# ENGINEERING REPORT DEEP TEST/INJECTION WELL

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\overline{f}$  $\mathbf{v}_k$ 

### ZEMEL ROAD LANDFILL

Charlotte County, Florida

Prepared for:

Charlotte County Solid Waste<br>P.O. Box 1054<br>27221 Best Avenue<br>Punta Gorda, Florida 33950

October 1992

POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN, INC.<br>Engineering . Planning . Hydrogeology<br>8600 N.W. 36th Street Miami, Florida 33166

RECEIVER

OCT 27 1992

 $\mathbf{\hat{z}}$ 

**J.E.R. SULLET UISTNIFTS** 

10-231.46

# Section 1 **INTRODUCTION**

#### $1.1$ **BACKGROUND**

 $\mathbf{A}$ 

Charlotte County disposes of its solid waste in a sanitary landfill named the Zemel Road Landfill (ZRL) because of its location adjacent to Zemel Road in the southern Early in 1989, the Charlotte County Board of County part of the County. Commissioners approved a planned expansion of the then existing disposal area and on August 15 of that year hired Post, Buckley, Schuh & Jernigan, Inc. (PBS&J) to design that expansion. Part of that design included developing a leachate collection system and a leachate disposal arrangement. After reviewing various disposal alternatives, it was concluded that deep well injection was the best alternative both economically and environmentally. Zemel Road Landfill is actually located within Drainage Basin 10-C (Kenner et al, 1967) (see Figure 1-1) about half a mile west of U.S. Highway 41 south of Zemel Road (see Figure 1-2). The landfill is in Section 25, Township 42 South, and Range 23 East. The landfill property includes all of Section 25 but at this time only the northeastern quarter of this section is actively used.

Deep well injection has been used by the oil industry for years in southwest Florida to inject returned brine from oil well drilling and production into deep formations. The use of this technology has been proven to be a viable disposal option in Sarasota County to the north, and in Lee County to the south. Nonetheless, to increase confidence that deep-well injection for disposal of treated leachate was feasible in this area of Charlotte County, the Charlotte County Board of County Commissioners approved construction of a deep test/injection well and testing program.

The results from the deep test/injection well and testing program are very positive and reasonably assure the existence of good overlying confinement and of an injection zone which can accept 300 gpm as proven by the twenty-four-hour injection With all the intensive testing completed, the DITW is ready and on line, test. anticipating DER approval to start operational testing using the treated leachate from the leachate treatment plant.





#### $1.4$ SITE DESCRIPTION

 $\lambda$ 

The ZRL facility occupies a site located adjacent to and south of Zemel Road in southern Charlotte County.

As shown in Figure 1-3, the existing landfill site is located in the northeastern quarter of Section 25, Township 42 South, Range 23 East. The leachate treatment plant facilities occupy the central area of the site, and the new landfill the western area (see Figure 1-3). The injection well and the monitor well are both located near the center of the site. The site contains undeveloped space to the south which will be used for future stormwater retention.

### 1.4.1 Topography

The immediate area of the plant site and the injection well has none of the original topographic relief and with the exception of a small undeveloped triangular area south of the plant site, the topography of this property consists totally of artificially raised land surfaces for buildings, structures, and roads.

The man-made elevations range from 22 to 26 feet above mean sea level (msl) throughout the site except at the above-mentioned retention pond where the natural bottom is at 19 feet above msl. In the undeveloped area which forms the southeast corner of the property, natural elevations average 19 feet above msl. Artificially filled areas for buildings and structures are about 26 feet above msl.

Fill excavated from the lakes and drainage canals when they were constructed, was used to raise the land level to form the roads that parallel the canals.

The site lies fully within Basin 10C (Kenner, et al., 1967).

#### 1.4.2 Soils

 $\chi$ 

The soils in the area were mapped by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service (SCS) between 1976 and 1981 and a report was issued in 1984 (SCS, 1984). The natural soils at the ZRL site consist primarily of Boca and Pineda loamy siliceous fine sandy soils (see Figure 1-4); but construction on the site has





 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\cdot$ 



ل

د،

×

# SITE GEOLOGY

FIGURE  $2 - 8$ 



 $\sum_{i}$  $\infty$ 

SITE HYDROGEOLOGY



نع

1986 by PBS&J for a very similar site in North Ft. Myers, but has been slightly modified to include the most recent changes approved by the Committee on Hydrostratigraphic Nomenclature of the Southeastern Geological Society (Vechiolli et al., 1986), as shown in Figure 2-10.

The major hydrostratigraphic units in Florida, as proposed by the Southeastern Geological Society Committee on Hydrostratigraphic Nomenclature are the surficial aquifer system, intermediate aquifer system and/or confining unit, the Floridan Aquifer system, and the Sub-Floridan confining unit. Gilboy (1985) recognized these units in the SWFWMD area and assigned the Holocene, Pleistocene and Pliocene Age formations to the surficial aquifer system, the Miocene Age Hawthorn Formation to the intermediate aquifer system, the lower Miocene (Tampa), Oligocene and Eocene Age formations to the Floridan Aquifer system, and the Paleocene Age formations to the Sub-Floridan confining unit (Gilboy, 1985).

The nomenclature shown in Figure 2-9 applies to the hydrogeologic characteristics of Charlotte County. It can be tied in directly to the geology not only of the County in general (see Figure 2-5), but also of the ZRL site in particular.

# 2.4.2 Hydrogeologic Descriptions

 $\mathbf{I}$ 

There are three major aquifer systems in Charlotte County: the surficial aquifer system, the intermediate aquifer system and the Floridan Aquifer System.

The surficial aquifer system consists of Pliocene and younger poorly indurated limestones and unconsolidated sands and shells that blanket the area. In Charlotte County, the surficial aquifer contains the water table aquifer and permeable units of the Tamiami Formation. It is underlain by the intermediate aquifer.

The intermediate aquifer system is comprised of upper and middle Miocene quartz sands, clays and carbonates. This system is primarily a confining unit and effectively retards the exchange of water between the Floridan Aquifer and the surficial aquifer system. Within Charlotte County, the silty limestones of the lower Miocene are not contained within the intermediate aquifer system and are considered to be hydraulically connected to the Floridan Aquifer.

# Table 2-5

# DEPTH AND THICKNESS OF THE HYDROSTRATIGRAPHIC UNITS



 $m:R-66/N$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ 

### Table 3-2

# WELLS PERMITTED BY SWFWMD AND FDER<br>(AT SECTION 25, T.42S., R. 23E)<br>SPECIFICALLY FOR THE INJECTION PROJECT



 $\bullet$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\pi}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{0}^{\pi}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{1}{\$ 

m:R-66A/C

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

 $\label{eq:2} \begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}(\mathbf{r}) \end{split}$ 

 $\pm$ 

 $\overline{1}$ 

# Table 4-1

# DRILLING PROGRAM CHRONOLOGY: ZEMEL ROAD LANDFILL SITE



 $\overline{(\ }$ 

# Table 4-1 (Continued)

 $\langle \rangle$ 

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 



# Table 4-1 (Continued)

 $\mathcal{A}$ 

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

Î.

 $\frac{1}{3}$ 

Ă



# Table 4-1 (Continued)



 $m:R-66A/G$ 

 $\bar{\rm t}$ 

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\overline{a}$ 







# Section 7 HYDROGEOLOGIC TESTING PROGRAM

The geolograph records, the geophysical logs, the lithologic samples, the geologic cores, and the water quality samples collected during the drilling operation were used in Section 2 to develop the detailed descriptions of the geology and hydrogeology of the formations underlying the site. In this section that data are analyzed.

Depth discrepancies exist in the location of various features from one set of data to the next. These discrepancies result from a different starting datum, cumulative For example, the different datum used by the drillers and by the errors, etc. geophysical and T.V. loggers at each visit affects the depth at which various geophysical features are located in the logs in the Appendices. Consequently, the depths of various formations, caverns, water quality changes, and other important hydrogeolgical features are sometimes slightly different from the true depths below land surface. These variations should not be viewed as mistakes in the data base. but rather as errors inherent to the data acquisition by different individuals. In any case, because they are usually never more than a couple of feet off, they do not reduce the accuracy of the conclusions and recommendations derived from the data.

#### $7.1$ LITHOLOGIC SAMPLES

The PBS&J site supervisors collected representative formation samples every ten feet during drilling of the pilot hole of both the T/I well and the DZM well, and each sample was described and recorded in the field in a preliminary lithologic log (see Appendix 23). These field descriptions were later supplemented by detailed in-office examinations under the microscope from which final descriptions were prepared (see Appendix 24a and Appendix 24b).

From the sample descriptions and the lithologic logs, and with the help of data from other investigations, the depths and nomenclatures of the various formations and hydrologic divisions were identified in Section 2. For the lower geological units, which are of primary interest in this study, few data from previous investigations were available and therefore cuttings from the lower parts of the T/I well provided the principal source of data. Although data from the monitor well were also used, these data were restricted to the 1,850-foot depth of the monitor well. Core

samples collected by the drillers and sent to Core Laboratories Inc. (CLI) for analyses were also used. For the upper geologic units, of secondary concern in this study, geologic and hydrologic identifications were largely based on work at the site and on the lithologic descriptions in Appendices 23 and 24, but data from other nearby sites were also used.

