

Hydrochemical groundwater monitoring

Results from water sampling in the Forsmark area 2016

SVENSK KÄRNBRÄNSLEHANTERING AB

SWEDISH NUCLEAR FUEL AND WASTE MANAGEMENT CO

Box 3091, SE-169 03 Solna Phone +46 8 459 84 00 skb.se

Johanna Ragvald

SVENSK KÄRNBRÄNSLEHANTERING

ISSN 1651-4416 **SKB P-18-11** ID 1689161 August 2018

Hydrochemical groundwater monitoring

Results from water sampling in the Forsmark area 2016

Johanna Ragvald, Geosigma AB

Keywords: AP SFK-16-012, Measurements, Groundwater.

This report concerns a study which was conducted for Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB (SKB). The conclusions and viewpoints presented in the report are those of the author. SKB may draw modified conclusions, based on additional literature sources and/or expert opinions.

Data in SKB's database can be changed for different reasons. Minor changes in SKB's database will not necessarily result in a revised report. Data revisions may also be presented as supplements, available at www.skb.se.

A pdf version of this document can be downloaded from www.skb.se.

© 2018 Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB

Abstract

The present report documents the hydrochemical monitoring of deep groundwaters in the Forsmark area including the Spent Nuclear Fuel Repository Project as well as the SFR Extension Project. The sampling includes 30 out of the 41 borehole sections within the monitoring program.

Sampling was conducted in series of three samples collected at three different occasions during continuous pumping i.e. varying the purged volume prior to sampling. All standpipes connected to the sections were, with a few exceptions, cleaned before sampling.

Generally, the chloride concentrations and also the groundwater composition as a hole is stable in the sampled sections and no significant changes occur.

Sammanfattning

Denna rapport dokumenterar hydrokemisk monitering av djupt grundvatten inom Forsmarksområdet där Projekt Kärnbränsleförvaret samt Projekt SFR-Utbyggnad ingår. Provtagningen inkluderar 30 av 41 borrhålssektioner inom moniteringsprogrammet.

Provtagningen gjordes i serier om 3 prov, tagna vid tre olika tillfällen under tiden som kontinuerlig pumpning pågick det vill säga de omsatta volymerna innan provuttaget varierandes. Med några få undantag spolades alla vattenståndsrör, som är kopplade till sektionerna, innan provtagningen.

Generellt är kloridkoncentrationerna såväl som hela grundvattensammansättningarna i de provtagna sektionerna stabil och inga signifikanta förändringar har observerats.

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 General

This report includes results from hydrochemical groundwater monitoring in boreholes included in the Spent Nuclear Fuel Repository Project as well as the SFR Extension Project in the Forsmark area during year 2016. The long-term hydrochemical monitoring programme of percussion-drilled and core-drilled boreholes aims at creating long time series of data that will provide a base-line in order to facilitate evaluation of possible future impacts on the groundwater situation from the construction and the operation of the two facilities. The sizes of natural variations are important information in order to identify possible future changes in water composition. Since the two study sites overlap, each project benefit from the increased amount of information about the hydrochemical conditions.

The controlling documents valid for the hydrochemical monitoring activities are listed in Table 1-1. Both activity plan and method descriptions are SKB's internal controlling documents. Original data from the reported activities are stored in the primary database Sicada. Data are traceable in Sicada by the activity plan number (AP SFK 16-012). Only data in the database are accepted for further interpretation and modelling. The data presented in this report are regarded as copies of the original data. Data in the database may be revised, if needed. However, such revision of the database will not necessarily result in a revision of this report.

* Water sampling and measurement procedures are also described in SKB PIR-04-12, "Översikt över provhanterings- och analysrutiner för vatten-prov" (SKB internal documents).

1.2 Background

The monitoring program for groundwater has been on-going since 2005 (SKB 2005). It was initiated during the site investigations for a final repository of spent nuclear fuel (SKB 2001) and has continued after the completion of the site investigation in 2007. The current monitoring program is developed from the program in R-07-34 (SKB 2007) and since 2012 boreholes drilled during the site investigations for the SFR extension project (SKB 2008) are incorporated in the monitoring program for the Forsmark area. During the years, the program has been modified concerning sampling techniques and analytical protocol. The full monitoring history for each borehole is presented in Appendix 1.

1.3 Boreholes and borehole sections

A total of 41 borehole sections, representing 20 core drilled boreholes and 10 percussion drilled boreholes, are included in the hydrochemical monitoring program for groundwater in the bedrock, Figure 1-1 and Table 1-2. One new section, KFR01:1, was added to the program this year.

In order to evaluate the results of groundwater analyses and observed trends in the groundwater chemistry, it is important to have information about previous investigations in each borehole and to understand the implications of these activities on the groundwater chemistry. Investigations likely to affect subsequent water sampling include hydraulic pumping and injection tests, tracer tests, SWIW tests (*Single Well Injection and Withdrawal-tests*) and tracer dilution tests.

Figure 1‑1. General overview of the Forsmark area and the boreholes included in the hydrochemical monitoring program for groundwater. The (telescopic) cored boreholes and the percussion boreholes within the monitoring program are marked with green and blue filled circles, respectively.

In the boreholes included in the SFR Extension Project, no such activities have been performed before year 2016. Since the last sampling campaign, interference tests (withdrawal-tests) have been performed in KFR105, KFR27 and KFR103 and injection tests have been performed in KFR105 and KFR103. KFR27 and KFR103 are not included in the monitoring program, but the tests in these boreholes could have affected the water in other SFR boreholes included in the monitoring program. The only previous activities in the other boreholes besides drilling and instrumentation are hydrochemical sampling, cleaning of standpipes and pumping (Lindquist and Nilsson 2013).

