	from Constant Head Yest, an Estimation of Radius
	PAGE 22		from Constant Head Test, an Estimation of Radius
			PAGE 24
	PAGE 22 22		PAGE 24 24
	PAGE 22		PAGE 24
1	PAGE 22 22 It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4	1	PAGE 24 Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh.
1 2	PAGE 22 It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation.	1 2	PAGE 24 Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if
1 2 3	PAGE 22 It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day	1 2 3	PAGE 24 Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that.
1 2 3 4	PAGE 22 It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day?	1 2 3 4	PAGE 24 Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the
1 2 3 4 5	PAGE 22 It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2.	1 2 3 4 5	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the
1 2 3 4 5 6	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability	1 2 3 4 5 6	PAGE 24 Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the	1 2 3 4 5 6	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to acquire water is just as permeable or impermeable,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as well and confirm your testimony?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to acquire water is just as permeable or impermeable, depending on how you look at it, as the soils which are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as well and confirm your testimony? A. Same page?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to acquire water is just as permeable or impermeable, depending on how you look at it, as the soils which are going to prevent downward migration of surface water?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as well and confirm your testimony? A. Same page? Q. Page 5, yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to acquire water is just as permeable or impermeable, depending on how you look at it, as the soils which are going to prevent downward migration of surface water? A. I won't say that. You see, the production	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as well and confirm your testimony? A. Same page? Q. Page 5, yes. MR. GAUKLER: This is Revision 2, dated
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to acquire water is just as permeable or impermeable, depending on how you look at it, as the soils which are going to prevent downward migration of surface water? A. I won't say that. You see, the production of the water, not only when you heat the aquifer, is not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as well and confirm your testimony? A. Same page? Q. Page 5, yes. MR. GAUKLER: This is Revision 2, dated March 27, 2001.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to acquire water is just as permeable or impermeable, depending on how you look at it, as the soils which are going to prevent downward migration of surface water? A. I won't say that. You see, the production of the water, not only when you heat the aquifer, is not only depend permeability. They are also when so-called	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as well and confirm your testimony? A. Same page? Q. Page 5, yes. MR. GAUKLER: This is Revision 2, dated March 27, 2001. A. You only want me to look at page 5?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to acquire water is just as permeable or impermeable, depending on how you look at it, as the soils which are going to prevent downward migration of surface water? A. I won't say that. You see, the production of the water, not only when you heat the aquifer, is not only depend permeability. They are also when so-called transmittability. Because permeability is this way, the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as well and confirm your testimony? A. Same page? Q. Page 5, yes. MR. GAUKLER: This is Revision 2, dated March 27, 2001. A. You only want me to look at page 5? MR. GAUKLER: If you need to look at the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	It's a range. The clay permeability had a range from .4 feet to 1.2 feet per day. That's my calculation. Q. The clay ranges between 0.44 feet per day and 1 foot per day? A. 1.2. Q. 1.2. Having done the conversion, is there a significant difference between your calculation of the permeability of the surface soils and the permeability of the soils at the bottom of the test well? A. I didn't get you at first. Will you repeat the question? Q. Is there a significant difference in the permeability? A. No. In my engineering, we say this the same magnitude order. Q. So the soils from which PFS is intending to acquire water is just as permeable or impermeable, depending on how you look at it, as the soils which are going to prevent downward migration of surface water? A. I won't say that. You see, the production of the water, not only when you heat the aquifer, is not only depend permeability. They are also when so-called	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Influence for the Proposed Water Well. A. Uh-huh. Q. I'd like you to take a look at it and see if you're familiar with that. MR. GAUKLER: Could you show him the calculation, please. And also I'd like to have the revision of the data and calculations stated for the record. For the record, it's revision zero, the calculation dated April 22nd, 1999. A. Yeah. Q. Mr. Gaukler has raised a good point. I understand that there was a newer revised version part of this document, which we received yesterday. Here's a revised version of the same document. There's a page 5. Could you look at that as well and confirm your testimony? A. Same page? Q. Page 5, yes. MR. GAUKLER: This is Revision 2, dated March 27, 2001. A. You only want me to look at page 5?

In the Matter of Private Fuel Storage

George H. C. Liang	*	April 17, 2001
SHEET 4 PAGE 25		PAGE 27 27
25	١.	
1 Q. (BY MR. SEEL) There's a symbol on there		length squared?
2 identified as K.	2	A. Yes.
3 A. Yeah.	3	Q. And for hydraulic conductivity, will the
4 Q. What is the	4	units always be length over
5 A. The K is permeability, meter per second.	5	A. Length over time.
6 Q. What are the units associated with the K?	6	Q time?
7 A. The unit? I said meters per second.	7	A. Per second. Yup.
8 Q. Are those the correct units for	8	 Q. Getting back to page 5 of the Stone &
9 permeability?	9	Webster document.
10 A. I believe so.	10	A. Uh-huh.
11 Q. I have an introductory groundwater textbook	11	Q. What are the units on permeability?
by the name of Freeze and Cherry. I'd like you to take	12	A. Liter per second.
13 a look at page 29.	13	Q. Are those the correct units for
14 A. Page 29.	14	permeability?
15 Q. At the bottom there's two parameters	15	A. There is a difference in the textbook and
1	16	the calculation. The unit differs. But we can check
16 sorry. Look at page 30 29. 17 A. Twenty-nine.	17	back on the reference weighted formula or reason it
18 Q. Two parameters, one identified as	18	from, because there's a reference for this formula, and
	19	I believe the formula also define the way, what units
	20	should be used in that formula.
The state of the s	21	
1 	22	
22 permeability? 23 MR. GAUKLER: Use as much of the document,	23	Q. Take your time.
	24	
24 the book, as you need to. 25 THE WITNESS: Yeah.	25	
	+	PAGE 28
PAGE 26 26		28
1 A. Okay, I'm finished.	1	by the unit of individual turn. L is lengths of the
2 Q. What are the units associated with the	. 2	permeability test section in meter, and then Q is the
3 parameter of permeability?	3	water flow rate into the well, liter per minute. And
A. The table did not show that. The table only	4	then H is height of the water above static equilibrium
5 show you from one unit how to convert to the other unit.	5	
6 There's a different way to express a unit. But this is	6	I just operate the unit and come out
7 so-called conversion factor for permeability. It is not	1 7	after I all cancelled this, it came out as length over
8 the unit for permeability. So you have a unit, he show	8	time.
9 this table. If you have foot per second, how to convert	وا	Q. So it's really not permeability at all, it's
to feet per second and so on.	10	hydraulic conductivity?
11 Q. Why would the units change between the	11	. I
12 conversion? Why would the units between permeability	12	
13 and hydraulic conductivity be different?	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
17 changed the system of units.	18	
18 A. Correct, yeah. 19 Q. We've gone from metric to English.	19	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	20	
1 7-	21	
21 Q. Let's take a different approach. Is	22	
22 permeability, the units of permeability always length	23	m 11 1 1 6 11
over excuse me. Are the units for permeability always length squared? It doesn't matter what unit or		
24 always length squared? It doesn't matter what unit or	174	(). I understood there were three factors.
what type of system you're in, it's always going to be a	24 25	•

	George H. C. Lian	ng *	April 17, 2001
	PAGE 29	,	PAGE 31
1	O The first being death to seem that a	1 .	31
	Q. The first being depth to groundwater	1	and the desired of the party to decind do d title!
2	A. Uh-huh.	2	The same of the sa
3	Q the low permeability of soils at the	3	and the breaking fitty water
4	surface	4	coming out on the side way. We're actually pumping the
5	A. Yeah.	5	water from here.
6	Q and low amounts of precipitation.	6	Q. And this is up here, this is cement?
7	A. Yes.	7	A. Yes.
8	Q. This is from a document I believe you've	8	
9	already looked at. This is page 3.	9	coming up to the surface, not to prevent surface water
10	A. Yes. This is an attachment to the	10	from going down into the well?
11	calculation.	11	
12	Q. And this is well construction log for the	12	A. Yeah, Yes. Actually, there's two way. We don't want surface water to we don't know what
13	test well?	13	don't want surface water to we don't know what
14	A. Okay.	14	surface quality will be. Actually, it's a two way. We
15	Q. My understanding from looking at the log		prevent the surface water because we don't want it to
16	is that, at the bottom of the borehole	15	come down there. And we don't want the groundwater
17	A. Uh-huh.	16	coming up the side way, you know, which will be
18		17	affect our pumping from here.
19	Q a sandy silt or silty	18	Q. So the bentonite seal and cement bentonite
20	A. Silty sand.	19	placed around the well
21	Q. Silty sand?	20	A. Yes.
	A. Uh-huh.	21	Q is to prevent water from the surface
22	Q. And that was where you were going to be	22	migrating down, and water from the subsurface
23	acquiring water for your pump well when it was	23	A. Going up.
24	installed?	24	Q going up. And that's to preserve the
25	A. Normally we extract water when we heat this	25	water quality?
	PAGE 30		PAGE 32
١.	30		32
1	water coming out, heat a depth which we have water	1	A. That's one of the reasons, uh-huh. I look
2	pumping out. It could be some other location change,	2	at that very carefully. And they were confirmed through
3	maybe deeper or shallower. But at that spot, yes, we	3	a Driscoll, author by Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook,
4	will have a silty sand and we heat the water.	4	the construction of the well.
5	Q. This area here, is this sand in the	5	Q. The construction of the well was to
6	construction log?	6	A. Is very follow the guideline according to
7	A. Yes.	1 -	
8		7	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. But the
	Q. Is that not from the surrounding formation?	1 :	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the
9		8 9	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on.
10		8 9	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this
1	A. No. We put it when we install the well.	8 9 10	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that
10	A. No. We put it when we install the well.Q. And then there's this layer here?A. Uh-huh.	8 9 10 11	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration?
10 11 12	 A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? 	8 9 10 11 12	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would
10 11 12 13	 A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some 	8 9 10 11 12 13	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined.
10 11 12 13 14	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the
10 11 12 13 14 15	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No. Q. Why did you put it in?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back. If they had not put the seal in place around this well.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No. Q. Why did you put it in? A. Because you have to seal the well, prevent	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back. If they had not put the seal in place around this well, would it have provided a pathway for surface waters to
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No. Q. Why did you put it in? A. Because you have to seal the well, prevent the water coming in the side, which is a	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back. If they had not put the seal in place around this well, would it have provided a pathway for surface waters to migrate into the aquifer?
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No. Q. Why did you put it in? A. Because you have to seal the well, prevent the water coming in the side, which is a circumference is circular.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back. If they had not put the seal in place around this well, would it have provided a pathway for surface waters to migrate into the aquifer? A. I don't understand your question.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No. Q. Why did you put it in? A. Because you have to seal the well, prevent the water coming in the side, which is a circumference is circular. Q. It's to prevent water from coming up the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back. If they had not put the seal in place around this well, would it have provided a pathway for surface waters to migrate into the aquifer? A. I don't understand your question. Q. What is the purpose behind putting the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No. Q. Why did you put it in? A. Because you have to seal the well, prevent the water coming in the side, which is a circumference is circular. Q. It's to prevent water from coming up the well?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back. If they had not put the seal in place around this well, would it have provided a pathway for surface waters to migrate into the aquifer? A. I don't understand your question.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No. Q. Why did you put it in? A. Because you have to seal the well, prevent the water coming in the side, which is a circumference is circular. Q. It's to prevent water from coming up the well? A. Uh-huh. No, no yeah, coming up it.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back. If they had not put the seal in place around this well, would it have provided a pathway for surface waters to migrate into the aquifer? A. I don't understand your question. Q. What is the purpose behind putting the bentonite and cement bentonite seal in the well?
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. No. We put it when we install the well. Q. And then there's this layer here? A. Uh-huh. Q. What's that say? A. 125.5 to 122 elevation we put some bentonite, b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e, pellet, p-e-l-l-e-t, seal. Q. So the bentonite isn't part of the surrounding formation? A. No. Q. Why did you put it in? A. Because you have to seal the well, prevent the water coming in the side, which is a circumference is circular. Q. It's to prevent water from coming up the well?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the book of Driscoll, Groundwater Handbook. Put the sand and then sealed it by cement and so on. Q. If they had not put in the seal, would this have punctured this zone of surface silt and clays that PFS asserts will prevent downward migration? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What would puncture it? It's not defined. Q. (BY MR. SEEL) The borehole in which the well is installed. A. Uh-huh. Q. It would have punctured that step back. If they had not put the seal in place around this well, would it have provided a pathway for surface waters to migrate into the aquifer? A. I don't understand your question. Q. What is the purpose behind putting the

In the Matter of Private Fuel Storage

George H. C. Liang * April 17, 2001 PAGE 35 SHEET 5 PAGE 33 35 ' Uh-huh. After they present in the ER. I already answered. The reason, because we 1 A. 1 Were you involved at all in the drilling of don't want the groundwater coming on the side way, 2 ٥. rather than we like water coming up from the well casing 3 these boreholes? No. A colleague. 4 A. itself. That's the reason. 4 Your --If the bentonite seal and the cement 5 0. 5 My colleague at Stone Webster. bentonite portion of the well was not there, could 6 A. 6 7 Colleaque? surface waters migrate down into the aquifer? 7 Yeah, my co-worker. 8 A. A. Approximately how many boreholes are located 9 0. If the question is not clear --Q. 9 No, no, surface water would not migrate. If 10 on that map? A. 10 you don't have this sand or the bentonite over there, Based on the symbol -- one, two, three, A. 11 11 four; one, two, three, four, five. Four times five is the surface water will not migrate, no. 12 12 13 Surface waters would not migrate down 13 Do you know what the diameter of those 14 through this area? 14 15 boreholes were? Uh-huh. A. 15 If my memory right, it's about two inches. 16 Why not? 16 0. I may be wrong. Or one inch. 17 Because there's soil surrounding it. 17 A. I'll show you another document entitled 18 So why bother to put in a bentonite seal at 18 19 Boring Log. all? 19 20 A. Okay, yeah. Because, as I say earlier, it prevent the 20 water coming up from the side way, not from the casing, Boring B-1. 21 Q. 21 Uh-huh. the well casing itself. 22 A. 22 Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation, As I say earlier, the bentonite pellet also 23 23 let the water stay down so they can go into the --Sheet 1 of 2, dated 8/31/99. 24 Uh-huh. through the wells the sand have the filter effect, so it A. PAGE 36 PAGE 34 36 Please take a look at that. keep the water you pump in from the casing clear. You 0. 1 2 don't want some sediment or something to come up when A. you pump the water. This practice also for any In the area identified as methods. 3 0. Uh-huh. You mean the boring log, yeah. residential when you have your own water well supply 4 A. Methods. from your backyard. 5 Methods. It should identify the --6 MR. GAUKLER: We've been more than an hour. 6 actually, would you read that section? 7 Can we break? 7 Drilling soil: 3-1/4 inch inside diameter 8 MR. SEEL: Why don't we take a break. 8 hollow stem augers. Sampling soil: Two-inch outside 9 (Recess from 10:25 to 10:41 a.m.) 9 diameter split spoon, 24 inches long, 3-inch outside 10 (BY MR. SEEL) Mr. Liang, I'd like to return 10 diameter Shelby sampler, S-h-e-l-b-y sampler, 30 inch to the three factors that PFS relied upon to reach its 11 11 long. Drilling: Rock. conclusion that surface soil at the site will prevent 12 12 Thank you. Where it says "3-1/4 inch inside 13 the downward migration of surface waters. 13 diameter hollow stem augers, does that mean the auger 14 I have a document here entitled Figure 14 was 3-1/4 inches in diameter? 2.6-2, Plot Plan and Location of Geotechnical 15 15 As I understand it, something like this, and 16 Investigations, Sheet 1 of 2 from the Safety Analysis then inside diameter means this. 17 Report, Revision 8. Would you take a look at it, 17 Inside the hollow stem? 18 0. please. 18 Uh-huh. 19 A. 19 So inside the hollow stem is 3-1/4 inches in 20 0. There are a number of borehole locations 20 21 diameter? identified on that document. 21 Inside diameter. The symbols say "boring location," yes. 22 A. 22 So the outside diameter of the auger itself 23 Are you familiar with this document? 23 would be more than 3-1/4 inches? I reviewed the document. 24 24 A. True. You reviewed this document? 25 0. 25

	George H. C. Liz	ıng *	* April 17, 2001
	PAGE 37	_	PAGE 39
1		7	39
2	Q. So the borehole was at least 3-1/4 inches?	1	5
1	A. During the drilling, yes.	2	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
3	Q. It would have been at least 3-1/4 inches	3	f. proraborad chops ports after such Asie
4	diameter?	4	arrive wouldn't direct their permeability;
5	A. Yes.	5	roar desperou brees, demerar, pergase we are
6	Q. Would you read the comment section of that	6	doing something on one spot. I don't know that we're
7	document?	7	going to change. On that hole itself, I would say it
8	A. "No groundwater or bedrock encountered.	8	could.
9	Backfilled to ground surface with soil, marked with	9	 When soils are placed back into a borehole,
10	stake."	10	are you familiar with how that process takes place?
11	Q. Do you know why they didn't backfill these	11	A. That's a common practice. I don't know the
12	boreholes with something other than soil?	12	detail of the process.
13	A. I don't know. However, based on my expert	13	Q. Do you know whether the geologist on the rig
14	opinion, why fill with something else?	14	is the one who fills in the borehole?
15	Q. Well, when PFS drilled their well, they	15	A. No.
16	backfilled with a cement bentonite mixture and a	16	Q. The driller? The driller's helper?
17	bentonite seal.	17	A. I cannot answer this question, because we
18	A. That is because for different purpose.	18	have a I have a co-worker. He was at the operation
19	Q. My understanding is PFS has taken the	19	when the driller drilled this thing, make sure
20	position that the surface soils are permeable enough to	20	everything follow the rule procedure or the scope of
21	prevent the downward migration of surface waters to the	21	survey we developed, Stone Webster.
22	aquifer. Is that correct?	22	Q. Do you know whether they placed the soils
23	MR. GAUKLER: Asked and answered. You may	23	back into the hole and compressed them so that they were
24	answer it again.	24	the same density as the surrounding soils?
25	A. I don't understand. You say pick a	25	A. No, I don't know this.
1	PAGE 38		PAGE 40
	38		
1	position. Will you clarify what that means?		PAGE 40 40
1 2	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are		PAGE 40 40
1 2 3	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface	1	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the
1 2 3 4	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer.	1 2	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole
1 2 3	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd	1 2 3	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding
1 2 3 4	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground	1 2 3 4	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water.	1 2 3 4 5	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches. A. If you have a hole in the ground, clear, no	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that were taken by the person who logged the hole would
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches. A. If you have a hole in the ground, clear, no	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that were taken by the person who logged the hole would indicate how they backfilled those boreholes?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches. A. If you have a hole in the ground, clear, no obstruction on that hole, you say pathway, I will agree this.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that were taken by the person who logged the hole would indicate how they backfilled those boreholes? A. I reviewed a couple of the bore logs
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches. A. If you have a hole in the ground, clear, no obstruction on that hole, you say pathway, I will agree this. Q. In your expert opinion, would backfilling	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that were taken by the person who logged the hole would indicate how they backfilled those boreholes? A. I reviewed a couple of the bore logs specifically to ER, CBT No. 5. I didn't read any they
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches. A. If you have a hole in the ground, clear, no obstruction on that hole, you say pathway, I will agree this. Q. In your expert opinion, would backfilling the boreholes with soil sufficiently seal that zone so	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that were taken by the person who logged the hole would indicate how they backfilled those boreholes? A. I reviewed a couple of the bore logs specifically to ER, CBT No. 5. I didn't read any they described the method to backfill back to the borehole.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches. A. If you have a hole in the ground, clear, no obstruction on that hole, you say pathway, I will agree this. Q. In your expert opinion, would backfilling the boreholes with soil sufficiently seal that zone so they could not act as a pathway for surface waters?	1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that were taken by the person who logged the hole would indicate how they backfilled those boreholes? A. I reviewed a couple of the bore logs specifically to ER, CBT No. 5. I didn't read any they described the method to backfill back to the borehole. Q. Are there boring logs that were handwritten
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches. A. If you have a hole in the ground, clear, no obstruction on that hole, you say pathway, I will agree this. Q. In your expert opinion, would backfilling the boreholes with soil sufficiently seal that zone so they could not act as a pathway for surface waters? A. Yes, because that soil is pretty much what	1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that were taken by the person who logged the hole would indicate how they backfilled those boreholes? A. I reviewed a couple of the bore logs specifically to ER, CBT No. 5. I didn't read any they described the method to backfill back to the borehole. Q. Are there boring logs that were handwritten in the field from which this boring log was generated?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	position. Will you clarify what that means? Q. PFS has concluded that the surface soils are impermeable enough to prevent the migration of surface waters to the aquifer. A. With this in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd say is very little chance to infiltrate into the ground from the surface water. Q. What if there were holes punctured in that surface layer? Would those holes act as a pathway for surface waters to migrate to the aquifer? A. I need some definition of puncture. Because if I say you have a membrane or some soil, then puncture I understand. When you have a soil, I don't know how you define a puncture. Q. A borehole of a minimum diameter of 3-1/4 inches. A. If you have a hole in the ground, clear, no obstruction on that hole, you say pathway, I will agree this. Q. In your expert opinion, would backfilling the boreholes with soil sufficiently seal that zone so they could not act as a pathway for surface waters?	1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Do you know whether they just shoveled the dirt back in? A. No, because I was not there. Q. If the soils weren't placed back in the hole and compressed to the same density as the surrounding materials, would that change the permeability of those soils within the borehole? A. In my expert opinion, no. If they compact, put back the soil which originally come from the hole, I don't think it will change the permeability. That's only my own expert opinion. Q. Do you know why the state well drilling regulations require cement or bentonite placed into boreholes instead of just soil cuttings? A. No, I don't. Q. Do you know if the original field logs that were taken by the person who logged the hole would indicate how they backfilled those boreholes? A. I reviewed a couple of the bore logs specifically to ER, CBT No. 5. I didn't read any they described the method to backfill back to the borehole. Q. Are there boring logs that were handwritten

2

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

George H. C. Liang * April 17, 2001

make some field note. And later on after contract completed, he would probably generate log, and then if any discrepancy he will fill in. But the field logs exist, as far as you know, for these boreholes, the original field logs? MR. GAUKLER: Objection on what you mean by

"original." MR. SEEL: Handwritten. Unless the driller or the geologist on site somehow through a computer generated that document right there, there must be some underlying documents from which that document is derived.

