Camp Dresser & McKee

$SUN-T3$

 \mathfrak{f}

City of Sunrise Injection Well No. 3 Hydrogeologic Evaluation Report

FDEP UC 06-212792

City of Sunrise
Injection Well No. 3 Hydrogeologic Evaluation Report

FDEP UC 06-212792

August 1995

CDM Project No. 6505-01

Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.

800 Brickell Avenue, Suite 710 environmental services Miami, Florida 33131 Tel: 305 372-7171 Fax: 305 372-9167

August 8, 1995

Mr. Alfred Mueller, P.E., P.G. Chairman TAC-UIC Florida Department of Environmental Protection 1900 South Congress Avenue, Suite A West Palm Beach, Florida 33416

Subject: Casing Setting Depth for Dual Zone Monitor Well No. 3 Sawgrass Utility Site - City of Sunrise, Broward County, Florida FDEP Construction Permit UC 06-212792

Dear Mr. Mueller:

The construction of injection well No. 3 at the Sawgrass Utility Site of the City of Sunrise has been completed. The drillers (Youngquist Brothers) are ready to proceed with the construction of the dual zone monitor well just as soon as we receive FDEP approval for the casing depths of the two monitor zones.

Enclosed please find a copy of the Hydrogeologic Evaluation and of the accompanying data required by the permit's Specific Conditions 3.d and 3.e (page 8 of the permit). Copies of these documents are also being mailed at this time to all the TAC members so that they may review them before you contact them for concurrence of the recommended depths.

As you can see, in the recommendations section of the report, we are proposing a setting depth of 2,060 feet below land surface for the lower monitor zone casing and 1,700 feet below land surface for the upper monitor zone casing. A 50-foot monitoring interval is recommended for both zones. The lower monitor interval is positioned in a transmissive interval below the USDW (1,924 feet) and above the injection zone and major confining units (2,260 feet). The upper monitor interval is located in a transmissive interval immediately above the point of salinity increase (1,800 feet) as indicated by the resistivity log.

Attachment C of the report are the geophysical logs. Full size copies of these logs were sent to each of the TAC members last March 8 (see our letter of March 22). We are not including extra full size copies of these logs with this report because we need to save those copies for the final report. We have, however, duplicated at reduced scale the dual induction, the acoustic, and the gamma ray logs in Figure 5 of the report. Should any TAC member not be able to find the copies sent March 8 and if the reduced scale copy in Figure 5 is not adequate, we do have a couple of the full size copies that can be made available and still have enough copies left for the final report.

CDM Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.

Mr. Alfred Mueller, P.E., P.G. August 8, 1995 Page 2

We would like to have your consent on the setting depths as soon as possible so that the drilling can proceed without delays. Please contact me for consultation on this matter if there are any questions or if you or any of the TAC members require additional information. If you need to call a TAC meeting on August 22 to discuss this issue and would like to have us there to present any information or clarify any point, please let us know as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

CAMP DRESSER & McKEE INC. Milliam A. J. Pitt, P.E., P.H. Senior Hydrologist **『Florida RE: #12577** WAJP/sek Attachments

File: 6505-01-GSC

Mark Silverman, P.G. CC: J. P. Listick Will Evans, P.G. Richard Deuerling, P.G. Jeanne Dove Scott Hoskins Steve Anderson, P.G. Ronald Reese, P.G. John Foglesong, P.E. James S. Caldwell, P.E. Chris R. Helfrich, P.E. Victor J. Pujals, P.E.

sk1958

City of Sunrise Injection Well No. 3 **Hydrogeologic Evaluation Report**

Background

Specific Condition 3.d. of the September 2, 1994 Construction Permit for the City of Sunrise Injection Well No. 3 requires that the data and analysis supporting the selection of the monitoring intervals for the dual zone monitor well be submitted to the TAC as a hydrogeologic evaluation of the proposed monitoring zones. The Specific Condition also requires that this hydrogeologic evaluation report include interpretation and analysis of the pertinent cores, the geophysical logs, the packer tests and the fluid samples.

The recommended depth of casing settings for the upper limits of the monitor zones are required to be accompanied by technical justification in the form of approved geophysical logs with engineering and geological interpretations, and water quality.