Some early activities that may have affected, for example, the Uranine or trace metal concentrations are discussed in Nilsson et al. (2010). After 2009, Amino-G most often was used as tracer instead of Uranine for dilution tests. In the boreholes HFM15 and KFM05A, however, Uranine has been used even later, for example during the dilution tests performed in 2013 (Wass 2015). In KFM01D, the borehole equipment has been removed and reinstalled before the sampling 2016. During the open period in 2015, complete chemical characterisation (CCC) was performed in the borehole.

Borehole [Idcode:section no.]	Section [mbl] 1	Elevation secmid [m.b.s.l] $^{2)}$	Transmissivity $[m^2/s]$	Comments
KFM01A:5	109.0-130.0	115.6	1.0 $E - 7^{3}$	
KFM01D:2	429.0-438.0	343.1	$8.0 E - 73$	
KFM01D:4	311.0-321.0	252.5	$2.0 E-73$	
KFM02A:3	490.0-518.0	495.0	2.1 E-6 3	
KFM02A:5	411.0-442.0	417.8	$2.5 E-63$	
KFM02B:2	491.0-506.0	483.8	$3.0 E - 54$	
KFM02B:4	410.0-431.0	407.1	2.0 E-5 ⁴⁾	
KFM03A:1	969.5-994.5	969.1	5.5 $E-7^{3}$	
KFM03A:4	633.5-650.0	631.1	2.4 E-6 3	Not sampled ⁶⁾
KFM04A:4	230.0-245.0	199.7	$2.0 E-53$	
KFM06A:3	738.0-748.0	622.8	$1.2E - 7^{3}$	
KFM06A:5	341.0-362.0	298.5	$3.5 E-63$	
KFM06C:3	647.0-666.0	527.1	5.3 E-8 3	
KFM06C:5	531.0-540.0	434.9	1.1 E-6 3	
KFM07A:2	962.0-972.0	795.6	$5.0 E-7$ ³⁾	Not sampled 7
KFM08A:2	684.0-694.0	550.6	1.0 $E-6^{3}$	Not sampled 7
KFM08A:6	265.0-280.0	127.8	1.0 $E-6^{3}$	Not sampled 7
KFM08D:2	825.0-835.0	622.6	$2.4 E-83$	Not sampled ^{6) and 7)}
KFM08D:4	660.0-680.0	538.1	$2.0 E-73$	Not sampled 6) and 7)
KFM10A:2	430.0-440.0	299.8	$3.0 E-5^{3}$	Not sampled 6) och 7)
KFM11A:2	690.0-710.0	593.8	1.0 $E-6$ ³⁾	
KFM11A:4	446.0-456.0	389.6	6.0 E-7 3	Not sampled 6) and 7)
KFM12A:3	270.0-280.0	226.7	1.0 $E-6^{3}$	
HFM01:2	33.5-45.5	37.0	4.0 $E-5$ ⁵⁾	
HFM02:2	38.0-48.0	39.9	5.9 E-4 5	
HFM04:2	57.9-65.9	57.9	$7.9 E-5$ ⁵⁾	
HFM13:1	159.0-173.0	138.6	$2.9E-4^{5}$	Not sampled 6) and 7)
HFM15:1	85.0-95.0	59.1	1.0 $E-4$ ⁵⁾	
HFM16:2	54.0-67.0	57.2	3.5 E-4 5	
HFM19:1	168.0-182.0	136.2	$2.7 E-4^{5}$	
HFM21:3	$22.0 - 32.0$	18.8	4.0 $E-5$ ⁵⁾	Not sampled ^{6) and 7)}
HFM27:2	46.0-58.0	45.6	4.0 $E - 5^{5}$	
HFM32:3	26.0-31.0	27.5	2.3 E-4 5	
KFR101:1	279.5-341.8	240.2	5.8E -6^{3}	No dummy in section
KFR102A:2	423.0-443.0	389.0	$1.6E - 6^{3}$	
KFR102A:5	214.0-219.0	194.6	$3.6E - 7^{3}$	
KFR104:1	333.0-454.6	306.5	$6.5E - 8^{3}$	No dummy in section
KFR105:1	265.0-306.8	153.6	$6.1E - 8^{3}$	Tunnel borehole. Not sampled ⁶⁾
KFR106:1	260.0-300.1	261.0	$1.0E - 5^{3}$	No dummy in section
KFR106:2	143.0-259.0	187.2	$3.3E - 5^{3}$	No dummy in section
KFR01:1	44.65-62.3	94.3	-	

Table 1-2. Boreholes and borehole sections included in the monitoring programme for percussion- and core-drilled boreholes, corresponding transmissivity values and comments to sections and sampling.

 $1)$ mbl = metres borehole length

 $^{2)}$ m.b.s.l. = metres below sea level [RHB 70 = the national levelling system]

³⁾ From differential flow logging

4) From injection tests

⁵⁾ From flow logging

⁶⁾ Due to other activities in the section

7) Due to drilling of KFM24

2 Equipment

2.1 Installations in a borehole test section with connected standpipe

The monitored boreholes are divided into sections sealed off by inflated rubber packers. The groundwater pressure is measured on-line in standpipes hydraulically connected to each section and transmitted to HMS (*Hydro Monitoring System*), i.e. SKB's hard- and software system for processing and interim storage of hydrological, hydrogeological and meteorological data. Most of the sampled sections are so called circulation sections and are also hydraulically connected to wider standpipes, which allow lowering of a pump. This fixed equipment (packers, tubing, standpipes etc.) remains in the borehole from year to year. An overview of the installation equipment is seen in Figure 2-1.

Figure 2‑1. Installations in a borehole test section with connected standpipes and monitoring equipment. The installation is permanent in the borehole, except for the pump and filter (marked with the red frame).

