

Table of Contents

1

2 1.0 INTRODUCTION 1-1

3 1.1 EPA Certification Decision Conditions 1-3

4 1.2 Applicable Regulations 1-5

5 1.2.1 40 CFR Part 191 1-5

6 1.2.2 40 CFR Part 194 1-6

7 1.2.3 Compliance Application Guidance for 40 CFR Part 194 1-9

8 1.2.4 Guidance to the U.S. Department of Energy on Preparation for

9 Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant with 40 CFR Parts 191

10 and 194 1-9

11 1.3 Project Background 1-9

12 1.4 Site Selection Process 1-10

13 1.5 Program for Evaluating Long-Term Performance 1-12

14 1.6 Compliance Recertification Application Synopsis 1-15

15 1.7 Summary of Changes Since the CCA 1-17

16 REFERENCES 1-27

17 2.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION 2-1

18 2.1 Geology 2-8

19 2.1.1 Data Sources 2-9

20 2.1.2 Geologic History 2-11

21 2.1.3 Stratigraphy and Lithology in the Vicinity of the WIPP Site 2-14

22 2.1.3.1 General Stratigraphy and Lithology below the Bell Canyon 2-18

23 2.1.3.2 The Bell Canyon 2-19

24 2.1.3.3 The Castile 2-21

25 2.1.3.4 The Salado 2-25

26 2.1.3.5 The Rustler 2-33

27 2.1.3.5.1 Los Medaños Member 2-39

28 2.1.3.5.2 The Culebra Dolomite Member 2-39

29 2.1.3.5.3 The Tamarisk Member 2-42

30 2.1.3.5.4 The Magenta Dolomite Member 2-43

31 2.1.3.5.5 The Forty-niner Member 2-45

32 2.1.3.6 The Dewey Lake 2-45

33 2.1.3.7 The Santa Rosa 2-48

34 2.1.3.8 The Gatuña 2-48

35 2.1.3.9 Mescalero Caliche 2-50

36 2.1.3.10 Surficial Sediments 2-52

37 2.1.3.11 Summary 2-53

38 2.1.4 Physiography and Geomorphology 2-53

39 2.1.4.1 Regional Physiography and Geomorphology 2-54

40 2.1.4.2 Site Physiography and Geomorphology 2-54

41 2.1.5 Tectonic Setting and Site Structural Features 2-57

42 2.1.5.1 Tectonics 2-57

43 2.1.5.2 Loading and Unloading 2-61

1		2.1.5.3	Faulting	2-64
2		2.1.5.4	Igneous Activity.....	2-64
3	2.1.6		Nontectonic Processes and Features.....	2-66
4		2.1.6.1	Evaporite Deformation.....	2-66
5		2.1.6.1.1	Basic WIPP History of Deformation Investigations..	2-66
6		2.1.6.1.2	Extent of the Disturbed Zone at the Site	2-69
7		2.1.6.1.3	Deformation Mechanisms.....	2-71
8		2.1.6.1.4	Timing of Deformation of the Disturbed Zone at the	
9			Site	2-71
10		2.1.6.2	Evaporite Dissolution.....	2-71
11		2.1.6.2.1	Brief History of Project Studies	2-71
12		2.1.6.2.2	Extent of Dissolution	2-73
13		2.1.6.2.3	Timing of Dissolution	2-73
14		2.1.6.2.4	Features Related to Dissolution	2-75
15	2.2		Surface Water and Groundwater Hydrology	2-76
16		2.2.1	Groundwater Hydrology.....	2-77
17		2.2.1.1	Conceptual Models of Groundwater Flow.....	2-82
18		2.2.1.2	Units Below the Salado.....	2-84
19		2.2.1.2.1	Hydrology of the Bell Canyon Formation	2-84
20		2.2.1.2.2	Castile Hydrology	2-85
21		2.2.1.3	Hydrology of the Salado	2-88
22		2.2.1.4	Units Above the Salado	2-92
23		2.2.1.4.1	Hydrology of the Rustler Formation.....	2-94
24		2.2.1.4.1.1	Los Medaños.....	2-95
25		2.2.1.4.1.2	The Culebra Dolomite Member	2-96
26		2.2.1.4.1.3	Tamarisk	2-110
27		2.2.1.4.1.4	Magenta	2-111
28		2.2.1.4.1.5	Forty-niner	2-112
29		2.2.1.4.2	Hydrology of the Dewey Lake and the Santa Rosa ..	2-114
30		2.2.1.4.2.1	Dewey Lake	2-114
31		2.2.1.5	Hydrology of Other Groundwater Zones of Regional	
32			Importance	2-117
33		2.2.1.5.1	Capitan Limestone	2-117
34		2.2.1.5.2	Hydrology of the Rustler-Salado Contact Zone in	
35			Nash Draw	2-120
36		2.2.2	Surface-Water Hydrology	2-122
37	2.3		Resources	2-127
38		2.3.1	Extractable Resources	2-128
39		2.3.1.1	Potash Resources at the WIPP Site.....	2-128
40		2.3.1.2	Hydrocarbon Resources at the WIPP Site	2-129
41		2.3.1.3	Other Resources	2-133
42		2.3.2	Cultural and Economic Resources	2-133
43		2.3.2.1	Demographics	2-133
44		2.3.2.2	Land Use	2-136
45		2.3.2.3	History and Archaeology	2-137
46	2.4		Background Environmental Conditions.....	2-140

