

2920

GLOVER

~~4/2/80~~  
Copy ~~bridge~~ to  
Publication  
(Approved)

A DUAL-POROSITY MODEL FOR SIMULATING  
SOLUTE TRANSPORT IN OIL SHALE

---

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Water-Resources Investigations Report 85-4281

**A DUAL-POROSITY MODEL FOR SIMULATING  
SOLUTE TRANSPORT IN OIL SHALE**

**By Kent C. Glover**

---

**U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

**Water-Resources Investigations Report 85-4281**

**Cheyenne, Wyoming**

**1986**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DONALD PAUL HODEL, Secretary

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Dallas L. Peck, Director

---

For additional information  
write to:

District Chief  
U.S. Geological Survey  
2120 Capitol Avenue  
Box 1125  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82003

Copies of this report can  
be purchased from:

Open-File Services Section  
Western Distribution Branch  
U.S. Geological Survey  
Box 25425, Federal Center  
Denver, Colorado 80225  
(Telephone: (303) 236-7476)

# CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Oil shale as a dual-porosity medium.....	10
Methods of simulation.....	11
Ground-water flow.....	11
Solute transport.....	13
Application of the finite-element method.....	15
Ground-water flow.....	15
Solute transport.....	19
Diffusion within the oil-shale matrix.....	21
Sources of solute within the retort chamber.....	23
Model calibration and sensitivity.....	27
Relationship of measured data and calculated results.....	27
Hydraulic head.....	28
Solute concentration.....	30
Estimating parameters for models of steady-state ground-water flow.....	31
Sensitivity analysis of transient ground-water flow and solute transport.....	35
Evaluation of model.....	36
Ground-water flow.....	36
Solute transport.....	42
Computer program.....	45
Sample simulation.....	47
Summary.....	51
References cited.....	53
Supplemental information.....	55

## ILLUSTRATIONS

	Page
Figure 1. Map showing location of in situ oil-shale retort near Rock Springs, Wyoming.....	7
2-5. Graphs showing:	
2. Comparison of flow-model results with Theis's analytical solution.....	37
3. Comparison of results from solute-transport model with analytical solution at 100 days.....	42
4. Boundary conditions and node locations along the bottom of the aquifer system used in the sample simulation.....	47
5. Boundary conditions and node locations along a vertical section of the aquifer system used in the sample simulation.....	47

## TABLES

Table 1. Computer-program listing.....	50
2. Instructions for preparing model data.....	96
3. Aquifer properties used in sample simulation.....	50
4. Input data for sample simulation.....	109
5. Selected output for sample simulation.....	115

## CONVERSION DATUM

For those readers interested in using the metric system, the following table may be used to convert the inch-pound units of measurement used in this report to metric units:

<u>Multiply</u>	<u>By</u>	<u>To obtain</u>
foot	0.3048	meter
foot per day	0.3048	meter per day
foot squared per day	0.09290	meter squared per day

A DUAL-POROSITY MODEL FOR SIMULATING  
SOLUTE TRANSPORT IN OIL SHALE

By Kent C. Glover

ABSTRACT

A model is described for simulating three-dimensional ground-water flow and solute transport in oil shale and associated hydrogeologic units. The model treats oil shale as a dual-porosity medium by simulating flow and transport within fractures using the finite-element method. Diffusion of solute between fractures and the essentially static water of the shale matrix is simulated by including an analytical solution that acts as a source-sink term to the differential equation of solute transport. While knowledge of fracture orientation and spacing is needed to effectively use the model, it is not necessary to map the locations of individual fractures.

The computer program listed in the report incorporates many of the features of previous dual-porosity models while retaining a practical approach to solving field problems. As a result the report does not extend the theory of solute transport in any appreciable way. The emphasis in the report is on bringing together various aspects of solute-transport theory in a manner that is particularly suited to the unusual ground-water flow and solute-transport characteristics of oil-shale systems.

## INTRODUCTION

Digital models of ground-water flow and solute transport have been used to predict possible impacts of oil-shale development on the ground-water resource (Robson and Saulnier, 1981). Unfortunately, modeling techniques used in the past either were not developed for use in rock, such as oil shale, where porosity depends on fracturing, or required data that usually are not available. From 1980 to 1983 the U.S. Geological Survey studied migration of solute from an in situ oil-shale retort near Rock Springs, Wyo. (fig. 1). The emphasis of the study was to identify geo-

---

Figure 1.--(caption on next page) belongs near here.

---

logic, hydraulic, and chemical factors that control the process of solute transport in oil shale. During the study, it became apparent that no existing model was well suited for the unusual flow and transport characteristics of oil-shale systems. Therefore, as part of the study, a model was developed.

This report describes two digital-computer programs that are used to simulate ground-water flow and solute transport in oil shale with interbedded tuff or sandstone. The U.S. Department of Energy experimental, in situ, oil-shale retort near Rock Springs, Wyo., was used as the prototype flow system of the model. The application of modeling techniques to this flow system is described in a report by K. C. Glover, U.S. Geological Survey, written commun. (1985). The model is designed for use in site-specific studies and consequentially includes many features, such as diffusion of solute between fractures and the shale matrix, that may not be important to basin-wide or regional investigations.



---

**Figure 1.--Location of in situ oil-shale retort near  
Rock Springs, Wyoming.**

---

A wide array of ground-water flow and solute-transport models have become available in recent years. Konikow and Bredehoeft (1978), and INTERCOMP Resource Development and Engineering, Inc. (1976) describe two of the more commonly used programs. Other models that are potentially useful in studies of oil-shale hydrology are described by Bibby (1981), Noorishad and Mehran (1982), and Rasmuson and others (1982). The model described in this report incorporates many of the features of the above models while retaining a practical approach to the solution of field problems. Boundary conditions can be applied easily and mapping of individual fractures is not necessary. As a result of this approach, the present model does not extend the theory of solute transport in fractured media in any appreciable way. Instead, various aspects of this theory are brought together in a manner that is particularly suited to the unusual ground-water flow and solute-transport characteristics of oil-shale systems.

Throughout the remainder of this report it is assumed that the reader is familiar with the basics of solute-transport modeling in porous media, such as sand-and-gravel aquifers, as well as the finite-element method of numerical analysis. It is believed that most hydrologists faced with a problem of solute migration in oil shale will have faced similar problems in unfractured media. For those readers unfamiliar with applications of solute transport modeling using the finite-element method, it is suggested that teaching references such as Freeze and Cherry (1979), Konikow and Bredehoeft (1978), and Zienkiewicz (1971) be consulted.

## OIL SHALE AS A DUAL-POROSITY MEDIUM

Porosity in oil-shale formations may be classified on the basis of its relationship to hydraulic conductivity. Porosity may be considered effective for increasing hydraulic conductivity if the pores are interconnected or not effective, as in shale, if the pores are relatively isolated. Porosity due to faults, joints, collapse breccia, and solution cavities is the major source of permeability in oil shale with otherwise low permeability (Robson and Saulnier, 1981). Persistent layers of permeable tuff or sandstone, ranging in thickness from less than an inch to several inches, also are common in oil shale (Bradley, 1964) and contribute to the hydraulic conductivity. The porosity of the shale and marlstone matrix, although relatively high, does not contribute significantly to hydraulic conductivity.

Any attempt to simulate ground-water flow and solute transport in oil shale must include consideration of the dual-porosity nature of these sediments. The solute-transport processes of hydrodynamic dispersion and advection are related directly to seepage velocity and therefore are related to the effective porosity of the formation. However, several investigators including Grisak and Pickens (1980) and Bibby (1981) have noted that dispersion and advection alone cannot account for the distribution of non-reacting solute in fractured formations. The extremely low seepage velocity of water within the shale matrix minimizes dispersion and advection, increasing the relative importance of diffusion. The porosity of the shale matrix, although not contributing to hydraulic conductivity, is important to dispersion.

## METHODS OF SIMULATION

### Ground-Water Flow

Only the part of formation porosity that contributes to hydraulic conductivity needs to be considered in analysing ground-water flow systems. For most practical purposes this porosity in oil shale, whether resulting from faulting, solution channels, or thin beds of permeable tuff and sandstone, can be analysed using the techniques of Snow (1969). He showed that many problems of flow through dual-porosity media can be solved using an anisotropic hydraulic-conductivity tensor in conjunction with standard porous-media techniques. His approach to the problem of ground-water flow is valid if the formation has a fracture density that is high compared to the scale of the problem. In such a case, the hydraulic characteristics of the fractured formation are similar to those of granular media. If fracture spacing is irregular in a given direction, the formation will exhibit heterogeneity. Because mapping of individual fractures is impractical for most field problems, the approach of Snow (1969) is used in this model. From a practical viewpoint the model described in this report may be useful when the hydrologist has some knowledge of the average spacing, aperture size, and directions of fracturing, but accurate mapping of individual fractures is not possible. Through proper alignment of the model cartesian coordinate axes with principal directions of fracturing and use of heterogeneous hydraulic conductivity values, many different fracture geometries can be simulated.

The three-dimensional nature of a fracture system, along with the essentially horizontal bedding plane of most formations, generally results in a three-dimensional flow system in oil-shale strata. Three-dimensional flow systems in oil shale have been observed on both a regional scale by Robson and Saulnier (1981) and on a local scale by the author at the Department of Energy in situ oil-shale retort near Rock Springs, Wyo. Therefore, the program given in this report is intended for use in studies of three-dimensional ground-water flow.

Rocks in the vicinity of an in situ retort are altered due to induced fracturing. As a result fracture patterns in the retort chamber are significantly different than regional fracture patterns. The values and degree of anisotropy of hydraulic conductivity within a retort chamber also differ from regional estimates. Nevertheless the fracture density usually is high, compared to the dimensions of the retort chamber, and standard porous-media techniques can be used to simulate ground-water flow in the immediate vicinity of the retort chamber.

### Solute Transport

The extension of solute-transport theory to dual-porosity media has attracted considerable attention in water-resources literature. Much of the literature has been directed toward studies of radionuclide migration through individual fractures and as such is not directly applicable to field problems where mapping of individual fractures is impractical. Grisak and Pickens (1980) modeled fractured media by using separate finite elements to represent fractures and adjacent low permeable rock. Finite elements used to represent the fractures were modeled with material properties that differed from adjacent low-permeability elements. This approach was extended by Noorishad and Mehran (1982), who also introduced the use of an "upstream-weighting" technique to simulate more accurately the essentially advective transport that occurs within the fractures.

Bibby (1981) took a different approach to modeling solute movement through dual-porosity media. Molecular diffusion between fractures and the primarily static water in the shale matrix was incorporated in the model as a source-sink term utilizing an appropriate analytical solution. To apply this two-dimensional model the user needs to know average spacing, aperture diameter, and direction of fractures but does not need to map individual fractures. This approach is analogous to the method of flow analysis discussed by Snow (1969). Although no upstream-weighting technique was used, Bibby (1981) reported no difficulty in applying the model to a field problem in a limestone aquifer.

Rasmuson and others (1982) presented a model for simulating three-dimensional solute transport in fractured rocks that is based on an integrated finite-difference approach. The model produces excellent results if solute transport is dominated by hydrodynamic dispersion. Because advection dominates most solute-transport problems in oil-shale strata (Robson and Saulnier, 1981), the approach of Rasmuson and others (1982) is not considered practical for use with oil shale.

The approach to modeling solute transport presented in this report is basically the model described by Bibby (1981) and extended to three dimensions. This approach has been selected because it strikes a balance between theoretical accuracy and practical applicability. Accurate mapping of fractures is not needed to use the model, although some knowledge of the fracture system is required. The ease with which boundary conditions can be applied also supports this approach. One disadvantage of the approach is the difficulty of extending the analytical solution for diffusion between fractures and the shale matrix to problems of multiple-species transport.

A model that can be extended to problems of multiple-species transport is described by Huyakorn and others (1983). Unfortunately, fracture locations must be accurately mapped to use the model successfully. Therefore the model of Huyakorn and others (1983), although theoretically superior to the model of Bibby (1981), cannot be applied in most practical field problems.

