WILLIAMS & ASSOCIATES, INC.

P.O. Box 48, Viola, Idaho 83872 (208) 883-0153 (208) 875-0147

Hydrogeology • Mineral Resources Waste Management • Geological Engineering • Mine Hydrology

'85 NOV 18 P3:28

November 13, 1985
Contract No. NRC-02-85-008
Fin No. D-1020
Communication No. 8

Mr. Jeff Pohle
Division of Waste Management
Mail Stop 623-SS
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

WM-RES
WM Record File
D1020
W+A

WM Project 10, 11, 16
Docket No.
PDR ✓
LPDR ✓ (B, N, S)

Distribution:
Pohle
(Return to WM, 623-SS)

RE: BWIP

Dear Jeff:

We have discussed topics for the upcoming (December 9-11, 1985) BWIP meeting as requested. Specifically, we have discussed the issues that we believe should be addressed in the upcoming meeting with DOE. These issues are outlined below.

1. What is the scale of the most recently proposed test at the RRL-2 location? What is the proposed duration of the most recently proposed test?
2. What is the status of plans to test the hydrofractured zones in borehole RRL-2A? The preliminary plans we have in hand call for conducting short term single well tests in the Cohassett flow interior in borehole RRL-2A.
3. When will the large scale test at the RRL-2 location begin?
4. What are the water level recovery trends to date? We are interested particularly in the water level data obtained since May 1, 1985, that has had barometric effects removed.
5. How does RHO propose to verify that the water discharged to the surficial unconfined aquifer, during the test, will not affect the data obtained from the test horizons? We understand that the water discharged to the surficial unconfined aquifer could have an undetectable effect on the test data obtained from the Grande Ronde Formation; but this assumption should be verified by some data collection procedures and evaluation of these data. Does RHO propose to monitor for mounding that might occur in the surficial aquifer? Does RHO propose to monitor the shallow basalts to see

2588

if there is evidence of vertical communication between the surficial unconfined aquifer and the upper confined basalt aquifer? The nonpoint source of injection of water to the surficial unconfined aquifer may be useful for a qualitative evaluation of vertical hydraulic conductivity in the vicinity of the groundwater mounding.

6. What is the status of the hydrochemistry baseline measurements? We recognize that an effort has been made to avoid disturbing the potentiometric baseline; it is our understanding currently that pumping for sampling purposes has been studiously avoided.
7. What is the status of the recirculating tracer test conducted at DC-7/8? Are more reports forthcoming on this test?
8. How does BWIP intend to quantify vertical hydraulic conductivity from the proposed test well configuration? What are the data interpretation limitations created by the test design?
9. The test schedule apparently has slipped again. How does the 'large' scale test relate time wise to the sinking of the exploratory shaft?
10. How does RHO propose to demonstrate hydraulic continuity with the 'reduced' scale test as we understand it to be proposed currently? The areal extent of the cone of depression will be limited considerably because, as we understand the test plan, the test will be terminated if 'drawdown occurs' at the DC cluster sites. Thus the radius of the cone of depression can be no larger than the distance between the cluster DC-22 and RRL-2B (approximately 1.5 miles).
11. Has the recent drilling affected any of the continuous water level records?

Please call if you have any questions concerning the above topics.

Sincerely,

Roy E. Williams

Roy E. Williams