Purpose

This hydrogeologic evaluation is presented to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) in fulfillment of the construction permit requirements (FDEP UC 06-212792).

The recommended casing settings and open intervals of the two monitor zones have been made to take into account the additional permit requirements found in Specific Condition 3.d. Those requirements state that the lower monitor interval should ideally be positioned in a transmissive interval below the USDW and at an appropriate point above the injection interval and major confining units to monitor for reasonable assurance of vertical confinement and external mechanical integrity. Similarly, the upper monitor interval should be ideally positioned in a transmissive interval immediately above and proximal to the base of the USDW.

Scope

This hydrologic evaluation report presents the laboratory data results of the analyses of the pertinent cores, the geophysical logs pertinent to the determination of the location of the confining zone, the laboratory results of the analyses of the packer tests water quality samples, and the results of the field testing of water quality during packer testing.

Finally it concludes with the recommendations for the setting of the casings of the upper and lower monitor zones for the dual zone monitor well for injection well No. 3 whose construction is pending FDEP approval of the monitor zones.

Geologic Cores

In compliance with the technical specifications and the permit conditions for the deep test/injection well, a total of 23 attempts to collect cores were made during the drilling of the pilot hole. The coring operations are outlined in Table 1, starting on February 21, 1995. Of the 23 attempts, 22 cores were recovered. The first eight cores were taken from above the casing depth of the intermediate casing. They were taken while the pilot hole for that casing was being drilled. Cores number 1 through 18 were taken from the Avon Park Formation, with no recovery on core number 2, and cores numbered 19 through 23 were taken from the Oldsmar Formation (see Figure 1). All 23 cores were four inches (10 cm) in diameter and up to 17 feet in length (100% recovery). One sample from each core was selected by CDM for analysis by Ardaman & Associates, Inc. (AAI) (see Figure 2 and Table 2). Geologic and lithologic descriptions of the cores are included as Attachment A to this document and the results of the special core analysis study conducted by AAI are presented as Attachment B.

Core Testing Results

As noted in Table 2, twenty-two samples obtained from the twenty-three corings attempted at the City of Sunrise IW-3 were submitted to AAI for testing. The depths from which the samples were selected are shown in the first column in Table 3.

The testing program on the samples included:

- \blacksquare Vertical coefficient of permeability
- \blacksquare Porosity
- Specific Gravity
- \blacksquare Compressive strength
- Modulus of elasticity

Vertical Coefficient of Permeability and Porosity

Permeability Tests

The permeability test results are presented in Table 3. Vertically oriented permeability test specimens were obtained by subcoring 5.1 cm diameter cylinders from the 10 cm diameter core samples. The specimens were then confined and permeated with deaired water. The inflow to and outflow form each specimen were monitored with time, and the coefficient of permeability was calculated for each recorded flow increment.

Porosity

The porosity of each permeability test specimen was calculated using the measured dry density and specific gravity. The calculated porosities are presented in Table 3.

Table 1 SUMMARY OF IW-3 PILOT HOLE GEOLOGIC CORING OPERATIONS

 \sim \sim

 $\frac{1}{2}$.

 \sim

js
1

Table 1 (continued)
SUMMARY OF IW-3 PILOT HOLE **GEOLOGIC CORING OPERATIONS**

 ~ 10

bo1606.c1

 \sim \sim

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

b.

ŀ,

ł,

 $\bar{}$ l,

ò,

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

C:\ACAD\6505-001\

GSG00001

07/17/95 10:40:46

8:55:23

environmental engineers, scientists,
planners, & management consultants

SENT TO LABORATORY

 $FIGURE$ 2

Table 2 CORE RECOVERY DATA

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 \overline{a}

 Δ

*Plug Interval Stored at AAI - Orlando, Florida

 $\sim 10^7$

Table 2 (continued)
CORE RECOVERY DATA

 \mathbf{v}

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

 \sim \sim

*Plug Interval Stored at AAI - Orlando, Florida

bo1606.d1,

 \sim

Table 3

PERMEABILITY TEST RESULTS SUNRISE DEEP INJECTION WELL NO. 3

Where: $w_c =$ Molsture content; $\gamma_d =$ Dry density; n = Porosity calculated from equation: n= 1 - (γ_d / G_a γ_w) where $G_s =$ Specific gravity and $\gamma_w =$ Unit weight of water;
 $\bar{\sigma}_c =$ Average isotropic effective confinin

Final molsture content measured and corresponding degree of aaturation calculated after performing unconfined compression test on the permeability test specimen.