## APPLICATION OF THE FINITE-ELEMENT METHOD

### Ground-Water Flow

The basic governing equation for three-dimensional flow, when Cartesian coordinate axes are aligned with the principal components of the hydraulic-conductivity tensor, is as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (K_i \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_i}) + W = S_s \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (1)$$

where  $K_i$  = the hydraulic conductivity tensor [ $LT^{-1}$ ];

$W$  = the source-sink function (positive for a source) [ $T^{-1}$ ];

$S_s$  = specific storage [ $L^{-1}$ ];

$h$  = the hydraulic head [ $L$ ];

$x_i$  = Cartesian coordinate [ $L$ ], and use of a repeated subscript indicates summation on that subscript; and

$t$  = time [ $T$ ].

The source-sink term may be distributed areally or may represent a well. Boundary conditions that may be applied on the periphery of the problem area include known specific discharge normal to the boundary or known hydraulic head. Parameters  $K_i$ ,  $W$ , and  $S_s$  are approximated by subdividing the region of interest into discrete zones. Parameters are assumed to be constant within each zone which gives rise to internal boundary conditions at zonal discontinuities. Along these internal boundaries both hydraulic head and normal specific discharge must remain unchanged as the boundary is crossed.



Equation 1 may be solved by using the finite-element method based on the Galerkin criteria. Details of this method are described in Zienkiewicz (1971) and Pinder and Gray (1977). Within this report, first-order basis functions are used to describe each cubic element. While use of these basis functions requires more elements than if higher-order functions were used, the reduced oscillatory behavior and integration time associated with linear functions make this simpler approach preferable.

The matrix equation resulting from the finite-element discretization of equation 1 is as follows:

$$\left(\frac{1}{\Delta t_m} \bar{C} + \theta \bar{K}\right) \bar{h}^m = \bar{q} + \left(\frac{1}{\Delta t_m} \bar{C} - (1-\theta)\bar{K}\right) \bar{h}^{m-1} \quad (2)$$

where  $\bar{C}$  = a coefficient matrix involving specific storage ( $S_s$ ) and calculated for a single finite element as  $\iiint_V S_s \bar{n} (\bar{n})^t dV$ ;

$\bar{K}$  = a coefficient matrix, with off-diagonal components equal to zero, involving hydraulic conductivity and calculated for a single finite element as

$$\iiint_V (K_i \frac{\partial \bar{n}}{\partial x_i} (\frac{\partial \bar{n}}{\partial x_i})^t) dV, \quad i = 1, 2, 3;$$

$\bar{h}^m$  = the vector of hydraulic head at time  $m$ ;

$\bar{q}$  = the known vector involving source-sink terms and specified flux boundary conditions;

$\Delta t_m$  = the length of the time step;

$\theta$  = a number ranging from 0 for an explicit solution to 1 for an implicit solution;

$V$  = the volume of the finite element;

$\bar{n}$  = the vector of finite-element shape functions; and

$( )^t$  = the transpose of the enclosed vector.

Equation 2 is solved by Gaussian elimination for banded symmetric matrices. Although other direct-solution techniques, such as Cholesky decomposition, can be used, the procedure used in this report has proven adequate. Gupta and Tanji (1976) has suggested the use of matrix solvers that take full advantage of the sparse nature of coefficient matrices in attempts to reduce core storage requirements. The trade-offs in these matrix solvers are increased disk access and increased computational time. With the introduction of virtual-memory operating systems used by most computers, such detailed attention to minimizing core storage is not required.

### Solute Transport

The transport of a conservative solute in ground water is described by the following equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (D_{ij} \frac{\partial c}{\partial x_j}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (cq_i) = \phi \frac{\partial c}{\partial t} - Wc^* \quad i, j = 1, 2, 3 \quad (3)$$

where  $D_{ij}$  = the hydrodynamic-dispersion coefficient [ $L^2 T^{-1}$ ];

$c$  = solute concentration [ $ML^{-3}$ ]; and

$\phi$  = porosity [dimensionless];

$q_i = -K_i \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_i}$  = the Darcian fluid velocity [ $LT^{-1}$ ];

$W$  = a source-sink function [ $T^{-1}$ ];

$c^*$  = solute concentration in a fluid source [ $ML^{-3}$ ].

When applied to dual-porosity media such as oil shale, the terms are defined relative to the joint or fracture system, with the shale matrix considered impermeable. The hydrodynamic-dispersion coefficient ( $D_{ij}$ ) is related to Darcian fluid velocity in the fracture system by

$$D_{ij} = a_{ijmn} \frac{q_m q_n}{|q|} + D^* \quad i, j, m, n = 1, 2, 3$$

where  $a_{ijmn}$  = dispersivity of the fractured media [ $L$ ],

$q_m$  and  $q_n$  = Darcian fluid velocity [ $LT^{-1}$ ],

$|q|$  = the magnitude of the Darcian velocity vector [ $LT^{-1}$ ], and

$D^*$  = the molecular-diffusion coefficient [ $L^2 T^{-1}$ ].

for isotropic media,

$a_{iiii} = \alpha_L$  = the longitudinal dispersivity for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ;

$a_{iijj} = \alpha_T$  = the transverse dispersivity for  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ ; and

$a_{ijij} = \frac{1}{2} (\alpha_L - \alpha_T)$  for  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ .

There is no corresponding theory describing hydrodynamic dispersion in anisotropic media.

The form of the transport equation used in this report also is used by Pinder and Gray (1977), and Bibby (1981). Konikow and Bredehoeft (1978) and most studies of solute transport done by the U.S. Geological Survey use a form of the equation that is obtained by dividing equation 3 by porosity. The hydrodynamic-dispersion coefficient then is defined in terms of seepage velocity. Either form of the equation can be used successfully. However, when comparing results of studies using different forms of the transport equation, it should be recognized that the dispersion coefficients will differ by the magnitude of porosity.

Galerkin's method of weighted residuals, when applied to equation 3 with isoparametric finite elements, gives

$$\left(\frac{1}{\Delta t_m} \bar{P} + \theta \bar{D}\right) \bar{c}^m = qc^* + \left(\frac{1}{\Delta t_m} \bar{P} - (1-\theta)\bar{D}\right) \bar{c}^{m-1} \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{P}$  = a coefficient matrix involving porosity and is calculated for a single finite element as  $\iiint_V \phi \bar{n} (\bar{n})^t dV$ ;

$\bar{D}$  = a coefficient matrix involving hydrodynamic dispersion and advection and is calculated for a single finite element as  $\iiint_V (D_{ij} \frac{\partial \bar{n}}{\partial x_i} (\frac{\partial \bar{n}}{\partial x_j})^t - q_i \frac{\partial \bar{n}}{\partial x_i} (\bar{n})^t) dV$   $i, j, = 1, 2, 3$ ;

$\bar{c}^m$  = the vector of solute concentration in fractures at time  $m$ ; and

$qc^*$  = a known vector involving specified flux boundary conditions and source-sink terms ( $W$ ), solute concentration in fluid sources ( $c^*$ ), and diffusion between fractures and the rock.

Detailed information on formulating this equation can be obtained from Bibby (1981) or Pinder and Gray (1977, p. 144-148). Equation 4 is solved by the Gauss-Doolittle method for banded, nonsymmetric matrices.

## Diffusion within the Oil-Shale Matrix

The exchange of solute between water in a system of parallel fractures and the essentially static water in the adjacent oil-shale matrix can occur by molecular diffusion and can be simulated by the addition of a source-sink term to equation 4. Bibby (1981) gives this source-sink term as a convolution integral that is expressed here in discrete form at time  $t_m$ .

$$Wc^* = - \frac{\phi_B b}{\Delta t_m (f+b)} [c_B(t_m) - c_B(t_{m-1})] \quad (5)$$

where  $Wc^*$  = the mass flux of solute entering the fracture  $[M/L^3/T]$ ;

$\phi_B$  = the porosity of the oil-shale matrix [dimensionless];

$b$  = the average distance between parallel fractures  $[L]$ ;

$\Delta t_m = [t_m - t_{m-1}]$ , the length of the time step  $[T]$ ;

$f$  = the average fracture width  $[L]$ ;

$c_B$  = the average solute concentration in the oil-shale matrix  $[M/L^3]$ ;

$$c_B(t_m) = c(t_0) \left[ 1 - \frac{8}{\pi^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{E_n} \exp(-B_n t_m) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^m \{ c(t_i) - c(t_{i-1}) \} \left\{ 1 - \frac{8}{\pi^2} \frac{1}{\Delta t_i} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{E_n B_n} \left[ \exp[-B_n(t_m - t_i)] - \exp[-B_n(t_m - t_{i-1})] \right] \right\} ;$$

$c(t_0)$  = the solute concentration in the fracture at the beginning of the simulation  $[M/L^3]$ ;

$n$  = an index of summation [dimensionless];

$E_n = (2n - 1)^2$ ;

$B_n = D_d(2n+1) \pi^2/b^2$ ;

$c(t_i)$  = the solute concentration in the fracture at time  $t_i$   $[M/L^3]$ ; and

$D_d$  = molecular diffusion of solute within the oil-shale matrix  $[L^2/T]$ .

The only unknown variable in equation 5 is  $c(t_m)$ . Therefore, the coefficient associated with  $c(t_m)$  is placed on the main diagonal of the  $\bar{D}$  matrix in equation 4, while the remainder of the expression is placed in the right-hand vector of known values. Equation 5 involves summation over the entire period of the simulation. Fortunately, little truncation error is introduced by retaining only a small number of terms in the summations. The optimum number of terms to retain depends on the values of  $D_d$ ,  $b$  and  $\Delta t_m$ ; however, from information presented by Bibby (1981), it is apparent that between five and ten terms are adequate for most applications.

Several aquifer properties must be determined to use equation 5 successfully. These properties include molecular diffusion within the oil-shale matrix ( $D_d$ ), average distance between parallel fractures ( $b$ ), average fracture width ( $f$ ), and can be obtained for each of these properties, model calibration usually must be used to improve upon the estimates. Therefore equation 5 generally is useful only in studies with well distributed and frequent measurements of solute concentration in wells.

## Sources of Solute Within the Retort Chamber

Mechanisms for creating and leaching chemicals from burned shale within an in situ retort chamber to the formation water are poorly understood. Knowledge of conditions during the retort process is needed to determine the chemicals that are created, while an understanding of dissolution controls is needed to predict how the created chemicals are transferred from the burned shale to the formation water.

The retort temperature, total time of retorting, permeability of the retort chamber, and initial mineralogy affect the type and amount of chemicals created during a burn. During combustion of a retort chamber, a "flame front" or zone of combustion moves through the fractured oil-shale bed. Hot gases from this combustion move ahead of the flame front and provide energy for pyrolysis of kerogen. In the process, a number of chemical by-products are created. A discussion of how these by-products are created is outside the scope of this report. However, it is important to recognize that the resulting chemicals will vary from retort chamber to retort chamber. In large chambers, the distribution of chemical by-products within the chamber also may be important. Coring of an abandoned retort chamber before it resaturates and lab analysis of the cores by long-term leaching studies can provide some understanding of the chemicals that are created during retorting.



After the retort operation ceases, the chamber resaturates and chemicals created during the burn are leached into the water. During the time that it takes to resaturate the retort chamber a rapid increase in the concentration of solute occurs. For many studies of solute transport, an equation to describe the initial dissolution is not needed because migration of solute from the retort chamber is unlikely until the formation resaturates.

After the retort chamber resaturates, Hall (1982) proposed that diffusion between the pores of the oil-shale matrix and fractures acts as a dominant mechanism for introducing solute to a ground-water system. This mechanism is simulated by equation 5. As discussed previously, equation 5 describes diffusion between the oil-shale matrix and a system of parallel fractures. Fracturing within a retort chamber is much more irregular but can be conceptualized as two systems of parallel fractures, one vertical and one horizontal, resulting in cubes of oil-shale. Matrix diffusion within the retort chamber can be simulated by applying equation 5 once for each fracture orientation.