2.2 Cleaning equipment for standpipes

The cleaning is conducted using a specially designed nozzle combined with a pressure washer,

Figure 2-2. The nozzle is designed to direct the jet in an upward direction in the standpipe in order to flush any flakes out of the standpipe. To lift the litter out of the standpipe more efficiently, a nitrogen gas tube was mounted just above the nozzle to achieve a gas-lift pumping effect in the standpipe. A more detailed description of the cleaning equipment can be found in (Lindquist et al. 2012).

Figure 2‑2. Cleaning equipment used to clean the standpipes prior to pumping and sampling.

2.3 Sampling equipment

Several identical pumping equipment set-ups (GEOPUMP UV45) were used to retrieve the water samples from the sampled sections, Figure 2-3. The sampling equipment is identical to what was used in previous campaigns and is further described in Lindquist et al. (2012). When using this equipment, a mini-packer is expanded in the standpipe above the inlet to the filter and pump so that only water from the section and lowest part of the standpipe is pumped. In some sections, dissolved gas is released when the pressure decreases. The gas accumulates under the mini-packer and causes pump stops. To avoid such problems, a special evacuation tube is used, allowing the gas to evacuate.

In the borehole sections without connection to wide standpipes for sampling, sampling was performed in the narrow standpipes for pressure measurements. The smaller diameter of these standpipes does not allow pumping with the normal pumping equipment. Therefore these sections were pumped using gas-lift pumping (with nitrogen). The function of this pump is briefly described in Lindquist and Nilsson (2013) and the sampling equipment is also further described by Sandström et al. (2011).

Figure 2‑3. The pumping equipment (GEOPUMP UV-45) used for pumping in wide standpipes. It consists of a filter and a pump connected to the mini-packer. The small diameter plastic hose is used for expanding the packer and the plastic hose connected to the pump is the pumping hose (enclosed picture right lower corner).

Figure 2-4 shows a photo of the equipment. The sampling conditions caused by gas-lift pumping are different from the conventional pumping generally used in the hydrogeochemical monitoring programme. The more effective (intermittent) pump action might affect the borehole walls (microbe coating, mineral particles etc.), and thus have an impact on the water composition. Especially, constituents such as hydrogen sulphide, TOC, DOC and trace metals may be affected.

In tunnel boreholes, no pumping equipment is needed due to the pressure gradient. When the valve is opened, water flows out from the section.

Figure 2‑4. The equipment used for gas-lift pumping. On the left, the tubing lowered in the standpipe (the more narrow tube for sample water and the wider for gas) on a bobbin to simplify the lowering. To the upper right the control unit for the pumping/gas supply and lower right the end of the gas-lift pump.

3 Performance

3.1 General

Monitored boreholes and borehole sections, days between cleaning and pump start, collected samples, as well as SKB class/classes and pumping technique at each sampling location are presented in Table 3-1.

¹⁾ If no other comment, third sample in series were class $4+$ (or class $3+$).

2) Third sample in series was class 5.

³⁾ No HS[−] or Fe²⁺ analyses due to pumping technique.

 $4)$ A = UV45 pump, B = nitrogen lifting pump (in standpipe for pressure measurements), C = valve opening (no pump) and $D =$ docking unit.

3.2 Cleaning of standpipes

A special cleaning procedure was performed in most of the standpipes connected to the borehole sections prior to the sampling campaign. Some sections were not cleaned for different reasons; KFR03A:1 and KFM11A:2 due to risk of disturbing ongoing measurements in other sections in the boreholes, HFM32:3 and HFM01:2 because the locations of the boreholes make it difficult to transport the cleaning equipment and KFR101:1, KFR104:1, KFR106:1 and KFR106:2 due to staff shortages. The tunnel boreholes KFR105 and KFR01 are not connected to standpipes, so no cleaning is needed.

After cleaning, the water in the standpipes was evacuated with gas (mammoth pumping) so that the standpipe filled up from underneath with section water. This was done to remove cleaning water from the standpipe and avoid cleaning water in the samples. The mammoth pumping was done twice in each standpipe. The groundwater in the standpipes and the borehole sections was then allowed to settle for a period of at least 3 weeks before the pumping and sample collection started. The time between cleaning of the standpipes and start of pumping for collection samples in each section is given in Table 3-1.

3.3 Water sampling in series and field measurements

Sampling in series was performed in all sampled borehole sections. Each series consisted of three samples distributed with respect to pumped "plug-flow volumes" (including also the volume of the tube connecting to the section). The term "plug-flow volume" refers to the theoretical volume that has to be withdrawn in order to remove the exchangeable water present in the borehole section and get samples with close to 100 % formation water (water originating directly from water bearing fractures in the surrounding rock). As the theoretical plug-flow volume may be underestimated due to laminar flow effects, 100 % formation water is assumed at minimum 1.5 times the calculated plug-flow volume. The plug-flow volume varies from section to section depending on the distribution of water-yielding fractures along the section and their hydraulic transmissivities. This concept is further described in Nilsson et al. (2010) and Lindquist et al. (2012). With some exceptions 1.5, 3 and 5 plug-flow volumes were planned to be removed before sampling. The exceptions are KFM06A:3, KFM06C:3 and KFM11A:2 where larger volumes were planned to be removed before sampling due to the high pH values that was observed during monitoring previous years (see Appendix 2, Table A2-2).

Due to time constraints, the adequate water volumes according to the plug flow calculations were not always removed. In KFR101:1, KFR102A:2, KFR104:1 and KFR106:2 the plug flow volumes were based on less than 100 % formation water. The volumes and percent formation water for each of these borehole sections are presented in Appendix 2 (Table A2-3).