1-95091.T01

Analysis of the Core Data

Table 3 indicates a great range in permeability in the cores. Values range from 10^3 cm/sec to $10⁹$ cm/sec, and this difference can be quite significant in identifying confining intervals. However, despite the wide range of values, the vertical permeability in most samples is still low. Samples from 2,448', 2,276', and 2,047' are practically impermeable, and samples from 1,592', 1,766', and 2,502' are of extremely low permeability. Samples from 2,122', within the Lower Monitor Zone of Monitor Well No. 2 is showing the next to highest permeability, but even this one has a permeability of only 1.5×10^3 cm/sec (about 3 gallons per day per square foot), which is low. The other samples, with the exception of the one at 2,072', are all less than 3 gallons per day per square foot.

Sample porosity shows direct relationship to permeability. Figure 3 shows a plot of the porosity versus permeability of the core 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 35 percent and permeability above 0.001 cm/sec are removed, the fit is 0.92.

The plot in Figure 3 is not a mathematical or theoretical derivation, but only an empirical relationship and is applicable only to similar types of rock samples extracted from the general area in and near the Sunrise site. The porosity has a direct semilogarithmic relationship with the permeability for these samples, but this relationship might not hold true for other samples. The relationship developed in Figure 3 for porosity and permeability can be presented in the form of an equation, as follows:

 $\log y = mx + b$ where b is the y intercept, and m is the slope of the line

When expressed in the terms of permeability and porosity the equation becomes:

 $Log P = 11.479 n - 8.1235$ where P is the permeability (in millidarcies) and n is the porosity (in percent)

From the sonic logs (see Attachment C), transit times (Acoustic Travel Time) were obtained for each cored sample depth; these are shown with the corresponding sample porosity in Table 4. Since the relationship between transit time and porosity is linear (Schlumberger, 1972) the two values for each sample were then represented in the form of a linear relationship and plotted in Figure 4.

Table 4 COMPARISON OF ACOUSTIC TRAVEL TIME AND POROSITY

 $\bar{\gamma}$

A linear regression analysis of the data points shown in Figure 4 produced the following function:

 $n = 0.0054t - 0.2271$

where n is the rock porosity (percent), and t is acoustic transit time of saturated rock matrix (microseconds/foot).

The relationship expressed in Figure 4 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 can now be utilized to evaluate the porosities of the different geologic strata from the sonic log. The use of this equation is, however, restricted to those formations from which it was originally developed (Schlumberger 1972) and extreme values of porosity and transit time should be viewed as less accurate and suspect.

The resulting empirical relationships between transit time and porosity and between porosity and permeability developed earlier from the laboratory analyses of the cores, and their comparison with the geophysical logs, can now be used and combined to better define the confining characteristic of the confining zone (see Figures 3 and 4). The equations for the lines in Figure 3 and Figure 4, can be solved together to yield a function as follows:

 $Log P = 0.05t - 3.19$

where P is the permeability (in millidarcies), and t is the transit time (in microseconds/foot)

Using this empirical relationship, and applying it to the confining layers, except where cavityriddled zones and caverns are present, the permeability of the various layers of the confining zone can be calculated. For example, in the interval from 2,570 to 2,580 feet, the average sonic velocity transit time is about 75 microseconds/foot and the formula above yields a permeability of 1.75 millidarcys. This is equivalent to 0.01 gpd/ft^2 .