From the examination of the lithologic samples, from the mineralogical analyses, and from existing literature, a column showing the geologic units penetrated at the ZRL site was developed. Figure 2-8 shows the estimated depth ranges of the geologic units underlying the ZRL site (see Section 2).

#### $7.2$ **CORE ANALYSIS**

In compliance with the technical specifications for the ZRL deep test/injection well, a total of ten cores were taken during the drilling of the pilot hole (see Figures 7-1A through 7-1F). The first two cores were taken from above the USDW zone in the Ocala Group Formations, cores numbered 3 through 6 were taken from the Avon Park Limestone, and cores numbered 7 through 10 were taken from the Lake City Limestone (see Figure 2-8). All ten cores were 4 inches in diameter. Two samples from each core were selected for analysis by Core Laboratories, Inc. (CLI) (see Figures  $7-2A$  and  $7-2B$ ). These core sets are described in Section 7.2.1, followed by a detailed discussion of the core analysis in Section 7.2.2. The coring operations have been described in Section 4 as they occurred, and are outlined in Table 4-1 starting on February 10, 1992. Geologic and lithologic descriptions of the cores are included in Appendix 25 and the results of the special core analysis study conducted by CLI are presented in Appendix 19. Water samples from the same depth as each of the cored zones were either provided as part of the water sampling program or were analyzed by CLI (see Appendix 19); and based on the results of these analyses, synthetic formation brines were prepared for use with the appropriate core material in all the laboratory tests.

## 7.2.1 Core Description

The first coring was into the Crystal River Formation of the Ocala Group from a depth between 1,324 and 1,340 feet below land surface, where an 86 percent recovery was achieved. From the recovered section, samples were selected from















**FIGURE 7-2 (B)** 



CORE SAMPLES ANALYZED AT LABORATORY





N.

1,325 and 1,334 feet (see Table 7-1) which were then sent to the CLI laboratory for analysis. Plugs from the section around 1,325 and 1,334 feet are stored at the Miami offices of PBS&J and are available for inspection. Core  $#1$  is representative of the Upper Monitor Zone of the Dual Zone Monitor Well.

The second core was also drilled out of the Crystal River Formation. This core was obtained from between 1,442 and 1,457 feet below land surface, and 96 percent of the core was recovered. The portions of the core sent to the lab for analysis and the portion stored away for future reference are listed in Table 7-1. Core  $#2$  is from the zone immediately above the 10,000 mg/l TDS contact for the USDWs. Plugs from the portions sent to lab for this and for all other cores are available for inspection at the PBS&J Headquarters Office in Miami.

The third core was taken in the Avon Park Limestone Formation from 1,626 to 1,637 feet and produced an 87 percent recovery. Core  $#3$  is from just below the 10,000 mg/l TDS contact.

The fourth coring was also from the Avon Park and produced a 98 percent recovery. The sections from 1,727 and 1,732 feet were sent to the lab for analysis.

Í

The fifth core came from a depth of between 1,772 and 1,787 feet in the Avon Park Limestone. Two separate coring samples were sent to the lab; the first, from 1,771 feet and the second from 1,780 feet. The cored section only produced 46 percent recovery. Core #5 is from just above the Lower Monitor Zone of the Dual Zone Monitor Well and is therefore representative of it.

The sixth core came from a zone between 1,893 to 1,906 feet below land surface and is the last core obtained from the Avon Park. It produced an 81 percent recovery.

The seventh coring was performed in two parts because the first attempt only produced 10 percent recovery. Core 7A was taken from 2,078 to 2,095 feet, and Core 7B, which yielded 89 percent recovery, was from 2,099 to 2,117 feet. Core  $#7$ is the first core obtained from the Lake City Limestone Formation. Core #7A is representative of the confining layer at this injection site.

## Table 7-1



## CORE RECOVERY DATA

\*Stored at PBS&J - Miami, Florida

 $\sim 10^7$ 

 $\text{m:}\text{R-66B/B}$ 

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

The next two cores were collected in the confining zone. The eighth, came from a section of the Lake City Limestone between 2,246 and 2,262 feet below land surface. The ninth came in two parts, one from 2,310 to 2,395 feet and the other from 2,320 to 2,335 feet. These cores yielded 41 and 55 percent recovery. The last core collected, core number 10, also came from the confining zone. It came from near the bottom of the Lake City, from between 2,432 and 2,447 feet below land surface. This core, the closest one to the injection zone, was used to provide approximate laboratory results for the heat capacity and thermal conductivity of the rocks of the injection zone needed.

### 7.2.2 Core Testing Results

As noted in Section 7.2.1, twenty samples selected from the ten corings made at ZRL were submitted to CLI for testing. These core samples were accompanied by water samples from the zones the cores were taken from. The depths from which the samples were selected are shown in the last column in Table 7-1.

The testing program on the samples included:

- Air permeability  $\mathbf{o}$
- Porosity  $\mathbf{o}$
- Liquid permeability  $\mathbf{o}$
- Formation resistivity factor  $\mathbf{o}$
- $\mathbf{o}$ Resistivity index
- Accoustic velocity (compressive velocity and shear velocity)  $\mathbf{o}$
- $\mathbf{o}$ Dynamic moduli (shear modulus, bulk modulus, bulk density, Poisson's Ratio, and Young's modulus).

Core number 10, as stated earlier, was also tested for its rock heat capacity and thermal conductivity (see Section 9). In addition, rock compressibility (pore volume) was determined for Cores 2, 5 and 6 at the request of the USGS to help compare this test site with other sites investigated by USGS. Finally, X-ray diffraction (XRD) analyses were conducted on the twenty samples from the ten cores to determine the mineral content of the various cores.

#### $7.2.2.1$ Air Permeability and Porosity

ţ

Sample plugs from each core were obtained using a diamond drill bit with water as the bit coolant and lubricant. The sample plugs were cleaned in methyl alcohol and Permeability to air and Boyle's law porosity (using dried in a convection oven. helium) measurements were then taken on the cleaned and dried samples. **The** results for both measurements are shown in Table 7-2, and the laboratory report is shown in Appendix 19. The permeability to air in Table 7-2 is given in darcy units (millidarcys), and not in the usual gallons per day per square foot (gpd/ft2) because the dimensional requirements of the latter include the permeant characteristics. **The** darcy unit does not include permeant characteristics and different permeants can, therefore, be compared directly.

Table 7-2 indicates consistently greater permeability in the horizontal direction than in the vertical direction for all of the cores, except for Cores 6 and 7, and this difference can be as much as one order of magnitude. However, despite the higher horizontal than vertical permeability, both the vertical and the horizontal permeability in most samples is still extremely low. Samples 7, 8 and 9 are practically impermeable, and Samples 5 and 10 are of extremely low permeability. Sample 6 from just below the Lower Monitor Zone of the Deep Monitor Well is the one showing highest permeability, but even this one has a permeability of only about 9 gallons per day per square foot, which is very low. The other Samples, 1, 2, 3 and 4, are all less than 1 gallon per day per square foot.

Sample porosity shows an obviously direct relationship to permeability. Figure 7-3 shows a plot of the porosity versus permeability of the samples. A straight line relationship through the best fit of the points has a correlation coefficient of 0.73 and, if the samples with porosity above 30 percent and permeability above 11 millidarcies are removed, the fit is 0.92.

The plot in Figure 7-3 is not a mathematical or theoretical derivation, but only an empirical relationship and should be applicable only for similar types of rock samples extracted from the ZRL site. The porosity has a direct semilogarithmic relationship with the permeability to air for these samples, but this relationship might not hold true for other samples.

# Table 7-2

 $\mathcal{A}$ 

 $\frac{1}{\lambda}$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

# AIR PERMEABILITY AND POROSITY





\*600 psi confining stress. A millidarcy equals 0.0182 gallons per day per square foot.<br>\*Letter V after the sample number represents vertical values.<br>Letter H after the sample number represents horizontal values.

 $m:R-66B/C$ 

Ĵ.

 $\mathfrak{t}$


Zemel Road Landfill

The relationship developed in Figure 7-3 for porosity and permeability can be presented in the form of an equation, as follows:

 $Log P = 0.1434 \, \phi - 3.0068$ 

where P is the permeability to air (in millidarcys) and  $\varphi$  is the porosity (in percent)

 $7.2.2.2$ Liquid Permeability (Permeability to Water)

The samples of formation water from the zones of interest were analyzed (see Appendix 19) and an equivalent TDS/sodium chloride brine was calculated from the water analysis for each zone and used in all subsequent core tests, including specificpermeability-to-water measurements.

The samples were then pressure-saturated with the corresponding formation brine equivalent. Each sample was individually placed in a hydrostatic core holder and injected, under back pressure, with the saturant to assure 100 percent saturation. Following this step, specific permeabilities to water were determined. The results of the tests for specific permeability to water are shown in Table 7-3. As expected, the laboratory analysis results for permeability to water were much less than the permeability-to-air results shown in Table 7-2 by an average of less than 2 to 1  $(1/2)$ . The water-to-air permeability ratios are also given in Table 7-3.