1	2.5	Climate and Meteorological Conditions	2-140
2	2.5.1	Historic Climatic Conditions.....	2-140
3	2.5.2	Recent Climatic Conditions.....	2-143
4	2.5.2.1	General Climatic Conditions.....	2-143
5	2.5.2.2	Temperature Summary.....	2-143
6	2.5.2.3	Precipitation Summary.....	2-144
7	2.5.2.4	Wind Speed and Wind Direction Summary.....	2-144
8	2.6.1	Seismic History	2-155
9	2.6.2	Seismic Risk	2-157
10	2.6.2.1	Acceleration Attenuation	2-157
11	2.6.2.2	Seismic Source Zones	2-158
12	2.6.2.3	Source Zone Recurrence Formulas and Maximum	
13		Magnitudes.....	2-158
14	2.6.2.4	Design Basis Earthquake	2-161
15	REFERENCES	2-162
16	3.0	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	3-1
17	3.1	General Facility Design	3-3
18	3.1.1	DOE Facility Acquisition Process.....	3-7
19	3.1.2	Configuration Control	3-8
20	3.1.3	Surface Structures.....	3-9
21	3.2	Repository Configuration.....	3-11
22	3.3	Disposal-System Barriers.....	3-12
23	3.3.1	MgO Engineered Barrier	3-13
24	3.3.1.1	Change of MgO Supplier	3-15
25	3.3.1.2	Elimination of MgO Minisacks	3-15
26	3.3.2	Shaft Seals	3-15
27	3.3.2.1	Site Setting.....	3-16
28	3.3.2.2	Design Objectives	3-16
29	3.3.3	Panel Closure System.....	3-19
30	3.3.4	Borehole Plugs	3-22
31	REFERENCES	3-26
32	4.0	WASTE DESCRIPTION.....	4-1
33	4.1	Waste Inventory	4-3
34	4.1.1	Sources of TRU Waste	4-4
35	4.1.2	TRU Waste Sites	4-6
36	4.1.3	TRU Waste Inventory	4-10
37	4.1.3.1	Inventory Terminology	4-12
38	4.1.3.2	Nonradionuclide Inventory Roll-Up.....	4-16
39	4.1.3.3	Radionuclide Inventory Roll-Up.....	4-22
40	4.2	Waste Components and Characteristics.....	4-25
41	4.2.1	Identification and Qualification.....	4-25
42	4.2.2	Repository Limits	4-26
43		Waste Container Limits	4-30