Using this methodology to identify the confining zone as the zone shown to posses the lowest permeability (hydraulic conductivity) as determined by the evaluation of the geophysical logs, the actual value of conductivity is based on the core data most closely resembling the value representative of that zone. It will be seen in the geophysical logs, that the zone from 2,260 to 2,290 feet represented by core number 16 is the most confining layer above the injection zone and that it is represented by the hydraulic conductivity of 1.7×10^8 cm/sec of core number 16. In the geophysical log the integrated value for the acoustic travel time is 65 microseconds per foot, and when this value is inserted in the equation derived in Figure 4, the hydraulic conductivity is 0.06 millidarcies (6x10⁻⁵ darcies) or roughly 5.4x10⁻⁸ cm/sec which is as close to the laboratory value of 1.7×10^{-8} cm/sec as can be expected from the integration of the geophysical log with its inherent margin of error.

Geophysical Logs

The pilot hole geophysical logs whose interpretation adds to the understanding of the hydrogeology of the confining zone at the site of injection well No. 3 are included in Attachment C. For convenience in reviewing the geophysical logs data, a reduced scale copy of selected logs is shown in Figure 5.

BHC Sonic Log

Acoustic logging involves the recording of the time required for a sound wave to travel through a definite length of formation. Speed of sound in subsurface formations depends upon the elastic properties of the rock matrix, the porosity of the formations, and their fluid content and pressure. (Refer to Tables 1 and 2 in Attachment B for porosity and modulus of elasticity values of the rock matrix in the cores tested.)

The sonic log records the arrival of the first sonic wave trains emitted from two transmitters located above and below the receivers; but the presence of secondary porosity can obliterate that first wave. Thus, the travel times recorded on the sonic log are more representative of the primary porosity than of the secondary porosity unless there is a trace of the first wave. Primary porosity reflects intergranular porosity and is dependent upon the pore structure and pore-size distribution. Secondary porosity often consists of vugs, fractures and large cavities with dimensions larger than the pores of the primary porosity. Large sonic travel times recorded on the sonic log would indicate largely secondary porosity because of the larger openings; hence, the sonic log results can also be used to identify the presence of high permeability zones, although a quantitative analysis for secondary porosity would not be possible. A sonic log reading equivalent to the formation fluid transit time or higher would obviously indicate the absence of formation matrix and, therefore, confirm the presence of a cavity or hole.

From approximately 2,260 to 2,290 feet, the transit time peaks from 60 to 50 microseconds/foot, which indicates a very low permeability zone within the Avon Park Formation.

The borehole compensated sonic log was run together with a variable density log (VDL). This log is also helpful in determining the relative tightness (confining characteristics) of formations. One of the benefits of this log is that by measuring the travel time at various distances from the well centerline horizontally into the formation it provides a visual presentation of the locations where the most confining sections are. In this particular case, the VDL log shows the very distinctive outline of the tight confining interval between 2,260 and 2,290 feet bls.

The derivation of the empirical porosity equation earlier (see Figure 4) is based primarily on the analysis of the core samples taken from the pilot hole. The equation is thus applicable locally only to those portions of the sonic log in which similar formations are encountered, that is, in the Avon Park at the Sunrise site. (It cannot be used for the clayey Hawthorn, the dolomitic Arcadia, the sandy Suwannee or any other different formation 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 (see Figure 3) to further convert it to permeability.

Dual Induction Log

Dual induction electric logging is a method of measuring the resistivity (reciprocal of conductivity) of formations by means of logging induced alternating currents (induction logging). Earlier resistivity tools (64-inch and 16-inch Normal Resistivity tools for example) measured the same resistivity properties of the formations, but the advantage of electric inductive logging is its ability to investigate the thickness of beds, due to its focusing properties and its greater radius of investigation.

One characteristic of resistivity logs is that, when a short (shallow) and a long (deep) penetration signal are sent out together, both encounter essentially the same resistance when the material through which they travel is soft and porous and invaded with conductive fluids such as salty water; however, when the material is very hard and dense (impermeable), or when the material is stratified and has porosity in only one plane (horizontally for clays), or the fluid is not conductive, the long penetration signal encounters greater resistance than the short penetration signal.

Using this characteristic of the log, it is possible to identify those zones where the denser structures of the formations (not invaded by conductive fluids) hinders the travel of the electric signal, and by comparing this log with other logs (the acoustic log, for example), it is possible to interpret the relative degree of confinement that a formation can provide.