Cores 7 through 10 show a permeability to water that is between 0.7 and 0.3 times less than the already extremely low permeability to air, proving conclusively that these cored sections are truly confining and for all practical purposes impermeable.

 $7.2.2.3$ Formation Resistivity Factor and Index

The next two parameters for which the samples were tested, the formation factor and the resistivity index, are interrelated. Both of these parameters are related to resistivity measurements as follows:

 $F = Ro/Rw$ F is formation factor (dimensionless) where

## Table 7-3

## WATER PERMEABILITY



 $\bar{\lambda}$ 

 $\langle \rangle$ 

 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

# Table 7-3 (Continued)

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim$   $^{-1}$ 

 $\sim$ 



 $\sim$ 

 $\tilde{\lambda}$ 

 $\sim \lambda$ 

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $F = RdRw$ 

Ro is resistivity of saturated formation (ohms-cm) Rw is resistivity of formation fluid (ohms-cm)  $Sn = Ro/Rt = 1/RI$ where RI is resistivity index (dimensionless) S is the fraction of the pore space occupied by formation water n is saturation exponent Rt is resistivity of clean formation (ohms-cm)

The formation factor can be redefined in terms of the formation porosity by Archie's Equation (Kovacs, 1981) as follows:

 $F = a \phi$ 

where m is the cementation factor

a is an empirical constant usually taken as unity

 $\phi$  is the porosity

 $\Rightarrow$  not used in figures 7-4 to 7-9 The core samples were used for formation-resistivity-factor testing. A liquid resaturation porosity was calculated for each sample and was used in all electrical property evaluations. The resistivities of the brines and the brine-saturated samples were measured over a period of several days until stable, indicating that ionic equilibrium within the samples had been achieved.

Using the formation resistivity factor values developed by CLI (see Table 7-4 and Appendix 19), formation resistivity factor versus porosity graphs were plotted for the cores. Straddle Packer #6 data was used for Cores 1 and 2; Straddle Packer #4 data was used for Cores  $#3$ , 4 and 5; Straddle Packer  $#10$  data was used for Cores #6 and 7; and Straddle Packers #9, 8 and 7 were used for Cores #8, 9 and 10, The Archie parameter "a" was respectively (see Figures 7-4 through 7-9). constrained to a value of 1.00 due to the limited sample populations. Cementation exponents, "m," ranging from 1.78 to 2.61, were calculated using Archie's relationship and the data trends generated by the best-fit-least squares method. These values were then used to evaluate the geophysical logs, as described in Section 7.3.

After the formation resistivity factor measurements were completed, one sample from each core was gradually desaturated. At selected saturations, determined

 $\pi$  increasing  $\varphi$  increases  $m$ 

Zemel Road Landfill miss west

# FORMATION RESISTIVITY FACTOR AND RESISTIVITY INDEX



## Table 7-4 (Continued)



 $\Lambda$ 

## Table 7-4 (Continued)



 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\bullet$ 

 $\sim$   $\omega$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $\mathcal{A}$ 

 $m:R-66B/E$ 

 $\langle$ 

 $\bar{\bar{\xi}}$ 

gravimetrically, the resistivities of the core plugs were measured to provide a correlation between the formation resistivity index and water saturation. The results are tabulated with the formation factor results in Table 7-4. Saturation exponents. "n," determined from the lines of best fit to the data points, ranged from 1.27 to 2.73 (see Figures 7-10 through 7-29).

## $7.2.2.4$ **Acoustic Velocity**

A 1-inch-diameter vertically oriented plug from each of the 20 samples from the 10 cores was selected for use in acoustic velocity testing. The twenty samples were pressure-saturated with the formation brine equivalent, and mounted in acoustic velocity apparatus. Shear and compressional velocities were determined at a net hydrostatic stress equal to 600 psi at ambient temperature. Internal (pore) pressure was maintained to assure 100 percent saturation of the samples at all times. The results of these measurements varied (see Table 7-5) in proportion to the diverse lithologies of the samples. In general, the acoustic transit times both in compression and shear for all the samples showed a fair to good correlation to the sample porosities in Table 7-5.

From the sonic logs (see Appendices 7, 8 and 11, transit times were obtained for each test sample depth; these are shown with the corresponding sample porosity in Table 7-6. Since the relationship between transit time and porosity is linear (Schlumberger, 1972) the two values for each sample was then represented in the form of a linear relationship and plotted in Figure 7-30.

A linear regression analysis of the data points shown in Figure 7-30 produced the following function:

 $\phi = 0.389$  (i, t) - 7 where  $\phi$  is the rock porosity (percent)  $\mathbf{\hat{a}}$ t is acoustic transit time of saturated rock matrix (microseconds/foot).

The relationship expressed in Figure 7-30 shows that acoustic transit time increases with increasing void space within the rock, because of the longer transit time through the water in the saturated void spaces. The equation derived from these data is



## Table 7-5

 $\mathcal{L}^{(1,2)}$ 

## ULTRASONIC VELOCITY AND DYNAMIC MODULI

# Zemel Rd. Test/Injection Well<br>Charlotte County, Florida



 $m:R-66B/F$ 

## Table 7-6

 $\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

## ACOUSTIC TRANSIT TIME



## $m:R-66B/G$

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $\sim$   $\chi$ 

utilized in Section 7.3 to evaluate the strata porosities from the sonic log. The use of this equation is, however, restricted to those formations from which it was originally developed (Schlumberger 1972) and extremely low values of porosity and transit time should be viewed as less accurate and suspect. Lignite layers preclude the use of the equation anywhere throughout that material.

## $7.2.2.5$ Heat Capacity

A sample from Core 10 was selected for heat capacity measurements. A calorimeter bucket was filled with a known mass of heat transfer oil and maintained at 75°F. After the sample weight, length, and diameter, were recorded, the sample was placed in a constant-temperature oven set to the test temperature of 100°F. Sample temperature was monitored continuously and, at temperature equilibrium, the sample was quickly lowered into the calorimeter bucket to minimize heat loss. **The** temperature of the heat transfer oil in the bucket was recorded every five minutes until consecutive readings were within 0.001°F. The final equilibrium temperature was then recorded and heat capacity calculated.

The result of the heat capacity measurement for the sample averaged 0.309 BTU/lb.-<sup>o</sup>F for the dry rock (see Appendix 19). Heat capacity for a water-saturated sample, derived by calculation, was also 0.300 BTU/lb.ºF range. Standard average values of heat capacity for a water-saturated pure limestone, are somewhat lower, around 0.270 BTU/lb.ºF, respectively (Hodgman, 1955), but still close to the value measured for this sample which is not a pure limestone at all, but rather a very dolomitic core.

#### $7.2.2.6$ Thermal Conductivity

 $\langle$ 

A 1-1/2 inch-diameter horizontal plug was taken from Core 10 for thermal conductivity measurement. The sample was cut to approximately 1-1/4 inches in length and placed in a sample holder between pyroceram standards and saturated with the synthetic brine developed for that zone. The core assembly was then surrounded by a guard heater. The heat source and sink were mounted above and below the top and bottom standards and saturated with the synthetic brine developed for that zone. Axial and pore pressures of approximately 1,000 and 300 psi, respectively, were applied to the core sample. The guard heater was set to the initial test temperature (100°F), while the heat source and sink (top and bottom heaters) were set 30°F above and below the test temperature, respectively.

Temperatures were monitored and recorded at seven locations: inside the guard heater (midpoint of sample), at the top and bottom heater, below the top standard and above the bottom standard, and the top and bottom of the core sample. At a steady state condition (temperature equilibrium), temperature values were recorded and thermal conductivity values computed. The results of the measurement for the sample were 2.338 BTU/hr/ft/°F for the water-saturated sample (see Appendix 19).

#### $7.2.2.7$ Rock (Pore Volume) Compressibility

Three cored samples, 2A, 5A and 6A, were used in the rock-compressibility testing. The three vertical samples were restored to 100 percent saturation under vacuum, and then they were loaded into hydrostatic core holders and confining pressures were incrementally increased from 100 to 1,400 psi for samples 2 and 5 and from 100 to 1,700 psi for Sample 6. At each pressure, the volume of water produced from reduction in pore volume was monitored until stable. Pore volume reduction as a function of effective overburden was thus determined.

Rock compressibilities were calculated from these data. The results of these measurements are shown in Appendix 19.

#### $7.2.2.8$ X-ray Diffraction

 $\left($ 

The twenty samples from the ten cores were used for quantitative XRD analysis.

Quantitative XRD analyses were performed using an automated powder diffracto-The weight percentages of minerals present in the sand/silt fractions were meter. determined using internal standard ratio techniques. The weight percentages of the various minerals were determined profile-fitting/empirical  $by$ peak-area-ratio algorithms. The whole-rock compositions were calculated by mathematically combining the XRD data from all size fractions.

Compositions and species of clay minerals less than 1% could not be detected in the clay-size fractions using this method, but the detectability limit is 0.5 to 1.0 percent for crystalline phases present in the size fractions analyzed. The results of the analyses are tabulated in Appendix 19 and summarized in Table 7-7.

