LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1. Definition sketch for applying Fox and Baxter (1996) theory to API hydraulic conductivity tests .................................................................9

Figure 2-2. Plan view sketch of 3D model used by Eiben et al. (1994) .......................19

Figure 2-3. Histograms from Barvenik and Ayres (1987) case history ......................29

Figure 2-4. Histograms from Hayward Baker (1988) case history .........................30, 31

Figure 2-5. Histograms from Koelling et al. (1997) case history .........................32

Figure 2-6. Histograms from Zamojski et al. (1995) case history .........................33

Figure 3-1. Plan view of SBTF .............................................................................37

Figure 3-2. Section A-A view of SBTF .................................................................38

Figure 3-3. Section B-B view of SBTF ................................................................39

Figure 4-1. Compaction curves for Washout material used for CCL in pilot-scale experiments ..............................................................................46

Figure 4-2. Compaction characteristics of Washout material from three different compaction methods .................................................................47

Figure 4-3. CCL and LCS geometry for W1 ................................................................49

Figure 4-4. CCL and LCS geometry for W2 ................................................................50

Figure 4-5. CCL and LCS geometry for W3 ................................................................51

Figure 4-6. The finished CCL for W1 and compacting the LCS for W1 .....................52

Figure 4-7. Aquifer and soil-bentonite base soil grain size distributions .................54

Figure 4-8. Soil-bentonite mix design: hydraulic conductivities of Bedding Sand mixed with three different bentonite contents .................................57

Figure 4-9. Consolidation tests on soil-bentonite grab samples from W1 ..............58

Figure 4-10. Schematic diagram of Rantec plastic mixing eductor .......................59

Figure 4-11. Soil-bentonite mixing ......................................................................61
Figure 4-12. Excavating the trench for W1 using bioslurry for excavation support .............................................................. 66

Figure 4-13. Predicted stresses in pilot-scale cutoff walls from arching theory .................................................................................. 71

Figure 4-14. Destructive evaluation of W1 .................................................................................................................. 73

Figure 4-15a and b. Destructive evaluation of W2 ........................................................................................................... 75, 76

Figure 4-16. Degradation of bioslurry viscosity ............................................................................................................. 78

Figure 4-17. Filter cake in part of W3 excavated in Stage 2 ......................................................................................... 80

Figure 4-18. Filter cake thickness between soil-bentonite and LCS – W3 ................................................................. 81

Figure 4-19. Destructive evaluation of W3 .................................................................................................................. 83

Figure 5-1. API filter press apparatus ....................................................................................................................... 86

Figure 5-2. Use of monitoring wells in the barrier pit to control water levels and measure the flow rate through pilot-scale cutoff walls .................................................................................. 90

Figure 5-3. Sketch of W2 showing Layers A – D and the water level pairs used for evaluating the average hydraulic conductivity of the wall .......................................................................................... 94

Figure 5-4. Flow model 1 of flow rate through pilot-scale cutoff wall ................................................................. 96

Figure 5-5. Shape factors, s, for Flow models 1 and 2 ............................................................................................. 97

Figure 5-6a. SEEP2D finite element mesh used for Flow model 2 ......................................................................... 100

Figure 5-6b. SEEP2D flow net for mesh shown in 5-6a ............................................................................................. 101

Figure 5-7a. SEEP2D mesh used to investigate influence of $k_{CCL}$ on flow rate through cutoff wall .......................................................... 103

Figure 5-7b. Increase in flow rate through W3 due to flow through CCL .......................................................... 104

Figure 5-8a. Orthogonal view of MODFLOW grid used for Flow model 3, W2, Water level pair 4 .......................................................... 106
Figure 5-8b. View of MODFLOW grid for W2, Water level pair 4, in y-direction
..................................................................................................................107

Figure 5-8c. View of Column 16 of MODFLOW grid in x-direction.................108

Figure 5-8d. View of Column 16 MODFLOW solution .....................................109

Figure 5-8e. View of Layer 10 of MODFLOW grid in z-direction.....................110

Figure 5-9. Orthogonal view of MODFLOW grid used for Flow model 3, W2, Water level pair 1 .................................................................111

Figure 5-10. Modeling the constant head trench-wall boundary condition in MODFLOW ........................................................................................112

Figure 5-11. Geonor M206 piezometer .................................................................115

Figure 5-12. Flow nets for Teeter and Clemence (1986) correction factor for piezometer tests in cutoff walls .................................................................117

Figure 5-13a. Orthogonal view of the 3D finite difference MODFLOW grid used to evaluate shape factors for a piezometer in a cutoff wall (B/D = 43.4, L/D = 15.7).............................................................................119

Figure 5-13b. Close up view of the simulated piezometer ....................................120

Figure 5-13c. Top view of the 3D finite difference MODFLOW grid (B/D = 43.4, L/D = 15.7) at a layer in the middle of the piezometer filter .................................................................121

Figure 5-13d. Side view of the 3D finite difference MODFLOW grid (B/D = 43.4, L/D = 15.7).....................................................................................122

