Errata

Replace final paragraph of Discussion of Formulation 1 with the following.

To reiterate, cleanup within four years will result from pumping per strategy USU1b while siting well U-2 in any of the wavy cells in Figure 1. Strategy USU1b has many permutations, each differing only in the location of well U-2. The pumping rates for all wells remain the same. Strategy USU1b is (well, cubic feet per year):
EW3, -2.5298e+007; EW1 , -2.51304e+007; EW2 , 0; EW4, 0; IF1 , 0; IF2 , 3.30922e+007; IF3 , 4.91094e+007; U-1 at (48,57), -2.5298e+007; U-2 at any wavy cell in Figure 1, -6475175.1. Total pumping can be reduced somewhat (amount depends on the cell selected for well U-2), and still achieve cleanup within four years.

If pumping is to be continued only until achieving cleanup to MCL, cell (65,60) is a good location for well U-2 because of its: (a) balanced robustness range; (b) lower cost (the Formulation 1 goal); and (c) proximity to both main and feeder pipelines (I don’t know whether the existing feeder line can reasonably convey additional flow). This assumes that the true field conductivities are between 0.9 and 1.17 times the assumed values.

However, if: (a) the field conductivities are as little as 0.84 times the assumed values; or (b) pumping might continue significantly beyond four years to reduce adsorbed TNT mass; and (c) the existing feeder pipeline can convey the extra flow of well U-2; cell (58,60) would be a better choice for well U-2. If a robustness range intermediate between those of cells (65,50) and (58,60) is preferable, one can select a well location between the two cells.