## Table 7-7

التسمر

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

# X-RAY DIFFRACTION TEST DATA

# Charlotte County Zemel Rd. Test/Injection Well<br>X-ray Diffraction Analysis<br>(weight %)



 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

1,250 feet, now in the Ocala Group and in the Avon Park Limestone, the sonic log exhibited generally low values in transit time, although only to about 110 microseconds per foot, indicating low overall porosity. At 1,390 feet and at 1,560 feet, the trend reversed and the sonic log showed a sharp increase in transit time at those points. The higher porosity zones shown by the log at 1,390 feet, coincides with the middle of the upper monitor zone of the ZRL deep monitor well. An extremely low porosity zone extending from 1,400 to full depth of this log at 1,620 feet coincides with the tight zone in which the 10,000 mg/l TDS line occurs. This confirms that the deep monitor well, as constructed, monitors the first productive zone above the 10,000 mg/l TDS line and also confirms that the upper zone monitor well is in the first permeable zone above a confining zone that separates the upper and lower monitor zones.

Between 1,240 and the bottom of the pilot hole at 1,436 feet, the sonic log showed an average transit time of approximately 82 microseconds per foot, excluding a section between 1,290 and 1,310 feet where the acoustic log indicated high porosity.

The derivation of the porosity equation in Section 7.2.2.4 (see Table 7-6 and Figure 7-30) is based partially on the analysis of the core samples taken from the pilot hole between 1,329 and 1,340 feet in the Ocala, from 1,442 to 1,457 feet also in the Ocala, and from 1,622 to 1,637 feet in the Avon Park. The equation is thus applicable to those portions of the sonic log in which similar formations are encountered, that is, in the Avon Park and the Ocala. (It can not be used for the clayey Hawthorn, the dolosiltic Arcadia, or the sandy Suwannee since the acoustic travel times in those zones would not necessarily fit the empirical relationship.)

Based on the porosity equation, it is possible to calculate porosity from the acoustic log in the various zones penetrated, and using the porosity-permeability relationship developed in Section 7.2.2 (see Figure 7-3) to further convert it to permeability. These calculations are in Section 9.

#### 7.3.2.4 Temperature

The temperature of the water within the pilot hole increased from  $76.5^{\circ}F$  (24.7<sup>o</sup>C) just 50 feet below land surface to a high of 79 $\degree$ F (26.1 $\degree$ C) at a depth of 1,600 feet below land surface. One-half of a degree of this increase was a small and very

gradual increase down to about 700 feet where no sharp temperature changes were identified, but at 700 feet, a sharp continuous increase started to be noticed.

The water temperature slowly increased with hole depth, rising 2.5 degrees Fahrenheit in 1,600 feet. This temperature change is the result of the natural increase in temperature with depth within the earth's crust; however, it is well below the widely accepted average rise of 10 degrees Fahrenheit per thousand feet. This lower than average temperature increase is frequently found to be the case in Florida due to the circulation of groundwater, and the proximity of the ocean on both sides of the peninsula.

#### $7.3.2.5$ Spontaneous Potential Log

The spontaneous potential log (with one exception in the bottom 50 feet) exhibited no highly noticeable deflections throughout the length of this portion of the pilot hole. It did, however, exhibit very subtle changes in potential from 440 to 620 feet, and from 1,050 to 1,250 feet as the tool traveled through the lower permeability zones. A sharp rise in potential at 1,540 feet is quite evident, and most likely is the result of the salinity of the water which begins to increase very rapidly, and as a result, the spontaneous potential voltage increased. This change, as discussed later, also showed up on the resistivity log, as a sharp drop in resistivity. The other electric log (16-64 Normals) also shows a change at that depth. This is obvious proof that the sharp change in the water quality from less than to more than 10,000 mg/l TDS occurs at this point and that there is good separation between the USDWS and the non-USDWS zones at this site.

#### 7.3.2.6 Dual Induction Log

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

The induction log can be analyzed by utilizing the equations shown in Section 7.2.2.3 and assuming that the underlying formations are 100 percent saturated (as they undoubtedly must be) and, that the resistivities of the saturated formation and the clean formation are equal. For each of the selected depth ranges, the resistivity of the formation fluids may be averaged from the water quality data shown in Section 7.4. Using this average, it is then possible to obtain a porosity value using Archie's equation.

The induction log for the pilot hole in the 440- to 1,610-foot depth range showed three distinctive segments, as discussed below.

In the section between 440 and 720 feet below land surface, both the deep and the medium depth inductive signals encountered very high resistivity and thus indicated that the formation offers almost just as much resistance as the near drilling fluidfilled wall. It was, therefore, concluded that the formations are not very porous in this section and that the drilling fluid did not penetrate deeply enough into them to affect the resistivity recorded by the deep penetrating signal. At 594 feet, 690 feet and 710 feet, there are higher porosity sections where the resistivity of both signals drop and come together.

Between 720 and 1,520 feet, the two induction signals are near each other and closely parallel each other. This is a very low porosity zone. In the 16-64 Normal Induction log from 1,250 to 1,500 feet, the medium depth signal actually met the deep signal, indicating that both signals were encountering similar resistance and probably extremely low permeability zones.

The next distinct section of the dual induction log occurred from 1,520 to 1,610 feet below land surface. This section showed even closer values for both sondes and a large drop in resistance which is normally indicative of higher overall porosity, but in this case is caused primarily by the high salinity of the water which makes it easier to conduct electricity and reduce resistance. This is the depth at which the salinity of the water begins to increase with depth. From that point down to the bottom of the pilot hole at full depth in this well, the high salinity greatly masks the data, although it is still possible to see thick alternating sections of high and low porosity.

The change at 1,520 feet and below would at first appear to be caused by highly permeable zones, but when the acoustic log for this zone was examined, no such indication was obvious. The alternative explanation for this drop in resistivity is indeed the water quality change. This is a case where the dual induction log alone is not sufficient to make conclusions regarding the permeability of a zone.

#### $7.3.2.7$ Fluid Resistivity Log

The fluid resistivity log did not provide any data to help analyze the well. The test had to be run with the hole filled with drilling fluids because there was no place to dispose of the salty fluids; consequently, the whole column was homogeneous and provided no change with depth or strata. Since no internal flow in the well is apparent, the resistivity of the water did not show change.

## 7.3.3 Pilot Hole - Third Stage

The third stage of the pilot hole to a depth of 1,860 feet was logged on February 26, 1992. This section of the pilot hole represents the data used to select the lower monitor zone. The geophysical logs run over this depth of the pilot hole included the following:

- Caliper  $\mathbf{o}$
- Gamma Rav  $\mathbf{o}$
- Acoustic  $\overline{O}$

 $\overline{(}$ 

- Temperature  $\mathbf{o}$
- Spontaneous Potential  $\mathbf{o}$
- Fluid Resistivity  $\mathbf{o}$
- $\overline{O}$ Dual Induction
- Flowmeter  $\mathbf{o}$
- Resistivity.  $\Omega$

A copy of these geophysical logs is contained in Appendix 8.

All of the logs of this stage of pilot hole show a continuation of the conditions found at the bottom of the previous stage. The only difference is that as the hole advances deeper and deeper, the salinity of the water increases and therefore the resistivity logs show a decline with depth. At 1,810 feet, however, there is a significant change. There the first really permeable zone was encountered.

#### $7.3.3.1$ Sonic Log

The sonic log, run in the pilot hole prior to its being reamed out for the intermediate casing, provided additional information which indicated that the low permeability zones could be considered to extend another 250 feet below the USDW before the first permeable zone was reached at 1,800 feet. As a result, it was possible to select the lower monitor zone at 1,800 feet and take advantage of the greater monitor depth to increase the degree of reliability of the monitoring system.

In the section from 1,630 to 1,730 feet, the sonic log exhibited a zone of very low transit times (100 microseconds per foot or less); in another, between 1,764 feet and 1,800 feet below land surface, the transit time was even lower (75 microseconds per foot). These two sections have been identified as very confining, with permeabilities that calculate to values of less than  $10<sup>1</sup>$  gpd/ft<sup>2</sup> (5 millidarcys) range (see Section 9). The interval within the lower monitor zone between 1,806 and 1,824 feet showed high transit times, and in fact, the sonic log showed a very high permeability at a depth where the transit time was 140 microseconds per foot. Since this high transit time is beyond the curve developed from the data (Figure 7-30) it is not possible to assign a permeability value to this zone, but it would be safe to say that it would be higher than 1,000 gpd/ft<sup>2</sup>.

#### 7.3.3.2 Dual Induction Log

Ŷ.

Another log that was run in the pilot hole section from 1,500 to 1,860 feet also provided information on the confining qualities of the beds above the lower monitor zone. This log was also backed up with data from the 16-64 Normal Resistivity log. This resulted in much better differentiation between the deep and the medium induction signals and a much clearer showing of the low permeability of that zone.