MR. GAUKLER: Is that a question?

- (BY MR. SEEL) In your opinion, do people in the field collect raw data that they write down in a field notebook?
- This is my understanding. This is general 17 engineering practice. 18
- And it's from those field notebooks that 19 this boring log was derived? 20

MR. GAUKLER: If you know.

I believe so. 22 A.

SHEET 6 PAGE 41

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

21

23

24

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Do you know if those field logs have been 0. disclosed to the State of Utah?
 - Not to my knowledge. I don't know anything

PAGE 42 42

about this.

- My understanding is that PFS intends to install at least one sewer system or disposal system of some kind on the site. Is that correct?
- I think -- I'm not in that area, but my colleague which is in Denver engineered and designed the sewer system. So I don't think I am in the position to answer your question.
- Are you familiar that the sewer system will involve liquid disposal to the subsurface?
- I know the sewer system in general, how it Α. works, yeah.
 - Is your colleague Mr. Lewis? Q.
 - Wayne Lewis. A.
- He's the individual who would be familiar 0. with the design and operation of the system?
 - Is in my belief, yes.
- Would he also be familiar with the ultimate fate of the fluids that are going to be put down in that system? Or would that be the area that you would be familiar with?

MR. GAUKLER: Objection. What do you mean by ultimate fate? Unclear and ambiguous.

Where is the water that's going down the sewer system going to end up?

PAGE 43

That is area I'm not in a position to 1 answer, because that is design the sewer engineer would

Were you asked to give PFS -- strike that. PFS intends to use water from at least one source through the construction and operation of this proposed facility. Is that correct?

MR. GAUKLER: Object as vague and ambiguous.

- 8 Does PFS need water to construct its site? 9 0.
 - A.
 - Has PFS proposed where it intends to obtain ٥. that water?
 - Will you ask this question again? A.
 - Has PFS proposed a source for the water it intends to use to construct the site?
 - Were you responsible for determining the potential environmental effects from using the water from that source or sources?
 - No. But I reviewed the section which provided by my company colleague.
 - Are you able to give an expert opinion as to the environmental effects associated with using the water at the site?
 - MR. GAUKLER: Object. It's unclear when you

PAGE 44

43

say using the water at the site, the environmental effects of. Are you talking from environmental effects of water use at the site in terms of water being used in the construction process, or water being obtained, environmental effects of water being obtained from some source, i.e., the well?

- What are the potential sources of water that 0. PFS is proposing?
- As I read the ER, they proposed either on site, if they found available quantity of groundwater, or they would truck in from outside source, or for some aspect of the need they would bring in some bottled water.
- To determine a potential environmental effect on a source of water, do you need to know where that source is?

MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous question.

- Can you identify for me the exact location of the off-site sources?
- No, because I'm not involved the original proposal where to get these waters' source outside.
 - Do you agree that you need to know what the source of the water will be before you can take the next step and analyze what the potential environmental

FAGE 45 Fage Fage	,
2	
MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous question. You nay answer if you can. A. You have to repeat the question because I don't know if you're talking about outside the outside the site or on site or both. O. Precisely. How can you determine the environmental effects for using water from the source if you don't know where that source is? MR. GAUKLER: Please show him more of coutside the site or on site or both. MR. GAUKLER: Objection, ambiguous. MR. GAUKLER: Objection, ambiguous. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of t document.	47
4 A. You have to repeat the question because I don't know if you're talking about outside the	
don't know if you're talking about outside the	r me?
dourte know if you're talking about outside the outside the site or on site or both. 7	
5 don't know if you're talking about outside the 6 outside the site or no site or both. 7 Q. Precisely. How can you determine the 8 environmental effects for using water from the source if 9 you don't know where that source is? 10 MR. GAUKLER: Objection, ambiguous. 11 A. I remember Essection have addressed what 12 your question is, but I can't remember exactly where the 13 section or which chapter regarding your question about 14 identify the source of the water come from. And they 15 addressed what kind of impact would be and so on. It's 16 already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know 17 which section it is, because I criginally did not 18 participate about this proposal or calculation of how 19 much water used during different phase of the PFS 20 project into construction operation phase. 21 Q. So you believe the environmental report 22 looks at each potential source of water for this 23 facility and analyzes 24 A. Address the impact. 25 Q. Analyzing the environmental impact for each 26 for those 2 A. Address the impact. 27 A. Address the impact. 28 A. Address the impact. 29 C. Analyzing the environmental impact for each 29 and answer in RAI, NRC request for additional 20 information, I remember. But I don't know which 21 specific question. But this issue had been addressed 22 and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC 23 Alabout the water source, where it come from, what the 24 impact would be if we choose that way. 25 Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under 26 Impact would be if we choose that way. 27 Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under 28 ambiguous. Answer if you can.	the
outside the site or on site or both. Section	
7 O. Precisely. How can you determine the environmental effects for using water from the source if you don't know where that source is? 10	1
any or on the know where that source is? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, ambiguous. A. I remember ER section have addressed what your question is, but I can't remember exactly where the saction or which chapter regarding your question about his water used during different phase of the participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. 20	
you don't know where that source is? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, ambiguous. A. I remember ER section have addressed what section or which chapter regarding your question about identify the source of the water come from. And they addressed what kind of impact would be and so on. It's already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know which section it is, because I originally did not participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. O. So you believe the environmental report looks at each potential source of water for this facility and analyzes A. Address the impact. O. Analyzing the environmental impact for each PAGE 46 of those A. I remember a water in Al, NKC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. O. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? AR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of the document. THE WITNESS: If the site is located own. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of the document. THE WITNESS: Okay. I would like to have the title of the What the title of the What the itile of the What the title of the What the interest on Score and the discharge areas abould he what the water source, where it come from, what the impa	r the
MR. GAUKLER: Objection, ambiguous. A. I remember ER section have addressed what section or which chapter regarding your question about identify the source of the water come from. And they addressed what kind of impact would be and so on. It's already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know which section it is, because I originally did not participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. 20 project into construction operation phase. 21 Q. So you believe the environmental report looks at each potential source of water for this facility and analyzes 22 A. Address the impact. 23 A. Address the impact. 24 A. Address the impact. 25 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the sice? MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of to document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of to document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of to document. MR. GAUKLER: We'll get you more of to MRC MAK. GAUKLER: Wait till you get more of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the what the title of the WIREG 1557. Do you know the water to	. CIIC
A. I remember ER section have addressed what 12 your question is, but I can't remember exactly where the 13 section or which chapter regarding your question about 14 identify the source of the water come from. And they 15 addressed what kind of impact would be and so on. It's 16 already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know which section it is, because I originally did not 18 participate about this proposal or calculation of how 19 much water used during different phase of the PPS 19 project into construction operation phase. 20 project into construction operation phase. 21 O. So you believe the environmental report 1 looks at each potential source of water for this 22 facility and analyzes 24 A. Address the impact. 25 O. Analyzing the environmental impact for each 26 of those 2 A. Address the impact. 26 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 O sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and 15 ambiguous. Answer if you can. 17 don't know and the participate about this proposal or calculation of how what the title of the What	ho
12 your question is, but I can't remember exactly where the section or which chapter regarding your question about didentify the source of the water come from. And they addressed what kind of impact would be and so on. It's already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know which section it is, because I orginally did not participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. 10	16
section or which chapter regarding your question about identify the source of the water come from. And they addressed what kind of impact would be and so on. It's already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know which section it is, because I originally did not participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. 10	
identify the source of the water come from. And they addressed what kind of impact would be and so on. It's high already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know which section it is, because I originally did not participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PPS project into construction operation phase. 20	
addressed what kind of impact would be and so on. It's already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know which section it is, because I originally did not participate about this proposal or calculation of how participate about this proposal or calculation of how project into construction operation phase. 20 project into construction operation phase. 21 Q. So you believe the environmental report looks at each potential source of water for this facility and analyzes)I the
already been addressed in the ER, which I don't know which section it is, because I originally did not participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. 20 project into construction operation phase. 21 Q. So you believe the environmental report looks at each potential source of water for this facility and analyzes 22 A. Address the impact. 23 Q. Analyzing the environmental impact for each phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. 20 MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and the discharge areas, and the ambiguous. Answer if you can. 21 MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can.	
which section it is, because I originally did not participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. 1 Q. So you believe the environmental report looks at each potential source of water for this facility and analyzes 2 A. Address the impact. 2 Q. Analyzing the environmental impact for each page 46 1 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which space ficting question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC requestion. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC read a specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC read a specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC read and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC read and the discharge areas should be impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under read the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and read the section of monitoring wells to detect leakage fro storage structures should also be provided. Inform	
participate about this proposal or calculation of how much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. 1	NUREG,
much water used during different phase of the PFS project into construction operation phase. 1	title
project into construction operation phase. Q. So you believe the environmental report looks at each potential source of water for this facility and analyzes Q. Analyzing the environmental impact for each PAGE 46 1 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Wait till he gets it. A Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. Just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. What you request on second paragraph. PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. Just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. What you request on second paragraph. PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. What you request, the second paragraph. What you request on second paragraph. PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. What you request, the second paragraph. Which is a source of well water, the groundwater of which is a source of well water, the groundwater of they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater of well water, the groundwater of they are recharged and the discharge areas should be provided. Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. S just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. Which is a source of well water, well water, the groundwater of they are recharged and the discharge areas shoul	_
21 Q. So you believe the environmental report 22 looks at each potential source of water for this 23 facility and analyzes 24 A. Address the impact. 25 Q. Analyzing the environmental impact for each PAGE 46 1 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, RRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. 20 Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? 4 MR. GAUKLER: Wait till he gets it. 22 what you request on second paragraph. 23 MR. GAUKLER: Wait till he gets it. 24 (Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) 25 DAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 2 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to which is a source of well water, the groundwater as (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should be impact would be if we choose that way. 20 Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? 3 MR. GAUKLER: Wait till he gets it. 4 (Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) 4 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 4 what you request on second paragraph. 4 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 5 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to which is a source of well water, the groundwater of (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should be provided. 5 what you request on second paragraph. 6 (Page 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 2 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to which is a source of well water, the groundwater of (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should be provided. 8 described, the results of a	nd get
looks at each potential source of water for this facility and analyzes A. Address the impact. O. Analyzing the environmental impact for each PAGE 46 Of those A. Address the impact, yes. O. A. Address the impact, yes. A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. O. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUXLER: Objection, vague and analyzes What you request on second paragraph. (Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. What you request on second paragraph. (Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. What you request on second paragraph. (Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. What you request on second paragraph. (Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. What you request on second paragraph. (Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. What you request on second paragraph. (Recess from 11:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological unite they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater used they are recharged and the discharge areas, should be provided. No beneath the site, associated hydrological unite they are recharged and the discharge areas, should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater used they are rech	
facility and analyzes A. Address the impact. Q. Analyzing the environmental impact for each PAGE 46 1 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. Q sources? A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the pase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? A. Address the impact. 24 (Recess from I1:11 to 11:19 a.m.) PAGE 48 PAGE 48 PAGE 48 PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 2 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. 4 "If the site is located over an aquife which is a source of well water, the groundwater and described, the results of a survey of groundwater uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? A. Water table contour map showing surfa water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from storage structures should also be provided. Inform	ead
A. Address the impact. Q. Analyzing the environmental impact for each PAGE 46 1 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? A. Address the impact for each 25 PAGE 48 PAGE 48 PAGE 48 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 2 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to switch is a source of well water, the groundwater and which is a source of well water, the groundwater and secribed, the results of a survey of groundwater upon well location, source aquifers, water uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can.	
25 Q. Analyzing the environmental impact for each PAGE 46 1 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can. Address the impact for each 25 THE WITNESS: Okay. Actually it's Rev PAGE 48 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 2 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. 4 "If the site is located over an aquife 5 which is a source of well water, the groundwater and 6 (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological units 7 they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater up well location, source aquifers, water uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. A water table contour map showing surfa 1 locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage fro storage structures should also be provided. Inform	
PAGE 46 1 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I 5 can't remember exactly which section. Or during the 6 phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional 7 information, I remember. But I don't know which 8 specific question. But this issue had been addressed 9 and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC 10 RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the 11 impact would be if we choose that way. 2 Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under 3 the site? 4 MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and 46 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 2 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. 4 "If the site is located over an aquifer which is a source of well water, the groundwater and (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater users, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. 10 A water table contour map showing surfa locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage fro storage structures should also be provided. Inform	_
1 of those 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can. A haddress the impact, yes. 1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 2 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. 4 "If the site is located over an aquifer which is a source of well water, the groundwater and the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater under the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater under the site is located over an aquifer the subject of which is a source of well water, the groundwater and they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater under they are recharged and the discharge areas, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. A water table contour map showing surfact the site? A water table contour map showing surfact locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from the state is located to confirm that. Okay. A water table contour map showing surfact locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from the state is located to confirm that. Okay. A water table contour map showing surfact locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from the state is located to confirm the surfact locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from the state is located to confirm that. O	Lew
1 Plan, also the Reg Guide 1.17. That is my guess. 2 A. Address the impact, yes. 3 Q sources? 4 A. I remember I have read the section, but I 5 can't remember exactly which section. Or during the 6 phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional 7 information, I remember. But I don't know which 8 specific question. But this issue had been addressed 9 and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC 10 RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. 11 Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? 12 MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and 15 ambiguous. Answer if you can. 13 A. Address the impact, yes. 2 just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. 4 Which is a source of well water, the groundwater and 6 (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological units of the results of a survey of groundwater units	4.0
A. Address the impact, yes. Q sources? A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? A. Address the impact, yes. Just wanted to confirm that. Okay. Let me read to what you request, the second paragraph. What you request, the second paragraph. Which is a source of well water, the groundwater and described, the results of a survey of groundwater uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can.	48
Q sources? A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can. 3 what you request, the second paragraph. 4 "If the site is located over an aquifer which is a source of well water, the groundwater and (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. 12 A water table contour map showing surfa water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from storage structures should also be provided. Inform	1
A. I remember I have read the section, but I can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can. It is a source of well water, the groundwater and is a source of well water, the groundwater and described, the results of a survey of groundwater uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. A water table contour map showing surfate water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from storage structures should also be provided. Inform	you
can't remember exactly which section. Or during the phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can. which is a source of well water, the groundwater and the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater units described, and the discharge areas should be provided. 12	
phase of answer in RAI, NRC request for additional information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can. (S) beneath the site, associated hydrological units they are recharged and the discharge areas should he described, the results of a survey of groundwater uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. A water table contour map showing surfa water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from storage structures should also be provided. Inform	ır 'r
information, I remember. But I don't know which specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can. They are recharged and the discharge areas should be described, the results of a survey of groundwater uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. A water table contour map showing surfations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from storage structures should also be provided. Inform	uller
specific question. But this issue had been addressed and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and ambiguous. Answer if you can. 8 described, the results of a survey of groundwater uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. 10 levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. 11 water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from storage structures should also be provided. Inform	, and
9 and answered either in the ER or in the response to NRC 10 RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. 11 Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? 12 MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and 15 ambiguous. Answer if you can. 19 well location, source aquifers, water uses, static levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. 10 levels, pumping rates, and the draw-down should be provided. 11 water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage from storage structures should also be provided. Inform	e
RAI about the water source, where it come from, what the impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? A water table contour map showing surfa water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage fro storage structures should also be provided. Inform	sers,
impact would be if we choose that way. Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under the site? A water table contour map showing surfa water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage fro storage structures should also be provided. Inform	water
12 Q. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under 13 the site? 14 MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and 15 ambiguous. Answer if you can. 18 Has PFS determined what the aquifer is under 19 water bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the 19 locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage fro 19 storage structures should also be provided. Inform	
the site? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and maker bodies, decharge and discharge areas, and the locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage fro storage structures should also be provided. Inform	
MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and locations of monitoring wells to detect leakage fro storage structures should also be provided. Inform	ce
15 ambiguous. Answer if you can. 15 storage structures should also be provided. Inform	
25 Seerage Seraceutes should also be provided. Inform	a .
-av ass avalucing the quality of which it make the 116 on monteness colla about a ali.i	ition
and the state of t	ions,
2 between intervals, installation methods, and a	
10 representative hydrochemical analysis. An analysis	
25 Sounding the potential groundwater contamination in	m
120 Sice operation should be provided. A diabil of time	
versus radionactive concentrations at the crosest	
Q. I show you a document. 22 existing or potential downgradient well should be	
A. Okay. 23 included.*	
Q. It is from NUREG-1567, Section 2, page 2-12, 24 Q. In your expert opinion, has PFS performe	d
25 subsection 2.4.5 entitled Subsurface Hydrology. 25 work that would comply with that paragraph?	