In order to rule out factors in the sampling procedure that could affect for example the sulphide concentrations, the discharge flow rate from each borehole section was set to the same flow rate as was used in previous years. In sections with low hydraulic transmissivity, where a low flow rate has to be used, all three samples in the series could not be collected during the working hours of a day. The collected samples and the removed water volumes prior to each sample are presented in Appendix 2. The discrepancy between actually removed volumes and those prescribed is partly due to practical reasons (sampling could not be performed in the middle of the night). If the sampling was performed earlier or later than scheduled, subsequent sampling was adjusted to maintain, as far as possible, the desired difference in removed volume between the samples in each series. The total removed volumes were calculated from the readings in the field protocols (where date, time and flow rates for the discharge periods and sampling occasions were noted).

To avoid problems with the gas-lift pumping, the same pump settings as previous years were used instead of trying to adjust the pump flows. In KFR104:1 and KFR106:2, extra-long tubings were used when pumping.The higher pump flow was expected but since the plug-flow volumes for these sections represents less than 100 % formation water to decrease the time for pumping, the extra pumped volumes were only advantageous and no adjusting of the sampling schedule was done.

Generally, sampling was carried out successfully with the exception of one pump stop. In the section where the pump stop occurred, the pumped volume prior to the next sample was measured from the new pump start, but the documented total pumped volume include both pumping periods.

Sample portions intended for analysis of major constituents and trace metals (by ICP technique), DOC, iron (by spectrometry) and nutrient salts were filtered on-line in the field. Disposable 0.4 µm filters were fitted directly to the 8/6 mm polyamide-tube leading the pumped water from the borehole section. During the entire sampling, laboratory gloves were used to minimize the risk of contaminating the samples.

In addition to sampling of groundwater, field measurements of temperature, electrical conductivity (EC) and pH were conducted. The water from the borehole was led through a measurement cell on the ground surface with probes and electrodes as well as a temperature sensor for measurements of field pH (pH , F), field electrical conductivity (EC, F) and groundwater temperature. The results are given in Appendix 3.

The pumped water was, where needed, collected in tanks to prevent saline water from affecting the surroundings of the boreholes. The water was then discharged to the Baltic Sea.

The pressure in the borehole sections is continuously monitored by HMS, also during sampling. Pressure diagrams for each borehole and sampling occasion are given in Appendix 4. Possible short-circuiting, indicated by pressure responses in one or more sections other than the sampled ones, can be observed in several boreholes, see Appendix 4. However, observation of pressure propagation does not necessary mean that water is transported between the sections. Information on flow rates, removed volumes and pressure responses are reported in Appendix 2. In the boreholes sampled from the small diameter standpipes where gas-lift pumping was used, the pressure transducers had to be lifted and the pressure in the pumped section could not be monitored during pumping.

3.4 Water sample treatment and analyses

The constituents included in the different SKB chemistry classes are listed in Table 3-2. Sample treatment (filtration conservation, storage etc.) of samples for internal analyses as well for analyses by consulted laboratories generally follows standard procedures. An overview of sample treatment and analysis routines/methods for major constituents, minor anions, organic carbon, trace metals and isotopes is given in Appendix 5. The routines are applicable independently of sampling method or sampling object.

Table 3-2*.* **Constituents determined in the different SKB chemistry classes. Constituents in white cells are included in the classes 3 to 5. Constituents in blue cells are determined in the last sample in the sample series from each section (3+, 4+ and 5). Green cells and orange cells contain additional constituents determined in SKB class 4 and 4+ and in classes 4+ and 5, respectively. White, blue, green, orange and grey cells together contain the determinations included in SKB class 5.**

¹⁾ Plastic bottles are used if nothing else is mentioned.

3.5 Nonconformities

The hydrochemical monitoring of deep groundwater has been conducted according to the SKB internal controlling document AP SFK 16-012 with the following nonconformities.

Pumping procedures

- Pump stop occurred in one section, KFM02A:3.
- For some sections (e.g. KFM01D:4 and HFM04:2) the pumped volume before the first sample was lower than planned (see Appendix 2) because the pump started with a lower flow than planned (the first flow measurement after pump start took place when the first sample was collected but the flow was probably lower already from start).
- Pump flow in HFM16 was lower than planned during a part of the pumping period. Therefore, pumped volumes are smaller than planned.
- Flow rates are difficult to adjust when gas-lift pumping is used. Therefore, pumped volumes are higher or lower than planned for some of the sections pumped with this kind of pump.

Sampling

• KFR105:1 was not available for sampling due to hydraulic injection tests that were performed during the same period as chemistry sampling was performed.

Pressure measurements

- No pressure data is available for KFM04A:4 during the pumping period in KFM04A:4 due to corrosion problems.
- Pressure data for KFM06C:4 are not available during the pumping period in KFM06C:3 and KFM06C:5 due to problems with the pressure transducer.

Analyses

- No analysis of HS[−] in first sample from HFM32:3 due to broken sample bottles.
- No analysis of PO₄-P after hydrolysis in sample from HFM04:2 due to mistake at the laboratory.

4 Results

4.1 Water analysis and measurements

The results from analyses and field measurements are presented in Appendix 3. Table A3-1 includes the major constituents Na, K, Ca, Mg, HCO₃⁻, Cl⁻, SO₄²⁻, SO₄-S, Br⁻, F⁻, Si, Fe, Mn, Li and Sr as well as minor constituents like HS^- , $NO_2^- + NO_3^-$, NH_4^+ , $PO_4^3^-$, TOC and DOC from all sampled boreholes. Furthermore, this table contains laboratory data and field measurement data on pH, electrical conductivity (EC) and the water temperature recorded in the field.