The highly saline fluid in the section shown by the log is very conductive and easily transmits the induction signals. In the borehole itself, where the drilling fluid contains fresh make-up water, the conductive characteristic of the water is much lower. It is this characteristic that makes the induction log so reliable in identifying confining zones. Since the confining zones have low porosity and low permeability, the fresher drilling fluid does not invade the formation deeply. Therefore, the deeper inductive signal travels through the naturally high salinity water in the matrix, and

produces a lower resistance in the log than the medium penetration induction signal which travels through the low conductivity fresher water in the borehole and produces a higher resistance in the log. This is represented in the log by the increase in distance between the lines.

The zone of high resistivity and thus low permeability was, therefore, easily identifiable from the dual induction log. The log showed an extremely resistive layer all the way down to 1,795 feet.

## 7.3.4 Pilot Hole - Fourth Stage

 $\boldsymbol{f}$ 

ŧ

The hole for the last stage of the pilot hole was drilled after the installation and grouting of the intermediate steel casing and was subsequently logged on April 14-16, 1992. A television survey and a final set of geophysical logs were run on June 11-13, 1992. The geophysical logs run over the full length of the open hole to 2,710 feet below land surface, included:

- Caliper  $\mathbf{o}$
- Gamma ray  $\mathbf{o}$
- Temperature and fluid resistivity  $\mathbf{o}$
- $\mathbf{o}$ Spontaneous potential
- Acoustic (borehole compensated sonic)  $\mathbf{o}$
- Dual induction and SP  $\overline{O}$
- $\mathbf{o}$ Flow meter
- $\overline{O}$ Resistivity
- T.V. Video.  $\mathbf{o}$

A copy of these geophysical logs is contained in Appendix 11.

Caliper Log  $7.3.4.1$ 

The caliper log was run in the pilot hole from below the intermediate casing to the full 2,710-foot depth. The pilot hole below the 1,860-foot depth of the pilot hole drilled for the intermediate casing was drilled with an 12-1/4-inch drill bit.

The caliper tool used to run the log had a long arm length and therefore, the caliper arms could not be fully extended to the size of a cavity when the distance from floor of cavity to roof of cavity was small. For this reason, the caliper was unable to record the full size of the smaller cavities found in the injection zone.

The caliper log, however, does provide good specific information in the areas with larger cavities and caverns. It shows, for example, a section with large hole size between 1,806 and 1,828 feet and two other similar large hole sections between 2,500 and 2,550 feet and between 2,604 and 2,710 feet. Cavernous zones are also indicated at 1,570 and at 2,373 feet. These caverns show well in the T.V. video (see Table 4-6). The cavity riddled zone between 1,806 and 1,828 feet is included in the Lower Monitor Zone, and the large caverns and small caverns below 2,500 feet are a significant part of the injection zone. There are also other high permeability intervals that, although they show no cavities, still provide good permeability due to primary porosity.

In addition, the caliper log shows a hole that is extemely tight in five parts of the well above the injection zone and below the Lower Monitor Zone. These are the sections of the strata that provide confinement of the injection zone. These five sections are from 2,380 to 2,490 feet from 2,296 feet to 2,350 feet, from 2,138 feet to 2,224 feet, from 1,970 feet to 2,050 feet, and from 1,840 feet to 1,850 feet.

#### 7.3.4.2 Gamma Ray Log

f

 $\left\langle \right\rangle$ 

The gamma ray log shows gamma ray counts averaging about 10 API units throughout the low permeability portion of the pilot hole. This is higher than in the highly permeable injection zone and backs up the contention that gamma ray sources are concentrated in the less permeable zones and are dissolved out by the moving groundwater in the higher permeability zones.

The only exception to this occurs at 2,374 feet where a cavern (see the caliper log) shows high gamma ray count. The reason for this is that the cavern is within a 4foot lignite layer and the gamma count is produced by the lignite. In the tighter formations that make up the confining zones, the average gamma ray count increases beyond 20 API units, and in the most confining zones it averages about 30 API units. Following that observation, the gamma ray log indicates the existence of

confining zones as follows: 1,820 to 1,850 feet, 1,970 to 2,052 feet, 2,140 to 2,224 feet, 2.300 to 2.324, and 2.400 to 2.474 feet; and the existence of highly permeable zones as follows: 1,806 to 1,816 feet, 2,500 to 2,542 feet, and 2,606 to 2,662 feet. Within the injection zone at a depth of 2,546 to 2,576 feet, the level of gamma activity picked up beyond 100 API units. This increase in gamma ray activity is associated with the lignite beds at those depths (see Figure 2-8 and Appendix 23).

#### Temperature and Fluid Resistivity  $7.3.4.3$

The temperature log run on the pilot hole on April 16, 1992 does not contribute to the evaluation of the injection zone, probably because the hole was still filled with the drilling fluids when the log was run. A much better analysis can be made of the June 27, 1992 temperature log that was run after the injection test had concluded. That second log shows a very sharp increase in temperature just above the upper monitor zone. This is probably caused by the greater groundwater flow in that permeable zone and the warming effects of it. Below that, in the confining zone where there is little circulation of groundwater to warm up the cool injection water, there is perfect evidence that the cooler injection test water is well insulated within the interval of the confining zone between 1,900 and 2,510 feet. Below that, from 2,510 feet to full depth there is obviously none of the injected water. The cavernous zone at around that depth has quickly dissipated the cooler water stored there and the natural warm water of the formation has taken over.

The temperature log, therefore, can be said to present excellent corroboration for the depth range of the confining interval and of the injection zone and is in full agreement with the data from the caliper and gamma ray logs.

One final item of interest gleamed from this log is a constant water temperature in the injection zone. This tends to confirm the theory of excellent water circulation in this zone and therefore the great permeability of the zone.

The fluid resistivity log showed no significant changes probably because of the same reason expressed earlier, and the June 29, 1992 log did not either because it was taken after homogeneous fresher water was injected. At the injection zone, however, we do see that there is some layering as evidenced by changes in fluid resistivity with varying depth.

#### 7.3.4.4 Spontaneous Potential Log

The spontaneous potential log for the final pilot hole section of the well exhibited a pattern closely paralleled to that of the induction and the electric resistivity logs, but in opposite directions (potential vs. resistance). It clearly outlined the significant feature of high permeability in the injection zone and the low permeability features of the confining zone.

The signal deflections exhibited by the log appeared to be fully explainable by the lithologic changes, although some of the changes are attributable to water quality variations within the hole, since it is known that water quality gradually worsens with depth in the open hole (see Figure 9-1). Because of the great similarity with the conclusions for the dual induction log results, the reader should review these logs while studying Section 7.3.4.6 below.

#### 7.3.4.5 Borehole Compensated Sonic Log

Use of the borehole compensated sonic log to qualify and quantify low permeability zones is one of the most reliable logs, but this log is not as reliable to quantify high permeability zones. The margin for error increases where there are cavities and caverns that introduce secondary porosity and destroy the relationship between transit time and porosity. Nevertheless, qualitatively the log is also ideal to identify those highly permeable zones.

The BHC shows four zones with very low transit times and one with extremely low transit times. They are from below the Lower Monitor Zone at 1,830 to 1,852 feet, from 1,978 to 2,050 feet, the lowest of all, from 2,138 to 2,240 feet, from 2,200 to 2,270 feet and the last one (just above the Injection Zone) from 2,380 to 2,492 feet. The BHC also shows three zones of moderate to medium permeability within the The first from 1,804 to 1,838 feet (the Lower Monitor Zones), the tighter zones. second from  $2,248$  to  $2,300$  feet and the third from  $2,270$  to  $2,280$  feet.

These high permeability zones are not continuous within the intervals shown. In reality, they are separated from each other by extremely impermeable but thin beds. Since these beds are thin, they are not likely to be very extensive (areawise), but their net effect is to increase the degree of confinement above the injection zone.

The sonic log identified the injection zone as consisting of two highly permeable zones separated by a lower permeability but still permeable zone. It also identified numerous thin layers within the highly permeable zones of the injection zone that are tight and of low permeability. Those zones straddle the previous zones described above. However, from 2,500 to 2,710 feet below land surface, the BHC shows no sections that can be described as impermeable. Consequently, the effective injection zone is estimated to be about 500 feet thick. Of this, one of the most permeable zones extends from 2,500 to 2,554 and the other from 2,600 to 2,710 feet.

#### 7.3.4.6 Dual Induction

 $\bigg($ 

 $\boldsymbol{i}$ 

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

The induction logs run on this well and the 16-64 Normal Resistivity Log show excellent correlation with the acoustic log and with the caliper, gamma ray and temperature logs described earlier. The induction log has shown sufficient sensitivity and differentiation between signals to interpret both qualitatively and quantitatively the characteristics of the formation matrix from the induced currents traveling in the fluid inside the borehole and through the formations.

With this preamble in mind, the induction log of the confining and the injection zones are examined qualitatively in this section and quantitatively in Section 9. The most permeable zones appear to be from 1,806 to 1,828 feet, from 2,240 to 2,296 feet, and in the injection zone from 2,500 to 2,548 feet, and from 2,602 to 2,652 feet. The least permeable zones are from 1,830 to 1,850, from 1,972 to 2,050, from 2,134 down to 2,274 (the most impermeable zone) and from 2,296 down to 2,325 feet, all within the confining zone. Below the confining zone, at 2,550 feet to 2,580 feet, the induction log predicts low permeability as well. Below 2,652 feet to full depth at 2,710 feet, there is also a decrease in permeability indicated.