	George H. C. Liang		April 17, 2001
5	SHEET 7 PAGE 49 49	1	PAGE 51 51
	The state of the s	1	be looking for impacts?
1	A. Some have. Some we plan to do. Because too	-	A. I don't like if I don't refer to
2	many mentioned there. I will identify which one we	2	guideline, in my expert opinion is too conservative.
3	already	3	guideline, in my expert opinion is too conservative.
4	Q. In the first sentence it talked about an	4	It's more than necessary. But the guideline required
5	aquifer.	5	it. In my expert opinion, it's too conservative, is
6	A. Yes.	6	more than needed.
7	0. Has PFS determined what the aquifer is?	7	Q. And the reasons for it being too
8	A. In the ER itself, no, we have not identified	8	conservative are?
وا	the aquifer.	9	A. I don't know. Because that is the I
10	O. The first sentence states, "If the site is	10	don't know this requirement, because the what the
	located over an aquifer which is a source of well	11	technical behind the NRC, they said the guidelines
11	water." If you've not identified the aquifer yet, could	12	saying that you have to have a radius of five miles. I
12	Water. If you've not identified the addition for well	13	don't know. They may be my guess is because of
13	you identify what the source, or the source for well	14	conservatism, because normally a well, I shouldn't
14	water?	15	say that. I will stop here.
15	A. We drill a CPT operating well and put a	16	
16	casing on it and we found some groundwater.		Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an environmental impact on the aquifer?
17	Q. Would you please identify those areas in the	17	MR. GAUKLER: Objection, vague and
18	paragraph in which PFS has	18	
19	A. Okay.	19	ambiguous. Many type of potential of environmental
20	Q performed work and those which you	20	impacts, so if you have any particular ones in mind.
21	indicated that they would be performing in the future?	21	MR. WEISMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Gaukler. Could
22	A. We have done to send either in the SAR or in	22	you speak up a bit?
23	answer request for additional information from NRC the	23	MR. GAUKLER: I'm sorry. There's many
24	result of a survey of groundwater user within five-mile	24	different types of environmental impacts. What type are
25	radius of the site well locations, source aquifer,	25	you referring to, in general?
	INGIAN OF PRO PERO		
•	PAGE 50		PAGE 52
•	PAGE 50 50		PAGE 52 52
•	PAGE 50 50 water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have	1	PAGE 52 Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general
	PAGE 50 water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater	1 2	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on
1	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area.	1 2 3	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley.
1 2	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all.	1 2 3 4	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that?
1 2 3	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a	1 2 3 4 5	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes.
1 2 3 4	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users?	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question.
1 2 3 4 5	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too.
1 2 3 4 5 6	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge. Q. PFS did not do an independent analysis as to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge. Q. PFS did not do an independent analysis as to how far impacts to the aquifer may be caused?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the valley, however. Is that correct? A. In the valley, yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge. Q. PFS did not do an independent analysis as to how far impacts to the aquifer may be caused? MR. GAUKLER: Objection.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the valley, however. Is that correct? A. In the valley, yes. Q. Has PFS done an analysis to determine
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge. Q. PFS did not do an independent analysis as to how far impacts to the aquifer may be caused? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. Q. Yeah, it was poorly worded. In your expert	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the valley, however. Is that correct? A. In the valley, yes. Q. Has PFS done an analysis to determine whether the cumulative impact of all the water users in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge. Q. PFS did not do an independent analysis as to how far impacts to the aquifer may be caused? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. Q. Yeah, it was poorly worded. In your expert opinion, is five miles the outer boundary at which	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the valley, however. Is that correct? A. In the valley, yes. Q. Has PFS done an analysis to determine whether the cumulative impact of all the water users in the valley is having an adverse effect upon the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge. Q. PFS did not do an independent analysis as to how far impacts to the aquifer may be caused? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. Q. Yeah, it was poorly worded. In your expert opinion, is five miles the outer boundary at which impacts to the aquifer may be observed at the site?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the valley, however. Is that correct? A. In the valley, yes. Q. Has PFS done an analysis to determine whether the cumulative impact of all the water users in the valley is having an adverse effect upon the availability of water resources in the valley?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge. Q. PFS did not do an independent analysis as to how far impacts to the aquifer may be caused? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. Q. Yeah, it was poorly worded. In your expert opinion, is five miles the outer boundary at which impacts to the aquifer may be observed at the site? A. I can't answer your question. Will you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the valley, however. Is that correct? A. In the valley, yes. Q. Has PFS done an analysis to determine whether the cumulative impact of all the water users in the valley is having an adverse effect upon the availability of water resources in the valley? A. We did in one calculation demonstrate that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	water uses, static water levels, pumping rates. We have described in the Skull Valley where the groundwater recharge and decharge area. That's all. Q. You indicated that PFS has performed a survey of the groundwater users? A. Within file-mile radius of the site, yes. Q. I'm sorry; what was that? A. Within five-mile radius of the site. Q. Why did PFS choose five miles? A. Not only this site, any nuclear facility required to investigate at the radius of five miles. Q. If there were impacts to the environment or impacts of the aquifer outside of five miles, would PFS have studied that? A. Not to my knowledge. Q. PFS did not do an independent analysis as to how far impacts to the aquifer may be caused? MR. GAUKLER: Objection. Q. Yeah, it was poorly worded. In your expert opinion, is five miles the outer boundary at which impacts to the aquifer may be observed at the site?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. (BY MR. SEEL) I'm referring to in general draw-down of the aquifer and the impact it may have on the availability of water resources in the valley. A. Excuse me? You want me to address that? Q. Yes. A. I'd like you to repeat the question. Q. I'd like to repeat it, too. A. I don't understand it. Q. Will the use of water at the facility have an impact on the availability of water resources in the valley? A. I believe we have addressed the issue based on our 42 years of average annual use of the water if we coming withdraw from the well, and what kind of impact on the nearest well user. Q. PFS is not the only water user in the valley, however. Is that correct? A. In the valley, yes. Q. Has PFS done an analysis to determine whether the cumulative impact of all the water users in the valley is having an adverse effect upon the availability of water resources in the valley?

George H. C. Liang * April 17, 2001 PAGE 53 PAGE 55 1 impact would be on the current use of well water. 1 We used the Hood information and get the 2 Will there be sufficient water resources in information about charge or recharge of the aquifer. the valley to satisfy PFS's needs in 40 years? 3 How much is actually being used in the 3 4 A. Yes. 4 valley today? 5 0. And how did you come to that conclusion? 5 I don't know. They said some number in Α. 6 Based on that 42 years annual use is 2,040 A. 6 there. I do not memorize the paper. gallon per year, transfer to 1.42 gallon per minute. 7 7 0. I understand. 8 And also in other unit is 2.29 acre feet. That kind of 8 A. So many number. 9 compared to the other user or the availability of the 9 But if I understand you correctly, PFS is aquifer is so insignificant. 10 relying on the number in the Hood and Waddell report for 10 11 Where did you get the data to compare it to 11 its conclusion. 12 these other -- where is the data for these other users 12 If I remember right, talking about 5,000 13 in the valley? 13 acre feet compared to what we propose going to draw, 14 Oh, we based on those five -- a table or a 2.29 acre feet. That -- my expert opinion is 14 15 figure we presented within those five-mile radius. 15 insignificant. 16 And you determined that the recharge to the 16 0. The question is whether the data from 1968 17 area within the five-mile radius is greater than what is 17 is still accurate, and my question to you is, why do you 18 being extracted by those current water users? 18 feel the data from the 1968 report is still accurate? I base on the -- what available from the 19 19 I have answered already. Because previous 20 aquifer data which I extract an understanding from Hood 20 question, I don't know which question -- '87, they say and Waddell, W-a-d-d-e-l-l, the paper, the publication. 21 21 another publication concluded. Their study conclusion I forgot the last name. And they indicate an aquifer in 22 22 is not much different from Hood's result. 23 the Skull Valley, how much recharge and decharge 23 Secondly, State of Utah using the same 24 quantity. report for 1987, their planning of this project. 24 25 0. So is PFS relying solely on the Hood and 25 Was that facility located -- to be located PAGE 54 PAGE 56 54 1 Waddell 1968 report for its conclusions, as to the in Skull Valley? 2 conclusion that recharged --If I remember right, answer to that question 2 3 I believe we answered that question during I think is using Skull Valley, yes, the groundwater from 3 the answer one of the request for additional information 4 the aquifer in the Skull Valley, yes. addressed. After Hood publication we have more reason 5 Are there any other reasons why you believe 6 in 1987. Their conclusion is not too much different the 5,000 acre feet figure included in the Hood and 6 7 from Hood. Also, I remind you the State of Utah using 7 Waddell report is still valid? Hood for their 1987 to host superconductor, 8 8 My conclusion I think based on all available supercolliding project, they also rely on that report. 9 9 information. Oh, well, that's -- ever since the Hood 10 And we have to conduct some research. publication, the balance of the aquifer had not been 10 11 There's just no more -- not a more recent publication changed significantly. 11 available. 12 12 0. If new wells were being put into the 13 But PFS is relying on the Hood and Waddell aquifer, installed in the aquifer since the Hood and 13 14 report in coming to this conclusion? Waddell report, would that change your opinion? 14 15 MR. GAUKLER: Objection. Mischaracterizes 15 That depend on a lot of factor -- how much 16 the witness's testimony. water individual well will withdraw. 16 17 (BY MR. SEEL) Is PFS relying on anything 17 What other factors? 18 other than the Hood and Waddell report to come to its 18 That's one of the factors I just mentioned. 19 conclusion? depending on quantity of individually the withdraw from 19 20 MR. GAUKLER: What conclusion are you the aguifer. 21 referring to specifically? 21 Are there any other factors that would go 22 MR. SEEL: The conclusion that the amount of 22 into that determination? Do new wells automatically 23 recharge to the aquifer is greater than the amount being

56

24

conclusion --

used in the valley. If that's not the right

23

24

25

mean more extraction from the aguifer?

extract from the aquifer, yeah.

Yeah, if you have a new well you just

April 17, 2001 George H. C. Liang PAGE 59 SHEET 8 PAGE 57 59 Twenty-eight, okay. So has PFS determined how many new wells A. 1 1 -- in which there is -- I'd like you to take have been installed in the aquifer since the Hood and 2 0. a look at it so that I can ask you about it. 3 Waddell report? 3 Starts at page 28, right? MR. GAUKLER: I object to this whole line of 4 Page 28, that's correct. questioning on lack of relevance. You can answer that 5 5 (Witness reviews document.) 6 question if you know. MR. GAUKLER: Are you going to ask specific 7 I don't know. A. 7 questions with respect to the table? 8 If the groundwater table is lower, would 8 0. that have an environmental impact on vegetation in the 9 MR. SEEL: About the dates on the table and use during those dates. 10 valley? 10 MR. GAUKLER: He's going to ask a specific 11 If the groundwater table is low, I don't 11 A. question about the table. If you need to look at more know how that interconnected vegetation. I would say 12 12 of the document, feel free to do so. 13 13 THE WITNESS: Okay. The table. Do some types of vegetation extract water 14 14 (BY MR. SEEL) My understanding is that -from the subsurface out around the groundwater table? 15 15 well, what does the table describe as far as use of 16 I don't know, because I'm not in that area 16 17 water in the Skull Valley? of my study. 17 The table is percent of -- is estimated well Are you familiar with the Hood and Waddell 18 A. 18 0. discharge based mainly on a measurement made during a 19 report? Have you read it? 19 reconnaissance during 1963 and '65, electrical power 20 I read very casually, not word by word. A. 20 consumption, acreage and pumpage, reported by the U.S. Do you know what evapotranspiration is? 21 21 0. My understanding of that word means 22 22 A. Can you tell me what the total usage of 23 ٥. evaporate and escaping to the air. 23 water in 1957 was, according to that table? What does the transpiration part of that 24 24 0. Total rounded is 3,500. The unit is acre 25 term mean? 25 PAGE 60 PAGE 58 60 58 I only know the first part. Transpiration, 1 feet. $\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}.$. Can you tell me what the amount estimated 2 I don't know what exact mechanism in science. according to the table is in the subsequent year? 3 If the groundwater table is lower in the 3 1963, no total. 1964, a total of 4,100. In valley, would that allow saline water from the Great 4 1965 is 5,000 acre feet. 5 Salt Lake to encroach into the aquifer? So between -- if I understand the table 6 I don't know the answer to this question --6 correctly, Hood and Waddell estimate that between 1957 7 7 to your question. and 1965 the amount of water usage in the valley Is salt water generally denser than fresh 8 8 increased by how many acre feet? 9 9 water? Nine hundred acre feet. 10 A. 10 A. True. In 19 -- my understanding is PFS has taken Are you aware of any areas in the United 11 11 the position that that 5,000 acre feet per year usage States where saline water has encroached on fresh water 12 12 rate has not changed since 1968 when the report was 13 aquifers? 13 written? 14 14 Yes. A. No. We say change means the available or 15 A. What areas would those be? 15 0. recharge of the aquifer. 16 Florida. 16 A. -I'm sorry? 0. 17 Do you know what the cause of the 17 It's user, amount of use. 18 A. encroachment was? 18 I don't understand the difference. Would 19 0. I don't know the exact cause, but one thing, 19 you explain that to me? Is PFS relying on the 5,000 the factor which determine is the distance between the 20 20 acre feet per year annual usage rate that Hood and aquifer and what the source of salt water. That's a 21 21 Waddell came up with as being the current usage rate? 22 very important factor. 22 No, we do not -- I don't believe we used I'm going to hand you a copy of -- I'll hand 23 23 so-called usage, rather than we're using the first page. you all of the Hood and Waddell report. I'd like you to 24 24 If you look at the -- let's see, where's the -- right

look at page 28. There's a table on use --

25

	George H. C. Lian	g *	April 17, 2001
	PAGE 61		PAGE 63
,	61	1.	63
	here. We present this number in our ER. Estimate every	1	wells?
2	annual groundwater recharge and discharge in the range	2	A. Not significantly, based on the available
3	of 30,000 to 50,000 acre per year. We use that number	3	data to me.
4	in our ER, SAR. We did not use this number anywhere, I	4	Q. And what about in the rest of the Skull
5	believe, in our ER or SAR. I may be wrong, but that's	5	Valley?
6	my memory. That's what I had read those sections, ER	6	A. Oh, I've read a report. They say in the
7	section, SAR section.	7	Dugway, they say public water supply. In that
8	Q. Has PFS done any studies as to the current	8	particular location is simply water elevation I mean,
9	amount of well usage in Skull Valley?	9	groundwater elevation is significantly buried, reduced
10	A. Recur amount?	10	because of pumping. But that is 19 miles from the site,
11	Q. The current amount of water being pumped	11	as I recall.
12	from wells in Skull Valley.	12	Q. So to clarify: the 5,000 acre feet that's
13	A. I don't know of I don't understand your	13	being used, that Hood and Waddell says is being used in
14	"recur."	14	the valley, may or may not be accurate?
15	MR. GAUKLER: I object to this whole line of	15	MR. GAUKLER: Objection. This is asked and
16	questioning as relevance. You can answer if you can.	16	answered. We've gone over this many times. It's not
17	Go ahead and rephrase the question.	17	relevant, and now you should move on to a new topic.
18	Q. Has PFS done any studies as to the annual	18	MR. SEEL: If PFS wants to take the
19	amount of water being pumped from wells in Skull Valley?	19	position
20	A. For all the user.	20	MR. GAUKLER: We said we don't rely upon the
21	MR. GAUKLER: Entire Skull Valley, you're	21	5,000 feet. I don't see why you need to come back to
22	talking about?	22	it. You've asked this many different ways. I've been
23	A. Entire Skull Valley? Not to my knowledge.	23	very patient. My patience is running out.
24	Q. Will the amount that's being pumped pump the	24	A. I'm not in a position to judge the Hood
25		4	in a position to judge the mood
1 40	additer dry in 40 years?	1 / 5	Daber to answer that But I halique their data is now.
	aquifer dry in 40 years?	25	paper to answer that. But I believe their data is very
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		PAGE 64
	AGE 62 A. I don't understand your question. Forty		PAGE 64 64
F	AGE 62 A. I don't understand your question. Forty	1	PAGE 64 64 accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough
1	PAGE 62 62	1	PAGE 64 64 accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very
1 2	AGE 62 A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project?	1 2	PAGE 64 64 accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough
1 2 3	AGE 62 A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct.	1 2	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other.
1 2 3 4	AGE 62 A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance.	1 2 3 4	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the
1 2 3 4 5	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any	1 2 3 4 5	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley?
1 2 3 4 5	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years?	1 2 3 4 5 6	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question.	1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped	1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question?	1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals"
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of A. My expert opinion is compared to other user,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed water resources investigation is needed to refine the
1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of A. My expert opinion is compared to other user, even this is insignificant.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed water resources investigation is needed to refine the estimates given in this reconnaissance. Such a study
1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of A. My expert opinion is compared to other user, even this is insignificant. Q. Precisely. And those other users are?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed water resources investigation is needed to refine the estimates given in this reconnaissance. Such a study should include the following considerations:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of A. My expert opinion is compared to other user, even this is insignificant. Q. Precisely. And those other users are? Where did you get the data about the other users?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed water resources investigation is needed to refine the estimates given in this reconnaissance. Such a study should include the following considerations: 1. A comprehensive inventory of the water
1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of A. My expert opinion is compared to other user, even this is insignificant. Q. Precisely. And those other users are? Where did you get the data about the other users? A. Within five miles we presented in the ER and	1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed water resources investigation is needed to refine the estimates given in this reconnaissance. Such a study should include the following considerations: 1. A comprehensive inventory of the water resources of the valley should be made to supplement
1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of A. My expert opinion is compared to other user, even this is insignificant. Q. Precisely. And those other users are? Where did you get the data about the other users? A. Within five miles we presented in the ER and SAR. They have quantity use, when they installed the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed water resources investigation is needed to refine the estimates given in this reconnaissance. Such a study should include the following considerations: 1. A comprehensive inventory of the water resources of the valley should be made to supplement coverage of this reconnaissance. Detailed data should
1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of A. My expert opinion is compared to other user, even this is insignificant. Q. Precisely. And those other users are? Where did you get the data about the other users? A. Within five miles we presented in the ER and SAR. They have quantity use, when they installed the well, how deep of the well, what kind of elevation from	1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed water resources investigation is needed to refine the estimates given in this reconnaissance. Such a study should include the following considerations: 1. A comprehensive inventory of the water resources of the valley should be made to supplement coverage of this reconnaissance. Detailed data should be obtained on the hydraulic characteristics of existing
1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I don't understand your question. Forty years, you're referring to Private Fuel Storage project? Q. That is correct. MR. GAUKLER: Objection; vague and ambiguous, also lack of relevance. Q. How do you know there's going to be any water in the aquifer in 40 years? MR. GAUKLER: Objection, lack of relevance. A. I don't know answer to this question, your question. Q. Don't you need to know how much they pumped in order to answer that question? A. I know how much the PFS will pump, 2.29 acre feet on every over 42 years life of the facility. Q. And how do you know that the aquifer will still be able to produce that much over the course of A. My expert opinion is compared to other user, even this is insignificant. Q. Precisely. And those other users are? Where did you get the data about the other users? A. Within five miles we presented in the ER and SAR. They have quantity use, when they installed the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	accurate, because they are very extensive, very thorough study, based on my technical in this area. Very thorough. One is a hydrologist, one is chemist. One or the other. Q. And it's a comprehensive inventory of the water, groundwater resources in the valley? A. Yes. Q. Would you please turn to the last page of that report. A. Okay. This is 57 is some reference. The last page? Q. Page 40 of the report entitled "Proposals for Additional Studies." Would you please read the first two paragraphs of that? A. Page 40, first two paragraphs. "Because Skull Valley has a potential for development, a detailed water resources investigation is needed to refine the estimates given in this reconnaissance. Such a study should include the following considerations: 1. A comprehensive inventory of the water resources of the valley should be made to supplement coverage of this reconnaissance. Detailed data should

George H. C. Liang * April 17, 2001 PAGE 67 SHEET 9 PAGE 65 67 When you say "only difference," I'm not springs, the use of water in the valley, and the 1 A. 2 quite sure. availability of surface water supply." I mean, they would use the same units. Do you agree that the authors of that report 3 0. 3 You're measuring the same -- I'm asking if you're seem to indicate that greater level of investigation is 4 measuring the same sort of thing, but the difference is required beyond what they did in Skull Valley? Strike 5 in the direction. 6 that. 6 7 A. Does the statement of the authors correspond 7 MR. WEISMAN: Okay. That's the only with your prior testimony that this was a comprehensive 8 8 9 question I had. 9 report? THE WITNESS: Okay. 10 At the time I believe that's very 10 EXAMINATION comprehensive. As a matter of fact, I did a lot of 11 11 research before coming here. All the conclusion at end 12 BY MR. GAUKLER: I had one short, quick question. We've of the paper always recommend something further be done. 13 13 heard a lot of talk about units for expressing 14 That's natural. Because nobody can claim, I'm the 14 exhaustive, this is it. Nobody would have the authority permeability --15 16 A. saying that. 16 -- you just talked about. Is it true that 17 0. MR. SEEL: Lunch? 17 you can express permeability in units of area as the 18 (Lunch Recess from 11:59 a.m. to 1:10 p.m.) 18 function of time or in your distance over time? 19 19 EXAMINATION Yes. I have seen different textbooks. One 20 BY MR. WEISMAN: 20 textbook expand in the area over time. Some other In answering one of the earlier questions, 21 21 they're using linear distance over time. Others using you talked about two parameters, permeability and 22 22 23 area over time. transmittability. 23 MR. GAUKLER: Okay. 24 Yes. 24 A. MR. GAUKLER: No further questions. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear 25 0. PAGE 68 PAGE 66 68 66 MR. WEISMAN: I think we should go back on on what the difference between the two of them is. 1 quickly for one comment, and that is, Mr. Blake informs Maybe I can shortcut this just a little bit. I 2 me that the term is "transmissibility" and not understood from your answer that you measured "transmittability." But I must have heard it wrong. permeability at the surface from the top down. 4 THE WITNESS: You're correct. Uh-huh. 5 MR. WEISMAN: So with that, I will be done. 6 And I'm going to infer from your answer that 6 MR. SEEL: I may have some follow-up. Just permeability of a sample of material may vary depending 7 7 8 give me a second. on the direction. You might measure it from the top or FURTHER EXAMINATION from the side, and you might get different answers. Is 9 9 that correct? So permeability could vary in the X, Y, 10 BY MR. SEEL: 10 As a follow-up to the questions that were and Z directions? That's what I'm asking. 11 11 just asked on permeability, and permeability may vary 12 Yes. The answer is yes. 12 depending on the X, Y, or Z axes, the three dimensions 13 Okay. So when you answered the question, 13 in space, has PFS done any testing to determine whether you said that you measured the permeability from the 14 14 the permeability in those three dimensions in the test surface. That's only in the up and down direction, 15 well screened area vary? 16 16 correct? A. No. 17 That's our pumping procedure defined, yes. 17 A. So they could be -- the permeability in all Okay. So for transmittability, would that 18 18 be the permeability in a direction parallel to the three directions could be the same? 19 19 Could be the same, could be different. 20 A. surface? 20 How would one go about determining whether That is my understanding that the 21 0. 21 they're different or not? 22 transmittability is the horizontal. 22 I don't know. I don't know the method how 23 Okay. So that would be -- the only real 23 to determine the difference. difference between permeability and transmittability 24 24

25

would be the direction of the flow; is that correct?