1	4.3	Waste Controls.....	4-33
2	4.3.1	Load Management.....	4-33
3	4.3.2	WIPP Waste Information System.....	4-34
4		Quality Assurance.....	4-36
5		Performance Demonstration Programs	4-37
6	4.4	Waste Characterization	4-38
7	4.4.1	Qualitative Methodologies	4-42
8	4.4.1.1	Acceptable Knowledge	4-42
9	4.4.1.2	Nondestructive Examination.....	4-43
10	4.4.1.3	Visual Examination.....	4-43
11	4.4.2	Quantitative Methodologies	4-44
12	4.4.2.1	Nondestructive Assay	4-44
13	4.4.3	Additional Change to the Waste Characterization Program	4-46
14		REFERENCES	4-47
15	5.0	QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	5-1
16	5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
17	5.1.1	Mission and Policy	5-1
18	5.1.2	Quality Assurance Program History.....	5-2
19	5.2	Quality Assurance Program Requirements	5-2
20	5.2.1	Requirements in the Code of Federal Regulations	5-2
21	5.2.1.1	40 CFR Part 194.....	5-2
22	5.2.1.2	40 CFR § 194.22, Quality Assurance	5-2
23	5.2.2	Other Requirements and Standards	5-3
24	5.3	Incorporation of 40 CFR § 194.22 Criteria in the QAPD.....	5-3
25	5.3.1	Criterion 1 – Organization.....	5-3
26	5.3.2	Criterion 2 – Quality Assurance Program	5-5
27	5.3.2.1	Quality Assurance Program Overview	5-5
28	5.3.2.2	Grading	5-6
29	5.3.2.3	Quality Assurance Program Documents.....	5-7
30	5.3.2.4	Qualification and Training.....	5-7
31	5.3.2.5	Management Assessments	5-8
32	5.3.3	Criterion 3 – Design Control.....	5-8
33	5.3.4	Criterion 4 – Procurement Document Control	5-8
34	5.3.5	Criterion 5 – Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings.....	5-8
35	5.3.6	Criterion 6 – Document Control.....	5-9
36	5.3.7	Criterion 7 – Control of Purchased Items and Services	5-9
37	5.3.8	Criterion 8 – Identification and Control of Items.....	5-10
38	5.3.9	Criterion 9 – Control of Processes	5-10
39	5.3.10	Criterion 10 – Inspection.....	5-11
40	5.3.11	Criterion 11 – Test Control	5-11
41	5.3.12	Criterion 12 – Control of Measuring, Monitoring, Data Collection and	
42		Test Equipment.....	5-12
43	5.3.13	Criterion 13 – Handling, Storage, and Shipping	5-12
44	5.3.14	Criterion 14 – Inspection, Test, and Operating Status	5-13
45	5.3.15	Criterion 15 – Control of Nonconforming Items.....	5-13

1	5.3.16	Criterion 16 – Corrective Action.....	5-14
2	5.3.17	Criterion 17 – QA Records.....	5-14
3	5.3.18	Auditor and Technical Specialist Skills and Background.....	5-15
4	5.3.19	Criterion 18 – Audits and Surveillances.....	5-16
5	5.3.20	Criterion 19 – Software Quality Assurance	5-17
6	5.3.21	Criterion 20 – Scientific Investigation	5-18
7	5.3.22	Criterion 21 – Data Quality Characteristics	5-20
8	5.3.23	Criterion 22 – Qualification of Data.....	5-21
9	5.4	The Carlsbad Field Office Quality Assurance Program Document.....	5-22
10	5.4.1	Purpose of the Quality Assurance Program Document.....	5-22
11	5.4.2	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Requirements in the Quality	
12		Assurance Program Document.....	5-22
13	5.4.3	Use of the Graded Approach	5-23
14	5.4.4	Quality Assurance Program Document Implementation.....	5-23
15	5.4.5	Quality Assurance Program Document Changes	5-23
16	5.4.6	Quality Assurance Program Participant Support.....	5-23
17	5.4.7	Structure of the QAPD	5-24
18	5.4.8	Quality Assurance Program Document Crosswalk to NQA-1, -2, and -3	
19		Requirements.....	5-24
20	5.4.9	CBFO Implementing Procedures	5-25
21	5.5	Applicability of the QA Program.....	5-26
22	5.5.1	Waste Characterization Activities and Assumptions	5-27
23	5.5.2	Environmental Monitoring, Monitoring of the Performance of the	
24		Disposal System, and Sampling and Analysis Activities.....	5-27
25	5.5.3	Design of the Disposal System and Actions Taken to Ensure	
26		Compliance with Design Specifications.....	5-28
27	5.5.4	Collection of Data and Information to Support Compliance	
28		Application(s).....	5-28
29	5.6	Quality Assurance Program Adequacy, Implementation, and Effectiveness	5-28
30	5.6.1	Adequacy of the Quality Assurance Program	5-28
31	5.6.2	Implementation of the Quality Assurance Program	5-29
32	5.6.3	Effectiveness of the Quality Assurance Program.....	5-29
33	5.7	The Carlsbad Field Office Audit Process	5-29
34	5.7.1	Overview of the Carlsbad Field Office Assessment Processes.....	5-29
35	5.7.2	Auditor and Technical Specialist Independence	5-31
36	5.7.3	Audit History	5-31
37		REFERENCE.....	5-32
38	6.0	CONTAINMENT REQUIREMENTS	6-1
39	6.0.1	Introduction.....	6-1
40	6.0.2	Overview of Chapter 6.0.....	6-1
41	6.0.2.1	Conceptual Basis for the Performance Assessment	6-3
42	6.0.2.2	Undisturbed Performance.....	6-4
43	6.0.2.3	Disturbed Performance.....	6-6
44		6.0.2.3.1 Cuttings and Cavings	6-8
45		6.0.2.3.2 Spallings.....	6-8