#### 7.3.4.7 Flowmeter Log

The flowmeter log was run on April 16, 1992, but the well could not be pumped because there was no place to dispose of the water. Inside the open hole, small changes in velocity (RPM) can be seen in the log. These are due to uneven pulling on the cable drum and not to flow zones.

The only apparent flow in the well occurred at 2,654 feet, but lack of any other collaborating evidence makes it impossible to conclude whether this flow is or is not real and not just an extraneous event.

#### $7.3.4.8$ T.V. Video

 $\sqrt{ }$ 

 $\left\{ \right.$ 

Á

The best method of identifying tight zones of low permeability, cavities and caverns is through a television survey. In conjunction with the dual induction log, the caliper log and the sonic log, confirmation of the presence of confining or producitive zones is a virtual certainty with the T.V. log. At ZRL, the sonic log and the induction log were in good agreement, confirming the majority of the caverns and cavities and confining layers identified in the television survey, but of the two, the sonic log was a better indicator. There was, however, a slight discrepancy in the depth indicator on the television videos. Therefore, the locations of the cavities and caverns, as shown by the geophysical logs and by the television survey differed. The difference is at times up to 2 feet. A description of the T.V. video can be found in Table 4-6 and in Appendix 1. A discussion has been presented in Section 4.6.2.

## 7.3.4.9 Summary

Besides the television survey log, the sonic and the induction logs are the best logs from which to interpret the presence of confinement and the presence of high permeability sections in the injection zone. Although neither of these logs can attach a numeric value to permeability when large openings are present, they nevertheless show where those openings are. The sonic log is particularly useful because the position of a single graph in this log provides an easy visual comparison. The induction log results are harder to visualize since both the positions of each of the three graphs and their relative positions to each other must be evaluated.

The sonic log of the injection zone of the ZRL deep test/injection well showed two sections where the transit time graph indicated the presence of highly permeable zones; but the principal one was found in the section between 2,498 and 2,548 feet. Another high permeability zone was shown by the graph between 2,610 and 2,700 feet, except for two tighter zones at 2,622 and 2,682 feet.

The sonic log also showed very slow transit times in the sections between 1.830 and 1,852 feet, between 1,972 and 2,042 feet, between 2,136 and 2,244 feet and 2,300 to 2.492 feet. The transit times between 2,136 and 2,244 feet indicated nearly impermeable conditions.

The dual induction log, like the sonic log, clearly identified the most permeable It also identified all the low permeability confining zones shown by the zones. acoustic log but was especially useful in identifying the extremely low permeability zone between 2,138 and 2,228 feet.

The tight confining zone and the high permeability injection zone identified in the television survey were also confirmed by the geophysical logs. The temperature log run after the injection test gave unusually good graphic representations of where the confing and the receiving zones are.

#### 7.4 WATER QUALITY PROFILE

 $\sqrt{ }$ 

 $\int$ 

To develop a profile showing how water quality changes with depth, several types of water samples were collected. Some water quality samples were collected from the drill stem discharge at the end of each drill rod (see Appendix 27), beginning once the drilling operation switched from mud drilling to reverse air drilling on February 5, 1992 at 425 feet. The first such sample was collected at 454 feet and successive samples were collected at approximately 30-foot intervals. Also, as part of the core testing process, core laboratories also analyzed water from packer samples for use in the development of simulated brine needed for testing purposes. The straddle packer samples were collected at preselected depths (see Table 7-8). In addition, after well completion and development, water samples were collected in the open hole (the injection zone) using a point sampler. Finally, samples were collected at the end of development from the injection zone and from both the Upper and Lower Monitor Zones of the DZMW.

The drill stem water samples were analyzed for the following indicator field parameters at the drill site: conductivity, salinity, pH and temperature, and those field results were presented in the field notes (see Appendix 23). The samples were then shipped to Bionics Laboratory, Inc. for the more extensive analyses required and to double check in the lab the field parameters. The water samples collected

## Table 7-8

# STRADDLE PACKER SAMPLE RESULTS



\*This packer reportedly leaked from above and the sample is probably contaminated with fresh water from the zones above.

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

with the straddle packer and with the downhole sampler were also analyzed by Bionics. The results of the drill stem, straddle packers, and downhole point samples laboratory analyses are contained in Appendix 27. The samples collected at the end of development to represent pre-injection background conditions at the injection zone and at the two Monitor Zones were analyzed partly by Bionics and partly by PBS&J Environmental Lab. These results are included in Appendices 29 and 31. respectively.

All water quality data collected from the deep test/injection well and from the monitor well during construction are included in the above mentioned appendices (19, 23, 27, 29 and 31). There are, however, some important limitations on the accuracy of the data obtained from the drill stem samples. The formation water present at the depth of the drill bit was drawn into the drill stem along with the cuttings, but mixed with it was the uphole water. Drill stem samples yielded a mixed, and usually diluted, sample. More reliable results were obtained from the samples collected with the packers. These packers isolated the zones sampled and the samples were collected only after the water quality had stabilized as monitored by field conductivity measurements.

Two graphical methods were chosen to present the water quality data: the Stiff diagram and the Piper diagram. These diagrams are complementary in their respective presentations of water quality data.

The Stiff diagram is useful in showing both differences and similarities within the water composition (Hem, 1970), and readily expresses any trends in the water quality data with sampling depth. Stiff diagrams for the packer samples collected at various depths are displayed in Figure 7-31. Diagrams 1 and 2 at the top of the figure are representative of the USDW in the mid and lower portion of the Ocala Group (Crystal River and Williston Formations), respectively. Diagram 1 is also representative of the Upper Monitor Zone. Diagram 3 is from the zone immediately below the 10,000 mg/l TDS contact from the bottom of the Willison and the top of the Avon Park Formations. Diagram 4, which represents the Lower Monitor Zone, is from the Avon Park. Diagrams 5 through 8 are from the Lake City Formations. They represent water quality in the confining zone. Figure 7-31 also shows a Stiff diagram of typical seawater, number 10. This diagram is included for the purpose of comparison between seawater and water in the injection zone.

 $7 - 78$ 

 $\langle$ 

## Table 9-2

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  ,  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

# INJECTION ZONE WATER QUALITY<br>(50-foot intervals)\*



 $\bar{\alpha}$ 

\*Expressed as mg/l.<br>\*Goldberg, 1963.

m:R-66C/F

 $\sqrt{ }$ 

 $\big($ 

 $\bar{\rm A}$ 

 $\bullet$ 

Vulume 2A

 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}} = \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}} + \mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\bigg)$ 

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

# APPENDIX 1 T.V. SURVEY DESCRIPTIVE LOG

Zemel Rd Landfill

RECENER

OCT 27 1992

**D.E.R. SUUTH UISTRIU!** 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

## ZEMEL ROAD LANDFILL SITE DEEP INJECTION WELL T.V. SURVEY (APRIL 18 & 20, 1992)

## DESCRIPTIVE LOG

The description of the T.V. survey of the formations penetrated by the test/injecton well is best accomplished by combining the T.V. surveys conducted at various times of the drilling process. This description uses the best and clearest pictures from each survey to describe the different zones. For example, it used the April 20, 1992<br>survey to describe the formations down to 2,495 feet, but used the April 18, 1992 tape to describe the open hole to 2,709 feet.

The following description begins with the zone immediately below the intermediate casing, including the lower monitor zone and passing through the confining zone. The description also includes the injection zone and ends at the bottom of the hole at 2,709 feet.





Ź

 $\left\langle \right\rangle$ 

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $-2-$ 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 



 $\mathcal{E}$ 

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $-3-$ 



Size classification for use with this description:

Y

 $\left($ 

Largest dimension 3" or less, round unless otherwise specified. vug

- Largest dimension 6" or less and of unspecified shape. hole
- Largest dimension less than 2 feet, shape variable, usually discoid more than 3" high cavity
- Largest dimension more than 2 feet caver:

## SHAPE CLASSIFICATION

2 cavities, essentially round, and so oriented that they probably extend across hole. tunnel

pancake cavities A stack of flat cavities, usually larger than full hole size.

 $m:R-66A/Q$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\pm}$  )
Post, Buckley, Schuh, & Jernigan, Inc.<br>File: DRES-92087

 $\Lambda$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 

### BASIC PROPERTIES AND LITHOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

Zemel Rd. Test/Injection Well<br>Charlotte County, Florida



Post, Buckley, Schuh, & Jernigan, Inc.<br>File: DRES-92087

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\big($  $\rightarrow$ 

 $\hat{I}$ 

#### BASIC PROPERTIES AND LITHOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

# Zemel Rd. Test/Injection Well<br>Charlotte County, Florida



### **APPENDIX 25** GEOLOGIC DESCRIPTION OF CORES

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\sim 10^{11}$  km s  $^{-1}$ 

 $\big($ 

Zemel Rd Zandfill

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

#### ZEMEL ROAD LANDFILL **TEST/INJECTION WELL CORE DESCRIPTIONS**

#### CORE SECTIONS SENT FOR ANALYSIS TO CORE LAB IN HOUSTON TEXAS AND HELD IN STORAGE AT THE PBS&J OFFICES



#### LITHOLOGIC CORE DESCRIPTIONS

 $\mathfrak{g}$ 

Core  $\#1$  A: Ls, lt tan, fnly xln, mic, v foss Core  $\#1$  B: Ls, lt tan, fnly xln, mic, v foss

FOSSILIFEROUS LIMESTONE, very pale orange (10 YR 8/2), intergranular and moldic porosity (7-10%), grain type is micrite and biogenic, very fine grained, 40% allochems, poor to moderate cement with micrite matrix, mollusk molds, bryozoans, many forams, chalky.

