Journal of Hydrology 528 (2015) 385-396

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Hydrology

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jhydrol

## Analysis of partially penetrating slug tests in a stratified formation by alternating piezometer and tube methods



HYDROLOGY

Yoshitaka Sakata<sup>a,\*</sup>, Toshikazu Imai<sup>b</sup>, Ryuji Ikeda<sup>c</sup>, Makoto Nishigaki<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Environmental System Research Laboratory, Division of Human Environmental Systems, Faculty of Engineering, Hokkaido University, North-13, West-8, Kita-ku, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060-8628, Japan

<sup>b</sup> GM Labo, Inc., 3-6, Nishi-Tenma, Kita-ku, Osaka, Osaka-fu 530-0047, Japan

<sup>c</sup> Division of Earth and Planetary Dynamics, Faculty of Science, Hokkaido University, North-10, West-8, Kita-ku, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060-0810, Japan

<sup>d</sup> Department of Environmental and Civil Design, Faculty of Environmental Science and Technology, Okayama University, Okayama, Japan

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 7 September 2014 Received in revised form 28 April 2015 Accepted 8 June 2015 Available online 15 June 2015 This manuscript was handled by Corrado Corradini, Editor-in-Chief, with the assistance of Okke Batelaan, Associate Editor

Keywords: Slug tests Partially penetrating well Hydraulic conductivity Sensitivity analysis Numerical simulation Heterogeneity

#### SUMMARY

In partially penetrating slug tests, hydraulic conductivity (K) estimates might not necessarily be valid because of vertical flows in heterogeneous formations. We assess the error in hypothetical stratified formations by numerical sensitivity analysis, and propose an effective method for compensation by incorporating two types of casing configuration (piezometer and tube). The hypothetical stratified formation consists of completely horizontal layers, each 1 m thick; the permeability is different between, but not within, layers. In this study, conductivity estimates in the piezometer and tube methods are calculated by assigning various patterns of conductivity to the test, upper, and lower layers:  $K_T$ ,  $K_U$ , and  $K_L$ . The effect of vertical flow becomes significant when  $K_{\rm T}$  is small relative to  $K_{\rm U}$  or  $K_{\rm L}$ , and  $K_{\rm L}$  is more important than  $K_{11}$  because the base of the borehole is open to the lower formation. The conductivity ratios (estimate over actual value) are treated as approximately linearly dependent on logarithms of  $K_T/K_U$ and  $K_{\rm T}/K_{\rm L}$ , so that conductivity estimates can be straightforwardly derived from one piezometer measurement and two tube measurements at the top and bottom of the screen. The linear relations are evaluated and constant parameters are determined under specific conditions. This study also recommends alternating piezometer and tube methods in the drilling procedure because the actual variation of K with depth is larger than that found using isolated measurements, as shown in a field study of alluvial fan gravel deposits in Sapporo, Japan.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

#### 1. Introduction

Slug tests are employed in both practical engineering and scientific studies to determine in situ hydraulic conductivity, *K*, by measuring the recovery of head in a single borehole after artificially raising or lowering the water level in the well. Although slug tests are sensitive to artificial and natural conditions in the well (e.g., Black, 2010), they are useful because they are simpler, cost less, and require less equipment than multiple pumping tests. It is also common for slug tests to have a logistical advantage, especially in groundwater contamination investigations. One reason is that slug tests can be conducted without removing or adding water, by lowering a solid piece of metal, called a slug, into a well, which does not disturb the site of suspected contamination. Another reason is that slug test results are related mainly to permeability on a small scale, and thus local information is directly relevant to preferential flow paths for contamination plumes. In addition, a series of slug tests at multiple depths aids in interpreting vertical variations of *K*. When such vertical profiles are interpolated among different locations, three dimensional distributions of *K* can be obtained for an individual site. Various previous studies have shown the spatial variability in *K* obtained from slug test analyses (Zlotnik and Zurbuchen, 2003; Zemansky and McElwee, 2005; Ross and McElwee, 2007; Leek et al., 2009; Cardiff et al., 2011).