The relative charge imbalance (RCB) provides an indication of the quality and uncertainty of the analyses of major constituents and, the charge balance errors were calculated for all samples. Relative errors within \pm 5 % are considered acceptable.

rel. error(
$$
\%
$$
) = 100 × $\frac{\sum cation(equivalents) - \sum anion(equivalents)}{\sum cation(equivalents) + \sum anion(equivalents)}$

The charge imbalances were all within the acceptable limit of \pm 5 %.

Trace elements and the isotopes $\delta^2 H$, $\delta^{18}O$ and 3H (TU) were determined in the last sample in each series (Table A3-4). Furthermore, the uranium and thorium element concentrations and isotopes $(^{238}U, ^{235}U, ^{234}U, ^{232}Th$ and $^{230}Th)$ were determined in the last sample from sections KFM02A:3, KFR106:1 and KFR106:2 (Table A3-3 and A3-5).

The laboratory measurements and field measurements of pH and EC from 2016 are compared in Figure 4-1 and Figure 4-2, respectively. The compared pH values deviate more than the measurement uncertainty in several of the samples, which may be due to temperature and pressure differences and/ or time delay. The large discrepancy between laboratory and field measurement in the first sample from KFM03A:1 (the data point with low field value and high laboratory value) is probably caused by mistakes during field measurement. The agreement between the different EC values is very good.

Figure 4‑1. Comparison between laboratory measurements and field measurements of pH. The laboratory measurements are performed at 25 °C and the field measurements are performed at the actual water temperature.

Figure 4‑2. Comparison between laboratory measurements and field measurements of EC. All values are corrected to the conductivity at 25 °C.

As previously observed in some of the monitored boreholes (see e.g. Ragvald 2016), high pH values are measured also in 2016. Of the eight sections that showed elevated pH values (pH above 8.5) in 2015, only four were sampled in 2016. All those four sections showed elevated pH values also this year, see Appendix 6. In three of those sections (KFM06A:3, KFM06C:3 and KFM11A:2) larger volumes than before were withdrawn before sampling. The extra pumping did not have any large effects on the pH values. Only small or no decrease of the pH values were found after the normal pumped volume, and the pH values in the last samples in the series were even higher than previous years in all three sections. In addition to the eight sections that showed elevated pH values 2015, two new sections showed elevated pH values in 2016; KFM06C:5 and KFM12A:3. Diagrams of pH values during the years in all sections with elevated pH values are presented in Appendix 6. The issue with elevated pH values are discussed in Nilsson and Sandberg (2017).

Possible effects from interference tests and injection tests, mentioned in chapter 1.3, are not evaluated or discussed in this report.

4.2 Chloride

Figure 4-3 to Figure 4-9 present chloride concentrations in collected samples from hydrochemical monitoring this year (2016) together with data from hydrochemical monitoring earlier years. The analytical uncertainty $(\pm 5\%)$ is shown as error bars in the diagrams. For some of the core drilled boreholes, data from the initial complete chemical characterisation (CCC) in corresponding borehole sections (Lindquist et al. 2012; SKB Database Sicada) are also presented. The CCC data are shown as dots on the y-axes (not corresponding to date on the x-axis). In the cases of sample series (after October 2009 and onwards), the value from the last sample in the series is presented in the diagrams. For boreholes included in the SFR Extension Project, the hydrochemical monitoring program started in 2012, but the diagrams of chloride concentrations (Figure 4-8 and Figure 4-9) also include data from earlier studies.

Within each sample series (increasing plug flow volumes), the chloride concentrations were generally quite stable. The exceptions are KFM03A:1, KFR104:1, and KFR106:1 where the chloride concentrations increase with pumped volumes. In KFR 106:1, the chloride concentration was lower than previous years, and a reason could be that the pumping time was shorter. The pumped volumes agreed with the planned plug flow volumes, but have been larger previous years. Also in KFR104:1 the chloride concentration was lower than previous years and there is a decreasing trend since 2014. As for KFR106:1 this could correlate to pumped volumes since they have also decreased since 2014 (mainly between 2014 and 2015 because the calculation of plug flow volume was changed to allow a somewhat smaller portion of the formation water and gain time).

Figure 4-3. Chloride concentrations in collected samples from hydrochemical monitoring 2005 to 2016 and from the initial complete chemical characterisation (CCC). The CCC data points are placed on the y-axes with no correlation to date on x-axis. The last sample in the collected sample series starting from 2009 are displayed in the plots.

Figure 4‑4. Chloride concentrations in collected samples from hydrochemical monitoring 2005 to 2016 and from the initial complete chemical characterisation (CCC). The CCC points are placed on the y-axes with no correlation to date on x-axis. The last sample in the collected sample series starting from 2009 are displayed in the plots.

Figure 4‑5. Chloride concentrations in collected samples from hydrochemical monitoring 2005 to 2016 and from the initial complete chemical characterisation (CCC). The CCC points are placed on the y-axes with no correlation to date on x-axis. The last sample in the collected sample series starting from 2009 are displayed in the plots.

Figure 4‑6. Chloride concentrations in collected samples from hydrochemical monitoring 2005 to 2016 and from the initial complete chemical characterisation (CCC). The CCC data points are placed on the y-axes with no correlation to date on x-axis. The last sample in the collected sample series starting from 2009 are displayed in the plots.

Figure 4‑7. Chloride concentrations in collected samples from hydrochemical monitoring 2005 to 2016. The last sample in the collected sample series starting from 2009 are displayed in the plots.

Figure 4‑8. Chloride concentrations in collected samples from hydrochemical monitoring 2005 to 2016. The last sample in the collected sample series starting from 2009 are displayed in the plots.

Figure 4‑9. Chloride concentrations in collected samples from hydrochemical monitoring 2005 to 2016. The last sample in the collected sample series starting from 2009 are displayed in the plots.