Core #2 A: Ls, lt tan, fnly xln, mic, foss Core #2 B: Ls, lt tan, fnly xln, mic, v foss, pyr

FOSSILIFEROUS LIMESTONE, very pale orange (10 YR 8/2) to yellowish gray (5 Y 7/2), grain type is micrite and biogenic, 45% allochems, very fine to medium grained, poor to moderate induration with micrite matrix, echinoids, benthic foraminifera.

Core #3 A: Ls, lt tan, xln, mic, pel Core #3 B: Ls, lt tan, xln, mic, foss, pel

LIMESTONE, yellowish gray  $(5 \text{ Y } 7/2)$ , intergranular and moldic porosity  $(7\%)$ , grain type is micrite and biogenic,  $40\%$  allochems, moderate induration with micrite and sparry calcite cement, lignite veins present, forams including Dictyoconus.

Core  $#4$  A: Ls, lt tan, fnly xln, mic, sli foss Core #4 B: Ls, lt tan, xln/sparry, mic, foss, pel

LIMESTONE, yellowish gray (5 Y 7/2), intergranular porosity, grain type is micrite and biogenic, 10% allochems, moderate induration with micrite and sparry calcite cement, benthic foraminifera.

Core  $#5$  A: Ls, lt brn, xln, congl, v mic Core  $#5$  B: Ls, lt brn, microxln, v mic, sli foss

LIMESTONE, yellowish gray  $(5 \text{ Y } 7/2)$  to very pale orange  $(10 \text{ YR } 8/2)$ , intergranular and moldic porosity, grain type is micrite, interclast and biogenic,  $10\%$ allochems, moderate induration with micrite and sparry calcite cement, lignite veins.

Core #6 A: Ls,  $\mu$  tan, crisy xin, mic Core #6 B: Ls, lt tan, crlsy xln, mic

FORAMINIFEROUS LIMESTONE, yellowish gray (5 Y 7/2) moldic, intergranular and intracrystalline porosity, possibly low permeability, grain type is biogenic, crystal and micrite, 55% allochems, poor to moderate induration with micrite and some sparry calcite cement, medium euhedral dolomite crystals in section (7%), benthic forams including Dictyoconus americanus and Coskinolina sp..

Core  $#7$  A: Dol, dk brn, microxln, dns, tr pyr Core  $#7$  B: Ls, lt tan, xln, v mic, sli foss

DOLOMITIC LIMESTONE with DOLOMITE INCLUSIONS - limestone is very pale orange (10 YR 8/2) to yellowish gray (5 Y 7/2), intergranular, intercrystalline and moldic porosity, grain type is biogenic and micritic, 40% allochems, poor to good induration with micrite, sparry calcite and dolomite cement, forams, echinoids, the micrite and sparry calcite grade into each other, there are dolomite intervals but less than 10% of section. Dolomite crystals are located throughout the sample. The largest crystals are located in the micrite.

Core #8 A: Ls, amber xls in lt gry mic matrix, lam Core #8 B: Ls, amber xls in lt gry mic matrix, lam

DOLOMITE LIMESTONE, very pale orange (10 YR 8/2), intergranular and intercrystalline porosity, possibly low permeability, medium euhedral dolomite crystals located throughout limestone, foraminiferous, some well preserved cones. Dolomite dense - dark yellowish brown (10 YR 4/2) in section, lignite also present in section  $(<\!2\%)$ .

Core  $#9$  A: Dol, it brn, fnly xln to cryptxln, vug Core #9 B: Dol, lt brn, fnly xln to cryptxln, calc

DOLOMITE, dusky yellow (5 Y 6/4) to light olive brown (5 Y 5/6) to light olive gray (5 Y 5/2), intercrystalline and vugular porosity, highly altered, dolomitic limestone represents <10% of section - yellowish gray (5 Y  $7/2$ ).

Core #10 A: Ls, lt tan, xln, mic, pyr<br>Core #10 B: Ls, lt tan, xln, mic, sli foss

DOLOMITE (75%), dark yellowish brown (10 YR 4/2) and DOLOMITIC<br>LIMESTONE (25%), very pale orange (10 YR 8/2), intergranular and intercrystalline<br>porosity, moderate to good induration with sparry calcite and dolomite cement

 $m:R-38D/I$ 

 $\left($ 

 $\left($ 

 $\langle$ 



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

YOUNGQUEST BROTHERS 15465 Pine Ridge Road Ft. Myers, FL 33908

Attn: PBS&J MIAMI Invoice Number: 10000304

 $\left($ 

UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Order #: B2-06-064 Date: 07/30/92 13:52 Work ID: MONITORING WELL Date Received: 06/25/92 Date Completed: 07/28/92 Client Code: YOUNGQUEST B

#### SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION



Sample Sample Number<sub>.</sub> Description TRIP BLANK

Certified By MARK KROMIS, CHEMIST

Zemel Road  $L$ andfill Water Quality Pata

Order  $# B2 - 06 - 064$ 07/30/92 13:52

 $\sqrt{ }$ 

ť

TEST RESULTS BY SAMPLE

Page 2

Sample: 01A UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92



Sample: 01B UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92



Sample: O1C UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92



Order # B2-06-064 07/30/92 13:52

TEST RESULTS BY SAMPLE

Sample: 01D UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92 Test Description Result Units Analyzed Limit Bv TOTAL PHENOLICS  $0.08$  $0.05$ mg/L 07/08/92 KS Sample: O1E UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92 Test Description Result <u>Limit</u> Units Analyzed By **CYANIDE BDL**  $0.02$ mg/L 07/07/92 **KS** Sample: O1F UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92 Result Test Description Units Analyzed Limit By CHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND 250 **BDL** mg/L 07/01/92 BK Sample: 01G UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92 Result Test Description Limit Units Analyzed **By** HYDROGEN SULFIDE  $0.10$ 0.58  $mq/L$  as H2S 06/26/92 **KS** Sample: 01H UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92 Test Description Result Limit Units Analyzed By TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON  $61.12$  $0.04$ mg/L 07/07/92 **JK** Sample: 01I UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92 Test Description Result **Limit** Units Analyzed By  $47+/-9.2$ GROSS ALPHA pCi/L 07/01/92  $_{\rm CG}$ **GROSS BETA**  $195+/-11$ pCi/L 07/01/92  $CG$ 07/08/92 RADIUM 226  $6.5+/-0.3$  $pci/L$  $_{\rm CG}$ RADIUM 228  $0.6 + / -0.4$ pCi/L 07/10/92 CG Sample: 01J UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92 Test Description Result Limit Units Analyzed By mg/L 06/30/92 SB AMMONIA NITROGEN  $0.03$  $0.40$ **NITRATE BDL**  $0.02$  $mg/L$ 06/30/92  $SB$ 07/01/92 SB TOTAL KJELDAHL NITROGEN  $0.40$  $0.04$  $mq/L$ 07/01/92 SB TOTAL ORGANIC NITROGEN **BDL**  $0.04$  $mg/L$  $SB$ TOTAL PHOSPHORUS 1.00 0.050  $mg/L$ 07/01/92 Sample: O1K UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92



Page 3

f.

 $\int$ 



#### Sample: OlL UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92



Sample: 01M UPPER MON. ZONE 1341-1415' Collected: 06/24/92





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

YOUNGQUEST BROTHERS 15465 Pine Ridge Road Ft. Myers, FL 33908

Attn: PBS&J MIAMI Invoice Number: 10000206 LOWER MON. ZONE 1795'-1854'

Order #: B2-06-034 Date: 08/04/92 09:22 Work ID: MONITORING WELL 1795FT-1854FT Date Received: 06/24/92 Date Completed: 07/28/92 Client Code: YOUNGQUEST B

#### SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION



Sample Number

Sample Description

fied By Certi MARK KROMIS, CHEMIST

Order #  $B2-06-034$ 08/04/92 09:22

TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS

TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS

TOTAL VOLATILE SOLIDS

TOTAL FIXED SOLIDS

TOTAL HARDNESS

TOTAL SOLIDS

TURBIDITY

pH

 $\sqrt{ }$ 

 $\overline{1}$ 

TEST RESULTS BY SAMPLE

Page 2

mg/L 06/25/92 LH

mg/L 06/29/92 LH

07/22/92

06/29/92

06/30/92

06/25/92

pH UNITS 06/26/92 LH

06/29/92 LH

**ML** 

LH

LH

**JK** 

mg/L as CaCO3

 $mg/L$ 

 $mg/L$ 

 $mg/L$ 

 $N.T.U.$ 



34,858

 $4,182$ 

5,873

 $7.5 -$ 

 $13$ 

7.51

34,866

30,684

 $0.5$ 

 $0.5$ 

 $5.0$ 

 $0.5$ 

 $0.5$ 

 $0.5$ 

 $0.05$ 

 $0.10$ 

Order #  $B2-06-034$ 08/04/92 09:22

 $\left($ 

 $\left($ 

 $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ 

TEST RESULTS BY SAMPLE

Page 3



Order #  $B2-06-034$ 08/04/92 09:22

 $\bigg)$ 

 $\overline{1}$ 

 $\left($ 



Zemal Road Landfill

#### **APPENDIX 27**

#### WATER QUALITY ANALYSIS

Drill Stem Water Quality Results (T/I Well) 1.