When dealing with porous media -- and we're

dealing with porous media flow; is that correct? A. Un-bub. Dealing with porous media such as silty sand, would you expect the permeability to differ dealing on the dimension? M. SERD: Mant's that? A. Yesh, I don't work, Will you repeat the grow with the properties, there were certain assumptions built did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula? A. Yes. O. Mean you did - let's steep back. When you did the pump test formula assumptions built did the pump test formula assumptions of the vertical direction, the parameteris of the pumping flow, have the bear directions? A. On, It's based upon? A. On, it's based upon according to what formula assumptions built the seam of the vertical direction will not be well as in the Q and then the - let me see. The head of the - define in the formula based upon? A. Yes. O. Mas there another assumptions that you're dealing with porous media? A. Yes. O. Has the same characteristics in all three dimensions is different or vary. O. Has the same characteristics in all three dimensions is different or vary. O. Work you define the pumping flow. Normally we decide which diseasion or different maniferent dimension. A. Yes. O. Work you define the the water were pumping to the variety of the dealing with a medium in valich the parameters of the malian of the variety law as	_	George H. C. Lia	ng 1	• April 17, 2001
dealing with porous media flow; is that correct? 2		PAGE 69	Γ	PAGE 71
2 A. On-hub. 3 O. Dealing with porces media such as silty a sand, would you expect the permeability to differ 5 despending on the dimension? 5 despending on the dimension or direction? 6 M. SAMA: Dimension or direction? 7 M. STIL: What's that? 8 A. Yesh I don't understand dimension. 9 O. I guess I'm using dimension as direction. 10 A. Direction, okay. Will you repeat the question again? 11 Q. Men you did — let's step back. When you did the pump test, there were certain assumptions brilt that the pump test, there were certain assumptions brilt that pump test, there were certain assumptions that you're dealing with porcous media? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Mas there another assumption that that porcess media is homogenous? 12 A. What does that mean? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Mas there another assumption that that porcess media is homogenous? 15 A. Mas what? 16 Q. Mas there another assumption that that porcess media is homogenous? 17 A. My understanding is we did not go into that 2 assumption, saying that different dimensions is different or vary. 18 Q. Morally we decide which dimension or directions? 19 A. Nornally we decide which dimension or the vertical direction, the permeability of the step of soil, or what? 20 A. Nornally we decide which dimension or the vertical direction the permeability in the vertical direction were reapprepaired in the vertical direction where reapprepaired is where we wish childrection our vater were pumping that the appropos parameter is the same in all three directions? 11 A. Nornally we decide which dimension or the vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction were reapprepaired in the vertical direction were very high direction our vater were pumping to the static head pump test assumed that the again and the vertical direction were reapprepaired in the vertical direction were prompting to the vertical direction were were pumping to the vertical di	1		' ₁	71
3 0. Dealing with porous media such as silty 5 depending on the dimension? 6 MR. BARKE: Dimension or direction? 7 MR. STEL. Whit's that? 8 A. Yesh, I don't understand dimension. 10 A. Direction, okay. Will you repeat the question again? 11 Q. Khen you did let's step back. When you did the pump test, there were certain assumptions built into that pump test, there were certain assumptions built into that pump test, there were certain assumptions that that 2 A. Yes. 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Mas one of those assumptions that that 2 porous media? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Mas there another assumption that that 2 porous media? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Mas there another assumption that that 2 porous media? 17 A. Mas what? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Mas there another assumption that that 2 porous media? 19 A. Mas what? 10 C. Mas there another assumption that that 2 porous media? 10 A. Mas what? 11 A. Mas what? 12 Q. Gomogenous? 13 A. Mat does that mean? 14 Q. Mas the same characteristics in all three 2 dimensions. PAGER 70 PAGER 70 PAGER 70 PAGER 70 Nould groundwater models usually assume that the assumption, saying that different dimensions is direction. 10 A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability on extract the water what you said. 11 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we're with with 1 specified. 12 Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? 13 C. Is that what the formula that was used in the vertical direction, the permeability of mension of the vertical direction, the permeability of mension of the vertical direction with the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? 19 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension of direction use depending on what direction or vary. 10 Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the vertical direction, the permeability of mension of the vertical direction, the permeability of men		acarring with porous means from, is that coffect:	1 1	other than direction of the pumping flow, have to be
sand, would you expect the permeability to differ depending on the dimensions NR. BLAKE: Dimension or direction? NR. BLAKE: Dimension or direction. NR. SCALE: Step back to the saics. Shall formula whith the same in all three directions? NR. Direction. NR. BLAKE: Dimension or direction. NR. SCALE: Step back to the saic is thased quop and cording to what formula what f	1 -		- 1	provide as an input for that formula other than the
5 depending on the dimension? 6	-	J 1	1 -	
MR. SEEL: What's that? A. Yeah, I don't understand dimension. O. I guess !"a using dimension as direction. A. Direction, oar, Will you repeat the life question again? O. When you did - let's step back. When you did the pump test, there were certain assumptions built into that pump test formula? O. When you did - let's step back. When you did the pump test, there were certain assumptions built into that pump test formula? A. Yes.				er to be been back to the babies.
The Normally we focus the same in all three directions or warry.			- 1	***************************************
A. Yeah, I don't understand dimension. 9	1		- 1	Q. What is the formula based upon? The formula
3			1	that we use in the static head test, what formula, what
10 Å. Direction, okay. Will you repeat the 11 question again? 12 Q. When you did let's step back. When you 13 did the pump test, there were certain assumptions built 14 into that pump test formula? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Was so of those assumptions that you're 17 dealing with porous media? 18 A. Yes. 19 A. Yes. 19 A. Was can of those assumption that that 10 porous media is bonogenous? 11 A. Was what? 12 Q. Bomogenous? 12 A. Was what? 13 A. Was what? 14 A. Was what? 15 A. Was what? 16 A. Was what? 17 A. I think that's how the formula yes. 18 Q. Does Darcy's law -is one of the basic 19 A. Was what? 10 A. Was the same characteristics in all three 19 dimensions. 10 A. Wy understanding is we did not go into that 10 assumption, saying that different dimensions is 10 different or vary. 11 A. Wy understanding is we did not go into that 12 assumption, saying that different dimensions is 13 different or vary. 14 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 15 are you not? 16 A. Normally we decide which dimension or 17 directions use depending on what direction you extract 18 the appropas parameter is the same in all three 29 directions? 20 A. Normally we focus the permeability. 20 (.) 'In sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 21 didn't hear what you said. 22 A. Normally we focus the permeability in the vertical direction water were pumping 23 to. So vertical direction will focus on the 24 permeability in the vertical direction. 25 didn't hear what you said. 26 A. Normally we focus the permeability in the vertical direction our water were pumping 27 the vertical direction will focus on the 28 permeability in the vertical direction. 29 Q. Is that what the formula that was used in 20 Q. Was tare an expension of the trace of the control of the vertical direction of the con			8	physical equation is it based upon?
11 Question again?	4	Q. I guess I'm using dimension as direction.	9	A. Oh, it's based upon according to what
pagestion again? Q. When you did let's step back. When you did the pump test, there were certain assumptions built into that pump test formula? A. Yes. 16		A. Direction, okay. Will you repeat the	10	formula is in the Q and then the let me see. The
12 U. Mean you didlet's step back. When you lid did the pump test formula? 13 did the pump test formula? 14 into that pump test formula? 15 A. Tes. 16 Q. Was one of those assumptions that you're dealing with porous media? 17 dealing with porous media? 18 A. Tes. 19 Q. Was there another assumption that that porous media is homogenous? 21 A. Was what? 22 Q. Bonogenous? 22 A. Was what? 23 A. Was the same characteristics in all three dimensions. 24 Q. Bas the same characteristics in all three dimensions. 25 dimensions. 26 PAGE 70 27 A. Wy understanding is we did not go into that assumptions, saying that different or vary. 3 assumptions, saying that different dimensions is different or vary. 4 Q. You're dealing with a medium in which the parameters of that medium are the same in all three directions? 4 Q. Would groundwater modeling, are you not? 5 A. Yes. 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Would groundwater modeling, are you not? 6 A. Yes. 10 A. Normally we decide which dimension or the vertical direction, the permeability. 11 A. Normally we decide which dimension or the wetrical direction, the permeability. 12 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. 23 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is the same we which direction our water were pumping to so vertical direction, the permeability. 18 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is what they conside a promote that the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. 19 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. 20 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is the same we which direction our water were pumping to so vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction our detered the vertical which is not based on Barcy's law that involves profused in the vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction will focus on the	1		11	head of the define in the formula, because we just
11 did the pump test, there were certain assumptions built 11 into that pump test formula? 12 A. Yes. 13 A. Yes. 14 Gealing with porous media? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Was one of those assumptions that you're 17 dealing with porous media? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Was there another assumption that that 20 porous media is homogenous? 21 A. Was what? 22 Q. Googenous? 23 A. What does that mean? 24 Q. Has the same characteristics in all three 25 dimensions. PAGE 70 PAGE 70 PAGE 70 PAGE 70 1 A. Ny understanding is we did not go into that 2 assumption, saying that different dimensions is 3 different or vary. 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 3 are you not? 5 are you not? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that 4 the apropos parameter is the same in all three 2 directions? 3 different or wary. 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 4 are you not? 5 are you not? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that 6 the apropos parameter is the same in all three 10 the vertical direction, the permeability. 11 direction use depending on what direction you extract 12 the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on 13 the vertical direction, the permeability. 14 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 15 didn't hear what you said. 16 A. Normally we focus the permeability. 17 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 18 didn't hear what you said. 19 A. Normally we focus the permeability. 10 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 19 permeability in the vertical direction. 20 A. Yes, it is. 21 A. Yes, it is. 22 A. Yes, it is. 23 A. What the formula that was used in 24 C. The formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves 25 flows. 26 A. Yes, it is. 27 Q. What are the units of the soil. I don't know. 28 A. I think that's how the formula which is not based on Darcy's law assumes that the medium 29 directions? 20 A. Yes, it is. 21 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension 22 A. Yes, it is. 23 A. Yes, it is. 24 A. Yes, it is. 25 A. I fl not homogen		Q. When you did let's step back. When you	12	take out from one of the reference. H is the let me
15 A. Yes. 16 O. Was one of those assumptions that you're 16 dealing with porous media? 18 A. Yes. 19 O. Was there another assumption that that 19 porous media is homogenous? 20 A. Was what? 21 A. Was what? 22 O. Homogenous? 23 A. What does that mean? 24 O. Has the same characteristics in all three 25 dimensions. 26 dimensions. 27 A. Wy understanding is we did not go into that 2 assumption, saying that different dimensions is 3 different or vary. 4 O. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, a re you not? 4 O. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, a re you not? 4 O. You're experienced in groundwater modeling of directions? 4 O. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropose parameter is the same in all three 3 directions? 4 O. Permeability or the ability of fluid to 5 flow. 5 flow. 6 A. Yes. 7 O. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropose parameter is the same in all three 4 O. Permeability or the ability of fluid to 5 flow. 6 A. Yes. 7 O. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropose parameter is the same in all three 6 didn't thear what you said. 6 A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, them we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. 7 Flain the well and the water of the vertical direction our water were pumping to So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. 7 Flain the well and the well and the was used in the static head pump text assumes? 7 A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar 7 Flain the well and the was used in the static head pump text assumes? 7 A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar 7 Flain the well and the same in all three directions? 7 A. If not homogeneous, is t		did the pump test, there were certain assumptions built	13	see how they defined H.
15 Q. Was one of those assumptions that you're dealing with porous media? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Was there another assumption that that 20 porous media is honogenous? 18 A. Yes. 18 Q. Does Darcy's law - is one of the basic assumptions of Darcy's law that you're dealing with homogenous media is homogenous? 22 Q. Homogenous? 22 M. Mas what? 23 A. Mhat does that mean? 24 Q. Has the same characteristics in all three 25 dimensions. 26 dimensions. 27 Make the same characteristics in all three 26 dimensions. 27 Q. So hased of Darcy's law, Darcy's law assumes that the parameters of that medium are the same in all three directions? A. Tens the same group of soil or the size of soil, or what? Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, a different or vary. 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, a reyou not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling are you not? 5 A. Yeah. 7 Q. Permeability or the ability of fluid to flow. 7 A. Yeah. 7 Q. Permeability or the ability of fluid to flow. 7 A. Yeah. 7 Q. Year was assumes that the medium in which the parameter is the same in all three direction you ware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? 7 A. Yeah. 7 Q. Y	1	- •	14	Q. Is that formula based upon Darcy's law? Are
10 dealing with porous media? 16 porous media? 18 A. Yes. 18 Nas there another assumption that that 19 0. Was there another assumption that that 19 20 porous media is homogenous? 21 A. Was what? 22 0. Homogenous? 22 0. Homogenous? 23 A. What does that mean? 25 dimensions. 26 dimensions. 27 27 28 dimensions. 27 28 dimensions. 28 different or vary. 29 A. Wy understanding is we did not go into that 20 assumption, saying that different dimensions is 21 different or vary. 22 different or vary. 23 different or vary. 24 0. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 25 dimensions 26 dimensions 27 directions? 27 directions? 28 directions 28 directions 29 directions			15	you familiar with Darcy's law for fluid flow through
18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Was there another assumption that that 20 porous media is homogenous? 21 A. Was what? 22 Q. Homogenous? 23 A. What does that mean? 24 Q. Has the same characteristics in all three 25 dimensions. PAGE 70 1 A. My understanding is we did not go into that 2 assumption, saying that different dimensions is 3 different or vary. 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 3 are you not? 5 A. Yes. 7 Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that 4 the aptropos parameter is the same in all three 3 directions 4 A. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 4 are you not? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that 5 the aptropos parameter is the same in all three 6 directions 9 directions: 9 A. Normally we decide which dimension or 10 direction use depending on what direction you extract 11 the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on 11 the vertical direction, the permeability. 12 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 15 didn't hear what you said. 16 A. Mormally we focus the permeability dimension 17 is where we which direction our water were pumping 18 to. So vertical direction. 20 I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 21 the static head pump test assumes? 22 A. Yes, it is. 23 Q. Does Barcy's law that you're dealing with homogeneous of the medium in which the parameters of that medium are the same in all three directions? 24 Q. Pou're experienced in groundwater modeling, 25 direction; 26 A. Yes. 70 Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the approposition of filow. 8 A. Yesh. 9 Q. Formeability of fluid to 8 flows equally well in each direction. 9 A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. 12 Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based 13 the static head pump test assumes? 14 A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar 15 Darcy's law roman what you asy medium all the employed of the same in all three directions? 16 A. Yesh. 17		Q. Was one of those assumptions that you're	16	porous media?
18		•	17	A. I know the formula, yes.
19	1		18	Q. Does Darcy's law is one of the basic
porous media is nonogenous? 1		Q. Was there another assumption that that	19	assumptions of Darcy's law that you're dealing with
A. Was what? 20. Homogenous? 21. A. What does that mean? 22. Q. Has the same characteristics in all three 23. A. What does that mean? 24. Q. Has the same characteristics in all three 25. dimensions. PAGE 70 PAGE 70 A. My understanding is we did not go into that 26. assumption, saying that different dimensions is 27. different or vary. A. Yes. A. Yes. C. Would groundwater models usually assume that 28. the apropos parameter is the same in all three 29. directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or 20. directions use depending on what direction you extract 21. the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on 23. the vertical direction, the permeability. 24. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 25. didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension 26. So vertical direction will focus on the 27. permeability in the vertical direction. 28. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know that it is or 29. Is that what the formula that was used in 29. So vertical direction will focus on the 29. Is that what the formula that was used in 29. It does not assume that the aquifer 29. Page 72 A. When you say medium all three airections? A. Yesh. C. Permeability or the ability or what? C. Permeability or the ability or what? C. Page 72 A. Yesh. C. Permeability or the ability or what? C. Page 72 A. Yesh. C. Permeability or the ability or what? C. Page 72 A. Yesh. C. Permeability or the ability or what? C. Permeability or the ability or what? C. Page 72 A. Yesh. C. Pos if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law assumes that the medium or which what is not have direction. C. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law assumes that the medium or what? C. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law assumes that the medium or what? C. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law assumes that the medium or which what is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? C. A. Yesh. C. A. Yesh. C. A. Yesh. C. A			20	homogenous material of a uniform particulate size?
121		A. Was what?	21	A. I think that's how the formula based upon.
24 Q. Has the same characteristics in all three dimensions. PAGE 70 1 A. My understanding is we did not go into that 2 assumption, saying that different dimensions is 3 different or vary. 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 5 are you not? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? 8 A. Normally we decide which dimension or 10 direction use depending on what direction you extract 12 the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on 13 the vertical direction, the permeability. 9 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 1 didn't hear what you said. 10 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension 16 didn't hear what you said. 11 A. When you say medium all the same in all three direction is the same group of soil or the size of soil, or what? 10 Q. Would groundwater modeling, 4 Q. Permeability or the ability of fluid to 6 A. Yeah. 11 Co. A. Yeah. 12 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just 16 didn't hear what you said. 13 A. When you say medium all the same in all three direction is the same group of soil or the size of soil, or what? 14 Q. Permeability or the ability of fluid to 6 A. Yeah. 15 Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. 16 A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call honogeneous of the media of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. 19 Q. So if the formula in this pump test is hased upon Darcy's law 19 A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. 10 Q. Is that what the formula that was used in 17 permeability in the vertical direction. 10 Q. Is those not assume that the aquifer 20 A. Yeah. 11 A. When you say medium all the same in all three direction is the same group of soil or the size of soil, or what? 12 A. Yeah. 13 A. Fan Darcy's law assumes that the medium in which the parameters of the what? 14 Q. Permeability well in acch direction is w			22	uniform size.
dimensions. PAGE 70 A. My understanding is we did not go into that assumption, saying that different dimensions is different or vary. Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, are you not? A. Yes. Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping is where we which direction our water were pumping to so so vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. If on't know the formula will require the YA. When you say medium all the same in all the same in all three direction is the same group of soil or the size of soil, or what? A. Yeah. Q. Fermeability or the ability	1		23	O. So based of Darcy's law. Darcy's law assumes
A. My understanding is we did not go into that assumption, saying that different dimensions is different or vary. Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, are you not? A. Normally we decide which dimension or directions A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer A. I don't know the formula whill require the 25 A. I don't know the formula will require the 26 A. I don't know understood your testimony? 27 A. When you say medium all three direction is the same in all three direction is the same group of soil or the size of soil, or what? 2 A. Weah. Q. Permeability or the ability of fluid to flow. A. Yeah. Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the unitium are the wall in the same in all three in what they call homogeneous of the median of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that	1	Q. Has the same characteristics in all three	24	you're dealing with a medium in which the parameters of
PAGE 70 1 A. My understanding is we did not go into that 2 assumption, saying that different dimensions is 3 different or vary. 4 Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, 5 are you not? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that 8 the apropos parameter is the same in all three 9 directions? 10 A. Normally we decide which dimension or 11 direction use depending on what direction you extract 12 the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on 15 the vertical direction, the permeability. 16 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension 17 is where we which direction our water were pumping 18 to. So vertical direction will focus on the 19 permeability in the vertical direction. 20 Q. Is that what the formula that was used in 21 the static head pump test assumes? 22 A. Yes, it is. 23 Q. It does not assume that the aquifer 24 parameters are all the same in all three directions? 24 A. I don't know the formula will require the 25 A. I don't know the formula will require the 26 Q. And you say that is the same an all three directions? 27 A. If I remember right, it is area over time. 28 A. I don't know I understood your testimony?	25	dimensions.	25	that medium are the same in all three directions?
A. My understanding is we did not go into that assumption, saying that different dimensions is different or vary. Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, are you not? A. Yes. Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes. Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction is the same group of soil or the size of soil, or what? Q. Permeability or the ability of fluid to flow. A. Yeah. Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law. A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?		PAGE 70	†	
assumption, saying that different dimensions is different or vary. Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, are you not? A. Yes. Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the appropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yeah. Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. Yeah. Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil. I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	Ι.		1	72
different or vary. Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, are you not? A. Yes. Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yeah. Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? Permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yeah. Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?		A. My understanding is we did not go into that	1	A. When you say medium all the same in all
ofference of vary. Q. You're experienced in groundwater modeling, are you not? A. Yes. Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the A. If remember right, it is area over time. Permeability or the ability of fluid to flow. A. Yeah. Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium flows equally well in each direction. A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? Parcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. A. If remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	1	assumption, saying that different dimensions is	2	direction is the same group of soil or the size of soil.
are you not? A. Yes. Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping is where we which direction our water were pumping to So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	3		3	or what?
A. Yes. Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	I -		4	Q. Permeability or the ability of fluid to
7 Q. Would groundwater models usually assume that the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? 8 A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. 10 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. 10 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. 10 A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. 10 A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction used depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. 10 A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction used depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. 11 would say this is the same what you just inferred. 12 Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law 23 A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. 24 A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media? 25 A. If don't know the formula that was used in all three directions? 26 A. Yes, it is. 27 Q. What are the units for transmissivity? 28 A. If I remember right, it is area over time. 29 Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	ſ	are you not?	5	flow.
the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	6		6	A. Yeah.
the apropos parameter is the same in all three directions? A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	7	 Would groundwater models usually assume that 	7	Q. That Darcy's law assumes that the medium
A. Normally we decide which dimension or direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I thought the thousand dollar assumption is what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I would say this is the same what you just inferred. Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law A. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	8	the apropos parameter is the same in all three	8	
direction use depending on what direction you extract the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Mormally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil. I What they call homogeneous of the media of the soil. I Would say this is the same what you just inferred. Q. So if the formula in this pump test is based upon Darcy's law - Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	-		9	
the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?			10	what they call homogeneous of the media of the soil I
the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?		direction use depending on what direction you extract		would say this is the same what you just inferred
the vertical direction, the permeability. Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know that it is or not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as parameters are all thore directions? Q. And you say that is that how I understood your testimony?		the water. Vertically, say, then we're more focused on		0. So if the formula in this numn test is based
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that. I just didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know. I don't know is not, is or is not. Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?		the vertical direction, the permeability.		upon Darcy's law
didn't hear what you said. A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	14		1	-
A. Normally we focus the permeability dimension is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the A. I don't know the formula will require the Q. Are you aware of any groundwater flow formula which is not based on Darcy's law that involves porous media? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	15	didn't hear what you said.	•	
is where we which direction our water were pumping to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	16			•
to. So vertical direction will focus on the permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the 18 porous media? 19 A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	17	is where we which direction our water were pumping	1	formula which is not based on Darguta law that invaluated
permeability in the vertical direction. Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the A. I don't know the formula will require the 19 A. If not homogeneous, is there another similar Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	18		1	porous media?
Q. Is that what the formula that was used in the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the A. I don't know the formula will require the Darcy's law formula which will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. Q. What are the units for transmissivity? A. If I remember right, it is area over time. Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	19			-
the static head pump test assumes? A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the A. I don't know the formula will require the 20 Dately S law lothed will apply in homogeneous media of the soil, I don't know. 21 Media of the soil, I don't know. 22 Q. What are the units for transmissivity? 23 A. If I remember right, it is area over time. 24 Q. And you say that is the same as permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?			1	Parcy's law formula which will apply in Language
A. Yes, it is. Q. It does not assume that the aquifer parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the 22 Q. What are the units for transmissivity? 23 A. If I remember right, it is area over time. 24 Q. And you say that is the same as 25 permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?		the static head pump test assumes?	1	media of the soil I don't brow
Q. It does not assume that the aquifer 23 A. If I remember right, it is area over time. 24 parameters are all the same in all three directions? 25 A. I don't know the formula will require the 26 permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?	22	_ - -		
parameters are all the same in all three directions? A. I don't know the formula will require the 23 A. I don't know the formula will require the 24 Q. And you say that is the same as 25 permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?		•	1	w. milat die the units for transmissivity?
25 A. I don't know the formula will require the 25 permeability? Is that how I understood your testimony?		parameters are all the same in all three directions?	ı	n. II I remember right, it is area over time.
permeability: Is that now I understood your testimony?			1	v. And you say that is the same as
CitiCourt, LLC			!	