Figure 5-13e. Close up of the piezometer filter circled in Fig. 5-13d .................123

Figure 5-13f. Equipotential surfaces for the model shown in Fig. 5-13a.............124

Figure 5-13g. Side view and top view of equipotential lines ..............................125

Figure 5-14. Shape factors for piezometer tests in cutoff wall from 3-D MODFLOW model .........................................................................................126

Figure 5-15a. Two-dimensional finite element mesh used for shape factor evaluation of a well in a cutoff wall with filter cakes ..............................129
Figure 5-15b. Equipotential lines and flow lines for the two-dimensional finite element mesh with B/D = 12 and $\varphi_{sb}$ / $\varphi_{fc} = 1.67$........................130

Figure 5-16a. Single-well test shape factors that account for filter cakes ....................132

Figure 5-16b. Chart for evaluating $k_{eq}$ from single-well test $k_{sb}$ (evaluated assuming no filter cakes) and estimate of filter cake permittivity .................................................................133

Figure 5-17. Effect of position of well in wall on shape factor ....................................136

Figure 5-18. Effect of formation soil hydraulic conductivity on boundary condition assumption................................................................................................138

Figure 5-19. Results of piezometer hydraulic fracture tests and predictions for W1 and W2 ........................................................................................................141

Figure 5-20. Pushing the piezocone into W1................................................................148

Figure 5-21. Obtaining and testing undisturbed samples from the cutoff walls.........................................................................................................................151

Figure 6-1. API hydraulic conductivity tests on grab samples – W1 ...........................156

Figure 6-2. Hydraulic conductivity measurement locations, W1 .................................158

Figure 6-3. Variable head piezometer test results, L2D2, W1 .....................................161

Figure 6-4. Effect of flow direction in variable head piezometer tests, W1.................162

Figure 6-5. Comparison of variable and constant head piezometer test results, W1.................................................................165

Figure 6-6. Comparison of variable head piezometer test results from Hvorslev-type and Cooper et al. analyses, W1 ........................167

Figure 6-7. Piezocone soundings
   a) P1 in W1 .............................................................168
   b) P2 in W1 .............................................................169
   c) P3 in W1 .............................................................170
   d) P4 in W1 .............................................................171
   e) P5 in W1 .............................................................172
   f) P6 in W1 .............................................................173
   g) P7 in compacted LCS ............................................174

Figure 6-8. Dissipation test data for P6 in W1 .............................................................177
Figure 6-9. API hydraulic conductivity tests on grab samples – W2 .................182

Figure 6-10. Hydraulic conductivity test locations, W2........................................184

Figure 6-11. API hydraulic conductivity tests on grab samples – W3 .....................191

Figure 6-12a. Measurement of background flow rates for W3 (i = 0).....................193

Figure 6-12b. Global measurement of average hydraulic conductivity of W3 (i = 1) ........................................................................................................................194

Figure 6-13. Results of SEEP2D flow rate computations with filter cakes modeled ..........................................................................................................................196

Figure 6-14. Hydraulic conductivity test locations, W3..........................................198

Figure 6-15. Influence of sample volume on soil-bentonite hydraulic conductivity for W3....................................................................................................................207

Figure 6-16. Comparison of $k_{sb}$ and $k_{eq}$ as a function of sample volume for W3 ...............................................................................................................................210

Figure 7-1. Schematic diagram of breakthrough experiment ...................................216

Figure 7-2. Theoretical steady state concentration profiles in the breakthrough experiment..........................................................................................................................218

Figure 7-3. Results of breakthrough experiment and analysis..................................220

Figure 7-4. Diffusion test results ...............................................................................225

Figure 7-5. Definition sketch for analysis of breakthrough experiment ..................226

Figure 7-6. Solution procedure for evaluating the influence of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the flux through a barrier .............................................234

Figure 7-7. Effect of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the flux through a cutoff wall, negative values of mean $P_e$ .................................................................237

Figure 7-8. Breakthrough curves for the case of $P_e < 0$ ........................................238, 239

Figure 7-9. Effect of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the breakthrough time through a cutoff wall, negative values of mean $P_e$ ........................................241
Figure 7-10. Effect of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the flux through a cutoff wall, positive values of mean $P_e$ .................................................243

Figure 7-11. Breakthrough curves for the case of $P_e > 0$ .............................................244

Figure 7-12. Effect of variability in hydraulic conductivity on the breakthrough time through a cutoff wall, positive values of mean $P_e$ ......................................................................................................245

Figures A-1 through A-37. Variable and Constant head piezometer test results for all tests shown in Tables 6-1 (W1), 6-8 (W2), and 6-11 (W3) ...............................................................................................272 – 308

Figure B-1. Dissipation test data for P1 in W1 .................................................................310

Figure B-2. Dissipation test data for P2 in W1 .................................................................311

Figure B-3. Dissipation test data for P3 in W1 .................................................................312

Figure B-4. Dissipation test data for P5 in W1 .................................................................313

Figure C-1. Batch equilibrium tests ..............................................................................315

Figure D-1. Soil-bentonite/NaCl compatibility tests .......................................................317