5 Summary and discussions

30 out of 41 borehole sections included in the monitoring program were sampled this year. The excluded sections were omitted due to other ongoing projects, the majority due to the drilling of KFM24. Only one pump stop occurred, in KFM02A:3. Gas evacuation was used in additional sections compared with previous years, which probably helped to avoid more pump stops.

According to chloride concentrations, the groundwater composition in the sampled sections is generally stable and no significant changes occur. In KFR104:1 and KFR 106:1 the chloride concentrations have decreased compared to previous years which could be due to smaller pumped volumes this year compared to previous years.

The samples with elevated pH values due to corrosion (stray currents interaction with the installed equipment in the borehole), naturally also show changes in the chemical composition. With large enough purging prior to sampling, the contribution from influenced section water present in the borehole section decreased as well as the pH, and more representative groundwater samples were obtained. Extra pumping was done this year in three of the sections with elevated pH values, but only small or no decrease of the pH values was detected after the normal pumped volume.

References

SKB's (Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB) publications can be found at www.skb.com/publications. SKBdoc documents will be submitted upon request to document@skb.se.

Lindquist A, Nilsson A-C, 2013. Hydrochemical groundwater monitoring. Results from water sampling at the SFR-site, spring and autumn 2012. SKBdoc 1413843 ver 1.0, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Lindquist A, Nilsson K, Jönsson S, 2012. Hydrochemical monitoring of groundwaters. Results from water sampling in the Forsmark area, spring and autumn 2010. SKBdoc 1334697 ver 1.0, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Nilsson A-C, Sandberg B, 2017. Elevated pH values in groundwater. Observations from SKB investigations 1976–2014 and possible causes. SKB R-16-04, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Nilsson A-C (ed), Berg C, Harrström J, Jönsson S, Thur P, Borgiel M, Qvarfordt S, 2010. Forsmark site investigation. Hydrochemical monitoring of groundwaters and surface waters. Results from water sampling in the Forsmark area, January–December 2009. SKB P-10-40, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Ragvald J, 2016. Hydrochemical groundwater monitoring. Results from water sampling in the Forsmark area 2015. SKBdoc 1542091 ver 1.0, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Sandström B, Nilsson K, Tullborg E-L, 2011. Site investigation SFR. Fracture mineralogy including identification of uranium phases and hydrochemical characterisation of groundwater in borehole KFR106. SKP P-11-41, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

SKB, 2001. Site investigations. Investigation methods and general execution programme. SKB TR-01-29, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

SKB, 2005. Forsmark site investigation. Programme for further investigations of geosphere and biosphere. SKB R-05-14, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

SKB, 2007. Programme for long-term observations of geosphere and biosphere after completed site investigations. SKB R-07-34, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

SKB, 2008. Geovetenskapligt undersökningsprogram för utbyggnad av SFR. SKB R-08-67, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB. (In Swedish.)

Wass E, 2015. Groundwater flow measurements in permanently installed boreholes, test campaign no. 9, 2013. SKBdoc 1384642 ver 1.0, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

¹⁾ High pressure cleaning and rinse pumping.
²⁾ KFM08D:2 was omitted

8) No cleaning in KFM03A:1, KFM11A:2, HFM01:2 and HFM32:3 due to various reasons.

⁹⁾ Due to high pH values during earlier years, the plug flow volumes were increased during 2016.

Appendix 2

Sampling information

Table A2-1. Sampling information.

 $1)$ The pumping period may contain pump stops. Medium flow rate and pumped volume is calculated from periods of actual pumping.

²⁾ The first sample is planned to be collected after 1.5 plug flow, the second after 3 and third and last sample in each series after 5 plug flow volumes.

³⁾ Pump stop has occurred causing restart of pumping during the pumping period for some sections. Volume written by each sample number represent volume pumped since restart in those cases, but total pumped volume include all pumping.

38

4) The planned volumes are higher than the normal plug flow volumes due to high pH values, see table table A2-2.

but total pumped volume include all pumping.

 4) The planned volumes are higher than the normal plug flow volumes due to high pH values, see table A2-2.

40

⁵⁾ Plug flow volume representing < 100 % formation water, see table A2-3.

< "value" = value below reporting limit.

SKB P-18-11

46

Id code	Secup m	Seclow m	Sample no.	Sampling date	δ ² H dev SMOW	3H TU	δ ¹⁸ Ο dev SMOW
HFM02	38.0	48.0	30879	2016-06-15	-82.3	4.9	-11.51
HFM04	57.9	65.9	30811	2016-05-25	-79.1	4.3	-11.66
HFM15	85.0	95.0	30839	2016-06-03	-80.6	6.7	-11.66
HFM16	54.0	67.0	30796	2016-05-19	-79.7	3.6	-11.74
HFM19	168.0	182.0	30833	2016-06-01	-64.7	${}_{0.8}$	-8.77
HFM27	46.0	58.0	30851	2016-06-10	-73.6	1.4	-10.45
HFM32	26.0	31.0	30836	2016-06-01	-63.7	0.9	-8.52
KFM01A	109.0	130.0	30845	2016-06-08	-87.0	1.1	-11.96
KFM01D	429.0	438.0	30830	2016-05-31	-69.2	1.3	-10.06
KFM01D	311.0	321.0	30842	2016-06-03	-71.1	1.2	-10.02
KFM02A	411.0	442.0	30790	2016-05-20	-74.1	${}_{0.8}$	-10.12
KFM02A	490.0	518.0	30802	2016-05-25	-65.4	< 0.8	-10.01
KFM02B	410.0	431.0	30805	2016-05-24	-70.3	& 0.8	-10.18
KFM02B	491.0	506.0	30808	2016-05-25	-63.7	${}_{0.8}$	-8.64
KFM03A	969.5	994.5	30827	2016-06-02	-92.0	2.0	-13.37
KFM04A	230.0	245.0	30781	2016-05-13	-70.7	0.8	-9.27
KFM06A	341.0	362.0	30787	2016-05-17	-86.8	& 0.8	-12.14
KFM06A	738.0	748.0	30799	2016-05-19	-83.7	${}_{0.8}$	-13.22
KFM06C	531.0	540.0	30784	2016-05-17	-79.6	1.2	-11.02
KFM06C	647.0	666.0	30793	2016-05-23	-91.3		-13.01
KFM11A	690.0	710.0	30876	2016-06-10	-84.8	0.8	-11.94
KFM12A	270.0	280.0	30778	2016-05-13	-110.1	${}_{0.8}$	-14.88
KFR01	44.7	62.3	30888	2016-06-14	-72.4	3.3	-9.80
KFR101	279.5	341.8	30885	2016-06-14	-109.2	${}_{0.8}$	-14.87
KFR102A	214.0	219.0	30857	2016-06-10	-82.0	${}_{0.8}$	-11.04
KFR102A	423.0	443.0	30882	2016-06-15	-89.4	& 0.8	-12.09
KFR104	333.0	454.6	30854	2016-06-13	-104.5	2.3	-14.29
KFR106	260.0	300.1	30821	2016-05-31	-98.3	2.3	-13.46
KFR106	143.0	259.0	30824	2016-06-01	-77.8	0.8	-10.51