In addition to rock and fracture characteristics discussed previously, the use of equation 5 to simulate a source of solute requires an estimate for the initial solute concentration in the pores of the oil-shale matrix ( $C_p$ ). Water-quality sampling as the retort chamber resaturates will provide a measure of solute concentration in fractures but not of solute concentration in the shale-matrix pores. In cases where solute migration outside the chamber does not occur until some time after the initial resaturation the initial solute concentration with the shale-matrix pores may be approximated by the initial solute concentration within fractures. Study by the author and the Department of Energy in situ oil-shale retort near Rock Springs, Wyo. indicate that this approximation may be reasonable in many cases.

In situ retort chambers are sources of solute for extended periods of time after retorting stops. This characteristic has been observed by the author at the U.S. Department of Energy, experimental, in situ, oil-shale retort near Rock Springs, Wyoming and by Hall (1982) in laboratory experiments. The source of solute cannot be explained solely by diffusion from burned shale into fractures.

Hall (1982) has proposed a mechanism to explain the long-term source of solute that is based on the slow dissolution of the mineral matrix from pore walls. Although he was unable to provide a good theoretical basis for this slow dissolution, he proposed the use of an empirical expression to simulate the mechanism. The expression is

$$K^* A (c_e - c) \quad (6)$$

where  $K^*$  = the mass transfer coefficient [ $L^{-2}T^{-1}$ ],

$A$  = the interfacial area [ $L^2$ ],

$c_e$  = the equilibrium concentration of fluid in contact with shale blocks [ $ML^{-3}$ ], and

$c$  = the solute concentration [ $ML^{-3}$ ].

This equation acts as a source-sink term to the solute-transport equation and simulates the dominant mechanism for leaching of burned shale after the passage of two to three pore volumes of water.

Application of the proposed leaching mechanism to a field problem requires that  $K^*$ ,  $A$ , and  $c_e$  in equation 6 be determined. While Hall (1982) determined values of the product  $K^*A$  for organic solute from column experiments, the applicability of these values to field problems is unknown. Therefore  $K^*A$  is effectively a parameter that must be estimated during model calibration. The equilibrium concentration,  $c_e$ , can be estimated from long-term leaching tests of burned shale. Unfortunately, these tests have been performed for very few of the chemical species found in oil-shale retort water.

The use of empirical equation 6 to describe mass transfer essentially provides an infinite source of solute to the medium where, in reality, such a source is finite. Therefore the use of equation 6 will over estimate solute concentrations in the trailing part of a plume. The use of equation 6 is justified in studies of solute transport in oil shale where the distribution of solute in the trailing part of the plume is not considered, or in studies where an estimate of maximum probable concentration of solute in the trailing part of a plume is needed.

## MODEL CALIBRATION AND SENSITIVITY

The approach to ground-water flow and solute transport used in this report along with the three-dimensional nature of flow through oil shale, introduces an unusually large number of calibration parameters. Considering the amount and distribution of water-level and solute-concentration data that are available in most field studies, it is possible to reach a point where additional detail in the simulation procedure does not significantly improve the model fit. Therefore, it is important to assess the uncertainty associated with the various calibration parameters if the model is to remain a practical one for use in field problems.

Cooley (1977) presents a method for evaluating the reliability of a model within the framework of steady-state flow of ground water in two dimensions. This technique has been extended to three dimensions and is described in a later section. Before presenting the technique, the relationship between measured data in wells and model-calculated hydraulic head is discussed. Observation wells that have been installed in oil-shale strata rarely are piezometers.

## Relationship of Measured Data and Calculated Results

### Hydraulic Head

The relationship between hydraulic head in the formation and the water level measured in a well open to part or all of the formation is governed by aquifer properties, well-bore characteristics and the vertical-head gradient within the formation. An accurate treatment of the relationship would involve solving the three-dimensional equation of ground-water flow in the close vicinity of the well bore using model estimates of aquifer properties and a boundary condition of uniform head along the well bore. The computed head in the well could be compared to measured water-level data. This approach is not practical in most field problems. Instead, a relationship is used in the model that is based on the steady-state conservation of water within the well bore and Darcy's law. The result is a simple weighted average of hydraulic head.

$$h_{\text{int}} = \frac{\int_{z_1}^{z_2} K_{ii} h dz}{\int_{z_1}^{z_2} K_{ii} dz} \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (7)$$

where  $h_{\text{int}}$  = the depth-integrated head in the well [L],

$h$  = hydraulic head obtained from the solution to equation 2 [L],

$z_2$  = the altitude of the top of the well bore open to the formation [L],

$z_1$  = the altitude of the bottom of the well bore open to the formation [L], and

$K_{ii}$  = hydraulic conductivity [ $LT^{-1}$ ].

Equation 7 is derived by writing Darcy's law for radial flow and integrating along the open interval of the well. Applying Darcy's law for radial flow from an circular boundary with no drawdown due to well-bore effects and assuming a well radius of 1 foot gives

$$q = \frac{2\pi K(h_b - h_{int})}{\ln(r)}$$

where  $q$  = the Darcian flux per unit length of well bore [ $L^2T^{-1}$ ],

$K$  = the hydraulic conductivity [ $LT^{-1}$ ],

$h_b$  = the head at the boundary [ $L$ ],

$h_{int}$  = the head in the well [ $L$ ], and

$r$  = the distance to the boundary [ $L$ ].

The distance  $r$  may be thought of as the radius of influence by the well bore. By assuming steady-state flow along the well bore, the amount of water entering the well along part of the open interval must equal the amount leaving along the remainder of the open section. The integral expression for this conservation of mass is

$$\int_{z_1}^{z_2} q \, dz = 0.$$

Substitution of Darcy's law for radial flow into the expression for conservation of mass gives

$$\int_{z_1}^{z_2} \frac{K}{\ln(r)} h_b \, dz = h_{int} \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \frac{K}{\ln(r)} \, dz.$$

Treating distance to the boundary as a constant,  $\ln(r)$ , may be moved outside the integral and equation 7 obtained.

The model in this report uses information on the open intervals of wells, estimates of hydraulic conductivity and calculated hydraulic head to determine the depth-integrated head at each observation well. The result may be compared to measured water-level data as a guide during model calibration when piezometers are not available.

### Solute Concentration

The relationship between solute concentration in the formation and that in a well is governed by the three-dimensional equation of solute transport. As with hydraulic head, it is not practical to solve this problem at each well bore. By assuming steady-state conservation of solute and using Darcy's law, one can obtain an expression similar to equation 7.

$$c_{int} = \frac{\int_{z_3}^{z_4} c q_i dz}{\int_{z_3}^{z_4} q_i dz} \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (8)$$

where  $c_{int}$  = the depth-integrated solute concentration  $[M/L^3]$ ,

$c$  = solute concentration obtained from the solution to equation 4  $[M/L^3]$ ,

$z_3$  to  $z_4$  = the part of the well bore where water enters  $[L]$ , and

$q_i = K_{ii}(h - h_{int})$ .

Equation 7 is used in the model to infer sections of the well bore where water enters. The derivation of equation 8 essentially is identical to the derivation of equation 7 and will not be given here.

## Estimating Parameters for Models of Steady-State Ground-Water Flow

Direct measurement of all hydrogeologic parameters needed to construct models of ground-water flow and solute transport is rarely possible. As a result, values of unmeasured parameters usually are adjusted until measured and calculated water levels and solute concentrations match in some acceptable manner. Cooley (1977) proposed a regression method for estimating an optimal set of hydrogeologic parameters and assessing parameter reliability within the framework of two-dimensional steady-state flow. An extension of this method to three dimensions is included in the model described in this report.

The following method is used to estimate parameters and assess reliability for a three-dimensional model of steady-state ground-water flow. Throughout the following development, deviations from the two-dimensional development of Cooley (1977) are noted. The method is an iterative technique that minimizes the squared difference between measured and calculated water levels in wells. To set up the iterative technique it is necessary to linearize the finite-element form of the equation of ground-water flow with respect to unknown model parameters, differentiate the linearized equation with respect to these parameters, and, setting each derivative equal to zero, solve the system of equations.



The derivatives of unknown model parameters are obtained in the following manner. A truncated Taylor series expansion of equation 2 is written for  $(\Delta t)^{-1}$  equal to zero and  $\theta$  equal to one. The resulting iterative equation is identical to the one given by Cooley (1977). Solving this Taylor series for hydraulic head gives

$$\bar{h}^{r+1} = \bar{h}^r + \bar{\Delta}^r + \bar{S}^r \bar{b}^{r+1} \quad (9)$$

where  $\bar{h}^{r+1}$  = the vector of hydraulic head at the  $r+1$  iteration;

$\bar{h}$  = the vector of hydraulic head at the  $r$  iteration,

$$\bar{\Delta}^r = -(\bar{K}^r)^{-1} \bar{f}^r;$$

$\bar{K}^r$  = the matrix involving estimates of hydraulic conductivity used in equation 2 at the  $r$  iteration;

$\bar{f}^r$  = the functional representation of equation 2 at the  $r$  iteration,

$$\bar{S}^r = -(\bar{K}^r)^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial \bar{f}^r}{\partial \bar{a}^r} \bar{a}^r \right);$$

$\bar{a}^r$  = the vector of model-parameter estimates at the  $r$  iteration, and

$$\bar{b}^{r+1} = \frac{\bar{a}^{r+1} - \bar{a}^r}{\bar{a}^r}.$$

This equation is identical to the one used by Cooley (1977) to calculate hydraulic heads for each new iteration. The definitions of the variables are given in three dimensions instead of two.

Hydraulic head calculated by equation 9 cannot be compared directly to water-level measurements in wells unless the wells are constructed as piezometers. Because wells usually are open to some interval of aquifer, water levels represent a depth-integrated value of hydraulic head. Therefore, the least squares criterion that must be satisfied differs slightly from the criterion used by Cooley (1977), where vertical-head variations were not considered.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{b}^{r+1}} \{ \bar{w}(\bar{h}_m - \bar{h}_{int}^{r+1})^2 \} = 0 \quad (10)$$

where  $\bar{w}$  = a vector of weights between 0 and 1 describing the reliability of  $\bar{h}_m$ ,

$\bar{h}_m$  = the measured head, and

$\bar{h}_{int}^{r+1}$  = the vector of depth-integrated head at the  $r+1$  iteration.

Depth-integrated head is calculated by using the finite-element approximation to equation 7 in conjunction with equation 9. Substitution of the result in equation 10 gives the following:

$$\bar{w}(\bar{N}^T \bar{S}^r)^T \bar{N}^r \bar{S}^r \bar{b}^{r+1} = (\bar{N}^T \bar{S})^T \bar{w}[\bar{h}_m - \bar{N}^r(\bar{h}^r + \bar{A}^r)] \quad (11)$$

where  $\bar{N}^r$  = the matrix of finite-element approximations of equation 7 involving estimated hydraulic conductivity at the  $r$  iteration, and,

$( )^T$  = the matrix-transpose operation.

With the exception of the  $\bar{N}^r$  term, equation 11 is identical to the least squares equation used by Cooley (1977). Equation 11 can be solved for  $\bar{b}^{r+1}$  which in turn can be used to calculate estimates of model parameters. Because the Taylor series expansion used to linearize the equations of ground-water flow is an approximation, the solution of equation 11 may not give global optimum values of  $\bar{b}^{r+1}$  unless  $\bar{h}^{r+1} - \bar{h}^r$  and  $\bar{a}^{r+1} - \bar{a}^r$  are small. Therefore iteration must be used.

The iteration procedure is identical to the one used by Cooley (1977). An initial estimate of aquifer properties and other unknown model parameters is used to solve equation 2 for hydraulic head. The coefficients  $\partial \bar{f}^r / \partial \bar{a}^r$  are calculated and equation 11 is used to solve for  $\bar{b}^{r+1}$  and new estimates of model parameters. The iteration number is advanced by one and the Taylor series expansion of equation 2 is used to compute  $\bar{f}^r$ . An iterative cycle is begun by resolving equation 2 with the latest estimates of aquifer properties and boundary flux rates until values for  $\bar{f}^{r+1}$  are less than some acceptable error.