1	6.0.2.3.3	Direct Brine Flow	6-9
2	6.0.2.3.4	Mobilization of Actinides in Repository Brine.....	6-9
3	6.0.2.3.5	Long-Term Brine Flow up an Intrusion Borehole	6-10
4	6.0.2.3.6	Groundwater Flow in the Culebra.....	6-10
5	6.0.2.3.7	Actinide Transport in the Culebra.....	6-11
6	6.0.2.3.8	Intrusion Scenarios.....	6-12
7	6.0.2.4	Compliance Demonstration Method	6-13
8	6.0.2.5	Results of the Performance Assessment.....	6-13
9	6.1	Performance Assessment Methodology.....	6-14
10	6.1.1	Conceptualization of Risk	6-16
11	6.1.2	Characterization of Uncertainty in Risk	6-18
12	6.1.3	Regulatory Criteria for the Quantification of Risk.....	6-21
13	6.1.4	Calculation of Risk	6-24
14	6.1.5	Techniques for Probabilistic Analysis.....	6-26
15	6.1.5.1	Selection of Variables and Their Ranges and Distributions	6-27
16	6.1.5.2	Generation of the Sample.....	6-27
17	6.1.5.3	Propagation of the Sample through the Analysis.....	6-28
18	6.1.5.4	Uncertainty Analysis.....	6-29
19	6.1.5.5	Sensitivity Analysis	6-29
20	6.2	Identification and Screening of Features, Events, and Processes	6-29
21	6.2.1	Identification of Features, Events, and Processes	6-30
22	6.2.2	Criteria to Screen Features, Events, and Processes and Categorization	
23		of Retained Features, Events, and Processes.....	6-32
24	6.2.2.1	Eliminating Features, Events, and Processes Based on	
25		Regulation, Probability, or Consequence.....	6-32
26	6.2.2.2	Undisturbed Performance Features, Events, and Processes.....	6-33
27	6.2.2.3	Disturbed Performance Features, Events, and Processes.....	6-33
28	6.2.3	Natural Features, Events, and Processes	6-34
29	6.2.4	Waste- and Repository-Induced Features, Events, and Processes	6-35
30	6.2.5	Human-Initiated Events and Processes	6-44
31	6.2.5.1	Historical, Current, and Near-Future Human Activities.....	6-51
32	6.2.5.2	Future Human Activities.....	6-51
33	6.2.5.2.1	Criteria Concerning Future Mining	6-51
34	6.2.5.2.2	Criteria Concerning Future Drilling.....	6-52
35	6.2.5.2.3	Screening of Future Human-Initiated EPs	6-53
36	6.2.6	Reassessment of Features, Events, and Processes for the Compliance	
37		Recertification	6-53
38	6.3	Scenario Development and Selection	6-54
39	6.3.1	Undisturbed Performance.....	6-55
40	6.3.2	Disturbed Performance.....	6-57
41	6.3.2.1	The Disturbed Performance Mining Scenario	6-57
42	6.3.2.2	The Disturbed Performance Deep Drilling Scenario	6-57
43	6.3.2.2.1	The E2 Scenario.....	6-67
44	6.3.2.2.2	The E1 Scenario.....	6-67
45	6.3.2.2.3	The E1E2 Scenario	6-67