The electric resistivity log utilizes three induction devices for measuring the resistivities of the formations: 1) a deep-reading induction device (ILD) whose signal penetrates deep into the formation, 2) a shallower or medium investigation device (ILM), whose readings are more influenced by the borehole and the invaded zone around it, and 3) LL3 which is a spherically focused inductive device. Variations in the signals from the three devices are good indicators of the degree of mud or drilling fluid invasion within the formations, with such invasions more likely to occur in the more permeable formations.

The induction log can be analyzed by utilizing the equations for Formation Factor and Resistivity Index, 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 the section dealing with the packer test sampling. Using this average, it is then possible to obtain a porosity value using Archie's equation. The Formation Factor and the porosity are interrelated. Both of these parameters are related to resistivity measurements as follows:

 $F = Ro/Rw$

where F is formation factor (dimensionless), Ro is resistivity of saturated formation (ohms-cm), and Rw is resistivity of formation fluid (ohms-cm)

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

 $F = (a)n^m$

m is the cementation factor, where a is an empirical constant, and n is the porosity

Therefore, the direct relationship between resistivity and porosity is:

$$
Ro = Rw (a) nm
$$

Using these relationships and the geophysical logs for the formation resistivities corresponding to the cores whose porosities were determined in the lab, a relationship was developed between porosity and formation resistivity which can now be used to determine porosities from the geophysical log data (see Figure 6).

From the graph, the porosity versus permeability relationship derived in Figure 3 can now be entered with the specific values of porosity from the geophysical log entry in Figure 6. However, the relationship only holds valid where the formation fluids are highly conductive. In other words, only where the TDS contact exceeds 10,000 mg/l concentration (samples below 1,930 feet).

The induction log shows decreasing resistivity starting at about 1,800 feet below land surface indicating a salinity increase with depth starting at that point. An inflection point at the 1,850 foot depth below land surface and another at 1,920 feet are additional indication of salinity increases. This leads to the conclusions that between the inflection points the salinity increases above the $10,000 \text{ mg/l}$ TDS level.

The distinctive segment, located from 2,260 feet to 2,290 feet, reflects a tight low permeability zone, in fact one of the lowest permeability zones in the well. Then, from 2,290 feet to 2,300 feet, the last segment of this section of pilot hole, the logs, included a zone with moderate porosity.

Packer Tests and Fluid Sampling

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, beginning once the drilling operation switched from mud drilling to reverse air drilling on February 18, 1995 at 1,030 feet. The first such sample was collected at 1,118 feet and successive samples were collected at approximately 30-foot intervals.

Also, as part of the testing process, straddle packer samples were collected at preselected depths (see Table 5 and Figure 5). In addition, while the packers were being pumped, periodic field samples were collected and analyzed in the field to make sure equilibrium had been reached before collecting the final packer test laboratory from that particular depth. Finally, the receiving zone water was equilibrium had been reached before collecting the final tested after well completion and development, water samples were collected in the open hole (the injection zone).

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. The water samples collected with the straddle packer were analyzed by Savannah Laboratory, Inc. The results of the straddle packers laboratory analyses are contained in Table 5. In Table 6 are presented the field results of the final stabilized results prior to laboratory sampling of the packed off interval.

The TDS values shown in the packer test results of Table 5 indicate that in the interval between 1,732 to 1,756 feet the concentration of total dissolved solids (TDS) was 5,600 mg/l while at the next lower packer interval between 1,930 and 1,954 feet, the concentration is 17,000 mg/l. This places the 10,000 mg/l line that delimits the USDW somewhere between these two depths. A packer sample was collected between 1,886 and 1,910 feet but unfortunately it was lost by the contractor. However the field data for the determination of equilibrium (See Table 6) shows a TDS of 8,000 mg/l in the interval between 1,886 and 1,910 feet. The 10,000 mg/l TDS line is therefore narrowed to between 1,910 and 1,930 feet bls based solely on water quality information. This is probably as accurate as the USDW can be determined. Through a close inspection of the induction log in the general area indicated by the water quality it is possible to identify an inflection point at 1,924 feet bls which may be caused by the increase in salinity of the water. This then is as close as the USDW has been identified from the water quality and other data collected during the construction of Injection Well No. 3 at the City of Sunrise site.