Table A3-4. Isotopes I (H-, O- and C-isotopes).

– = Not analysed SICADA_17_037

< "value" = result less than detection limit

– = Not analysed SICADA_17_037

BDL = Below detection limit

Figure A4-2. *Detailed plot of pumping and drawdown in KFM01A:5 in June 2016. The pumping in KFM01A:5 causes a drawdown in KFM01A:4.*
 $\frac{6}{10}$
 $\frac{1}{10}$

Figure A4-3. Pumping and drawdown in KFM01D:2 in May 2016 and in KFM01D:4 in June 2016. Section KFM01D:3 was affected by the pumping in KFM01D:2. Section KFM01D:4.
KFM01D:5 was affected by the pumping in KFM01D:4.
So

Figure A4-4. Pumping and drawdown in KFM02A:5 and KFM02A:3 in May 2016. No other sections were affected.
 $\frac{6}{60}$
 $\frac{1}{60}$

HBV:391 - KFM2B:1 HBV:392 - KFM2B:2 HBV:393 - KFM2B:3 HBV:394 - KFM2B:4 HBV:395 - KFM2B:5 HBV:396 - KFM2B:6 HBV:397 - KFM2B:7

Figure A4-5. Pumping and drawdown in KFM02B:4 and KFM02B:2 in May 2016. No other sections were affected.
 $\frac{1}{2}$

Figure A4-6. Pumping and drawdown in KFM03A:1 in May–June 2016. The pressure response observed in KFM03A:2 during pumping in KFM03A:1 may be caused by a leaking connection in the equipment between sections KFM03A:1 and KF

HBV:201 - KFM4A:1 HBV:202 - KFM4A:2 HBV:203 - KFM4A:3 HBV:204 - KFM4A:4 HBV:205 - KFM4A:5 HBV:206 - KFM4A:6 HBV:207 - KFM4A:7

Figure A4-7. Pumping and drawdown in KFM04A:4 in May 2016. None of the other sections were significantly affected by the pumping. In section 7 the pressure measurements were non-functioning during the sampling period.
We

Figure A4-8. Pumping and drawdown in KFM06A:3 and KFM06A:5 in May 2016. Section KFM06A:2 was affected by the pumping in KFM06A:3. KFM06A:4 was effected by
the pumping in section KFM06A:5. Temporary pressure increase due t

Figure A4-9. Pumping and drawdown in KFM06C:3 and KFM06C:5 in May 2016. Sections KFM06C:2 were affected by the pumping in section KFM06C:3. Usually, effects
can be seen in KFM06C:4, but the pressure measurement in KFM06C:4

Figure A4-10. Detailed plot of pumping and drawdown in KFM06C:5 in May 2016. The pumping in section KFM06C:5 causes a response in KFM06C:6. The pressure measure-

The pressure measurement in KFM06C:4 was non-functioning d

Figure A4-II. Pumping and drawdown in KFM11A:2 in June 2016. No other sections were affected. The pressure measurements in KFM11A:2 are not yet quality checked for
this period due to uncertain manual readings of the water

Figure A4-12. Pumping and drawdown in KFM12A:3 in May 2016. The pressure measurements in the section KFM12A:4 are not quality checked during this period. The pressure measurements in this sections are disturbed by gas and

⁶⁵ *Figure A4-13. Pumping and drawdown in HFM01:2 in June 2016. A possible pressure response was observed in section HFM01:3.*

Figure A4-14. Pumping in HFM02:2 in June 2016. No significant drawdown was observed in any of the borehole sections.
 $\begin{array}{c}\n\frac{6}{9} \\
\frac{1}{9} \\
\frac{1}{3}\n\end{array}$

Figure A4-15. Pumping in HFM04:2 in May 2016. No significant drawdown was seen in any section at pump start.
 \Im

Figure A4-16. Pumping in HFM15:1 during June 2016. No significant drawdown was observed in any of the borehole sections.
 $\frac{60}{60}$
 $\frac{1}{60}$

Figure A4-17. Pumping in HFM16:2 in May 2016. No significant drawdown was observed in any of the borehole sections.
 \odot

SKB P-18-11 *Figure A4-18. Pumping in HFM19:1 in May – June 2016. No significant drawdown was observed in any of the borehole sections.*

Figure A4-19. *Pumping in HFM27:2 in June 2016. No significant drawdown was observed in any of the borehole sections.*
 \cong

Figure A4-20. *Pumping and minor drawdown in HFM32:3 in June 2016. No significant drawdown was observed in any of the borehole sections.*
 $\frac{62}{60}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$

Figure A4-21. Pumping in KFR101:1 in June 2016. The pressure transducer in KFR101:1 was lifted during the pumping. No significant drawdown was noted in any other section.
3.