Analytical solutions for slug tests have been available since the work of Hvorslev (1951), and theoretical and numerical studies have contributed to the practical application of slug tests in a variety of conditions for target aquifers (e.g., confined or unconfined), well types (e.g., fully or partially penetrating wells), falling head data (e.g., normally overdamped or nonlinear oscillatory head data), and borehole configurations (e.g., skin or no skin effects), as summarized by Butler (1997). Even in the last decade, analytical solutions of slug tests have been developed, for example, for highly permeable formations (Butler and Zhan, 2004), varying pressure conditions (Chen and Wu, 2006), and unconfined aquifers with



<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Tel./fax: +81 11 706 6288. E-mail address: y-sakata@eng.hokudai.ac.jp (Y. Sakata).

### 

Nomencluture			
$a_1, b_1, c_1, a_2, c_{2U}, b_2$ , and $c_{2L}$ empirical parameters determined by numerical simulation		$\widetilde{K}_{SU}$	hydraulic conductivity estimate obtained by the upper tube method $(L T^{-1})$
d <sub>c</sub>	diameter of well casing (L)	$\widetilde{K}_{\mathrm{T}}$	hydraulic conductivity estimate obtained by alternating
d <sub>s</sub>	diameter of well screen in the piezometer	1	the piezometer and tube methods $(LT^{-1})$
	method (L)	п	total number of horizontal layers consisting of the for-
Н	drawdown of hydraulic head in the well during slug		mation
••	tests (L)	r	radial coordinate with origin at base of well (L)
$H_0$	initial drawdown of hydraulic head at slug tests (L)	Р	capillary pressure (L)
$H_1$	drawdown of hydraulic head at the beginning time for	Qg	groundwater discharge rate during slug tests into the
1	analysis (L);	<u> </u>	well $(L^3 T^{-1})$
$H_2$	drawdown of hydraulic head at the end time for analy-	$R_{\rm U}$	logarithm of ratio of upper adjoining conductivity to
2	sis (L)	0	target conductivity; $K_{\rm U}/K_{\rm T}$
L	length of screen interval in the piezometer method (L)	$R_{\rm L}$	logarithm of ratio of lower adjoining conductivity to tar-
Κ	hydraulic conductivity (LT <sup>-1</sup> )	L	get conductivity; $K_{\rm I}/K_{\rm T}$
Ki	hydraulic conductivity in the <i>i</i> th layer from the top to	$\widetilde{R}_{L}$	estimated logarithm of ratio of lower conductivity to
-	the bottom of the numerical model $(LT^{-1})$	-	target conductivity
KL	hydraulic conductivity in the lower adjoining layer	Ss	specific storage coefficient $(L^{-1})$
-	(L T <sup>-1</sup> )	S <sub>w</sub>	degree of saturation (%)
$K_{Li}$	hydraulic conductivity in the <i>i</i> th layer upper from the	t	time (T)
	test layer $(LT^{-1})$	Т	time interval for slug test analysis (T)
$K_{\rm r}$	radial component of hydraulic conductivity (L T <sup>-1</sup> )	$T_0$	basic time lag at which a normalized head of 0.37 (T)
K <sub>T</sub>	hydraulic conductivity in the layer to be tested by the	Z	vertical coordinate (L)
	piezometer method (L T <sup>-1</sup> )	α	dimensionless storage parameter, $(2d_s^2S_sL)/d_c^2$
Ku	hydraulic conductivity in the upper adjoining layer	$\alpha_L$	ratio of estimate by the piezometer method to by the
	$(L T^{-1})$		upper tube method, $\frac{\widetilde{K}_{HV}}{\widetilde{K}_{HV}}$
K <sub>Ui</sub>	hydraulic conductivity in the <i>i</i> th layer upper from the		K <sub>SU</sub>
	test layer (L T $^{-1}$ )	$\alpha_{\rm U}$	ratio of estimate by the piezometer method to by the
Kz	vertical component of hydraulic conductivity (L $T^{-1}$ )		lower tube method, $\frac{\widetilde{K}_{HV}}{\widetilde{K}_{HV}}$
<i>K</i> <sub>HV</sub>	estimate of hydraulic conductivity in the piezometer		K <sub>SL</sub>
	method (L $T^{-1}$ )	$\theta$	volumetric water content
$\widetilde{K}_{\rm HV}$	hydraulic conductivity estimate obtained by the	$\psi$	square root of the anisotropy ratio over the aspect ratio,
~	piezometer method (L T <sup>-1</sup> )		$\sqrt{K_z/K_r}$
$\tilde{K}_{SL}$	hydraulic conductivity estimate obtained by the lower		$\frac{1}{2L/d_s}$
	tube method (LT <sup>-1</sup> )		