Confining Zone

Chapter 62-528 (FAC) requires that a confining zone be present above the injection zone, and that it should be able to prevent the upward migration of injected fluid from the injection zone. In practice, however, no natural soil or rock is totally impermeable and, therefore, able to totally prevent the migration of fluid from any aquifer system (Todd, 1980; Bear, 1979; Freeze and Cherry, 1979; etc.). All rocks are permeable to one degree or another; therefore, the issue addressed in this section is the degree of fluid migration rather than its complete prevention. However, the confining layers of the confining zone are for all practical purposes impermeable.

In the following subsections, the confining layer located between 2,260 and 2,290 feet bls is discussed in terms of its hydraulic characteristics. The physical limits are also discussed.

Physical Limits

The boundary between the injection zone and the overlying major confining zone (that is, the bottom of the confining zone) was determined by the geologic cuttings, the geophysical logs and the water quality to be at a depth of about 2,290 feet. The top of this major confining zone was

Table 5

Stradle Packer Sample Laboratory Results

 $\sim 10^{-1}$

NOTE: Packer sample from 1886' to 1910' was unobtainable

 \mathcal{A}^{\pm}

 \sim

Table 6

Stradle Packer Sample Results (Field)

similarly identified at 2,260 feet. At 2,290 feet, a sharp decrease in signal velocity (long transit time) was seen in the acoustic log (see Attachment C), and in the dual induction electric logs, shallow induction signals indicate an increase in porosity and permeability. The deeper induction signals also begins to separate a little at 2,290 feet.

Hydraulic Characteristics

The resulting empirical relationships between transit time and porosity and between porosity and permeability developed from the laboratory analyses of the cores, and their comparison with the geophysical logs, can now be used and combined to better define the confining characteristic of the confining zone (see Figures 3 and 4). The equations for the lines in Figure 3 and Figure 4, can be solved together to yield a function as follows:

 $Log P = 0.05t - 3.19$

where

P is the permeability (in millidarcies), and t is the transit time (in microseconds/foot)

Using this empirical relationship, and applying it to the confining layer, the permeability of the confining zone was calculated. For example, in the interval from 2,260 to 2,290 feet, the average sonic velocity transit time is about 65 microseconds/foot and the formula above yields a permeability of 0.06 millidarcies. This is equivalent to 0.001 gpd/ft².

Conclusions

Review and analysis of the coring, geophysical logging, packer testing, and field water testing performed as part of drilling and testing of the City of Sunrise's Injection Well No.3, has resulted in the following conclusions:

A tight major confining zone has been identified above the level at which a freshening of the formation waters has been recorded. This tight confining zone begins at a depth of 2,260 feet below land surface and has prevented any migration of injected fluids past it.

Water quality data indicate that above this confining zone the native formation fluids have not been affected by the injection at this site; while immediately below this confining layer there is evidence of upward migration of injected fluids up to that level.

Core testing data indicate a hydraulic conductivity of only 1.7X10-8 cm/sec (0.0004 gallons/ day/square foot) in cores taken from this zone.

Geophysical logs data indicate that this zone is the most impermeable one of all the low permeability zones encountered during drilling of the injection well. This is confirmed by both the induction logs and the acoustic logs, and is backed up by the gamma ray and VDL logs.

Packer test water quality field data indicate a TDS concentration of 8,000 mg/l in the interval from 1,886 and 1,910 feet below land surface. Packer test water quality laboratory data indicate a TDS concentration of 17,000 mg/l in the interval from 1,930 to 1,954 feet below land surface. A determination has been made regarding the position of the 10,000 mg/l TDS line that delimits

the bottom of Underground Sources of Drinking Water. This line has been determined to be located at approximately 1,924 feet below land surface.