## Sensitivity Analysis of Transient Ground-Water Flow and Solute Transport

Development of a statistical procedure for estimating model parameters under transient conditions is more difficult than under steady-state conditions. Several approaches to solving this problem may be possible, but all have proven overly expensive in terms of disc storage, core storage or computational time. Therefore, calibration of transient ground-water flow and solute-transport models remains a trial-and-error process in this report.

A review of the differential equation of solute transport (eq. 3) shows that ground-water velocity acts as a calibration parameter. Therefore, it usually is necessary to develop a ground-water flow model concurrently with the development of a solute-transport model. Darcy's law is used to compute velocity from estimates of hydraulic conductivity and model-calculated head. The linkage between ground-water flow and solute transport often forces the hydrologist to iterate between the flow and transport models until a distribution of hydraulic conductivity is obtained that reproduces both historical water-level and solute-concentration data. Bibby (1981) observed that the solute-transport model can have a strong influence in determining optimal estimates of hydraulic conductivity.

## EVALUATION OF MODEL

A number of tests of the model have been made including comparisons of model results to analytical solutions and to one field application. Because analytical solutions rarely exist for three-dimensional problems, tests have been designed to verify the accuracy of the model in one and two dimensions. Repeated applications of the test problems in each of the three directions were used to isolate any programming or logic errors. Comparisons of model results with analytical solutions are discussed below. Application of the model to a field problem, solute transport from an in situ oil-shale retort near Rock Springs, Wyo., will be discussed in a later report (K. C. Glover, U.S. Geological Survey, written commun., 1985).

### Ground-Water Flow

An evaluation of the basic model of ground-water flow (eq. 2) has not uncovered any unusual characteristics. For problems with relatively regular boundaries, the evaluation showed that the finite-element method did not improve upon head distribution calculated by finite-difference methods. In problems with complex and irregular aquifer geometry, the finite-element method can be used to model the flow system with fewer nodes.

Model results were compared to Theis's analytical solution for draw-down in the vicinity of a pumping well (Lohman, 1979). The Theis solution is for a fully penetrating well in an infinite confined aquifer with no vertical movement of water. These conditions were simulated in the flow model by using variable node spacing, a zero-drawdown boundary 20,000 ft from the well, and uniform aquifer properties. The aquifer was assumed to be 100 ft thick with a hydraulic conductivity of 12.5 ft/d and specific storage of  $10^{-6}$  ft<sup>-1</sup>. Well discharge, distributed uniformly along the well bore, was simulated at a rate of 2.0 ft<sup>3</sup>/sec. Model results and the analytical solution are plotted in figure 2 for three distances from the

---

Figure 2.--(on following page) belongs near here

---

pumping well.

---

**Figure 2.--Comparison of flow-model results with Theis's analytical solution.**

---

The remainder of this section is a discussion of the regression technique for estimating aquifer properties and boundary-flow rates in steady-state systems. Most of the major conclusions of Cooley (1977 and 1979) seem to be appropriate for flow in three as well as two dimensions. Specific points of interest to three-dimensional problems are discussed below.

The number of aquifer properties and flux rates that are treated as regression parameters can have a strong influence on the convergence characteristics of the model. The vertical anisotropy that is common in most three-dimensional systems increases the number of regression parameters and can cause convergence problems more easily than in two-dimensional flow. The number of regression parameters in three dimensions also increases because horizontal hydraulic conductivity often varies with depth. With the large number of parameters that can occur in three-dimensional models it may be difficult to obtain adequate water-level data for all strata and convergence can be very slow. In cases where the number of regression parameters approaches the number of measured water levels, no solution may be possible. These characteristics can limit the use of the regression technique in three-dimensional problems.



Boundary-flux rates usually are measured with greatest accuracy when the flow occurs at or near the land surface. This fact has a number of implications in using the regression technique. If significant recharge and discharge occurs at depth as underflow and the hydraulic conductivity is not known exactly, the least-squares matrix usually is ill-conditioned and no solution is possible. On the other hand, if boundaries are identified at depth such that no flow occurs across them, a solution may be possible. However, the standard errors of estimate for hydraulic conductivity usually will be very large. Large standard errors can be common especially if measured water-level data do not accurately describe vertical head gradients throughout the study area.

Cooley (1977) found that models of ground-water flow are characterized by having large standard errors for the parameters. These errors are caused by anomalous measured water levels as well as errors in specified boundary conditions. If errors that usually occur in boundary-flux estimates are not considered during model applications, the resulting standard errors for the parameters usually will be artificially small. Test problems using the three-dimensional regression procedure supported these conclusions.

The regression model in this respect can be used to assess reliability of computed parameters and predicted values of head if the model is approximately linear with respect to the parameters. Cooley (1979) provides a test for linearity that also is applicable to three dimensions. Because the model is nonlinear with respect to hydraulic conductivity, the large number of hydraulic-conductivity parameters in most three-dimensional systems makes it more difficult to pass this test of linearity. Therefore, the use of confidence regions and test of hypothesis may not be appropriate for many three-dimensional problems. Additional testing of the regression method in three dimensions is needed to evaluate this conclusion.

### Solute Transport

An analytical solution for one-dimensional solute transport from a specified concentration boundary into a fractured aquifer of uniform thickness is given by Bibby (1981, p. 1078). Fractures are assumed to be horizontal and separated by sufficient impermeable strata to be considered of infinite extent. The solute is considered to be non-reactive. The analytical solution was obtained by analogy to a corresponding solution for conduction and convection of heat into an aquifer.

Model results were compared to this analytical solution using representative values for aquifer characteristics. Seepage velocity of water in the fissures was set equal to 0.5 ft/d. Longitudinal and transverse dispersivities were set to 100 ft/d, and the diffusion coefficient of solute in water in the unfractured formation blocks was  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  ft<sup>2</sup>/d. The block porosity was set to unity to permit comparison with the analytical solution thickness of the blocks made sufficiently large so as not to violate assumptions in the analytical solution. Several simulations with various block dimensions were made to insure the assumptions were reproduced.

Model and analytical results after 100 days of solute transport are presented in figure 3. The close comparison verifies the model theory

---

Figure 3.--(on following page) belongs near here

---

and program logic. The model slightly overestimates solute concentrations in the leading part of the profile and slightly underestimates concentrations in the trailing part. This characteristic probably is due to the effects of numerical dispersion associated with nodal spacing.

---

Figure 3.--Comparison of results from solute-transport model with analytical solution at 100 days.

---

Additional simulations were made with the dual-porosity equation to evaluate the sensitivity of the model to variations in the dual-porosity coefficients. The coefficients that had the greatest effect on the distribution of solute appeared to be shale-matrix porosity and fracture width. The matrix-diffusion coefficient and fracture density also were important in determining the distribution of solute. These observations are in agreement with those of Grisak and Pickens (1980) and show that in fractured rock, matrix diffusion can be an important mechanism for solute transport. Factors reducing the need to consider matrix diffusion are small matrix porosities and large fracture width and density.

A review of the dual-porosity equation (eq. 5) shows that a large number of coefficients must be known even for relatively simple fracture geometries. Because in most studies these coefficients must be estimated during model calibration, the amount of water-quality data needed is far greater than the amount needed to use a continuum model. Within the framework of a three-dimensional system, sufficient data may be available only for a preliminary calibration of the model. Nevertheless in rock where matrix diffusion is dominant, a scarcity of data is not sole justification for ignoring the more complex model.

## COMPUTER PROGRAM

A listing of the FORTRAN program that solves the three-dimensional equations of flow and solute transport in dual-porosity media is given in table 1 (at end of report). Data-input formats are described in table 2 (at end of report). Although data entry into a finite-element program typically is more cumbersome than for finite-difference programs, the increased data-entry time usually is compensated by increased flexibility in locating nodes. With a finite-element model, nodes can be accurately located at observation or pumping wells. In general, fewer nodes are needed to accurately model aquifer geometry when using a finite-element model.

Data entry into a finite-element program is more cumbersome because of the need to identify the relationships among all nodes and elements. As a result, all nodes and elements must be numbered, the Cartesian coordinates of all nodes must be coded, and the nodes associated with each element must be designated.

The system used to number aquifer nodes and elements has a significant impact on the efficiency and size of the computer program. The global coefficient matrices developed in equations 2 and 4 represent the largest block of computer storage used by the program. The solution technique is more efficient, in terms of time and storage requirements, if the size of the global coefficient matrices is minimized. Storage requirements of the global coefficient matrices are directly related to the largest difference between two node numbers in an aquifer element. Therefore, efficient nodal ordering minimizes this difference and improves the efficiency of the solution. The program calculates and prints the band width. If the dimensions of arrays are not sufficient, the simulation will stop.

## SAMPLE SIMULATION

Use of the model is illustrated by simulating solute transport from a buried source in a three-layer aquifer system. The bottom layer represents an aquifer where horizontal joints are common within relatively thick impermeable rock. The middle layer represents an aquifer where vertical fractures are common. The top layer represents a homogeneous isotropic sandstone. Boundary conditions and nodal locations are shown horizontally in figure 4 and vertically in figure 5. Aquifer properties

---

Figures 4 and 5.--(on following pages) belong near here

---

for each layer are given in table 3. Pumping by two wells, one from the bottom layer and one from the top, also is simulated. Steady-state flow conditions are assumed.

The input data used in the model run and results for one time step are listed in tables 4 and 5 (at end of report). Results present total time into the simulation, and the hydraulic head and solute concentration for each node in the finite-element grid. Principal components of Darcian velocity and dispersion coefficient also are printed for each element.

---

Figure 4.--Boundary conditions and node locations along the bottom of the  
aquifer system used in the sample simulation.

---



---

Figure 5.--Boundary conditions and node locations along a vertical section of the aquifer system used in the sample simulation.

---

Table 3.--Aquifer properties used in sample simulation

Aquifer property	Bottom layer	Middle layer	Top layer
Hydraulic conductivity			
x-direction (feet/day)	20.0	10.0	40.0
Hydraulic conductivity			
y-direction (feet/day)	20.0	2.0	40.0
Hydraulic conductivity			
z-direction (feet/day)	5.0	10.0	40.0
Longitudinal dispersivity (feet)	10.0	1.0	100.0
Transverse dispersivity (feet)	3.0	.3	30.0
Molecular diffusion in low permeabil-			
ity blocks (square feet per day)	.0001	.0001	.0
Fracture width (feet)	.2	.01	.0
Block width (feet)	1.8	.19	.0
Effective porosity (dimensionless)	.1	.05	.3
Block porosity (dimensionless)	.01	.01	.0
Flux boundary (feet/day)	.4	.2	.4
Specified-head boundary (feet)	--	--	500.0
Solute-concentration boundary			
(milligrams per liter)	100.0	--	--

## SUMMARY

The model described in this report can simulate three-dimensional ground-water flow and solute transport in oil shale and associated hydrogeologic units. The model treats oil shale as a dual-porosity medium by simulating flow and transport within fractures using conventional finite-element methods. Diffusion of solute between fractures and the essentially static water of the shale matrix is simulated by including an analytical solution that acts as a source-sink term to the differential equation of solute transport. While knowledge of fracture orientation and spacing is needed to effectively use the model, it is not necessary to map the locations of individual fractures.

The computer program listed in the report incorporates many of the features of previous dual-porosity models while retaining a practical approach to solving field problems. As a result the report does not extend the theory of solute transport in any appreciable way. The emphasis in the report is on bringing together various aspects of solute-transport theory in a manner that is particularly suited to the unusual ground-water flow and solute-transport characteristics of oil-shale systems.

Methods for quantifying the uncertainty in parameter estimates that occur during model development are given in this report. The quasilinear regression method described by Cooley (1977) for estimating parameters and assessing reliability for two-dimensional models of steady-state ground-water flow has been extended to three dimensions. Because the number of model parameters in three-dimensional simulations generally is larger than in two-dimensional simulations, adequate water-level data may not be available for evaluating parameter reliability. When it is possible to evaluate parameter reliability, standard errors for hydraulic-conductivity estimates of buried strata generally are large.