 $2.$ Downhole Point Samples Water Quality Results (T/I Well)

Straddle Packers Water Quality Results (T/I Well)  $3.$ 

Drill Stem Water Quality Results (DZMW) 4.



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN FOR<sub>1</sub> 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622

 $Deill$  stand<br> $Desl1$  stand

ATTN: William Pitt

 $\left($ 

RE: Sample(s) Received 2/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

Casing set at 427'

**LABORATORY REPORT** 





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST. BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\left($ 

Sample(s) Received 2/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE<sub>i</sub>$ T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





 $\overline{(\cdot)}$ 

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

### **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 2/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\left($ 

 $RE<sub>i</sub>$ Sample(s) Received 2/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**



 $(E)$  = Less than statistically valid number of colonies or greater than 200 colonies per plate or confluent growth precent.

 $\mathbf{r}$ 



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

Sample(s) Received 2/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE:$ T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





 $\big($ 

 $\left($ 

# **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- Sample(s) Received 2/10/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE<sub>1</sub>$ T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami. Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\overline{1}$ 

Sample(s) Received 2/10/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE:$ T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

**LABORATORY REPORT** 





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST. BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\overline{(}$ 

Sample(s) Received 2/10/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE:$ T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





 $\left($ 

Ť

## **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- $RE<sub>1</sub>$ Sample(s) Received 2/10/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





 $\sqrt{ }$ 

 $\frac{1}{4}$ 

### **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- Sample(s) Received 2/10/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE:$ T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**



 $(E)$  = Less than statistically valid number of colonies or greater than 200 colonies per plate or confluent growth precent.

 $\sim$ 

 $\cdot$ 



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- William Pitt ATTN:

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 2/14/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





 $\sqrt{ }$ 

 $\int$ 

 $\left($ 

### **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 2/14/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- William Pitt ATTN:

Í

 $\left(\right)$ 

Sample(s) Received 2/14/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE<sub>i</sub>$ T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





 $\overline{1}$ 

### **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 5, 1992

- FOR<sub>1</sub> POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- $RE<sub>2</sub>$ Sample(s) Received 2/18/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





 $\bigg)$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

## **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 18, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN FOR: 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- Sample(s) Received 2/27/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE:$ T/I WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL DEEP INJECTION WELL PROJECT

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**



 $(E)$  = Less than statistically valid number of colonies or greater than 200 colonies per plate or confluent growth precent.

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 18, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ 

 $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 2/27/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/I WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL DEEP INJECTION WELL PROJECT

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**



 $(E)$  = Less than statistically valid number of colonies or greater than 200 colonies per plate or confluent growth precent.

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\cdot$ 



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 18, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

ĵ.

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

 $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 2/27/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/I WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL DEEP INJECTION WELL PROJECT

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**





 $\vec{l}$ 

### **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

June 4, 1992

FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 3140 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622

ATTN: William Pitt

RE: Sample(s) Received 4/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/L WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL **REVISED** WELL DEEP INJECTION WELL PROJECT #10-231.46





 $\big($ 

 $\left($ 

# **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

June 4, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

RE: Sample(s) Received 4/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/L WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL **REVISED** WELL DEEP INJECTION WELL PROJECT #10-231.46





 $\mathfrak{g}$ 

### **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

June 4, 1992

FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622

ATTN: William Pitt

 $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 4/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/L WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL **REVISED** WELL DEEP INJECTION WELL PROJECT #10-231.46





 $\overline{1}$ 

## **Bionomics Laboratory, Inc.**

4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

June 4, 1992

FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622

ATTN: William Pitt

 $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 4/7/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/L WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL **REVISED** WELL DEEP INJECTION WELL PROJECT #10-231.46






4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

May 1, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W.  $36^{TH}$  ST. FOR: Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ 

RE: Sample(s) Received 4/10/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL, PROJECT # 10.231.46

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

May 1, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W.  $36^{TH}$  ST. FOR: Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 4/10/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL, PROJECT # 10.231.46

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**



Mark Kromis, Chemist

 $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ 



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

May 4, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN FOR: 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- RE: Sample(s) Received 4/15/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL, PROJECT # 10.231.46





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

May 4, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN FOR: 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\overline{ }$ 

Sample(s) Received 4/15/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE:$ T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL, PROJECT # 10.231.46





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012<br>(407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

May 4, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN FOR: 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 4/15/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL, PROJECT # 10.231.46





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

May 4, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 4/15/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL, PROJECT # 10.231.46





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

May 4, 1992

FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622

 $\sim 10^{-10}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$  .

ATTN: William Pitt

ί

 $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 4/15/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL, PROJECT # 10.231.46





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012<br>(407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

July 21, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

 $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 6/12/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. ZEMEL RD TEST INJECTION WELL PROJECT T/I WELL PROJECT # 10.231.46

Pourhole samples ?





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

July 21, 1992

#### FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622

ATTN: William Pitt

RE: Sample(s) Received 6/12/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. ZEMEL RD TEST INJECTION WELL PROJECT T/I WELL PROJECT # 10.231.46





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

May 21, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W.  $36^{TH}$  ST. FOR: Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- $RE:$ Sample(s) Received 5/1/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

May 21, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W.  $36^{TH}$  ST. FOR: Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- RE: Sample(s) Received 5/1/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/1 WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEE RD. LANDFILL



#### **APPENDIX 29**

### INJECTION ZONE BACKGROUND WATER QUALITY ANALYSES

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

Zemel Ra Landfill



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012<br>(407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

COVER PAGE - ANALYSIS DATA PACKAGE



Release of the data contained in this hardcopy data package has been authorized by the Laboratory Manager, as verified by the following signature.

Mark Kromis, Chemist





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012<br>(407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

August 12, 1992

- POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN FOR: 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- William Pitt ATTN:

Sample(s) Received 6/12/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $RE:$ T/I WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL



POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH AND JERNIGAN August 12, 1992 Page Two

 $\alpha=1$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $< 0.050$ 

POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH AND JERNIGAN<br>August 12, 1992 Page Three

 $\overline{1}$ 

 $\sim 10$ 



POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH AND JERNIGAN August 12, 1992 Page Four





4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 19, 1992

in Dal

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami. Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt

Potassium as K

RE: Sample(s) Received 3/3/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL ROAD LANDFILL T/I WELL PROJECT buble

**LABORATORY REPORT** LAB I.D. NO. 9202422 9202423 straddle  $SP$  # 4  $SP$   $\neq$  3 **MARKS**  $\overline{1}$ , 765'-1, 729'  $1,566' - 1,601'$ Proker  $3/2/92$ DATE SAMPLED 2/27/92 TIME SAMPLED 2115 1330  $7.71$   $\angle$  $7.03$ pH. Lab  $99 -$ Bicarbonate as CaCO<sub>3</sub>, mg/l  $\lt 1$   $\lt$ Carbonate as CO<sub>3</sub>, mg/l Chlorides as Cl, mg/l 89، 5.000  $22,300 -$ Conductivity umhos/cm 1.14  $1.42 -$ Fluoride as  $F$ , mg/l 300  $290 -$ Sulfate as  $SO_4$ , mg/l  $0.5$ 15,422  $3.499**$ Total Dissolved Solids, mg/l TOTAL METALS, mg/l 314  $448 -$ Calcium as Ca 4.06  $16.4 -$ Iron as Fe 123 558 $\nu$ Magnesium as Mg

 $3.800 -$ 728 Sodium as Na

 $28.6$ 

 $95.5 -$ 

\*\* Sample turbid after filtering through 934 Whatman Filter Paper EPA Method 160.1. Turbidity reflects high TDS values.

 $(E)$  = Less than statistically valid number of colonies or greater than 200 colonies per plate or confluent growth present.



4310 E. Anderson Road Orlando, Florida 32812 DHRS/DER # 83331, E 83012 (407) 851-2560 FAX (407) 856-0886

March 30, 1992

- FOR: POST, BUCKLEY, SCHUH & JERNIGAN 8600 N.W. 36TH ST. Miami, Fl. 33166-6622
- ATTN: William Pitt
- RE: Sample(s) Received 3/5/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis. T/I WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL

#### **LABORATORY REPORT**



Sample(s) Received 3/10/92, Submitted By Client For Analysis.  $\bullet$ T/I WELL CHARLOTTE CO. ZEMEL RD. LANDFILL