1	6.3.2.3	The Disturbed Performance Mining and Deep Drilling	
2		Scenario.....	6-68
3	6.3.3	Scenarios Retained for Consequence Analysis	6-71
4	6.4	Calculation of Scenario Consequences.....	6-71
5	6.4.1	Types of Models.....	6-71
6	6.4.2	Model Geometries	6-72
7	6.4.2.1	Disposal System Geometry.....	6-72
8	6.4.2.2	Culebra Geometry.....	6-74
9	6.4.3	The Repository	6-74
10	6.4.3.1	Creep Closure.....	6-78
11	6.4.3.2	Repository Fluid Flow	6-80
12	6.4.3.3	Gas Generation.....	6-81
13	6.4.3.4	Chemical Conditions in the Repository	6-85
14	6.4.3.5	Dissolved Actinide Source Term.....	6-88
15	6.4.3.6	Source Term for Colloidal Actinides.....	6-91
16	6.4.4	Shafts and Shaft Seals	6-93
17	6.4.5	The Salado.....	6-94
18	6.4.5.1	Impure Halite	6-95
19	6.4.5.2	Salado Interbeds.....	6-96
20	6.4.5.3	DRZ.....	6-98
21	6.4.5.4	Actinide Transport in the Salado	6-99
22		6.4.5.4.1 NUTS Tracer Calculations.....	6-100
23		6.4.5.4.2 NUTS Transport Calculations.....	6-100
24	6.4.6	Units Above the Salado.....	6-102
25	6.4.6.1	The Los Medaños.....	6-103
26	6.4.6.2	The Culebra.....	6-103
27		6.4.6.2.1 Transport of Dissolved Actinides in the Culebra... 6-109	
28		6.4.6.2.2 Transport of Colloidal Actinides in the Culebra... 6-112	
29		6.4.6.2.3 Subsidence Due to Potash Mining	6-113
30	6.4.6.3	The Tamarisk	6-119
31	6.4.6.4	The Magenta	6-119
32	6.4.6.5	The Forty-niner	6-120
33	6.4.6.6	Dewey Lake	6-120
34	6.4.6.7	Supra-Dewey Lake Units.....	6-121
35	6.4.7	The Intrusion Borehole.....	6-121
36	6.4.7.1	Releases During Drilling.....	6-122
37		6.4.7.1.1 Direct Brine Release During Drilling.....	6-124
38	6.4.7.2	Long-Term Releases Following Drilling	6-127
39		6.4.7.2.1 Continuous Concrete Plug through the Salado and	
40		Castile	6-127
41		6.4.7.2.2 The Two-Plug Configuration.....	6-128
42		6.4.7.2.3 The Three-Plug Configuration.....	6-129
43	6.4.8	Castile Brine Reservoir	6-130
44	6.4.9	Climate Change	6-132
45	6.4.10	Initial and Boundary Conditions for Disposal System Modeling	6-135