Figure A4-22. Pumping and drawdown in KFR102A:2 and KFR102A:5 in June 2016. A clear response in KFR102A:1 was observed during pumping in KFR102:2. ²⁰
 $\frac{60}{60}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$

⁷⁵ *Figure A4-23. Pumping in KFR104:1 in June 2016. The pressure transducer in KFR104:1 was lifted during the pumping. A possible response was seen in section KFR104:2.*

Figure A4-24. Pumping in KFR106:1 and KFR106:2 in May–June 2016. The pressure transducers in the pumped sections were lifted during the pumping. KFR106:3 was not affected.
 $\frac{60}{60}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

 $1)$ Many elements may be determined by more than one ICP technique depending on concentration range. The most relevant technique and measurement uncertainty for the concentrations normally encountered in groundwater are presented. In cases where two techniques were frequently used, both are displayed.

- ²⁾ Reporting limits (RL), generally 10 × standard deviation, if nothing else is stated. Measured values below RL or DL are stored as negative values in SICADA (i.e. –RL value and –DL value).
- ³⁾ Measurement uncertainty reported by the laboratory, generally as \pm percent of measured value in question at 95 % confidence interval.
- 4) Reporting limits at electrical cond. 520 mS/m, 1440 mS/m and 3810 mS/m respectively.
- 5) Measurement uncertainty at concentrations 100×RL.
- $6)$ Measurement uncertainty at concentrations 10 \times RL.
- $7)$ Determined only in surface waters. PON, POP and POC refers to Particulate Organic Nitrogen, Phosphorous and Carbon, respectively.
- 8) Per mille deviation¹⁶ from SMOW (Standard Mean Oceanic Water).
- 9) TU=Tritium Units, where one TU corresponds to a tritium/hydrogen ratio of 10−18 (1 Bq/L Tritium = 8.45 TU).
- 10) Per mille deviation¹⁶ from SMOC (Standard Mean Oceanic Chloride).
- $11)$ Per mille deviation¹⁶ from PDB (the standard PeeDee Belemnite).
- $12)$ The following relation is valid between pmC (percent modern carbon) and Carbon-14 age: pmC = $100 \times e^{((1950-y-1.03t)/8274)}$ where y = the year of the C-14 measurement and t = C-14 age.
- $13)$ Per mille deviation¹⁶ from CDT (the standard Canyon Diablo Troilite).
- 14) Isotope ratio without unit.
- ¹⁵⁾ The following expressions are applicable to convert activity to concentration, for uranium-238 and thorium-232: 1 ppm U = 12.4 Bq/kg^{238} U, 1 ppm Th = 3.93 Bq/kg^{232} Th.
- $16)$ Isotopes are often reported as per mill deviation from a standard. The deviation is calculated as: δ yI = 1000×(K_{sample}–K_{standard})/K_{standard}, where K= the isotope ratio and ^γI =²H, ¹⁸O, ³⁷Cl, ¹³C or ³⁴S etc.
- 17) SKB estimation from duplicate analyses by the contracted laboratory.

Appendix 6

pH trends in some of the core drilled boreholes

Figure A6-1. Comparison between initial pH-values from complete chemical characterisation during PLU (blue points) and later measurements in the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM06A:3. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented *pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C, except those from 2013 which are from field measurements.*

Figure A6-2. Comparison between initial pH-values from complete chemical characterisation during PLU (blue points) and later measurements in the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM06A:5. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented *pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C, except those from 2013 which are from field measurements.*

Figure A6-3. Measurements of pH-values from the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM06C:3. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C, except those from 2013 and the last sample from 2015 which are from field measurements.

Figure A6-4. Measurements of pH-values from the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM06C:5. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C, except those from which are from field measurements.

84 SKB P-18-11

Figure A6-5. Comparison between initial pH-values from complete chemical characterisation during PLU (blue points) and later measurements in the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM07A:2. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C, except those from 2013 and 2015 which are from field measurements. No sampling of this section 2016 due to drilling of KFM24.

Figure A6-6. Comparison between initial pH-values from complete chemical characterisation during PLU (blue points) and later measurements in the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM08A:2. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C, except those from 2013 which are from field measurements. No sampling of this section 2016 due to drilling of KFM24.

Figure A6-7. Comparison between initial pH-values from complete chemical characterisation during PLU (blue points) and later measurements in the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM08D:2. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C. This section has been omitted from the monitoring program for many years due to corrosion problem. After reinstallation of borehole equipment it was sampled again 2015. No sampling of this section 2016 due to drilling of KFM24.

Figure A6-8. Comparison between initial pH-values from complete chemical characterisation during PLU (blue points) and later measurements in the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM08D:4. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C. This section has been omitted from the monitoring program for 2013–2014 due to corrosion problem. After reinstallation of borehole equipment it was sampled again 2015. No sampling of this section 2016 due to drilling of KFM24.

Figure A6-9. Measurements of PH-values from the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM11A:2. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C, except those from 2013 which are from field measurements.

Figure A6-10. Measurements of PH-values from the ongoing monitoring programme (red points) for KFM12A:3. The last sample in the series (or the only sample if no series) is marked with a darker red colour. All the presented pH-values are measured in the laboratory at 25 °C, except those from 2013 and 2015 which are from field measurements.

SKB is responsible for managing spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste produced by the Swedish nuclear power plants such that man and the environment are protected in the near and distant future.

skb.se