A large number of aquifer properties must be evaluated when simulating solute transport through dual-porosity media. Because properties such as the matrix-diffusion coefficient, matrix porosity, and fracture width and density often are estimated during model calibration, a large amount of water-quality data is needed. Within the framework of a three-dimensional system, sufficient data may be available only for a preliminary calibration of the model. Nevertheless, matrix diffusion can be an important mechanism for solute transport in fractured rock.

## REFERENCES CITED

- Bibby, Robert, 1981, Mass transport of solutes in dual-porosity media: Water Resources Research, v. 17, no. 4, p. 1075-1081.
- Bradley, W. H., 1964, Geology of Green River Formation and associated Eocene rocks in southwestern Wyoming and adjacent parts of Colorado and Utah: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 496-A, p. 31-34.
- Cooley, R. L., 1977, A method of estimating parameters and assessing reliability for models of steady state groundwater flow, 1, Theory and numerical properties: Water Resources Research, v. 13, no. 2, p. 318-324.
- 1979, A method of estimating parameters and assessing reliability for models of steady state groundwater flow, 2, Application of statistical analysis: Water Resources Research, v. 15, no. 3, p. 603-617.
- Freeze, R. A., and Cherry, J. A., 1979, Groundwater: Englewood Cliff, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 604 p.
- Grisak, G. E., and Pickens, J. F., 1980, Solute transport through fractured media, 1, the effect of matrix diffusion: Water Resources Research, v. 16, no. 4, p. 719-730.
- Gupta, S. K., and Tanji, K. K., 1976, A three-dimensional Galerkin finite element solution of flow through multiaquifers in Sutter Basin, California: Water Resources Research, v. 12, no. 2, p. 155-162.
- Hall, W. G., 1982, The kinetics of leaching of organic carbon from in situ spent shale: Lawrence Berkley Laboratory Report LBL-14231, 159 p.
- Huyakorn, P. S., Lester, B. H., and Mercer, J. W., 1983, An efficient finite-element technique for modeling transport in fractured porous media, 1, Single species transport: Water Resources Research, v. 19, no. 3, p. 841-854.

#### REFERENCES CITED--Continued

- Huyakorn, P. S., and Nilkuha, K., 1979, Solution of transient transport equation using an upstream finite element scheme: Applied Mathematical Modelling, v. 3, no. 1, p. 7-17.
- INTERCOMP Resource Development and Engineering, Inc., 1976, A model for calculating effects of liquid waste disposal in deep saline aquifers, Part I - development, Part II documentation: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 76-61, 253 p.
- Konikow, L. F., and Bredehoeft, J. D., 1978, Computer model of two-dimensional solute transport and dispersion in ground water: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations, Book 7, chapter C2, 90 p.
- Lohman, S. W., 1979, Ground-water hydraulics: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 708, 70 p.
- Noorishad, Jahan, and Mehran, Mohsen, 1982, An upstream finite element method for solution of transient transport equation in fractured porous media: Water Resources Research, v. 18, no. 3, p. 588-596.
- Pinder, G. F., and Gray, W. G., 1977, Finite element simulation in surface and subsurface hydrology: New York, Academic Press, 295 p.
- Rasmuson, A., Narasimham, T. N., and Neretnieks, I., 1982, Chemical transport in a fissured rock: Verification of a numerical model: Water Resources Research, v. 18, no. 5, p. 1479-1492.
- Robson, S. G., and Saulnier, G. J., 1981, Hydrogeochemistry and simulated solute transport, Piceance Basin, northwestern Colorado: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1196, 65 p.
- Snow, D. T., 1969, Anisotropic permeability of fractured media: Water Resources Research, v. 5, no. 6, p. 1273-1289.
- Zienkiewicz, O. C., 1971, The finite element method in engineering science: New York, McGraw-Hill, 521 p.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

Table 1.--Computer-program listing

C** A FINITE ELEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE SOLUTION OF	10
C** THREE-DIMENSIONAL TRANSIENT GROUND-WATER FLOW AND SOLUTE	20
C** TRANSPORT IN FRACTURED MATERIAL	30
C** OBSERVATIONS MAY BE VALUES OF HEAD AND CONCENTRATION IN WELLS	40
C** OPEN TO SOME OR ALL OF THE AQUIFER SYSTEM	50
C** ELEMENTS ARE ISOPARAMETRIC CUBES WITH LINEAR SIDES.	60
C** UPSTREAM FINITE ELEMENTS USED FOR SOLUTE TRANSPORT.	70
C** GUIDELINES FOR ARRAY DIMENSIONS -- IF NOT SOLVING TRANSPORT PROBLEM	80
C** THE DIMENSIONS OF TRANSPORT ARRAYS MAY BE REDUCED TO 1	90
C** LET NVARH=NPARRH+NQPAR+NBPARR	100
C** SET IDIM.GE.NUMNP, JDIMH.GE.IBH, JDIMC.GE.IBC, KDIM.GE.NUMEL,	110
C** NVEH.GE.NVARH	120
C** CURRENTLY DIMENSIONS ARE FOR A MAXIMUM OF	130
C** NUMNP= 490 NUMEL=300 NTIME=52 IBH= 90 IBC=180 NTPER=52 NTO=1	140
C** NTRE= 0 NTW= 0 NTS=1 NOBMAX=30 NBPARR= 0 NTB=0	150
C** NPARR= 8 NQPAR= 0 NUMAT=7 NTFRAC=9 ITRAC= 10 NLAYER= 3	160
C** MAIN ARRAYS --	170
C** XTXH(NVARH,NVARH),BH(4*NVARH)	180
C** PH(NVARH),RKH(NVARH),HINT(NTO*NOBMAX)	190
C** ZSPACE(NLAYER-1),CINT(NTO*NOBMAX),TITLE(20),HP1(NUMNP*2),	200
C** CP1(NUMNP*2),CO(NTO*NOBMAX),	210
C** NXTO(NTO+1),NXTW(NTW+1),NXTS(NTS+1),NXTB(NTB+1)	220
DIMENSION XTXH(8,8),BH(32),	230
\$ PH(8),RKH(8),HINT(30),CINT(30),	240
\$ ZSPACE(3),TITL(20),	250
\$ CO(30),NXTO(1),	260
\$ NXTW(1),NXTS(2),NXTB(1)	270
C** COFBLK ARRAYS --	280
C** H(NUMNP*2),C(NUMNP*2),QHTMP(NUMNP),WELL(NUMNP*(NTW+1)),	290
C** CFRAC(NTFRAC+1,NUMNP),CINIT(NUMNP),	300
C** WELLC(NUMNP*(NTW+1)),SFOBSH(NUMNP+NOBMAX),SFOBSC(NUMNP+NOBMAX),	310
C** WTNOD(NUMNP),DM(NUMAT),FP(NUMAT),FQ(NUMAT),	320
C** RPBR(NUMAT),CBINIT(NUMAT),RX(NUMAT),RY(NUMAT),RZ(NUMAT),	330
C** HO(NTO*NOBMAX),RC(NUMAT),RPR(NUMAT),DL(NUMAT),DT(NUMAT),	340
C** IPRMH(3,NUMAT),MAT(NUMEL),NBP(NUMNP),RMT(NUMAT)	350
COMMON/COFBLK/CFRAC(10, 490),QHTMP( 490),CINIT( 490),	360
\$ H( 980),C( 980),WELL( 490),WELLC( 490),	370
\$ RX(7),RY(7),RZ(7),RC(7),	380
\$ RPR(7),DM(7),FP(7),FQ(7),RMT(7),HO(30),	390
\$ RPBR(7),CBINIT(7),SFOBSH( 520),SFOBSC( 520),WTNOD( 490),	400
\$ DL(7),DT(7),THETAH,DTIME,TIMFAC,TIMBGN,CEQUI,DFW,	410
\$ TIMSUM,IPRMH(3,7),MAT(300),NBP( 490),IELMR	420
C** SINBLK ARRAYS --	430
C** XORD(NUMNP),YORD(NUMNP),ZORD(NUMNP),QS(NUMNP*(NTS+1)),CS(NUMNP*	440
C** (NTS+1)),QF(NQPAR),CF(NQPAR),QEH(8),QEC(8),NP(NUMEL,8),IBPRM(NUMEL)	450
COMMON/SINBLK/QEH(8),QEC(8),XORD( 490),YORD( 490),ZORD( 490),	460
\$ QS( 980),CS( 980),QF(1),CF(1),NP(300,8),IBPRM(300)	470
DOUBLE PRECISION QEH,QEC	480
C** SENBLK ARRAY --	490
C** WH(NTO*NOBMAX),WC(NTO*NOBMAX),NPBC(NUMNP,NTB+1),NODOBS(NUMNP)	500
COMMON/SENBK/WH(30),	510
\$ WC(30),THETAC,NPBC(490,1),NODOBS(490)	520
C** LDUBLK --	530



Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

C**	CPKH(IDIM,IBH),SH(NVARH,NUMNP),QH(NUMNP)	540
C**	CPKC(IDIM,IBC),QC(IBC)	550
	COMMON/LDUBLK/CPKC(490,180),CPKH(490, 90),SH(8, 490),	560
	\$ QC( 490),QH( 490),IBC,IBH	570
	REAL*8 CPKC,CPKH,SH,QC,QH	580
C**	SHABLK,SURBLK AND LINBLK -- ALL DIMENSIONS CONSTANT	590
	COMMON/SHABLK/SF(4,8,8),WF(4,8),WT(8),NUMQPT	600
	COMMON/SURBLK/AF(3,4),AWT,NQPTA	610
	COMMON/LINBLK/RLF(2,2),RLWT,LINOD(4,2)	620
	DOUBLE PRECISION SF,WT,WF,AF,AWT	630
C**	SET # RECORDS IN FILE 8 TO (NTIME/NTPER+1), # WORDS TO NUMNP	640
C**	SET # RECORDS IN FILE 9 TO (NTIME+1), # WORDS TO NUMNP	650
	OPEN (UNIT=8,FILE='HEADS',ACCESS='DIRECT',FORM='UNFORMATTED',	660
	\$ RECL=816)	670
	OPEN (UNIT=9,FILE='CONCN',ACCESS='DIRECT',FORM='UNFORMATTED',	680
	\$ RECL=816)	690
	OPEN (UNIT=5,FILE='SAMPLE.INPUT',STATUS='OLD')	700
	OPEN (UNIT=6,FILE='SOLUTION.PRT')	710
	IDIM=490	720
	JDIMH= 90	730
	KDIM=300	740
	NVEH=8	750
	LDIMH=NVEH*4	760
	JDIMC=180	770
	DO 105 I=1,3	780
	READ(5,1)(TITL(J),J=1,20)	790
	WRITE (6,2) (TITL(J),J=1,20)	800
105	CONTINUE	810
	WRITE(6,3)	820
	READ (5,4) NUMEL,NUMNP,NUMAT,NTIME,NTPER,NTB,NTD,NOBMAX,NTW,	830
	\$ NTS,NPARH,NQPAR,NBPAR	840
	WRITE(6,5) NUMEL,NUMNP,NUMAT,NTIME,NTPER,NTB,NTD,NOBMAX,NTW,	850
	\$ NTS,NPARH,NQPAR,NBPAR	860
	READ (5,4) NPLAYR,NEPLAY	870
	WRITE (6,68) NPLAYR,NEPLAY	880
	READ (5,4) ITMAX,IVELPR,IFRAC,NTFRAC,ITFRAC,NLAYER,IBEAL	890
	WRITE (6,6) ITMAX,IVELPR,IFRAC,NTFRAC,ITFRAC,NLAYER,IBEAL	900
	WRITE(6,7)	910
	READ (5,8) NTPRT,IPO,IPRX,AP,AMP,RP,RPF,EVH	920
	WRITE (6,8) NTPRT,IPO,IPRX,AP,AMP,RP,RPF,EVH	930
	READ (5,9) DTIME,TIMFAC,THETAH,THETAC,DFW,CEQUI	940
	WRITE (6,10) DTIME,TIMFAC,THETAH,THETAC,DFW,CEQUI	950
	READ (5,9) ALFLG,ALFAX,ALFAY,ALFAZ	960
	WRITE(6,11) ALFLG,ALFAX,ALFAY,ALFAZ	970
C**	INITIALIZE	980
	TIMBGN=DTIME	990
	DO 110 I=1,NUMNP	1000
	H(I)=0.0	1010
	NBP(I)=0	1020
	NPBC(I,1)=0	1030
	NODOBS(I)=0	1040
110	CONTINUE	1050
	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 130	1060