In the Matter of Private Fuel Storage

George H. C. Liang * April 17, 2001 PAGE 75 SHEET 10 PAGE 73 75 Case: In the Matter of Private Fuel Storage No. I say permeability can be expressed in Case No.: ASLPB No. 97-732-02-ISFSI Reporter: Vicky McDaniel 1 A. terms of area over time or linear over time. 2 Date taken: April 17, 2001 It can be expressed as both? 3 3 WITNESS CERTIFICATE 4 A. 4 MR. SEEL: No further questions. 5 I, George H.C. Liang, HEREBY DECLARE: (Deposition was concluded at 1:23 p.m.) 6 5 * * * That I am the witness referred to in the 7 foregoing testimony; that I have read the transcript and 6 8 know the contents thereof; that with these corrections I 9 have noted, this transcript truly and accurately reflects my testimony. 10 11 REASON PAGE-LINE CHANGE/CORRECTION 9 12 10 13 11 14 12 13 15 14 16 15 16 17 No corrections were made. 18 17 19 18 George H.C. Liang 19 20 SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to at 20 21 day of 21 , this 22 22 2001. 23 23 24 24 25 Notary Public 25 PAGE 74 74

CERTIFICATE 2 State of Utah SS. 3 County of Utah } I, Vicky McDaniel, a Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah, do hereby certify: That the deposition of George H.C. Liang, the witness in the foregoing deposition named, was taken on April 17, 2001, and that said witness was by me. before examination, duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in said cause;

That the testimony of said witness was reported by me in stenotype and thereafter transcribed 9 into typewriting and that a full, true, and correct transcription of said testimony so taken and transcribed 10 is set forth in the preceding pages.

I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties of said cause of action and that I am not interested in the 13 event thereof. WITNESS MY HAND and OFFICIAL SEAL at Saratoga Springs, Utah, this 23rd day of April, 2001. 15 16 17 18 Vicky McDaniel, RMR Utah License No. 87-108580 19 20 21 22 23

24 25

Case: In the Matter of Private Fuel Storage 1 ASLPB No. 97-732-02-ISFSI Case No.: Reporter: Vicky McDaniel 2 Date taken: April 17, 2001 3 WITNESS CERTIFICATE 4 I, George H.C. Liang, HEREBY DECLARE: 5 That I am the witness referred to in the foregoing testimony; that I have read the transcript and 6 know the contents thereof; that with these corrections I have noted, this transcript truly and accurately 7 reflects my testimony. 8 REASON CHANGE/CORRECTION PAGE-LINE in the fluid mechanics area typo error 9 tunnel 55 feet long and then typo error 21_ 4_ I have involved in lot of projects typo error 6 I participated in environmental report typo error 6 6 10 which I participated in, what happens typo error 9 6 typo error , and then assume a scenario 10 6 11 that the fluid hit the ground and the typo error 11 stations also involved, .., like Shoreham 14 typo error if a storm occurs, results in runoff, typo error 18 12 but at one point, I did involve. typo error 23 Webster is a very diverse company. typo error 24 technical personnel resource support typo error 13 I was involved in pumping test when 18 <u>typo error</u> As a matter of fact, I most recently, typo error 19 14 typo error 14 -- if it has 8 something in well analysis, data came in typo error 8 I mean, we still do lots of modeling typo error 9 8 15 [continued on next page] 16 No corrections were made. 17 18 19 SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to at Stoughton, Norfolk County, Comm 20 , this 15^{A} day of 21 22 2001. 23 24 Notary Public 25

PAGE-LINE	CHANGE/CORRECTION	REASON
9 9	but not on the latest project.	<u>typo error</u>
9 11	models, surface water model, and run	typo error
9 12	the models.	
9 21	On sections,	typo error
9 22	in the environmental report	<u>typo error</u>
10 20	to use in remediation of	<u>typo error</u>
10 21	different models.	typo error
11 3	the areas when we prepare project report,	<u>typo error</u>
11 22	say those required steps is not saying that I	typo error
	participated in every step on PFS project	
11 23	have to go to the PFS project management.	typo error
$\frac{11}{11}$ 24	specific for this I was brought on board	typo error
$\frac{11}{11}$ $\frac{25}{25}$, so those considerations: the	typo error
$\frac{11}{12}$ $\frac{23}{1}$	format to do this and how it is determined,	typo error
15 3	I need to know specifically what area?	typo error
15 4	Environmental Report covers so many sections,	typo error
	so many areas.	
15 5	And your question did I help prepare the	typo error
155	environmental	
15 6	report? I can not answer. All I can answer: I	typo error
	prepared hydrology section of	typo error
	We used references	typo_error
	, which has a NRC Reg guideline	typo error
	by the reg quideline, all the resulting	typo error
<u> 15 18</u>	information, required by the	<u> </u>
15 25	That is the reg guide, guideline gives you	typo error
$\frac{15}{16}$ $\frac{25}{2}$	Very detailed, what you should be used	typo error
16 25	or only few perennial streams,	typo error
$\frac{16}{17}$ $\frac{23}{1}$	very few, or none at the site.	typo error
$\frac{17}{17}$	we have found is some reservoirs or ponds	typo error
18 19	well, CBT No.5, which we installed a casing	typo error
$\frac{18}{21}$ $\frac{1}{1}$	They analyzed the soil at the Skull Valley.	Typo error
$\frac{21}{22} \frac{14}{14}$	In my engineering experience, we say this	typo error
22 15	order of magnitude.	typo error
$\frac{22}{22}$ $\frac{13}{21}$, not only when you hit the aquifer,	typo error
$\frac{22}{22}$ $\frac{22}{22}$	only depending upon permeability, but also	typo error
	depending upon so-called	
22 24	There are two	typo error
$\frac{22}{22}$ 25	coefficients in there.	Typo error
23 6	You have another coefficient also affecting	typo error
$\frac{-23}{27}$ 17	back on the reference based formula or the	typo error
	reason it derived	
27 19	I believe the formula also defines the way	typo error
28 1	by the unit of individual terms.	Typo error
28 6	I just calculate the unit and come out	typo error
28 7	after I cancelled all same units in this	typo error
	calculation,	•
2925	Normally we extract water when we hit this	typo error
30 1	water coming out, hit a depth which	typo error
30 2 & 3	It could be deeper or shallower at some other	type error
<u> </u>	locations. But at that spot, yes , we	typo error
30 4	have a silty sand type of soil and we hit the	typo error
	water.	
31 11	Actually, there are two ways.	typo error
$\frac{31}{31} \frac{11}{12}$	don't want the surface water to go down	
	surface water quality will be	typo error
31 13 32 3	a Driscoll's book, authored by Driscoll,	typo error
	Is very important to follow the quideline	typo error
	Because, as I said earlier, it prevents	typo error
33 20	As I said earlier, the bentonite	typo error
33 23	keeps the water which you pump from the well	typo error
<u> 34 1 </u>	casing, is clear.	CANO GITOT
	casing, is clear.	

[continued on next page]

PAGE-LINE	CHANGE/CORRECTION	REASON
	This practice is also for any	typo error
34 3 34 4	residential use when you have your own	typo error
35 1	After the information was presented in the ER.	typo error
$\frac{35}{37}$ $\frac{1}{25}$	You say taken the	typo error
	Were these in the ER or SAR, I forgot, we'd	typo error
	say there is very little chance to infiltrate	typo error
38 6 38 25	, you know, because you drill a hole, so	typo error
$\frac{38}{39}$ $\frac{25}{1}$	those are coming from the side way.	typo error
$\frac{39}{39}$ 20	everything follow the rule and procedure, or	typo error
40 9	which originally came from the hole	typo error
40 20	specifically in the ER, CBT No. 5	typo error
$\frac{40}{41}$	make some field notes.	typo error
42 6	colleague who is in Denver	typo error
42 17	It is my belief, yes.	typo error
43 1	That is the area I'm not in a position to	typo error
43 2	answer, because the engineer designed the	typo error
	sewer system would	
44 21	No, because I'm not involved in the original	<u>typo error</u>
45 11	I remember the ER Sections have addressed	typo error
45 14	identify the sources of the water come from.	typo error
45 19	much water used during different phases of	typo error
45 20	project, from construction to operation phase	typo error
48 13	water bodies, recharge and discharge areas,	typo error
49 22	We have done and sent to NRC either in the SAR	typo error
49 23	answering to request for additional information	<u>typo error</u>
	from NRC, the	
50 2	described in the ER: in the Skull Valley where	typo error
50 3	recharge and discharge area.	typo error
51 2	I don't like to go to a five-mile radius.	typo error
51 3	the guideline. In my expert opinion it is too	typo error
51 5	, it's too conservative, and is	typo error
51 9	I don't know. Because that is the guideline.	typo error
51 10	don't know the bases of this requirement, because the quideline what the	cypo error
11	technical bases behind the NRC's thinking. The	typo error
5111	guideline	C/DU GIEGE
51 12	saying that you have to cover a radius of five	typo error
5112	miles. I	
51 14	, because normally a pumping well, I shouldn't	typo error
$\frac{51}{52}$ $\frac{14}{24}$	based on those 42 years annual average rate,	typo error
53 6	Based on that 42 years annual average use	typo error
53 7	gallon per day, convert to 1.42 gallon	typo error
53 8	unit is 2.29 acre feet per year. That amount	typo error
53 15	within a five-mile radius	typo error
53 23		typo error
54 4	the answer to one of the request for	<u>typo error</u>
54 5	we have found one more recent reference	typo error
	published	
54 8		typo error
	water needs for hosting the Superconducting	
54 9		typo error
55 2		typo error
55 20	, I don't know which question. I said in '87,	typo error
55 24	their proposal planning of hosting SSC project	typo error
56 9	011/ 1/022/ 01100	typo error
61 10	0022011	typo error
61 14		typo error
62 14		typo error
63 6		typo error
63 7		typo error
63 8		typo error
	changes.	

[continued on next page]

PAGE-LINE		CHANGE/CORRECTION	REASON	
63	9	is significantly lowered, and reduced	typo	error
63	21	5,000 acre-feet.	typo	error
64_	2	, based on my technical experience in this area	typo	error
64	3	One of the authors is a hydrologist, the	<u>typo</u>	error
		other is a chemist		
67	21	textbook expressed in the area over time unit	<u>typo</u>	error
72	9	I thought the assumption is	typo	error
$\frac{-\frac{72}{72}}{}$	11	would say this is the same as what you just	<u>typo</u>	error

adverse [1] 52:21

•					
0					
0.142 [1] 19:10					
0.2 (1) 21:12					
0.44 [1] 22:3					
0.6 (1) 21:12					
1					
1 [4] 22:4 34.16 35:24 64:20					
1.17 (1) 48:1					
1.2 [4] 21:24 22:2,5,6					
1.42 [1] 53:7					
1:10 (1) 65:18					
1:23 [1] 73:6					
10:25 [1] 34:9					
10:41 [1] 34:9					
100 [1] 3:14					
11:11 [1] 47:24					
11:19 [1] 47:24					
11:59 [1] 65:18					
119 (1) 16:5					
120 [1] 21:25					
122 [1] 30:13					
125.5 [1] 30:13					
142 [3] 19:1 21:10,25					
1567 [3] 47:7,17,18					
17 [1] 74:7					
19 [2] 60:11 63:10					
1957 [2] 59:24 60:7 1963 [2] 59:20 60:4					
1963 (2) 59:20 60:4					
1965 [2] 60:5,8					
1968 [4] 54:1 55:16,18 60:13					
1987 [3] 54:6,8 55:24					
1999 [1] 24:10					
2					
2 [8] 6:15 20:23 21:13 24:20 34:16					
35:24 46:24 47:3					
2,040 [1] 53:6					
2-12 [1] 46:24					
2-23 [2] 20:24 21:6					
2.29 [3] 53:8 55:14 62:13					
2.4.5 [1] 46:25					
2.6-2 [1] 34:15					
2.6-23 [1] 20:10					
2001 [4] 24:21 74:7,15 75:22					
20037-1128 (1) 2:8					
22nd [1] 24:10					
23rd [1] 74:15					
24 [1] 36:10					
27 [1] 24:21					
28 [3] 58 :25 59 :4,5					
29 [3] 25:13,14,16					
3					
3 [3] 2:15 6:8 29:9					
3,500 [1] 59:25					
3-1/4 [8] 36:8,13,15,20,24 37:1,3					
0-11-1-100.0, 10, 10,20,27 0111,0					

