5120 Butler Pike
Plymouth Meeting
Pennsylvania 19462
215-825-3000
Telex 846-343

Woodward-Clyde Consultants

December 11, 1987
87C2555B-1

#67

E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company
26th Street and Buffalo Avenue
Niagara Falls, New York 14302

Attention: Mr. Richard Gentilucci

Re: Hydraulic Conductivity Values from Slug Tests, Niagara Plant Wells Tested 1986 and 1987.

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to your request, slug test hydraulic conductivity values (cm/sec) are provided for twenty-two (22) Niagara Plant monitoring wells tested in 1986 and 1987 (Table 1). All calculations were reviewed to ensure consistency between the two sets of data. As a result, several tests for the 1986 data were re-calculated. Therefore, the values presently submitted for 1986 slug tests are the final calculated hydraulic conductivity values. Any data submitted previously should be disregarded.

It has been a pleasure working for you and Du Pont on the Niagara Plant project. If you have any questions please contact us.

Very truly yours,

WOODWARD-CLYDE CONSULTANTS

Andrew H. Leitzinger

Andrew H. Leitzinger
Senior Staff Geologist

Lynn Rubisch Penniman

Lynn Rubisch Penniman, CPSS
Project Manager

AHL/LRP/kcs/WM-8H

Attachment

cc: Frank S. Waller

Tables

TABLE 1

SLUG TEST HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY VALUES
MONITORING WELLS TESTED 1986 and 1987
DUPONT NIAGARA PLANT
Niagara Falls, New York

Monitoring Well	Test Date (year)	Hydraulic Conductivity (cm/sec)	
		Confined	Unconfined(A)
1A (R)	1986	NC	7.0×10^{-5}
1B (R)	1986	$< 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$(B)	NC
1J (R)	1986	$< 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$(B)	NC
2B	1986	NC	$< 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$(B)
4A (R)	1987	NC	5.6×10^{-5}
5A (R)	1987	NC	8.5×10^{-4}
6A (R)	1987	NC	$< 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$(B)
7A (R)	1986	NC	$< 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$(B)
7C (R)	1986	9.9×10^{-3}	NC
7F	1986	6.4×10^{-3}	NC
12A	1987	5.3×10^{-2}	5.8×10^{-3}
14D	1987	1.9×10^{-2}	4.1×10^{-3}
16B	1987	NC	5.2×10^{-3}
17A	1987	5.8×10^{-3}	5.6×10^{-4}
17F	1986	2.1×10^{-5}	NC
18D	1986	3.0×10^{-1}(C)	NC
20A	1987	DW	DW
23A	1987	NC	$< 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$(B)
23F	1987	6.8×10^{-3}	4.1×10^{-3}
24B	1986	1.0×10^{-2}	NC
26C	1986	3.0×10^{-2}	NC
26CD	1986	5.0×10^{-1}(C)	NC

(A) When possible data was reduced for both confined and unconfined conditions.
(B) Assumed value, little or no response, data irreducible.
(C) Value estimated by Kipps (1985) Water Resources Research.
DW Dry Well, no test completed.
NC Not computed.
(R) Replacement well.