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	DO 120 I=1,NUMNP	1070
	C(I)=0.0	1080
	DO 120 J=1,NTFRAC	1090
	CFRAC(J,I)=0.0	1100
120	CONTINUE	1110
130	N=NOBMAX*NTO	1120
	NXTO(1)=999999	1130
	IF (N.LE.0) GO TO 150	1140
	DO 140 I=1,N	1150
	HO(I)=0.0	1160
	WH(I)=0.0	1170
	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 140	1180
	CO(I)=0.0	1190
	WC(I)=0.0	1200
140	CONTINUE	1210
150	N=NUMNP*(NTW+1)	1220
	NXTW(1)=999999	1230
	DO 156 I=1,N	1240
	WELL(I)=0.0	1250
	IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) WELLC(I)=0.0	1260
156	CONTINUE	1270
	N=NUMNP*(NTS+1)	1280
	NXTS(1)=999999	1290
	DO 158 I=1,N	1300
	QS(I)=0.0	1310
	IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) CS(I)=0.0	1320
158	CONTINUE	1330
	DO 160 I=1,NUMAT	1340
	IPRMH(1,I)=0	1350
	IPRMH(2,I)=0	1360
	IPRMH(3,I)=0	1370
160	CONTINUE	1380
	NUMM=NUMNP-NLAYER+1	1390
	NLAYM2=NLAYER-2	1400
	NLAYM1=NLAYER-1	1410
	READ (5,9) (ZSPACE(I),I=1,NLAYM1)	1420
	WRITE(6,9) (ZSPACE(I),I=1,NLAYM1)	1430
	WRITE (6,69)	1440
	DO 162 I1=1,NPLAYR	1450
	READ (5,12) I,N,XORD(I),YORD(I),	1460
	\$ ZORD(I)	1470
	NM1=N-1	1480
	DO 162 J=1,NM1	1490
	XORD(I+J)=XORD(I)	1500
	YORD(I+J)=YORD(I)	1510
	ZORD(I+J)=ZORD(I)+ZSPACE(J)	1520
162	CONTINUE	1530
	READ (5,13) N	1540
	READ (5,14) (I,NPBC(I,1),NODOBS(I),WTNOD(I),H(I),WELL(I),QS(I),	1550
	\$ I1=1,N)	1560
	WRITE(6,15) (I,NPBC(I,1),NODOBS(I),WTNOD(I),XORD(I),YORD(I),	1570
	\$ ZORD(I),H(I),WELL(I),QS(I),I=1,NUMNP)	1580
	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 164	1590

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	WRITE (6,16)	1600
	READ (5,17) N	1610
	READ (5,17)(I,C(I),WELLC(I),CS(I),I1=1,N)	1620
	WRITE(6,67)(I,C(I),WELLC(I),CS(I),I=1,NUMNP)	1630
	DO 163 I=1,NUMNP	1640
	CINIT(I)=C(I)	1650
163	CONTINUE	1660
164	IBH=0	1670
	WRITE(6,18)	1680
	DO 170 I1=1,NEPLAY	1690
	READ (5,19) I,N,(NP(I,J),J=1,4)	1700
	NM1=N-1	1710
	MAT(I)=1	1720
	DO 166 J=5,8	1730
	NP(I,J)=NP(I,J-4)+1	1740
166	CONTINUE	1750
	IF (NLAYER.LE.2) GO TO 170	1760
	DO 168 K=1,NM1	1770
	DO 168 J=1,8	1780
	MAT(I+K)=K+1	1790
	NP(I+K,J)=NP(I,J)+K	1800
168	CONTINUE	1810
170	CONTINUE	1820
	DO 174 I=1,NUMEL	1830
	WRITE (6,20)I,(NP(I,J),J=1,8)	1840
	DO 172 J=1,8	1850
	DO 172 K=J,8	1860
	J1=IABS(NP(I,J)-NP(I,K))	1870
	IF (J1.GT.IBH) IBH=J1	1880
172	CONTINUE	1890
174	CONTINUE	1900
	IBH=IBH+1	1910
	IBC=IBH*2-1	1920
	WRITE (6,72) IBH,IBC	1930
	IF (NUMNP.GT.IDIM) STOP	1940
	IF (IBH.GT.JDIMH) STOP	1950
	IF (IBC.GT.JDIMC.AND.THETAC.GE.0.0) STOP	1960
	WRITE (6,23)	1970
	DO 188 I=1,NUMEL	1980
	IBPRM(I)=0	1990
188	CONTINUE	2000
	READ (5,4) N	2010
	IF (N.GT.0) READ (5,24)(I,MAT(I),IBPRM(I),I1=1,N)	2020
	WRITE (6,13)(I,MAT(I),IBPRM(I),I=1,NUMEL)	2030
	WRITE (6,25)	2040
	READ (5,26) (I,RX(I),RY(I),RZ(I),RC(I),I1=1,NUMAT)	2050
	WRITE (6,26) (I,RX(I),RY(I),RZ(I),RC(I),I=1,NUMAT)	2060
	ISTEDY=1	2070
	DO 190 I=1,NUMAT	2080
	IF (RC(I).NE.0.0) ISTEDY=0	2090
190	CONTINUE	2100
	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 196	2110
	WRITE (6,28)	2120

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	READ (5,27) (DL(I),DT(I),DM(I),RPR(I),FP(I),FQ(I),RMT(I),	2130
	\$ RPBR(I),I=1,NUMAT)	2140
	WRITE (6,29) (I,DL(I),DT(I),DM(I),RPR(I),FP(I),FQ(I),RMT(I)	2150
	\$ ,RPBR(I),I=1,NUMAT)	2160
	IF (IFRAC.NE.1) GO TO 196	2170
	WRITE (6,32)	2180
	READ (5,27) (CBINIT(I),I=1,NUMAT)	2190
	WRITE (6,33) (CBINIT(I),I=1,NUMAT)	2200
196	IF (NPARH.LT.1) GO TO 206	2210
	DO 198 I=1,NPARH	2220
	RKH(I)=0.0	2230
198	CONTINUE	2240
	WRITE (6,34)	2250
	READ (5,35) (I,IPRMH(1,I),IPRMH(2,I),IPRMH(3,I),I1=1,NUMAT)	2260
	WRITE (6,35) (I,IPRMH(1,I),IPRMH(2,I),IPRMH(3,I),I=1,NUMAT)	2270
	IXTRFL=0	2280
	DO 200 I=1,NUMAT	2290
	IF (IPRMH(1,I).GT.0) IXTRFL=1	2300
	IF (IPRMH(2,I).GT.0) IXTRFL=1	2310
	IF (IPRMH(3,I).GT.0) IXTRFL=1	2320
200	CONTINUE	2330
	WRITE (6,36)	2340
	READ (5,37) (I,RKH(I),I1=1,NPARH)	2350
	WRITE (6,37) (I,RKH(I),I=1,NPARH)	2360
206	IF (NQPAR.LE.0) GO TO 208	2370
	WRITE (6,40)	2380
	READ (5,41) (I,QF(I),RKH(I+NPARH),I1=1,NQPAR)	2390
	WRITE (6,41) (I,QF(I),RKH(I+NPARH),I=1,NQPAR)	2400
	IXTRFL=1	2410
	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 208	2420
	WRITE (6,42)	2430
	READ (5,37) (I,CF(I),I1=1,NQPAR)	2440
	WRITE (6,37) (I,CF(I),I=1,NQPAR)	2450
208	IF (NBP.LE.0) GO TO 212	2460
	READ (5,43) (NBP(I),I=1,NUMNP)	2470
	WRITE(6,44) (NBP(I),I=1,NUMNP)	2480
	WRITE (6,45)	2490
	DO 210 I1=1,NBP	2500
	READ (5,37) I,RKH(I+NPARH+NQPAR)	2510
	WRITE(6,37) I,RKH(I+NPARH+NQPAR)	2520
210	CONTINUE	2530
212	NTF1=NTIFRAC+1	2540
	DO 216 I=1,NUMNP	2550
	H(I+NUMNP)=H(I)	2560
	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 216	2570
	C(I+NUMNP)=C(I)	2580
	IF (IFRAC.EQ.0) GO TO 216	2590
	DO 214 J=1,NTF1	2600
214	CFRAC(J,I)=C(I)	2610
216	CONTINUE	2620
C**	READ TRANSIENT DATA	2630
	IF (NTB.LE.0.AND.ITMAX.EQ.0) GO TO 228	2640
	NXTB(1)=999999	2650

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	IBCNT=1	2660
	IHR=1	2670
	ICR=1	2680
	WRITE (8'IHR) (H(J),J=1,NUMNP)	2690
	WRITE (9'ICR) (C(J),J=1,NUMNP)	2700
	IHR=IHR+1	2710
	ICR=ICR+1	2720
	NTH=NTIME/NTPER	2730
	IF (NTB.GT.0) READ(5,46) I1,I2	2740
	DO 226 I=1,NTH	2750
	IF (NTB.LE.0) GO TO 222	2760
	IF ((I-1)*NTPER.LT.I1) GO TO 222	2770
	IBM1=IBCNT	2780
	IBCNT=IBCNT+1	2790
	NXTB(IBM1)=I1	2800
	DO 218 J=1,NUMNP	2810
	NPBC(J,IBCNT)=NPBC(J,IBM1)	2820
218	CONTINUE	2830
	WRITE (6,47) I1	2840
	DO 220 K=1,I2	2850
	READ (5,48) J,NPBC(J,IBCNT),H(J),X1	2860
	IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) C(J)=X1	2870
220	CONTINUE	2880
	I1=999999	2890
	IF (IBM1.LT.NTB) READ (5,46) I1,I2	2900
222	WRITE (8'IHR) (H(J),J=1,NUMNP)	2910
	IHR=IHR+1	2920
	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 226	2930
	DO 224 K=1,NTPER	2940
	WRITE (9'ICR) (C(J),J=1,NUMNP)	2950
	ICR=ICR+1	2960
224	CONTINUE	2970
226	CONTINUE	2980
	NXTB(NTB+1)=999999	2990
228	IF (NTO.LE.0) GO TO 236	3000
	N=NTO*NOBMAX	3010
	DO 230 I=1,N	3020
	HINT(I)=0.0	3030
	IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) CINT(I)=0.0	3040
230	CONTINUE	3050
	WRITE (6,49)	3060
	DO 234 I=1,NTO	3070
	READ (5, 50) I1	3080
	WRITE (6, 51) I1	3090
	NXTO(I)=I1	3100
	DO 234 J=1,NOBMAX	3110
	READ (5, 52) K,X1,X2,X3,X4	3120
	WRITE(6, 52) K,X1,X2,X3,X4	3130
	L=NOBMAX*(I-1)+K	3140
	HO(L)=X1	3150
	WH(L)=X2	3160
232	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 234	3170
	CO(L)=X3	3180