30 [2] 25:16 36:11 30.000 [1] 61:3 4 [2] 21:23 22:1 4.100 [1] 60:4 4.2 [3] 15:24,24 16:3 40 [5] 53:3 61:25 62:7 64:12,15 42 [4] 52:13,24 53:6 62:14 5 5 [8] 18:19 23:22 24:16,19,22,25 27: 8 40:20 5,000 [7] 55:12 56:6 60:5,12,20 63: 12,21 50.000 [1] 61:3 55 [1] 5:21 57 [1] 64:10 6 6 [2] 20:23 21:13 65 [1] 59:20 67 [1] 2:16 7 70 [1] 6:5 8 8 [1] 34:17 8/31/99 [1] 35:24 80 [1] 6:5 84114-0873 [1] 2:5 87 [1] 55:20 87-108580 [1] 74:19 a.m [3] 34:9 47:24 65:18 ability [2] 23:12 72:4 able [3] 16:15 43:22 62:16 above [1] 28:4 according [5] 27:24 32:6 59:24 60:3 71:9 accurate [4] 55:17,18 63:14 64:1 accurately [1] 75:7 acquire [1] 22:17 acquiring [1] 29:23 acre [13] 53:8 55:13,14 56:6 59:25 60:5,9,10,12,21 61:3 62:13 63:12 acreage [1] 59:21 act [2] 38:9,22 acting [1] 31:1 action [2] 31:2 74:13 actual [2] 8:6 52:24 actually [8] 8:2 13:19 31:4,11,13 36:7 47:25 55:3 add [1] 19:21 additional [4] 46:6 49:23 54:4 64:

address [5] 3:12,14 45:24 46:2 52:

addressed [6] 45:11,15,16 46:8

52:12 54:5

admissions [1] 16:5

adversely [1] 10:25 affect [3] 23:6 31:17 39:4 affecting [1] 10:25 agree [3] 38:18 44:23 65:3 agriculture [1] 20:25 ahead [3] 4:20 14:13 61:17 air (2) 5:22 57:23 allow [1] 58:4 already [5] 29:9 33:1 45:16 49:3 55:19 ambiguity [1] 4:13 ambiguous [8] 42:23 43:8 44:17 45:2.10 46:15 51:19 62:5 amended [2] 6:6 9:22 amount [12] 18:5 52:25 54:22,23 60:2,8,18 61:9,10,11,19,24 amounts [4] 8:25 17:10 28:22 29: analysis [13] 8:10 9:22,24 10:7, 12: 21 13:10 20:12 21:5 34:16 48:18, 18 50:17 52:19 analyze [2] 21:1 44:25 analyzed [1] 27:25 analyzes [1] 45:23 analyzing [4] 12:10,25 13:3 45:25 annual [6] 52:13,24 53:6 60:21 61: 2.18 another [5] 8:19 35:18 55:21 69: 19 72:19 answer [32] 4:11,24 11:21,23 12:4 14:14 15:6.6 16:16 17:8 19:14 32: 25 37:24 39:17 42:8 43:2 45:3 46: 6.15 49:23 50:23 54:4 56:2 57:5 58:6 61:16 62:9.12 63:25 66:3.6. answered [8] 32:24 33:1 37:23 46: 9 54:3 55:19 63:16 66:13 answering [1] 65:21 answers [1] 66:9 appears [1] 16:6 applicant [1] 2:6 applicant's [4] 12:22 13:1 14:2 16: apply [1] 72:20 appreciate [1] 50:24 approach [2] 11:17 26:21 approximately [1] 35:9 april [3] 24:10 74:7,15 apropos [1] 70:8 aquifer [50] 7:17 14:3 22:21 23:4, 24 28:16 32:20 33:7 37:22 38:4, 10 46:12,16,17,19,21 48:4,5 49:5, 7,9,11,12,25 50:14,18,22 51:17 52: 2,25 53:10,20,22 54:23 55:2 56:4, 10,13,13,20,23,25 57:2 58:5,21 60: 16 61:25 62:7,15 70:23 aquifers [3] 23:1 48:9 58:13 area [32] 5:17,18 6:5,7,10 8:10,18, 18 9:1 15:3,4 17:7 19:4,5,5 21:9 30:5 33:14 36:3 42:5,20 43:1 50:3

53:17 57:16 64:2 67:18.21.23 68: 16 72:23 73:2 areas [7] 10:22 12:9 48:7,13 49:17 58:11.15 army [1] 59:22 around [3] 31:19 32:18 57:15 article [1] 10:18 aspect [1] 44:12 aspects [1] 10:5 asserts [1] 32:11 assistant [1] 3:16 associated [5] 25:6.21 26:2 43:23 48:6 assume [4] 4:17 18:12 70:7.23 assumes [3] 70:21 71:23 72:7 assuming (1) 8:11 assumption [3] 69:19 70:2 72:9 assumptions [3] 69:13,16 71:19 atomic [1] 3:8 attachment [1] 29:10 attorney [2] 2:4 3:17 auger [2] 36:14,23 augers [2] 36:9.14 author [1] 32:3 authority [1] 65:15 authors [2] 65:3,7 automatically [1] 56:22 availability [5] 52:3,10,22 53:9 65: available [7] 9:11 44:10 53:19 54: 12 56:8 60:15 63:2 average [1] 52:13 aware [2] 58:11 72:16 axes [1] 68:13 В b-1 [1] 35:21

b-e-n-t-o-n-i-t-e [1] 30:14 back [15] 20:5 27:8,17 28:13 32:17 39:9,23 40:2,4,9,21 63:21 68:1 69: 12 71:4 backfill [2] 37:11 40:21 backfilled [3] 37:9.16 40:18 backfilling [1] 38:20 background [3] 4:9 5:12,13 backvard [1] 34:5 balance [1] 56:10 base [2] 19:25 53:19 based [22] 14:10 15:13 17:9 18:8 35:11 37:13 52:12,24 53:6,14 56: 8 59:19 63:2 64:2 71:6,8,9,14,21,

basic [1] 71:18 basics [1] 71:4 become [2] 18:20 31:3 bedrock [1] 37:8 behind [3] 5:11 32:22 51:11 belief [1] 42:17 believe [16] 19:21 20:18 21:7,12 25:10 27:19 29:8 41:22 45:21 52: 12 54:3 56:5 60:23 61:5 63:25 65:

23 72:12.17

CitiCourt, LLC 801.532.3441

38:15

3-3 [1] 20:12

3-inch [1] 36:10

10 beneath [1] 48:6 bentonite (14) 30:14.15 31:18.18 **32** 23,23 **33**·5,6,11,18,23 **37**:16,17 40:13 between [16] 5:22 16:7,12 17:5.6. 20 22:3,7 23:16 26:11.12 58:20 60:6,7 66:1,24 beyond [1] 65:5 bit [3] 4:8 51:22 66:2 blake [2] 68:2 69:6 board [4] 3.9 11:24 12:13,18 bodies [1] 48:13 body [2] 6:12 17:16 book [2] 25:24 32:7 bore [1] 40:19 borehole [9] 29:16 32:14 34:20 37: 1 38:15 39:9,14 40:7,21 boreholes [8] 35·3,9,15 37:12 38: 21 40:14,18 41:5 boring [8] 18:21 34:22 35:19,21 36:4 40:22,23 41:20 boston [1] 6:3 both [3] 45 6 64:24 73:3 bother [1] 33:18 bottled [1] 44:12 bottom [3] 22:9 25:15 29:16 boundaries [3] 5.9 10:10 14:21 boundary [2] 12:1 50:21 bounding [1] 48:19 break [6] 4.20,21,23,25 34:7,8 breaks [1] 4:21 bring [3] 5:21 11:24 44:12 brought [2] 12:13.18 building [2] 6:10 20:11 built [1] 69:13 buried [1] 63.9 business [1] 3:13

 \mathbf{c}

calculated [1] 18:25 calculation [12] 18:25 19:14,17 22:2,7 23:23 24:6,10 27:16 29:11 45:18 52:23 calculations [1] 24:7 call [1] 72:10 came [4] 8:11 18:8 28:7 60:22 cancelled 111 28:7 canister [1] 20:11 cannot [3] 15:6 19:14 39:17 carefully [1] 32:2 case [2] 4:8 75:1 casing [6] 18:19 33:3,21,22 34:1 49:16 casually [1] 57:20 categories [1] 21:2 cause [4] 58:17,19 74·8,13 caused [1] 50:18 cbt [2] 18:19 40:20 cbt-5 [1] 19:25

cement [7] 31:6,18 32 8,23 33:5

37:16 40:13 center [1] 3:14 certain [1] 69:13 certify [2] 74:5.12 chance [1] 38:6 chancellor [1] 2:3 change [7] 26:11 30:2 39:7 40:6. 10 56:14 60:15 changed [3] 26:17 56:11 60:13 chapter [1] 45:13 characteristics [3] 64-23,24-69: charge [1] 55:2 check [1] 27:16 chemist [1] 64:3 cherry [1] 25:12 choose [2] 46:11 50:10 circular [1] 30:21 circumference [1] 30:21 city [1] 2:5 civil [1] 5:15 claim [1] 65:14 clarify [3] 4:16 38:1 63:12 classification (1) 21:3 clay [9] 17:4,4 20:20 21:3,3,23,24 22:1.3 clavs [1] 32:10 cleanup (1) 6:25 clear [4] 33:9 34:1 38:17 65:25 closest [1] 48:21 co-worker [2] 35:8 39:18 coefficient [4] 22:25 23:4,6,8 colleague [6] 35:4,6,7 42.6,13 43: collect [4] 8:21 11:16 18:13 41:15 collected [2] 18:16,24 come [13] 6:18 7:14 28:6,14 31:2, 15 34:2 40:9 45:14 46:10 53:5 54: 18 63:21 coming [15] 30:1,20,22,24 31·4,9, 16 33:2,3,21 38:24 39:1 52:14 54: 14 65:12 comment [2] 37:6 68:2 commission [1] 2:10 common [1] 39:11 compact [1] 40:8 company [2] 6:24 43:21 compare [4] 10:20 21:14,18 53:11 compared [3] 53:9 55:13 62:17 comparison [1] 21:25 completed [1] 41:2 comply [2] 15:21 48:25 comprehensive [4] 64:5,20 65:8, compressed [2] 39.23 40:5 computer [1] 41:9 concentrations [1] 48:21 concluded [3] 38·2 55:21 73:6

conclusion [18] 16:19 17.7 18:2,9

28:14 34:12 53:5 54:2,6,14,19,20,

22,25 55:11,21 56:8 65:12

conclusions [2] 17:9 54:1 conduct [1] 54:10 conductivity [7] 23:17,20 25:19 26:13,14 27:3 28:10 confirm [2] 24:17 48:2 confirmed [1] 32:2 connecticut [3] 5:16,19,25 connection [1] 17:19 conservatism [1] 51:14 conservative [3] 51:3.5.8 consider [6] 8:9.14.23 9:13 19:18. consideration [1] 11:25 considerations [1] 64:19 constant [2] 18:23 23:25 constitute [1] 46:21 constitutes [1] 46:18 construct [2] 43:9,15 construction [8] 7:16 29:12 30:6 32.4,5 43:6 44:4 45:20 consumption [1] 59·21 contaminant (3) 12:22 13:7,15 contamination [3] 13:24 14:7 48: contention [13] 3:19,19,22 8 22 10:3,5 12:15 13:14,22 14:1,6,10 16:5 continue (1) 11:11 contour [1] 48:12 contract [1] 41:1 control [1] 6:19 conversion [5] 21:19.21 22:6 26: 7,12 convert |2| 26:5,9 converted [1] 26:15 copy [1] 58:23 corporation [3] 6:3 23:23 35:23 correct [17] 10:14 25 8 26:18 27: 13 28:19 37:22 42:4 43:7 52:17 59:5 62:3 66:10,16,25 68:5 69:1 74:10 correctly [4] 12:4 14:9 55.9 60:7 correspond [1] 65:7 county [1] 74:3 couple [1] 40:19 course [2] 11:22 62:16 coverage [1] 64:22 covers [1] 15:4 coworkers 1118:7 cpt [1] 49:15 cumulative [1] 52:20 current [5] 53:1,18 60:22 61:8,11 cuttings [1] 40:14 ח

d.c [1] 2:8 darcy's [10] 71:14,15,18,19,23,23 72:7,13,17,20 data [21] 8.11,12,15,21 11:16 14: 11 15:15 18:13,16,24 24:7 41:15 53:11,12,20 55:16,18 62:20 63:3,

25 64:22 dated [3] 24·10,20 35:24 dates [2] 59:9,10 day [11] 6:4 19:1,10 21:10,24,24,25 22:2,3,4 74:15 dealing [6] 68:25 69:1,3,17 71:19, decharge [3] 48:13 50:3 53:23 decide [5] 11:16,20 15:16 18:21 70:10 decided |1111:12 decision [2] 12:2 17:14 deep [1] 62:23 deeper [1] 30:3 define [3] 27:19 38:14 71:11 defined [3] 32:13 66:17 71:13 definition [1] 38:11 degradation [2] 10:23,24 demonstrate [1] 52:23 denise [1] 2:3 denser [1] 58:8 density (2) 39:24 40:5 denver [1] 42:6 department [1] 20:25 depend [3] 19:22 22:22 56:15 depending [6] 22:18 56:19 66:7 68:13 69:5 70:11 deposed [2] 3:24,25 deposition (6) 3:18 4:1,4,9 73:6 74:6 depth [5] 17:24 18:4 28:20 29:1 30: derived [2] 41:12,20 describe [2] 20:17 59:16 described [3] 40:21 48:8 50:2 design [2] 42:16 43:2 designed [1] 42:6 detail [1] 39:12 detailed । व 16:2 64:16,22 detect [1] 48:14 determination [2] 23:24 56:22 determine [7] 23:12 44:14 45:7 52:19 58:20 68:14.24 determined [6] 12:1 46:12,18 49: 7 53:16 57:1 determining [3] 12:22 43:17 68: developed [2] 20:25 39:21 development [1] 64:16 diameter [13] 18:22 35:14 36:8,10, 11,14,15,17,21,22,23 37:4 38:15 differ [1] 69:4 difference [10] 22:7,12 23:16 27: 15 60:19 66:1,24 67:1,5 68:24 different [17] 8:16 10:21 26 6,13, 21 37:18 45:19 51:24 54:6 55:22 63:22 66:9 67:20 68:20,22 70:2,3 differs [2] 23:2 27:16 dimension [6] 69:5,6,8,9 70:10,16 dimensions [5] 23:2 68:13,15 69: 25 70:2

direct [4] 16:7,12,19 18:9 direction [18] 66:8,15,19,25 67:6 69:6,9,10 70:11,11,13,17,18,19 71: 1,3 72:2,8 directions [5] 66:11 68:19 70:9.24 71:25 dirt [1] 40:2 discharge [5] 48:7,13 59:19 61:2 64:24 disclosed [1] 41:24 discrepancy [1] 41:3 discussing [1] 19:24 disperse [1] 6:12 disposal [2] 42:3,10 disrupting [1] 39:3 distance [3] 58:20 67:19,22 diverse [1] 6:24 document [23] 20:15 23:22 24:14. 16,24 25:23 27:9 29:8 34:14,21, 23,24,25 35:18 37:7 41:10,11 46: 22 47:5,11,14 59:6,13 documents [6] 13:11,18,20 14:18 15:11 41:11 doing [3] 11:14 15:21 39:6 dollar [1] 72:9 done [11] 8:1 14:22 21:18 22:6 49: 22 52:19 61:8.18 65:13 68:6.14 down [12] 21:25 31:10.15,22 33:7, 13.24 41:15 42:19,24 66:4,15 downgradient [1] 48:22 downgrading [1] 14:7 downward [7] 20:8,19 22:19 28: 15 32:11 34:13 37:21 draw [1] 55:13 draw-down [2] 48:10 52:2 drill [1] 49:15 drilled [3] 37:15 39.4.19 driller (3) 39:16.19 41:8 driller's [1] 39:16 drilling [6] 35:2 36:8,12 37:2 38: 24 40:12 driscoll [3] 32:3,3,7 drive (1) 3:14 dropping [1] 62:25 dry [1] 61:25 dugway [1] 63:7 duly [1] 3:3 during [8] 16:23 37:2 45:19 46:5 54:3 59:10,19,20

Ε

each |5| 11:16 21:15 45:22,25 72:8 earlier |3| 33:20,23 65:21 early |1| 6:4 east |1| 20:12 easy |1| 20:20 education |1| 5:13 educational |1| 5:12 effect |3| 33:25 44:15 52:21 effects |9| 13:1 14:2 43:18,23 44:2, 2.5 45:1,8

George H. C. Liang either [3] 44:9 46:9 49:22 electrical [1] 59:20 elevation [4] 30:13 62:23 63:8.9 elevations [1] 48:16 encountered [1] 37:8 encroach [1] 58:5 encroached [1] 58:12 encroachment [1] 58:18 end [2] 42:25 65:12 engineer [4] 6:3 7:20 40:25 43:2 engineered [1] 42:6 engineering [5] 5:15 22:14 23:23 35:23 41:18 engineers [1] 18:25 english [2] 26:19,20 enough [3] 19:19 37:20 38:3 entire [3] 24:24 61:21,23 entitled [7] 20:10,11 23:24 34:14 35:18 46:25 64:12 environment [3] 11:6,12 50:13 environmental [28] 6:25 9:19 10: 6,7,22 11:15 12:5,10 13:1,8 15:1, 4,7,24 43:18,23 44:1,2,5,14,25 45: 8,21,25 51:17,19,24 57:9 equally [1] 72:8 equation [1] 71:8 equilibrium [1] 28:4 er [21] 11:8 13:8 15:9,12,14,21 20: 21 21:7 35:1 38:5 40:20 44:9 45: 11,16 46:9 49:8 61:1,4,5,6 62:21 escaping [1] 57:23 esq [2] 2:3,6 estimate [2] 60:7 61:1 estimated [2] 59:18 60:2 estimates [1] 64:18 estimation [1] 23:25 evaluate [1] 11:6 evaluation [4] 11:9 16:24 20:22. 24 evaporate [1] 57:23 evapotranspiration [1] 57:21 even [2] 6:15 62:18 everything [1] 39:20 exact [3] 44:19 58:2,19 exactly [2] 45:12 46:5 examination [6] 2:15,16 3:5 65: 19 67:11 68:9 examined [1] 3:4 example [1] 6:8 excuse [2] 26:23 52:4 exhaustive [1] 65:15 exist [1] 41:4 existing [5] 13:11,18 15:16 48:22 64:23 expand [1] 67:21 expect [2] 14:23 69:4 experienced [2] 7:15 70:4 expert [31] 3:22 5:6,7,9,10 8:9,12, 23 9:13 10:10,11,16 14:9,22,23,24

24 16:15 17:9 21:4 37:13 38:20

40:8.11 43:22 48:24 50:20 51:3,5

55:14 62:17
expertise [1] 8:10
explain [4] 4:8 16:18 18:15 60:20
express [2] 26:6 67:18
expressed [3] 27:25 73:1,3
expressing [1] 67:14
extensive [1] 64:1
extract [5] 29:25 53:20 56:25 57:
14 70:11
extracted [1] 53:18
extraction [1] 56:23

F facility [10] 3:10 11:13 16:3 43:7

45:23 50:11 51:16 52:9 55:25 62: fact [4] 7:19 10:17 11:2 65:11 factor [5] 17:24 26:7 56:15 58:20. factors [14] 17:13 18:4,8,12,13 20: 6 28:13,17,20,24 34:11 56:17,18, familiar [17] 3:19 8:5,16 10:3,6 16: 8.14 23:19 24:4 34:23 39:10 42:9, 15.18.21 57:18 71:15 far 151 10:23 12:21 41:4 50:18 59: fate [2] 42:19,23 federal [2] 9:10 11:7 feel [2] 55:18 59:13 feet [26] 5:21 19:1,10 21:10,23,24, 25,25 **22:**2,2,3 **26:**10,15 **53:**8 **55:** 13.14 56:6 60:1,5,9,10,12,21 62: 14 63:12.21 few [1] 16:25 field (9) 40:16,23 41:1,4,5,15,16,19, figure 16 14:22 20:10,10 34:14 53: 15 **56:**6 figures [1] 20:16 file-mile (1) 50:7 fill [3] 37:14 39:1 41:3 fills [1] 39:14 filter [3] 31:1.1 33:25 find (2) 5:8 14:16 finished [1] 26:1 first [12] 3:3 11:8,18,21 22:10 29:1 49:4.10 58:1 60:24 64:14,15 five [9] 35:12,12 50:10,12,14,21 51 12 53:14 62:21 five-mile [6] 17:15 49:24 50:9,25 53:15.17 florida [1] 58:16 flow [8] 5:17 28:3 66:25 69:1 71:1, 15 72:5.16 flows [1] 72:8 fluid [2] 71:15 72:4 fluids [1] 42:19 focus [4] 5:16,19 70:16,18 focused [1] 70:12 follow [3] 28:23 32:6 39:20

follow-up [2] 68:7.11 following [1] 64:19 follows [1] 3:4 foot [2] 22:4 26:9 foregoing [1] 75:6 forgot [2] 38:5 53:22 format [1] 11:14 formation [3] 8:18 30:8,16 formations [3] 8:17,24 20:18 formula [21] 27:17,18,19,20,24,25 69:14 70:20.25 71:2,6,6,7,10,11, 14,17,21 72:12,17,20 formulate [1] 9:9 forth [2] 5:7 74:11 forty [1] 62:1 fossil [3] 6:15,17 11:4 found [6] 16:25 17:3,16,17 44:10 49-16 foundation [1] 20:11 four [4] 6:16 35:12.12.12 free [1] 59:13 freeze [1] 25:12 fresh [2] 58:8,12 fuel [6] 3:8,9 12:3,20 62:2 75:1 full (1) 74:10 function [1] 67:19 further [5] 65:13 67:25 68:9 73:5 74:12 future [1] 49:21