wellbore inertial effects and well skins (Malama et al., 2011). However, most previous studies of slug tests have been based on the assumption of homogeneity: that is, any flow parameters are constant. This idealized view of formations is not necessarily realistic in nature, and hydraulic properties are often variable to a considerable degree in geologic settings. For example, K in coarse mixtures ranges over several orders of magnitude, depending on grain sizes and the volume fractions of each component (Koltermann and Gorelick, 1995). However, to our knowledge, only a few studies have discussed the application of slug tests in naturally heterogeneous formations. Karasaki et al. (1988) presented rigorously analytic solutions of fully penetrating slug tests in a formation that contains two layers of different permeability with no vertical flows. In this case, slug test results entirely agreed with those from a homogeneous formation, for which K was the thickness-weighted arithmetic average, when the vertical flows were neglected. Due to the complexity of aquifer and boundary conditions, numerical approaches offer more flexibility than theoretical studies for handling vertical flow. For example, Beckie and Harvey (2002) numerically examined fully penetrating slug tests with stochastic realizations of K, and used the solution reported by Cooper et al. (1967) for simulated head recovery data in each realization. As a result, these solutions approximately corresponded to the geometric means of *K* in the support volume of slug tests, but were close to the arithmetic means when the characteristic scale of heterogeneity (correlation scale of K) increased. On the other hand, partially penetrating slug tests are more affected by vertical flows from the lower adjoining layers than fully

penetrating slug tests. As an example of a typical field study, Shapiro and Hsieh (1998) performed double-packer slug tests in the crystalline fractured rock of central New Hampshire. They found that the water responses in the analytical models are different from the measured responses, probably due to non-radial flow in the vicinity of the borehole. Yu and Lloyd (1992) used several optimization procedures to compensate for the effects of vertical flows in double-packer slug test results under the assumption of multiple layered systems. The effect of vertical flow in partially penetrating slug tests was discussed through a comparison between semi-analytical and conventional solutions (Hyder et al., 1994). Hyder et al. found that the effect was large for small aspect ratios  $2L/d_s$ , where L is the screen interval length and  $d_s$  is the borehole diameter, as shown later in Fig. 2. Furthermore, Butler et al. (1994) used numerical simulation to evaluate the effect in a horizontally layered formation. They considered the case of multi-level double-packer slug tests and assumed that the hypothetical formation contained horizontal layers of various thicknesses, but with two types of K. They found that slug test results corresponded approximately to a thickness-weighted average of K in cases where the test interval spans a number of layers. The conclusion matches that of the study of fully penetrating slug tests described above. The study also revealed that considerable error may be introduced into the estimate of *K*, owing to the effects of adjoining layers, when the test interval length was of the order of the average layer thickness. However, this study examined only one set of permeabilities, and the effects of adjoining layers were not examined for various patterns of K variation. In addition, the

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6410901

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6410901

Daneshyari.com