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	WC(L)=X4	3190
234	CONTINUE	3200
236	NXTO(NTO+1)=999999	3210
	IF (NTW.LE.0) GO TO 242	3220
	WRITE (6,53)	3230
	DO 240 I=1,NTW	3240
	DO 238 J=1,NUMNP	3250
	J1=NUMNP*I+J	3260
	WELL(J1)=WELL(J1-NUMNP)	3270
	IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) WELLC(J1)=WELLC(J1-NUMNP)	3280
238	CONTINUE	3290
	READ (5, 50) I1,I2	3300
	WRITE (6, 54) I1	3310
	NXTW(I)=I1	3320
	ITMP=MOD(I1,NTPER)	3330
	I1=NUMNP*(I)	3340
	IF (ITMP.NE.1) GO TO 248	3350
	DO 240 J=1,I2	3360
	READ (5,52) K,X1,X2	3370
	WRITE (6,52) K,X1,X2	3380
	L=I1+K	3390
	IF (ITMP.EQ.1) WELL(L)=X1	3400
	IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) WELLC(L)=X2	3410
240	CONTINUE	3420
242	NXTW(NTW+1)=999999	3430
	IF (NTS.LE.0) GO TO 250	3440
	WRITE (6,55)	3450
	DO 246 I=1,NTS	3460
	DO 244 J=1,NUMNP	3470
	J1=NUMNP*I+J	3480
	QS(J1)=QS(J1-NUMNP)	3490
	IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) CS(J1)=CS(J1-NUMNP)	3500
244	CONTINUE	3510
	READ (5, 50) I1,I2	3520
	WRITE (6, 56) I1	3530
	NXTS(I)=I1	3540
	ITMP=MOD(I1,NTPER)	3550
	I1=NUMNP*(I)	3560
	IF (ITMP.NE.1) GO TO 248	3570
	DO 246 J=1,I2	3580
	READ (5, 52) K,X1,X2	3590
	WRITE (6, 52) K,X1,X2	3600
	L=I1+K	3610
	QS(L)=X1	3620
	IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) CS(I)=X2	3630
246	CONTINUE	3640
	GO TO 250	3650
248	WRITE(6,80)	3660
	STOP	3670
250	NXTS(NTS+1)=999999	3680
1	FORMAT (20A4)	3690
2	FORMAT (1X,20A4)	3700
3	FORMAT (' NUMEL NUMNP NUMAT NTIME',	3710

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	\$	'	NTPER	NTB	NTC	NOBMAX	NTW',	3720	
	\$	'	NTS	NPARH	NQPAR	NBPAR')		3730	
4		FORMAT	(14I5)					3740	
5		FORMAT	(14I7)					3750	
6		FORMAT	('OITMAX=',I5,' IVELPR=',I5,' IFRAC=',I5,					3760	
	\$	'	NTFRAC=',I5,' ITFRAC=',I5,' NLayer=',I5,' IBEALE=',I5)					3770	
7		FORMAT	(' NTPRT IPO IPRX	AP	AMP	RP	RPF',	3780	
	\$	'	EVH')					3790	
8		FORMAT	(3I5,5E10.3)					3800	
9		FORMAT	(7E10.3)					3810	
10		FORMAT	('ODTIME = ',E12.5,' TIMFAC = ',F5.2,' THETAH = ',F5.2,					3820	
	&	'	THETAC = ',F5.2/' DFW = ',E12.5,					3830	
	\$	'	CEQUI = ',E12.5)					3840	
11		FORMAT	(' ALFLG = ',E12.5,' ALFAX = ',E12.5,' ALFAY = ',E12.5,					3850	
	\$	'	ALFAZ = ',E12.5)					3860	
12		FORMAT	(2I10,3E10.3)					3870	
13		FORMAT	(12I10)					3880	
14		FORMAT	(3I10,4E10.3)					3890	
15		FORMAT	(3I5,7E10.3)					3900	
16		FORMAT	('	NODE	C	WELLC	CS',	3910	
	\$	'	NODE	C	WELLC	CS',		3920	
	\$	'	NODE	C	WELLC	CS')		3930	
17		FORMAT	(I10,3E10.3)					3940	
18		FORMAT	(' ELEMENT	NP ARRAY')				3950	
19		FORMAT	(8I5)					3960	
20		FORMAT	(I5,5X,8I5)					3970	
23		FORMAT	('	ELEMENT	MAT	IBPRM',		3980	
	\$	'	ELEMENT	MAT	IBPRM',			3990	
	\$	'	ELEMENT	MAT	IBPRM',			4000	
	\$	'	ELEMENT	MAT	IBPRM')			4010	
24		FORMAT	(3I10)					4020	
25		FORMAT	('	ZONE	RX	RY	RZ	RC')	4030
26		FORMAT	(I10,4E10.3)					4040	
27		FORMAT	(8E10.3)					4050	
28		FORMAT	('	ZONE	DL	DT	DM	RP',	4060
	\$	'	FP	FQ	RMT	RPBR')		4070	
29		FORMAT	(I10,8E10.3)					4080	
32		FORMAT	('OCBINIT VALUES')					4090	
33		FORMAT	(1X,8F10.3)					4100	
34		FORMAT	(' ZONE	IPRMH ARRAY')				4110	
35		FORMAT	(5I5)					4120	
36		FORMAT	(' PARAMETER RKH')					4130	
37		FORMAT	(I10,E10.3)					4140	
40		FORMAT	(' PARAMETER	QF	RKH')			4150	
41		FORMAT	(I10,2E10.3)					4160	
42		FORMAT	(' PARAMETER	CF')				4170	
43		FORMAT	(15I5)					4180	
44		FORMAT	(' NBP ARRAY'/15I5)					4190	
45		FORMAT	(' BOUNDARY PARM	RKH')				4200	
46		FORMAT	(2I5)					4210	
47		FORMAT	('OTIME VARYING BOUNDARY CONDITIONS --	KT = ',I5/				4220	
	\$	'	NODE NPBC',9X,'H',9X,'C')					4230	
48		FORMAT	(2I5,F10.3,F10.3)					4240	

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

```

49  FORMAT ('OBSERVED HEAD AND CONCENTRATION DATA')          4250
50  FORMAT (2I10)                                              4260
51  FORMAT (' TIME STEP ',I5/' OBS HO WH',                  4270
    &      ' CO WC')                                          4280
52  FORMAT (I10,4E10.3)                                       4290
53  FORMAT ('OTIME VARYING POINT SOURCE-SINK DATA')          4300
54  FORMAT (' TIME STEP ',I5/' NODE WELL WELLC')            4310
55  FORMAT ('OTIME VARYING LINE SOURCE-SINK DATA')          4320
56  FORMAT (' TIME STEP ',I5/' NODE QS CS')                  4330
57  FORMAT (' TIME STEP ',I5,' TOTAL TIME OF SIMULATION',F12.2/ 4340
    $      ' NODE XORD YORD',                                4350
    $      ' ZORD H C')                                       4360
58  FORMAT (I10,5E12.5)                                       4370
59  FORMAT (I10,3E12.5,12X,E12.5)                             4380
60  FORMAT ('O OBS HO HINT',                                  4390
    $      ' CO CINT')                                       4400
61  FORMAT (I5,4(1X,E12.5))                                   4410
62  FORMAT (I5,26X,2(1X,E12.5))                               4420
63  FORMAT ('OSTATISTICS OF INITIAL HEAD SOLUTION')          4430
64  FORMAT ('OSTATISTICS OF INITIAL CONCENTRATION SOLUTION') 4440
65  FORMAT ('ONUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS = ',I5/' ESTIMATED SUM OF ', 4450
    $      'SQUARED ERRORS FOR INITIAL SOLUTION = ',E12.5/ 4460
    $      ' ERROR VARIANCE FOR INITIAL SOLUTION = ',E12.5) 4470
66  FORMAT ('OINITIAL SOLUTION')                              4480
67  FORMAT (I10,3E10.3,I10,3E10.3,I10,3E10.3)               4490
68  FORMAT (' NPLAYR=',I5,' NEPLAY=',I5)                   4500
69  FORMAT (' NODE NPBC NODOBS WTNOD XORD YORD ZORD',         4510
    $      ' H WELL QS')                                       4520
70  FORMAT (' FLOW PROBLEM')                                  4530
71  FORMAT (' SOLUTE TRANSPORT PROBLEM')                     4540
72  FORMAT ('OFLOW PROBLEM BAND WIDTH = ',I5/' TRANSPORT PROBLEM ', 4550
    $      'BAND WIDTH = ',I5)                                4560
73  FORMAT (' UPDATED PARAMETERS'/' MATI RX',                4570
    $      ' RY RZ ')                                          4580
74  FORMAT (I5,3(1X,E11.5))                                   4590
75  FORMAT (' PARAMETER QF ')                                 4600
76  FORMAT (I10,1X,E11.5)                                     4610
77  FORMAT ('FLOW PARAMETER ',I5,' EFFECTIVELY ZERO')        4620
78  FORMAT (' SOLUTION FAILED TO CONVERGE IN ',I5,' ITERATIONS') 4630
79  FORMAT (' SOLUTION CONVERGED IN ',I5,' ITERATIONS')       4640
80  FORMAT (' TIME STEP IS INVALID FOR A CHANGE OF PARAMETERS'/ 4650
    $      ' TIME STEP MUST BE DIVISIBLE BY NTPER WITH A REMAINDER', 4660
    $      ' OF 1')                                           4670
    CALL SHAFAC(THETAC)                                       4680
    CALL SURFAC                                              4690
    CALL LINFAC                                              4700
    NVARH=NPARH+NQPAR+NBPAP                                  4710
    NVHX2=NVARH+NVARH                                         4720
    NVHX3=NVARH+NVHX2                                         4730
    NODES=8                                                  4740
C** COMPUTE AND COUNT PRIOR INFORMATION                      4750
    NPRIRH=0                                                 4760
    IF (NVARH.LT.1) GO TO 254                                4770

```



Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	DO 252 I=1,NVARH	4780
	PH(I)=1.0	4790
	IF (RKH(I).LE.0.0) GO TO 252	4800
	RKH(I)=EVH/(RKH(I)*RKH(I))	4810
	NPRIRH=NPRIRH+1	4820
252	CONTINUE	4830
C**	COMPUTE INITIAL SOLUTION	4840
254	WRITE (6,66)	4850
	IFLOW=0	4860
	KTH=0	4870
	IOBCNT=1	4880
	IWCNT=1	4890
	ISCNT=1	4900
	IBCNT=1	4910
	SKBIG=0.0	4920
	SKBIG2=0.0	4930
	DTIME=TIMBGN/TIMFAC	4940
	TIMSUM=0.0	4950
	OBSH=0.0	4960
	YSQH=0.0	4970
	ERVARH=0.0	4980
	OBSC=0.0	4990
	YSQC=0.0	5000
	ERVARC=0.0	5010
	IOBCNT=1	5020
	DO 294 KT=1,NTIME	5030
	DTIME=DTIME*TIMFAC	5040
	TIMSUM=TIMSUM+DTIME	5050
	LU=0	5060
	IFLOW=IFLOW+1	5070
	IF (IFLOW.GT.NTPER) IFLOW=1	5080
	IF (IFLOW.EQ.1) KTH=KTH+1	5090
	IF (KT.EQ.1) LU=1	5100
	IF (KT.GT.NXTIO(IOBCNT)) IOBCNT=IOBCNT+1	5110
	IF (KT.EQ.NXTB(IBCNT)) LU=1	5120
	IF (TIMFAC.GT.1.01) LU=1	5130
	LUH=LU	5140
	LUC=LU	5150
	IF (KT.EQ.NXTW(IWCNT)) IWCNT=IWCNT+1	5160
	IF (KT.EQ.NXTS(ISCNT)) ISCNT=ISCNT+1	5170
	IF (KT.EQ.NXTB(IBCNT)) IBCNT=IBCNT+1	5180
	IF (IFLOW.GT.1) GO TO 260	5190
	IF (NTB.LE.0) GO TO 258	5200
	IHR=KTH+1	5210
	DO 256 I=1,NUMNP	5220
	J=I+NUMNP	5230
	H(I)=H(J)	5240
256	CONTINUE	5250
	J1=NUMNP+1	5260
	J2=NUMNP*2	5270
	READ (8'IHR) (H(J),J=J1,J2)	5280
258	CALL FLOW (IWCNT,ISCNT,IBCNT,KT,KTH,	5290
	\$ NTPER,NUMNP,NVARH,NPARH,LUH,NUMEL,	5300