G

gallon [2] 53:7.7 gaukler [45] 2:6,16 14:13 24:5,12, 20.23 25:23 28:11 32:12,24 34:6 37:23 41:6,13,21 42:22 43:8,25 44:17 45:2,10 46:14 47:4,10,13, 23 50:19 51:18,21,23 54:15,20 57: 4 59:7.11 61:15,21 62:4,8 63:15, 20 67:12,24,25 general [9] 2:4 3:17 11:13 16:18 39:5 41:17 42:11 51:25 52:1 generally [2] 6:1 58:8 generate [1] 41:2 generated [2] 40:23 41:10 geologic [2] 8:17,18 geological [1] 8:21 geologist [2] 39:13 41:9 geology [1] 18:22 george [5] 2:14 3:2,13 74:6 75:19 geotechnical [6] 8:20 17:3 18:23, 25 34:15 40:25 gets [1] 47:23 getting [2] 20:5 27:8 give [8] 6:7 7:5,20 8:12 15:25 43:4, 22 68:8 given [1] 64:18 giving [2] 4:10 5:10 goal [1] 11:5 government [2] 9:10,15 graduate [1] 5:15 graduated [1] 5:24

graph [1] 48:20 great [1] 58:4 greater [3] 53:17 54:23 65:4 ground [7] 6:11 7:3 18:4 37:9 38.6. 17 62:24 groundwater [44] 5:18 6:7,11 7:4 10.16,19,23 11:1 13:23 14:6 16:7. 12 17:7,21,22,24 25:11 28:20 29: 1 31.8,15 32:3,7 33:2 37:8 44:10 48.5,8,19 49:16,24 50:2.6 56:3 57: 8,11,15 58:3 61:2 63:9 64:6 70:4 7 72:16 group [6] 8:19.20 17:3 18:23 21:2 72:2 guess [4] 19:18 48:1 51:13 69:9 guide [4] 15:24,25 16:3 48:1 guideline (5) 15:14,25 32:6 51:3,4

Н

guidelines [2] 11:8 51:11

h.c [3] 3:13 74:6 75:19 hand [2] 58:23,23 handbook [2] 32:3,7 handwritten [2] 40:22 41 8 happen [1] 6:9 happens [1] 6:18 hardly [1] 17:5 hazardous [1] 10:20 head [6] 18:23 23:25 48:16 70:21 71:7.11 hear [2] 12:17 70:15 heard [2] 67:14 68-4 heat [4] 22:21 29:25 30:1,4 height [1] 28:4 help [3] 13:19 14:19 15.1 helped [2] 9:23 15:8 helper [1] 39:16 hereby [1] 74:5 heterogeneity [1] 23:1 himself [1] 40.25 hit [1] 6:11 hole 191 18:21 38:17,18,25 39:7,23 40:4,9,17 holes [2] 38:8.9 hollow [4] 36:9.14.18.20 homogeneous [3] 72:10,19,20 homogenous [3] 69:20,22 71:20 hood [19] 53:20,25 54:5,7,8,13,18 55:1,10 56:6,9,13 57:2,18 58:24 60:7,21 63:13,24 hood's [1] 55:22 horizontal [3] 22:24 23:4 66:22 host [1] 54:8 hour [4] 20:23 21:12.13 34:6 however [2] 37:13 52:17 hundred [1] 60:10 hydraulic [8] 23:16,19 25:19 26: 13,14 27:3 28:10 64:23 hydrochemical [1] 48:18 hydrologic [4] 15:8 16:12,20 17.

hydrological [4] 14:7 16:7 18:9 48:6 hydrologist [1] 64:3 hydrology [11] 5:18,25 6:7,18 8: 23 9:21,25 10:1 15:7 16:1 46:25

i.e [1] 44:6 identified [6] 25·2,18 34:21 36:3 49:8.12 identify [6] 36:6 44:19 45:14 49:2, 13.17 impact [17] 10:22 11.6,9 13.9 14:6 45:15,24,25 46:2,11 51:17 52:2. 10,15,20 53:1 57:9 impacts [13] 10:6,7 11:13,15 12 6, 10 50:13,14,18,22 51:1,20,24 impermeable [2] 22:17 38:3 important [1] 58:22 inch [6] 20:23 21:13 35:17 36:8,11, inches [10] 18:19 21:12 35:16 36:

10.15,20,24 37:1,3 38:16 include [2] 48:16 64:19 included [3] 16:1 48:23 56:6 including (2) 5:17 6:6 increased [1] 60:9 independent [1] 50:17 indicate [3] 40:18 53:22 65:4 indicated [2] 49:21 50:5 individual [3] 28:1 42:15 56:16 individually [1] 56:19 infer (1) 66:6 inferred [1] 72:11 infiltrate (1) 38:6

influence [1] 24:1 information [10] 14:11 15:12.18 46:7 48:15 49:23 54:4 55:1.2 56:9 informs [1] 68·2 initial [1] 12:5 input [3] 7:5 15:15 71:2 inside [6] 36:8,13,17,18,20,22 insignificant (3) 53:10 55:15 62:

install [4] 18:19,21 30:9 42:3 installation [1] 48:17 installed @ 7:24 29:24 32:15 56:

13 57:2 62:22 instead [1] 40:14 intending [1] 22:16 intends [4] 42:2 43:5,11,15 interconnected [1] 57:12

interconnection [1] 17:5 interested [1] 74:13 Intervals [1] 48:17 introductory [1] 25:11

inventory [2] 64.5.20 investigate [1] 50:12

investigation [4] 8:21 17:2 64:17 65:4

investigations [1] 34:16

involve [3] 6:4,17 42:10 involved [12] 6:14,16,21 7:18 9:18 12:7,10,21,25 13:6 35:2 44:21 involvement [2] 13:4,10 involves [1] 72:17 irrigation [1] 17:18 isn't [2] 11:19 30:15 issue [3] 16:16 46 8 52:12 itself [5] 33:4,22 36:23 39:7 49.8

iobs (1) 5:25 judge [1] 63:24

keep [1] 34:1 kin [1] 74:12 kind [8] 7:21 18:13 42:4 45:15 52: 14,25 53.8 62:23 knowledge [3] 41:25 50:16 61:23

K

kurt [1] 3:16 laboratory [1] 5:20 lack [5] 16:6,11 57:5 62:5,8 lake [2] 2.5 58:5 large [2] 64:24.25 last [3] 53:22 64:8,11 later [2] 18:21 41:1 latest [1] 9:9 law [10] 71:14,15,18,19,23,23 72:7, 13,17,20 layer [2] 30:10 38:9 leakage [1] 48:14 least [4] 37:1,3 42:3 43:5 leaves [1] 6:20 length [6] 26:22,24 27:1,4,5 28:7 lengths (1) 28:1 level [3] 8:2 28:5 65:4 levels [2] 48:10 50:1 lewis [2] 42:13,14 liang [8] 2:14 3:2,13,24 14:20 34: 10 74:6 75:19 license [2] 3.9 74:19 licensing (1) 3:8 life [1] 62:14 line [2] 57:4 61:15 linear [2] 67:22 73.2 link 5 16:7,12,20 17:6 18:10 liquid (1) 42:10 liter [2] 27:12 28:3 literature [1] 15:16 little 131 4:8 38.6 66:2 IIc [1] 3:8 located [6] 35:9 47:12 48:4 49:11

logs [9] 7:10,12,16 40:16,19,22 41: 4,5,23 long [2] 36:10,12 look [20] 7:3,7,10,12 8:12 20:13 22: 18 24:3,16,22,23 25:13,16 32:1 34:17 36:1 58:25 59:3,12 60:25 looked [1] 29:9 looking [3] 20:12 29:15 51:1 looks [1] 45:22 lot [8] 5:11 6:4,16 8:20 9:5 56:15 65:11 67:14 low [7] 17:10 21:4 28:21,21 29:3,6 57:11 lower [2] 57:8 58:3 lunch [2] 65:17.18

M made [2] 59:19 64:21 magnitude [1] 22:15

mainly [2] 5.19 59:19 major (1) 5:14 many [13] 7:1 10:5 15:4,4 35:9 49: 2 51:19,23 55:8 57:1 60:9 63:16. map [2] 35:10 48:12 march [1] 24:21 marked [1] 37:9 massachusetts [1] 3:15 material [2] 66:7 71:20 materials [1] 40:6 matter [18] 3:7,9,18 4:6 5.8,10 7: 19.24 9:20 10:10,17 11:2,3 14:25 15:2 26:24 65:11 75:1 mcdaniel [2] 74:4 75:2 mean [13] 9:8 10:24 36:4,14 40:24 41:6 42:22 46:16 56:23 57:25 63: 8 67:3 69:23 means [4] 36:17 38:1 57:22 60:15 measure [1] 66.8 measured [2] 66:3,14 measurement [1] 59:19 measuring [2] 67:4.5 mechanics [1] 5:17 mechanism [2] 5:22 58:2 media [9] 68:25 69:1,3,17,20 71: 16 72:10,18,21 medium [4] 71:24,25 72:1,7 membrane [1] 38:12 memorize [1] 55:6 memory [2] 35:16 61:6 mentioned [3] 11:18 49:2 56:18 merely [1] 14:19 merit [1] 74·4 meter [4] 25:5 26:14 27:25 28:2 meters [2] 25:7 28.5 method [2] 40:21 68.23 methods [4] 36:3,5,6 48:17 metric [2] 26:19,20

might 1317:13 66:8,9

38:10

migrate [6] 32:20 33:7,10,12,13

55:25,25

48:9 63:8

36:4 40:23 41.2,20

logged [1] 40:17

location [6] 30:2 34:15,22 44:19

locations [3] 34:20 48:14 49:25

log [9] 7:13 29:12.15 30:6 35:19

migrating [1] 31:22 migration [8] 20:8,19 22:19 28:16 32:11 34:13 37:21 38:3 mile [1] 6:15 miles [7] 50:10,12,14,21 51:12 62: 21 63:10 millstone [1] 6:8 mind [1] 51:20 minimum [1] 38:15 minute [2] 28:3 53:7 mischaracterizes [1] 54:15 mixture [1] 37:16 model [7] 9:10,11,11 10:19,21 11: 20 15:16 modeling [11] 6:7 9:2,4,11 10:12, 16 11:5,8,18,20 70:4 models [2] 9:16 70:7 moment [1] 27:22 monitor [1] 18:18 monitoring [7] 6:21 7:3,4 18:20, 22 48:14,16 most [2] 6:16 7:19 mostly [2] 6:5 17:3 mountain [1] 64:25 move [1] 63:17 much [13] 19:22 23:5 25:23 38:23 45:19 53:23 54:6 55:3.22 56:15 62:11.13.16 must [2] 41:10 68:4 myself [1] 8:14 -

Ν

name [5] 3:11,13,16 25:12 53:22 named [1] 3:21 national [1] 5:14 natural [1] 65:14 nearest [2] 6:12 52:15 necessary [1] 51:4 need [12] 15:3 21:22 24:23 25:24 38:11 43:9 44:12,15,23 59:12 62: 11 63:21 needed [2] 51:6 64:17 needs [1] 53:3 never [1] 4:4 new [5] 56:12,22,24 57:1 63:17 newer [1] 24:13 next [2] 10:9 44:24 nine [2] 6:15 60:10 nobody [2] 65:14,15 none [1] 17:1 normally [4] 29:25 51:14 70:10,16 notary [1] 75:25 note [1] 41:1 notebook [1] 41:16 notebooks [1] 41:19 noted [1] 75:7 nothing [1] 74:8 nrc [14] 11:7 12:14,19 15:14,19,21, 23 16:3 20:22 21:6 46:6,9 49:23 nuclear [8] 2:10 3:9 6:5,8,13 11:4

16:3 50:11 number [11] 7:2 15:17 20:25 34: 20 47:5 55:5,8,10 61:1,3,4 nureg [4] 47:5,16,17,18 nureg-1567 [1] 46:24

0

object [4] 43:8,25 57:4 61:15 objection [16] 14:13,14 28:11 32: 12 41:6 42:22 44:17 45:2,10 46: 14 50:19 51:18 54:15 62:4,8 63: objective [1] 11:10 observe [1] 5:22 observed [1] 50:22 obstruction [1] 38:18 obtain [2] 19:7 43:11 obtained [3] 44:4.5 64:23 off-site [1] 44:20 office [1] 2:4 okay [31] 4:19 5:1 7:15 9:6,18 12:9 14:16 18:4,15 26:1 29:14 34:19 35:20 36:2 46:23 47:15,21,25 48: 2 49:19 59:1,14 64:10 66:13,18, 23 67:8,10,24 69:10 71:5 one [32] 6:9,23 7:20 11:2 21:16 25: 18,19 26:5 32:1 35:11,12,17 39:6. 14 42:3 43:5 49:2 52:23 54:4 56: 18 58:19 64:3.3.3 65:21 67:13,20 68:2,21 69:16 71:12,18 ones (1) 51:20 only [18] 4:22 6:24 15:6 16:25 17: 17 22:21,22 23:5 24:22 26:4 40: 11 50:11 52:16 58:1 66:15,23 67: 1.8 operate [1] 28:6 operating [1] 49:15 operation [7] 9:15 38:24 39:18 42: 16 43:6 45:20 48:20 opinion [16] 8:12 16:15 21:4 37:14 38:20 40:8,11 41:14 43:22 48:24 50:21 51:3,5 55:14 56:14 62:17 opinions [2] 5:10 17:9 order [2] 22:15 62:12 original [4] 40:16 41:5,7 44:21 originally [2] 40:9 45:17 other [34] 4:6,23 5:18 6:13,15 7:16 11:17,19 14:2 15:11,11 16:1 17: 13 21:15,16 23:6 26:5 30:2 37:12 53:8,9,12,12 54:18 56:5,17,21 62: 17,19,20 64:4 67:21 71:1,2 others (1) 67:22 otherwise [1] 4:17 out [18] 5:8 11:12,15,16 14:16,22 17:3 28:6,7 30:1,2 31:2,4 38:24 57:15 63:23 71:3,12 outer [1] 50:21 outside (8) 36:9,10,23 44:11,22 45: 5,6 50:14 over [20] 5:21 6:3,13 26:23 27:4.5 28:7 33:11 48:4 49:11 62:14,16

63:16 67:19,21,22,23 72:23 73:2, 2 own [3] 15:5 34:4 40:11

p-e-I-I-e-t [1] 30:14 p.m [2] 65:18 73:6 page [23] 2:13 20:24 21:6 23:22 24 16,18,19,22,25 25:13,14,16 27:8 29:9 46:24 58:25 59:4,5 60:24 64: 8,11,12,15 pages [1] 74:11 paper [5] 21:22 53:21 55:6 63:25 65:13 paragraph [6] 47:3,8,22 48:3,25 49:18 paragraphs [2] 64:14,15 parallel [1] 66:19 parameter [2] 26:3 70:8 parameters [5] 25:15,18 65:22 70: 24 71:24 part [4] 24:13 30:15 57:24 58:1 participate [4] 6:6,9 12:2 45:18 particular [2] 51:20 63:8 particulate (1) 71:20 pathway [5] 13:7 32:19 38:9,18,22 pathways [2] 12:22 13:15 patience [1] 63:23 patient [1] 63:23 paul [1] 2:6 pellet [2] 30:14 33:23 pen [1] 21:22 people [2] 8:20 41:14 per [27] 19:1,10 20:23 21:10,12,13. 23,24,25 22:2,3,4 25:5,7 26:9,10, 14,15 27:7,12,25 28:3 53:7,7 60: 12,21 61:3 percent [1] 59:18 perennial [1] 16:25 performed [5] 8:4 10:7 48:24 49: 20 50:5 performing [1] 49:21 periodically [1] 4:22 permanent [1] 17:16 permeabilities [1] 21:14 permeability [71] 17:11 18:5,16, 18 19:1,2,3,12,24 20:2,6,7,23 21:4, 8,11,23,24 22:1,8,8,13,22,23 23:2, 3,6,9,16,24 25:5,9,19,22 26:3,7,8, 12,22,22,23 27:11,14,24 28:2,9,21 29:3 39:4 40:6,10 65:22 66:4,7,10, 14,19,24 67:15,18 68:12,12,15,18 69:4 70:13,16,19 72:4,25 73:1 permeable [3] 19:19 22:17 37:20 person [1] 40:17 personal [1] 7:2 pfs [46] 8:25 9:19 10:7 11:11,23 16: 5,8,19 19:6 22:16 32:11 34:11 37: 15,19 38:2 42:2 43:4,5,9,11,14 44: 8 45:19 46:12,18 48:24 49:7,18 50:5,10,14,17 52:16,19 53:25 54:

13.17 55:9 57:1 60:11,20 61:8,18 62:13 63:18 68:14 pfs's [4] 13:15 16:4,11 53:3 ph.d [2] 5:19.25 phase [3] 45:19,20 46:6 physical [1] 71:8 pick [1] 37:25 pittman [1] 2:7 place [2] 32:18 39:10 placed [5] 31:19 39:9.22 40:4.13 plan [3] 34:15 48:1 49:1 planning [1] 55:24 plant [3] 6:15,17,25 please [17] 3:11 4:16,20 16:18 18: 15 20:13,17 24:6,24 34:18 36:1 47:2.4.5 49:17 64:8,13 plot [1] 34:15 pmf [3] 12:14,15,19 point (2) 6:23 24:12 pond [2] 13:16 17:17 poorly [1] 50:20 porous [7] 68:25 69:1,3,17,20 71: 16 72:18 portion [1] 33:6 portray [1] 13:4 position [10] 16:6.9.11 37:20 38:1 42:7 43:1 60:12 63:19,24 potential (15) 11:12,15 12:5,25 13: 23 14:6 43:18 44:7,14,25 45:22 48:19,22 51:19 64:16 power [4] 6:8,13,24 59:20 practice [3] 34:3 39:11 41:18 preceding [1] 74:11 precipitation [4] 17:10 18:6 28:22 29:6 precisely [2] 45:7 62:19 preparation [1] 16:24 prepare [13] 7:21 9:23 11:3,8,9 13: 19 14:12,19 15:1,5,7,8,12 prepared [4] 13:11 15:19 20:22 21:6 preparing [2] 9:18 15:20 present [3] 20:21 35:1 61:1 presented [4] 10:18 21:6 53:15 62:21 preserve [1] 31:24 pretty [2] 38:23 39:5 prevent [16] 20:8,19 22:19 28:15 30:19,22 31:3,8,9,14,21 32:11 33: 20 34:12 37:21 38:3 previous [1] 55:19 previously (1) 4:1 prior [2] 11:19 65:8 private [5] 3:7 12:2,20 62:2 75:1 probably [1] 41:2 procedure 3 4:10 39:20 66:17 proceed [1] 5:3 process [5] 11:19,25 39:10,12 44: produce [2] 8:24 62:16

production [4] 6:22 19:20 22:20

23:7 profile [1] 20:11 project [17] 6:4,5,14 9:8,9 11:3,23 12-2,3,6,11,12,19 45:20 54:9 55: 24 62:2 projects [1] 7:1 proposal [2] 44:22 45:18 proposals [1] 64:12 propose [1] 55:13 proposed [7] 11:13 16:22 24:1 43: 6,11,14 44:9 proposing [2] 19:6 44 8 provide [4] 14:23 15:15 19:12 71: provided [6] 14:11 32:19 43:21 48: 11,15,20 providing [1] 14:24 public [2] 63:7 75:25 publication [6] 10:19 53:21 54:5, 11 55:21 56:10 pump [16] 7:16,23 8:1,2,7 19.22 29:23 30:25 34:1,3 61,24 62:13 69:13,14 70:21 72:12 pumpage [1] 59:21 pumped [4] 61:11,19.24 62:11 pumping [12] 18:23 30:2 31·4,17 48:10 50:1 63:10 66:17 70:17 71: puncture [4] 32,13 38:11,12,14 punctured [3] 32:10,17 38:8 purpose [4] 5:11 17:18 32:22 37: purposes [1] 8:22 put [17] 5:7,9 7:7,8 10·9 14:20 30:9, 13,18 32:7,9,18 33:18 40:9 42:19 49:15 56:12 putting [1] 32:22 Q

qualify [1] 9:7 quality [5] 6:19 10 23,25 31:13,25 quantity [4] 44:10 53:24 56:19 62: question [52] 4:14,16,23,24 11:21, 24 12:13,19,24 13:7 14:14 15:5 19:15 22:11 23:15 27:21 32:21 33: 9 39:5,17 41:13 42.8 43:13 44:18 45:3,4,12,13 46:8,20 50:23,24 52: 6 54:3 55:16,17,20,20 56.2 57.6 58:6,7 59:12 61:17 62.1,9,10,12 66:13 67:9,13 69:11 questioning [2] 57:5 61:16 questions [10] 4:11 5:2,6,11 16: 16 59:8 65:21 67:25 68:11 73:5 quick [1] 67 13 quickly [1] 68:2 quite [1] 67:2