Recommendations

In order to meet the requirements of the FDEP permit for construction of IW-3 stating that "...the lower monitor interval should ideally be positioned in a transmissive interval below the USDW and at an appropriate point above the injection interval and major confining units to monitor for reasonable assurance of vertical confinement and external mechanical integrity." ...and that "...the upper monitor interval should be ideally positioned in a transmissive interval immediately above and proximal to the base of the USDW.", and based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

The lower and upper monitor zones should extend a minimum of 50 feet below the end of their respective casings in order to provide sufficient contact with the aquifer for adequate pressure and water quality monitoring.

The upper monitor zone should be located above the USDW. Since the USDW is expected to be located above 1,924 feet bls the monitor zone must monitor above that. The salinity transition zone begins at approximately 1,800 feet bls and it is our opinion that the upper monitor zone should be located above that transition zone otherwise slight natural fluctuations in salinity in the transition zone could result in frequent erroneous results in the monitored data. The zone recommended extends through the interval from 1,700 to 1,750 feet bls. The first 50 feet immediately below that interval is a low transmissive zone and is not recommended. The interval selected (1,700 to 1,750 feet bls) is in line with the upper monitor zone for injection well No. 1 (MW-1A).

The lower monitor zone should be located in a transmissive zone below the USDW (1,924 feet) and above the injection interval and major confining units (2,260 feet) in order to provide an early warning of any leakage across the zone. The most porous zone is located between 2,060 feet and 2,110 feet and is recommended as the lower monitor zone. The zone recommended starts 200 feet above the confining zone and extends 50 feet below that.

A final recommendation is that the TAC and the FDEP give their approval for the installation of the monitor well for injection well No. 3 (MW-3) with the upper and lower monitor casings set at 1,700 feet below land surface and at 2,060 feet below land surface respectively. A 50 foot monitoring interval is recommended for both monitor zones.

ATTACHMENT A

Geologic Description of Well Cuttings and Cores
(Test/Injection Well)

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$. In the $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$

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

 $\ddot{}$

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION NOTES George O. Winston

Cuttings and core chips were examined wet using a zoom stereo microscope and a 100 watt incandescent light.

The limestone classification is basically that of Dunham, with modifications such as substituting MICRITE for MUDSTONE (the latter is a variety of shale common in the Mesozoic of the Gulf Coast, and its application to carbonates can be confusing). Grain percentages are estimated to provide the reader with a picture of the rock, which the wackestone class of Dunham does not. As colors vary with the type of illumination, whether they are wet or dry, or with an individual's ability to differentiate shades, I have not used the GSA color chart which was designed for outcrop work in daylight.

The dolomite classification is my own, and contains these three varieties:

Euhedral: rhombic crystals are visible. Anhedral: light reflections indicate a crystalline

structure'but rhombic crystals are not visible (they are interlocking). Cryptocrystalline: a smooth appearance with no crystal reflections visible; in some instances it may be lithographic with conchoidal fracture, thus resembling chert.

The sizes of limestone grains and dolomite crystals were determined by the Wentworth scale.

Porosity percentages are visual estimates of effective porosity. Although chalky limestone has high porosity, it is a poor reservoir for the extraction or injection of fluids.

As can be seen in the core descriptions, lithologic changes occur every foot or two. In a 10-foot sample of cuttings there are probably eight lithologic changes (some repeating the same lithology). As it is impossible from a 10-foot sample to place them in their proper order, I have selected the 3 most common lithologies and arranged them in a logical sequence of beds. This method provides at least a generalized picture of the lithologic sequence throughout the well.

The greatest problem in describing minor lithologic constituents is deciding whether they are in place or are contamination by previously drilled rock.

Cores were sampled at approximately the center of each foot. To emphasize this, in the core description each foot has only one depth number. Each foot is listed, even if the lithology remains

DESCRIPTION ABBREVIATIONS

linoides (Nummulites) cyclina oconus americanus pconus gunteri lina ເຣ oids

ate onite lenite

Porosity $gran = granular$ $xln =$ intercrystalline $pp = pinpoint$ $modd = moldic$ chalky vug $occ = occasional$ $tr = trace$

 ~ 100

 $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$

Contract Contract $\epsilon_{\rm eff}$

 $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$

 \mathcal{L}^{\pm}

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{C})$

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}(\mathbf{A})$.