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	\$	ISTEDY,0,IDIM)	5310
		CALL UDU (NUMNP,LUH)	5320
260		ICR=KT+1	5330
		DO 262 I=1,NUMNP	5340
		J=I+NUMNP	5350
		IF (IFLOW.EQ.1) H(J)=QH(I)	5360
		IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 262	5370
		C(I)=C(J)	5380
262		CONTINUE	5390
		IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 270	5400
		IF (NTB.LE.0) GO TO 264	5410
		J1=NUMNP+1	5420
		J2=NUMNP*2	5430
		READ(9'ICR) (C(J),J=J1,J2)	5440
264		IVPTMP=0	5450
		IF (MOD(KT,NTPRT).EQ.0) IVPTMP=1	5460
		CALL SALT (IFLOW,IWCNT,ISCNT,IBCNT,KT,KTH,	5470
	\$	NTPER,NUMNP,LUC,NUMEL,ISTEDY,IVPTMP,IFRAC,1,0,	5480
	\$	IDIM,ALFAX,ALFAY,ALFAZ,ALFLG,NTFRAC,ITFRAC,	5490
	\$	NOBMAX,IOBCNT)	5500
		CALL LDU (NUMNP,LUC)	5510
		DO 268 I=1,NUMNP	5520
		I1=NUMNP+I	5530
		C(I1)=QC(I)	5540
		IF (IFRAC.EQ.0) GO TO 268	5550
		DO 266 J=2,NTF1	5560
		JM1=J-1	5570
		CFRAC(JM1,I)=CFRAC(J,I)	5580
266		CONTINUE	5590
		CFRAC(NTF1,I)=QC(I)	5600
268		CONTINUE	5610
270		IHR=KTH+1	5620
		ICR=KI+1	5630
		J1=NUMNP+1	5640
		J2=NUMNP*2	5650
		IF (IFLOW.GT.1.OR.NVARH.EQ.0) GO TO 272	5660
		WRITE (8'IHR) (H(J),J=J1,J2)	5670
272		IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 274	5680
		WRITE (9'ICR) (C(J),J=J1,J2)	5690
274		IF (MOD(KT,NTPRT).NE.0) GO TO 280	5700
		WRITE (6,57) KT,TIMSUM	5710
		DO 278 I=1,NUMNP	5720
		I1=NUMNP+I	5730
		I2=NUMNP+I	5740
		IF (THETAC.GE.0.0) GO TO 276	5750
		IF (IFLOW.EQ.1) WRITE (6,58) I,XORD(I),YORD(I),ZORD(I),H(I2)	5760
		GO TO 278	5770
276		IF (IFLOW.EQ.1) WRITE (6,58) I,XORD(I),YORD(I),ZORD(I),H(I2),C(I1)	5780
		IF (IFLOW.NE.1) WRITE (6,59) I,XORD(I),YORD(I),ZORD(I),C(I1)	5790
278		CONTINUE	5800
280		IF (NOBMAX.LE.0) GO TO 294	5810
		IF (KT.NE.NXTO(IOBCNT)) GO TO 294	5820
		C** COMPUTE INITIAL ERROR VARIANCE	5830

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	DO 286 I=1,NUMNP	5840
282	IF (NODOBS(I).LE.0) GO TO 286	5850
	I3=NUMNP+I	5860
	I2=NODOBS(I)+NOBMAX*(IOBCNT-1)	5870
	IF (IFLOW.GT.1) GO TO 284	5880
	HINT(I2)=HINT(I2)+SFOBSH(I)*H(I3)	5890
284	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 286	5900
	CINT(I2)=CINT(I2)+SFOBSC(I)*C(I3)	5910
286	CONTINUE	5920
	WRITE (6,60)	5930
	DO 290 I=1,NOBMAX	5940
	I2=I+NOBMAX*(IOBCNT-1)	5950
	IF (IFLOW.EQ.1.AND.THETAC.GE.0.0) WRITE (6,61) I,HO(I2),HINT(I2)	5960
	\$ ,CO(I2),CINT(I2)	5970
	IF (IFLOW.EQ.1.AND.THETAC.LT.0.0) WRITE (6,61) I,HO(I2),HINT(I2)	5980
	IF (IFLOW.GT.1.AND.THETAC.GE.0.0) WRITE (6,62) I,CO(I2),CINT(I2)	5990
	IF (IFLOW.GT.1) GO TO 288	6000
	IF (WH(I2).LE.0.0) GO TO 288	6010
	OBSH=OBSH+1.0	6020
	YSQH=YSQH+WH(I2)*(HO(I2)-HINT(I2))*2	6030
288	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 290	6040
	IF (WC(I2).LE.0.0) GO TO 290	6050
	OBSC=OBSC+1.0	6060
	YSQC=YSQC+WC(I2)*(CO(I2)-CINT(I2))*2	6070
290	CONTINUE	6080
	IOBCNT=IOBCNT+1	6090
292	CONTINUE	6100
294	CONTINUE	6110
	IF (NOBMAX.LE.0) GO TO 640	6120
	ERVARH=YSQH/(OBSH-NVARH+NPRIRH)	6130
	NTMP=OBSH	6140
	WRITE (6,63)	6150
	WRITE (6,65) NTMP,YSQH,ERVARH	6160
296	IF (THETAC.LT.0.0) GO TO 298	6170
	ERVARC=YSQC/(OBSC-NVARC+NPRIRC)	6180
	NTMP=OBSC	6190
	WRITE (6,64)	6200
	WRITE (6,65) NTMP,YSQC,ERVARC	6210
C**	BEGIN ITERATIONS	6220
298	INDT=0	6230
	ER=0.01	6240
	ERP=1000.0	6250
	IF (ITMAX.LE.0) GO TO 640	6260
	IF (ISTEDY.EQ.0) GO TO 640	6270
	DO 372 ITER=1,ITMAX	6280
	IOBCNT=1	6290
	IWCNT=1	6300
	ISCNT=1	6310
	IBCNT=1	6320
	IFLOW=1	6330
	KTH=1	6340
	DTIME=TIMBGN/TIMFAC	6350
	TIMSUM=0.0	6360

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	IF (AMP.LT.-.5) GO TO 304	6370
	YSQH=0.0	6380
	DO 302 I=1,NVARH	6390
	BH(I)=0.0	6400
	DO 302 J=1,NVARH	6410
	XTXH(I,J)=0.0	6420
302	CONTINUE	6430
304	IHR=1	6440
	J1=NUMNP+1	6450
	J2=NUMNP*2	6460
	READ (8'IHR) (H(J),J=J1,J2)	6470
	DTIME=DTIME*TIMFAC	6480
	TIMSUM=TIMSUM+DTIME	6490
	LU=0	6500
	DO 316 I=1,NUMNP	6510
	J=I+NUMNP	6520
	H(I)=H(J)	6530
316	CONTINUE	6540
	J1=NUMNP+1	6550
	J2=NUMNP*2	6560
	IHR=KTH+1	6570
	READ (8'IHR)(H(J),J=J1,J2)	6580
	CALL FLOW (IWCNT,ISCNT,IBCNT,KT,KTH,	6590
	\$ NTPER,NUMNP,NVARH,NPARH,LU,NUMEL,	6600
	\$ ISTEDY,ITER,IDIM)	6610
	CALL SENS (NVARH,NUMNP,IPO,KT,KTH,IOBCNT,	6620
	\$ IXRFL,NOBMAX,IBCNT)	6630
	DO 322 I=1,NUMNP	6640
	QHTMP(I)=QH(I)	6650
322	CONTINUE	6660
	DO 324 I=1,NUMNP	6670
	IF (NPBC(I,IBCNT).GE.0.OR.NPBC(I,IBCNT).EQ.-2.OR.NPBC(I,IBCNT)	6680
	\$ .EQ.-4) GO TO 324	6690
	IF (NBP(I).LE.0) GO TO 324	6700
	N=NBP(I)+NPARH+NQPAR	6710
	J=NUMNP+I	6720
	SH(N,I)=H(J)*THETAH+(1.0-THETAH)*H(I)	6730
324	CONTINUE	6740
330	CONTINUE	6750
C**	FORM LEAST SQUARES MATRIX	6760
	IF (AMP.LT.-.5) GO TO 344	6770
	DO 342 I=1,NOBMAX	6780
	I1=I+(IOBCNT-1)*NOBMAX	6790
	HTMP=0.0	6800
	DO 332 J=1,NUMNP	6810
	IF (NODOBS(J).NE.1) GO TO 332	6820
	HTMP=HTMP+SFOBSH(J)*QHTMP(J)	6830
332	CONTINUE	6840
	IF (WH(I1).LE.0.0) GO TO 342	6850
	TEMP=HO(I1)-HTMP	6860
	DO 340 K=1,NVARH	6870
	STMP=0.0	6880
	DO 334 J=1,NUMNP	6890

Table 1.--Computer-program listing--Continued

	IF (NODOBS(J).EQ.1) STMP=STMP+SFOBSH(J)*SH(K,J)	6900
334	CONTINUE	6910
	TMP=WH(I1)*STMP	6920
	DO 338 L=1,NVARH	6930
	STMP=0.0	6940
	DO 336 J=1,NUMNP	6950
	IF (NODOBS(J).EQ.1) STMP=STMP+SFOBSH(J)*SH(L,J)	6960
336	CONTINUE	6970
338	XTXH(L,K)=XTXH(L,K)+TMP*STMP	6980
340	BH(K+NVHX2)=BH(K+NVHX2)+TMP*TEMP	6990
	YSQH=YSQH+TEMP*TEMP*WH(I1)	7000
342	CONTINUE	7010
344	CONTINUE	7020
	J1=NUMNP+1	7030
	J2=NUMNP*2	7040
	IHR=KTH+1	7050
	IF (IFLOW.EQ.1) WRITE (8'IHR) (H(J),J=J1,J2)	7060
	WRITE (6,70)	7070
	CALL LSTSQ (XTXH,BH,RKH,PH,YSQH,AP,AMP,RP,RPF,NVARH,NVHX2,NVHX3,	7080
	\$ IPO,INDT,ITER,NVEH,LDIMH)	7090
	IF (INDT.EQ.1) GO TO 521	7100
C**	UPDATE HEAD	7110
348	DO 352 I=1,NUMNP	7120
	I1=NUMNP+I	7130
	SUMH=0.0	7140
	IF (NVARH.LE.0) GO TO 352	7150
	DO 350 J=1,NVARH	7160
	SUMH=SUMH+BH(J)*SH(J,I)	7170
350	CONTINUE	7180
	IF (IFLOW.EQ.1) H(I1)=QHTMP(I)+SUMH	7190
352	CONTINUE	7200
	IHR=2	7210
	J1=NUMNP+1	7220
	J2=2*NUMNP	7230
	WRITE (8'IHR) (H(J),J=J1,J2)	7240
C**	UPDATE PARAMETERS	7250
354	IF (IPO.EQ.1) WRITE (6,73)	7260
	DO 356 I=1,NUMAT	7270
	IF (NVARH.LE.0) GO TO 356	7280
	L=IPRMH(1,I)	7290
	IF (L.GT.0) RX(I)=RX(I)*(BH(L)+1.0)	7300
	L=IPRMH(2,I)	7310
	IF (L.GT.0) RY(I)=RY(I)*(BH(L)+1.0)	7320
	L=IPRMH(3,I)	7330
	IF (L.GT.0) RZ(I)=RZ(I)*(BH(L)+1.0)	7340
	IF (IPO.EQ.1) WRITE (6,74) I,RX(I),RY(I),RZ(I)	7350
356	CONTINUE	7360
C**	UPDATE SURFACE AND POINT SOURCE-SINK PARAMETERS	7370
	IF (NQPAR.LE.0) GO TO 360	7380
	WRITE (6,75)	7390
	DO 358 I=1,NQPAR	7400
	QF(I)=QF(I)*(BH(I+NPARH)+1.0)	7410
	IF (IPO.EQ.1) WRITE (6,76) I,QF(I)	7420