R

radionuclide [1] 48:21 radius [11] 17:15 23:25 49:25 50:7. 9.12,25,25 51:12 53:15,17

rai [2] 46.6.10 raised [1] 24:12 range [3] 22:1,1 61:2 ranges [1] 22:3 rate [5] 28:3 52:24 60:13.21.22 rates [2] 48:10 50:1 rather [2] 33:3 60:24 raw [1] 41:15 reach [1] 34:11 reached [1] 16:19 read | 14| 36:7 37:6 40:20 44:9 46: 4 47:2,21 48:2 57:19,20 61:6 63:6 64:13 75:6 ready [1] 9:11 real [1] 66:23 really [2] 6:23 28:9 reason [6] 16:23 18:20 27:17 33.1. 4 54:5 reasonable [1] 50:25 reasons [3] 32:1 51:7 56:5 recall [1] 63:11 received [3] 12:19 13:6 24:14 recent [2] 6:16 54:11 recess [3] 34.9 47:24 65:18 recharge [7] 50:3 53:16,23 54:23 55:2 60:16 61:2 recharged [2] 48 7 54:2 recognize [1] 20:15 recommend [1] 65:13 reconnaissance [3] 59:20 64:18, 22 record [2] 24:8,9 recur [2] 61:10.14 reduced [1] 63:9 refer [1] 51 2 reference [6] 15:13 27:17,18,21 64:10 71:12 referring (4) 51:25 52:1 54:21 62: refine [1] 64:17 reg [5] 15:14,24,25 16,2 48:1 regarding 19 10:6 13:15,18,23 14: 2,6 16:16 18:16 45:13 regards [1] 3:22 registered [1] 74:4 regulation (3) 11:7 15:21,23 regulations [1] 40:13 regulatory [1] 2:10 relate [1] 5:6 related [2] 5:25 19:23 relevance [4] 57:5 61:16 62:5.8 relevant [1] 63:17 relied [2] 28:14 34:11 rely [3] 15:11 54:9 63:20 relying [6] 14:18 53:25 54:13,17 55:10 60:20

remediation [1] 10:20

5,7 55:12 56:2 72:23

remind [1] 54:7

render [1] 9:11

remember [9] 19:1 45:11,12 46:4,

repeat [8] 12:24 22:10 28:23 45:4 50:24 52:6,7 69:10 rephrase [1] 61:17 report [34] 6:6 9:19,22,22,24 11:3 15.2,6,7,24 20:13,22,24 21:5 34: 17 45:21 54:1,9,14,18 55:10.18.24 56:7,14 57:3,19 58:24 60:13 63:6 64:9,12 65:3,9 reported [1] 59:21 reporter [1] 75:2 reports [1] 14:11 representative [1] 48:18 request [5] 46:6 47:22 48:3 49·23 54:4 requests [1] 16:4 require [2] 40:13 70:25 required [8] 9 8 11:7 15:14,17,18 50:12 51:4 65:5 requirement [1] 51:10 research [2] 54:10 65:12 reservoir [1] 17:17 residential (1) 34:4 resource [1] 7:2 resources [8] 14:7 52:3,10,22 53: 2 64.6, 17, 21 respect [1] 59.8 respond [1] 16:15 response [1] 46:9 responses [1] 16:4 responsible (1) 43:17 rest [1] 63:4 result 5 8.6 21:16 38:24 49:24 55: resulting [1] 15:18 results [1] 48:8 resume [1] 10:19 retention [1] 13:15 return [1] 34:10 review [3] 7:13 8:15 47:25 reviewed [8] 8:6 13:7,18 14:19 34: 24,25 40:19 43:20 reviewing (1) 13:11 reviews [1] 59:6 revised [2] 24:13,15 revision [4] 24:7,9,20 34:17 rig [1] 39:13 rock [1] 36:12 rounded (1) 59:25 rule [1] 39:20 running [2] 15:17 63:23 runoff [2] 6:18.20 rupture [1] 6:10

S

s-h-e-l-b-y [1] 36:11 safety [8] 3:8 9:22,24 20:12,21,24 21:5 34:16 saline (3) 58:4,12 64:25 salt [4] 2:5 58.5.8.21 same [21] 21:17 22:14 24:15.18 26: 16 39:24 40:5 55:23 67:3,4,5 68:

19,20 69:24 70:8,24 71:25 72:1,2, 11.24 sample [1] 66:7 sampler [2] 36:11,11 sampling [1] 36.9 sand [10] 29:19,20 30:4,5 31:1,3 32:8 33:11,25 69:4 sandy [1] 29:18 sar [8] 13:8 20:21 38:5 49:22 61:4, 5,7 62:22 satisfy [1] 53:3 saying 6 11:22 20:22 23:9 51:12 65:16 70:2 says [2] 36:13 63:13 scenario [1] 6:10 science [1] 58:2 scope [5] 7:21 11:4,14 15:13 39: scoping [1] 12:5 screened [5] 19:4,5 21:8 48:17 68: seal [10] 30:14,19 31:18 32:9,18,23 33:5,18 37:17 38:21 sealed [1] 32:8 second [13] 25:5,7 26:9,10,14,15 27:7,12,25 47:8,22 48:3 68:8 secondly (1) 55:23 section [26] 9:21,21,25 10:1 15:4, 7,8,12,19,20 16:1,1 28:2 36:7 37: 6 43:20 45:11,13,17 46:4,5,24 47: 2,9 61:7,7 sections [1] 61-6 sediment [1] 34:2 see [6] 22:20 24:3 60:25 63.21 71: 10 13 seel [24] 2:15 3:6,16 14:16,20 25:1 32:14 34:8,10 41:8,14 47:7,19 52: 1 54:17,22 59:9.15 63:18 65:17 68:7,10 69:7 73:5 seem [1] 65:4 seen [2] 20:16 67:20 send [1] 49:22 sentence [2] 49:4,10 series [3] 4:10 5:5 19:7 set [1] 74:11 sewer [8] 12:23 13:1 42:3,7,9,11, 25 43:2 shallower [1] 30:3 shaw [1] 2.7 sheet [3] 23:24 34:16 35:24 shelby [1] 36:11 shorehan [1] 6:14 short [1] 67:13 shortcut [1] 66:2 shouldn't [2] 8:1 51:14 shoveled [1] 40:1 show [8] 8:15 24:5 26:4,5,8 35:18 46:22 47:4 showing [1] 48:12 side [7] 30:20 31:4,16 33:2,21 39:1

significant [2] 22:7,12 significantly [3] 56:11 63:2,9 silt [4] 17:3 20:23 29:18 32:10 silty [7] 17:4 21:3 29:18,19,20 30:4 69:3 similar [1] 72:19 simply [2] 26:16 63:8 since [6] 5:24 6:2 56:9,13 57:2 60: site [43] 7:24 8:4,25 10:20 12:20 15:15 16:8,21,22 17:1,5,11,16 18: 6 19:8.13 20:7 28:15,18 34:12 41: 9 42:4 43:9.15.24 44:1,3,10 45:6, 6 46:13.19 47:12 48:4,6,20 49:10, 25 50:7.9.11.22 63:10 sitina [2] 6:17.21 size [3] 71:20,22 72:2 skull [17] 3:10 20:22 21:1 50:2 53: 23 56:1,3,4 59:17 61:9,12,19,21, 23 63:4 64:16 65:5 so-called [6] 7:3 18:23 21:2 22:22 26:7 60:24 soil [23] 17:2 18:18 19:3.3 21:1.2. 16 33:17 34:12 36:8,9 37:9,12 38: 12,13,21,23 40:9,14 72:2,2,10,21 soils (24) 17:11 18:5.17 20:3.7.7 21:11 22:8.9.16.18 23:10 28:15, 21 29:3 37:20 38:2,25 39:3,9,22, 24 40:4,7 solely (1) 53.25 somehow [1] 41:9 someone [2] 13:12 21:17 sometimes [3] 6:25 9:8,10 sorry [8] 12:16 19:16 25:16 50:8 51:21.23 60:17 70:14 sort [1] 67:5 sounds [1] 10:11 source [22] 43:5,14,19 44:6,11,15, 16,22,24 45:1,8,9,14,22 46:10 48: 5,9 49:11,13,13,25 58:21 sources [4] 43:19 44:7,20 46:3 space [1] 68:14 speaking [1] 6:1 spec [1] 7:21 specific [5] 11:24 12:9 46:8 59:7, specifically [3] 15:3 40:20 54:21 specification [1] 7:5 split [1] 36:10 spoon [1] 36:10 spot [3] 18:20 30:3 39:6 spring [1] 64:25 springs [2] 65:1 74:15 squared [2] 26:24 27:1 stake [1] 37:10 started [1] 15:15 starts [1] 59:4 state [8] 3:11,17 12:14 40:12 41: 24 54:7 55:23 74:2 stated [1] 24:7 statement [1] 65:7

George H. C. Liang states [2] 49:10 58:12 static [6] 8:2 28:4 48:9 50:1 70:21 71:7 station [2] 6:8.14 stay [1] 33:24 stem [4] 36:9,14,18,20 step [7] 11:8,18,22 32:17 44:25 69: 12 71:4 steps [1] 11:19 still [6] 9:8 46:20 55:17,18 56:7 62: stone [12] 6:2,23 7:19 8:8,19 9:9 11:4 23:23 27:8 35:6,23 39:21 stop [1] 51:15 storage [7] 3:8,9 12:3,20 48:15 62: 2 75:1 storm [2] 6:18,20 stoughton [1] 3:14 stream [1] 16:25 strike [2] 43:4 65:5 structure [1] 11:14 structures [1] 48:15 studied [1] 50:15 studies [3] 61:8.18 64:13 study [9] 5:15 6:9,17 8:21 11:12 55:21 57:17 64:2,18 subject [2] 12:15 13:8 subscribed [1] 75:20 subsection (1) 46:25 subsequent [1] 60:3 subsurface [5] 8:22 31:22 42:10 46:25 57:15 sufficient [2] 19:12 53:2 sufficiently [1] 38:21 supercolliding [1] 54:9 superconductor [1] 54:8 supervise [2] 9:23 14:12 supervised [1] 40:25 supervising [1] 9:19 supervision [2] 7:20 8:7 supplement [1] 64:21 supply [3] 34:4 63:7 65:2 surface [56] 5:22 9:2,4,11,21 10: 12.23 11:1 13:23 16:8,13 17:4,6, 20 19:2 20:2,6,8,19 21:11 22:8,19 23:10 28:15,16,21 29:4 31:9,9,12, 13.14.21 32:10.19 33:7,10,12,13 34:12,13 37:9,20,21 38:2,3,7,9,10, 22 48:12 62:24 65:2 66:4,15,20 surrounding [5] 30:8,16 33:17 39: 24 40:5 survey [6] 7:22 16:24 39:21 48:8 49:24 50:6 sworn [2] 3:3 75:20 symbol [2] 25:1 35:11 symbols [1] 34:22

symposium [1] 10:18

42:3,3,7,9,11,16,20,25

system [12] 12:23 13:2 26:17,25

14 57:8.11.15 58:3.25 59:8.9.12. 14,16,18,24 60:3,6 62:25 taiwan [2] 5:14,14 talked [3] 49:4 65:22 67:17 tank [1] 6:10 technical (4) 7:5 40:24 51:11 64:2 technology [1] 3:14 term [3] 23:19 57:25 68:3 terms [3] 16:18 44:3 73:2 test [22] 7:23.23 8:1.2.2.7.9.12 18: 24 19:25 21:9,16 22:9 23:25 28:2 29:13 68:15 69:13.14 70:21 71:7 72:12 testified [2] 3:4 14:15 testify [1] 14:17 testimony [9] 14:10,23,25 24:17 54:16 65:8 72:25 74:9 75:6 testing [1] 68:14 tests [2] 7:16.17 textbook [3] 25:11 27:15 67:21 textbooks [1] 67:20 there's [18] 4:13.23 6:9 17:4.5 22: 24 24:16 25:1,15 26:6 27:18 30: 10 31:11 33:17 51:23 54:11 58:25 62:6 thesis (1) 5:20 thorough [2] 64:1,3 thousand [1] 72:9 three [19] 6:16 18 8,13 20:6 23:2 28:13,17,19,24 34:11 35:11,12 68: 13,15,19 69:24 70:8,24 71:25 till [2] 47:13,23 title [3] 47:16,17,17 today [5] 3:7,18 14:10,17 55:4 top [2] 66:4,8 topic [1] 63:17 topics (1) 5:7 total [4] 59:23,25 60:4,4 transcript [2] 75:6,7 transfer [2] 20:11 53:7 transmissibility [1] 68:3 transmissivity [1] 72:22 transmit [1] 23:13 transmittability 191 22:23,24 23:4, 7 65:23 66:18,22,24 68:4 transpiration [2] 57:24 58:1 truck [1] 44:11 true [9] 13:14,22 14:1,5 20:4 36:25 58:10 67:17 74:10 truly [1] 75:7 truth [3] 3:3 74:8,8 trying [3] 5:8 14:16,20 tunnel [1] 5:21 turn [2] 28:1 64:8 twenty [1] 35:13 twenty-eight [1] 59:1 twenty-nine [1] 25:17 two [16] 17:6,10 18:19 21:14 22:24 25:15.18 31:11.13 35:11.12.16 64:

table [21] 4:23 26:4,4.9 48:12 53:

two-inch [2] 18:22 36:9 type [3] 26:25 51:19,24 types [5] 7:16 8:16,24 51:24 57:14 typewriting [1] 74:10

u.s [3] 2:10 20:25 59:21 ultimate [4] 11:5,9 42:18,23 unclear [3] 14:14 42:23 43:25 under [7] 7:21 8:7 19:7 20:7 46:12, 19 47:8 undergrad [1] 5:13 underlying [2] 13:20 41:11 understand [23] 4:9,14,17 12:4 14:9 17:8 19:6,9 24:13 32:21 36: 16 37:25 38:13 46:20 52:8 55:7,9 60:6.19 61:13 62:1 69:8 70:14 understanding [14] 3:21 14:18 20:3,5 29:15 37:19 41:17 42:2 53: 20 57:22 59:15 60:11 66:21 70:1 understood [3] 28:24 66:3 72:25 unfiltered (1) 31:3 uniform [2] 71:20,22 unit [13] 21:17 25:7 26:5,5,6,8,8,24 27:16 28:1.6 53:8 59:25 united [1] 58:11 units [20] 21:19 25:6,8,21 26:2,11, 12,16,17,22,23 27:4,11,13,19 48:6 67:3.14.18 72:22 universe [1] 11:15 university [4] 5:14,16,19,24 unless [1] 41:8 up [14] 30:22,24 31:6,9,16,23,24 33: 3.21 34:2 42:25 51:22 60:22 66: upstairs [1] 47:19 usage [8] 14:2 59:23 60:8,12,21, 22.24 61:9 useful [1] 8:25 user [7] 49:24 52:15,16 53:9 60:18 61:20 62:17 users [8] 14:3 48:8 50:6 52:20 53: 12.18 62:19,20 uses [2] 48:9 50:1 using [14] 9:10,12 19:19 43:18,23 44:1 45:8 54:7 55:23 56:3 60:24 67:22.22 69:9 ut [1] 2:5 utah [9] 3:17,18 41:24 54:7 55:23 74:2,3,15,19 utah's [5] 13:14,22 14:1,5,10

V

vague [6] 43:8 44:17 45:2 46:14 51:18 62:4 valid [1] 56:7 valley [35] 3:10 20:23 21:1 50:2 52: 3,11,17,18,21,22 53:3,13,23 54:24 55:4 56:1,3,4 57:10 58:4 59:17 60: 8 61:9,12,19,21,23 63:5,14 64:6, 16,21,25 65:1,5 vary [5] 66:7,10 68:12,16 70:3

14,15 65:22 66:1

vein [1] 11:11 version |2| 24:13.15 versus [1] 48:21 vertical [4] 23:3 70:13,18,19 vertically (1) 70:12 vicky [2] 74:4 75:2 W w-a-d-d-e-l-l [1] 53:21 waddell [13] 53.21 54:1,13,18 55: 10 56:7,14 57:3,18 58:24 60:7,22 63:13 wait [2] 47:13.23 wanted [2] 48:2 65:25 wants [1] 63:18 washington [1] 2.8 waste [1] 10:20 wastewater [2] 12:23 13:2 water [122] 5:21,23 6:12,19 8:24 9: 2,4 10:12,25 11:1 13:23 14:2 17:4. 6,16 18:5 19:7,13,19,22 22:17,19. 21 23.5,13 24:1 28:3,4,20 29:23, 25 30:1,1,4,20,22,25 31:2,3,5,9,12, yesterday [1] 24:14 14,21,22,25 33:3,10,12,21,24 34:1, 3,4 38:7 42:24 43:5,9,12,14,18,24 44:1,3,3,4,5,7,13,15,24 45.8,14,19, 22 46:10 48:5,9,9,12,13 49:12,14 **50:1,1 51:16 52:3,9,10,13,16,20**, 22 53 1, 2, 18 56:16 57:14 58 4, 8, 9, 12,12,21 59:17,24 60.8 61:11,19 62:7,24,25 63 7,8 64:6,17,20 65:1, 2 70:12,17 71:3 waters [11] 20 8,19 28:16 32:19 33:7,13 34:13 37:21 38:4,10,22 waters' [1] 44:22 wave [2] 5:20,23 way [11] 22:23 26:6 27:19 31:4,11, 13,16 33:2,21 39:1 46:11 wayne [1] 42:14 ways [1] 63:22 webster [12] 6:3,24 7:19 8:8,19 9: 10 11:4 23:23 27:9 35:6,23 39:21 weighted [1] 27:17 weisman [5] 51:21 65:20 67:8 68: wells [14] 6.22,22 7:8 19:7 33:25 48:14,16 56:12,22 57:1 61:12,19 63:1 64:24 where's [1] 60:25 whether [7] 39:13,22 40:1 52:20 55:16 68:14.21 whole [4] 11:15 57:4 61:15 74:8 will [40] 3 17 4:10,17,21 6:11 8:20 9:9 12:24 20:8 22:10 27:3 28:23 30:4 31:13,16 32:11 33:12 34:12 38:1,18 40:10 41:3 42.9 43:13 44: 24 49:2 50:23 51:15,16 52:9 53:2

vegetation [3] 57:9,12,14

withdraw [4] 52:14.25 56:16.19 within [8] 11:4 40:7 49:24 50:7.9 53:15.17 62:21 without 3 19:14,17 31:1 witness [15] 2:13 3:22 24:25 25: 25 47:8,12,15,21,25 59:6,14 67:10 68:5 74:7,9 witness's [1] 54:16 word [3] 57:20,20,22 worded [1] 50:20 words [1] 4:24 work [4] 11:5 12:18 48:25 49:20 worked [2] 6:1 7:18 working [1] 6:2 works [2] 4:10 42:12 write [1] 41:15 written [1] 60:14 wrote [1] 10:17 year [6] 16:24 53:7 60:3,12,21 61:3

years [11] 6:4,13,16 52:13,24 53:3, 6 61:25 62:2,7,14 yourself (4) 7:8 8.9,23 9:13 yup [1] 27:7

zero [1] 24:9 zone [2] 32:10 38:21

ICLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the matter of	Official Exh. No. 159
Staf	The same of the sa
Applicant	1. (7)
Intervered	- 120
Oinc.	
DATE 4/24/02	To the co
DATE 4/24/02 Cler: Pu	h

CitiCourt, LLC 801.532.3441

70:18,25 72:20 wind । 3 5:20,20,21

56:16 61:24 62:13,15 68:6 69:10