 ~ 0.1

Contractor

 \mathcal{L}^{max} and \mathcal{L}^{max}

 \sim \sim

 \mathcal{A}^{\pm}

 \bar{z}

 $\sim 10^6$

 $\sim 10^{11}$.

 $\sim 10^7$

 $\ddot{}$

Ì

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

 \sim

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

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

 \sim

 \sim \sim

 \mathcal{L}

 ω

 \mathcal{L}

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

ATTACHMENT B

Special Core Analyses Study
(Core Laboratory Results)

।⋶

June 29, 1995

Geotechnical, Environmental and Materials Consultants

 CS JUN 30 A $9:55$

書店)

.

 $\overline{P.E.}$

 $5.0.$

Youngquist Brothers, Inc. 15465 Pine Ridge Road Fort Myers, Florida 33908

Attention: Mr. Bob Henshaw

Subject: Laboratory Test Results on Rock Core Specimens, Sunrise Deep Injection Well No. 3

Gentlemen:

Permeability, unconfined compression and specific gravity tests have been completed on 22 rock core samples provided by your firm from the Sunrise Deep Injection Well No. 3. The permeability tests were performed in general accordance with ASTM Standard D 5084 "Measurement of Hydraulic Conductivity of Saturated Porous Materials Using a Flexible-Wall Permeameter". The unconfined compression tests were performed in general accordance with ASTM Standard D 2938 "Unconfined Compressive Strength of Intact Rock Core Specimens". The specific gravity was determined in general accordance with ASTM Standard D 854 "Specific Gravity of Soils".

If you have any questions or require any additional testing services, please contact us.

Very truly yours, ARDAMAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

incones

Thomas S. Ingra, P!E. Senior Project Engineer Florida Registration No. 31987

cc: Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc. **Will Pulsford**

TSI/jcw

Table 1

PERMEABILITY TEST RESULTS SUNRISE DEEP INJECTION WELL NO. 3

Where: $w_c =$ Moisture content; $\gamma_d = Dy$ density; n = Porosity calculated from equation: n= 1 - (γ_d / $G_a\gamma_w$) where G_a = Specific gravity and γ_w = Unit weight of water;
 $\bar{\sigma}_c$ = Average isotropic effective conf

t Final molsture content measured and corresponding degree of saturation calculated after performing unconfined compression test on the permeability test specimen.

Contract \sim 100 \pm

Table 2

UNCONFINED COMPRESSION TEST RESULTS SUNRISE DEEP INJECTION WELL NO. 3

 $=$ Moisture content and $\gamma_{\mathsf{d}} =$ Dry density. $"c$

 \bullet

Moisture content measured after performing permeability test on the specimen.
Computed compressive strength corrected for $L/D = 2$ equals 872 lb/in² for sample from 1591.5 feet and
1827 lb/in² for sample from 2379.5 fe \ddagger \ddagger

Young's modulus calculated from the slope of the straight-line portion of the stress-strain curve.

1-95091.T01

AXIAL STRAIN, %

UNCONFINED COMPRESSION TEST RESULTS

UNCONFINED COMPRESSION TEST RESULTS

N₂₂₆a

UNCONFINED COMPRESSION TEST RESULTS

UNCONFINED COMPRESSION TEST RESULTS

FIGUAL $5¹$

via e

Avro

 $-95 - 091$

AXIAL STRAIN, %

UNCONFINED COMPRESSION TEST RESULTS

ATTACHMENT C

Pilot Hole Geophysical Logs from $1,030'$ to $2,300'$ Depth

Gamma Ray BHC Sonic (Acoustic Velocity) **VDL** Dual Induction (LL3, ILM, ILD) **SP**

Attachment C of the report are the geophysical logs. Full size copies of these logs were sent to each of the TAC members last March 8 (see our letter of March 22). We are not including extra full size copies of these logs with this report because we need to save those copies for the final report. We have however duplicated at reduced scale the dual induction, the acoustic, and the gamma ray logs in Figure 5 of the report. Should any TAC member not be able to find the copies sent March 8 and if the reduced scale copy in Figure 5 is not adequate, we do have a couple of the full size copies that can be made available and still have enough copies left for the final report.