1	6.4.10.1	Disposal System Flow and Transport Modeling (BRAGFLO and NUTS).....	6-135
2			
3	6.4.10.2	Culebra Flow and Transport Modeling (MODFLOW-2000, SECOTP2D)	6-137
4			
5	6.4.10.3	Initial and Boundary Conditions for Other Computational Models.....	6-138
6			
7	6.4.11	Numerical Codes Used in Performance Assessment	6-139
8	6.4.12	Sequences of Future Events	6-145
9			
10	6.4.12.1	Active and Passive Institutional Controls in Performance Assessment.....	6-145
11	6.4.12.2	Number and Time of Drilling Intrusions	6-146
12	6.4.12.3	Location of Intrusion Boreholes	6-147
13	6.4.12.4	Activity of the Intersected Waste.....	6-148
14	6.4.12.5	Diameter of the Intrusion Borehole	6-153
15	6.4.12.6	Probability of Intersecting a Brine Reservoir	6-153
16	6.4.12.7	Plug Configuration in the Abandoned Intrusion Borehole	6-154
17	6.4.12.8	Probability of Mining Occurring within the Land Withdrawal Area.....	6-154
18			
19	6.4.13	Construction of a Single CCDF.....	6-154
20			
21	6.4.13.1	Constructing Consequences of the Undisturbed Performance Scenario.....	6-155
22	6.4.13.2	Scaling Methodology for Disturbed Performance Scenarios... ..	6-156
23	6.4.13.3	Estimating Long-Term Releases from the E1 Scenario.....	6-157
24	6.4.13.4	Estimating Long-Term Releases from the E2 Scenario.....	6-158
25	6.4.13.5	Estimating Long-Term Releases from the E1E2 Scenario	6-160
26	6.4.13.6	Multiple Scenario Occurrences.....	6-162
27	6.4.13.7	Estimating Releases During Drilling for All Scenarios.....	6-162
28	6.4.13.8	Estimating Releases in the Culebra and the Impact of the Mining Scenario.....	6-164
29			
30	6.4.13.9	Final Construction of a Single CCDF	6-164
31	6.4.14	CCDF Family	6-165
32	6.5	Performance Assessment Results	6-165
33			
34	6.5.1	Demonstrating Convergence of the Mean CCDF	6-165
35	6.5.2	Complementary Cumulative Distribution Functions for the WIPP	6-166
36	6.5.3	Release Modes Contributing to the Total Radionuclide Release	6-171
37	6.5.4	Uncertainty and the Role of Conservatism in the Compliance Demonstration	6-173
38	6.5.5	Summary of the Demonstration of Compliance with the Containment Requirements.....	6-175
39			
40	REFERENCES	6-178
41	7.0	ASSURANCE REQUIREMENTS.....	7-1
42			
43	7.1	Active Institutional Controls.....	7-1
44			
45	7.1.1	Requirements for Active Institutional Controls	7-4
	7.1.2	Objectives for Active Institutional Controls	7-4
	7.1.3	Implementation of the Active Institutional Controls Program.....	7-5

1		7.1.3.1	Analysis of Activities.....	7-6
2		7.1.3.1.1	Ranching	7-6
3		7.1.3.1.2	Farming	7-7
4		7.1.3.1.3	Hunting	7-9
5		7.1.3.1.4	Scientific Activities.....	7-9
6		7.1.3.1.5	Utilities and Transportation	7-9
7		7.1.3.1.6	Groundwater Pumping	7-12
8		7.1.3.1.7	Surface Excavation	7-12
9		7.1.3.1.8	Potash Exploration and Extraction.....	7-16
10		7.1.3.1.9	Hydrocarbon Exploration.....	7-16
11		7.1.3.1.10	Construction.....	7-19
12		7.1.3.1.11	Hostile and Illegal Activities	7-19
13		7.1.3.2	Active Controls Design Features	7-19
14		7.1.3.3	Description of Active Institutional Controls Features	7-20
15	7.1.4		Effectiveness of the Active Institutional Controls Program.....	7-22
16	7.2		Monitoring	7-22
17	7.2.1		Monitoring Program Requirements.....	7-30
18	7.2.2		Monitoring Program Design.....	7-30
19	7.2.2.1		Significant Disposal System Parameters	7-31
20	7.2.2.2		Important Disposal System Concern	7-33
21	7.2.2.3		Meaningful Data in a Relatively Short Time	7-34
22	7.2.2.4		Preservation of Disposal System Integrity.....	7-34
23	7.2.2.4.1		Evaluation of Monitored Parameters	7-39
24	7.2.2.4.2		Direct Measurement.....	7-40
25	7.2.2.4.3		Telemetry Systems.....	7-40
26	7.2.2.4.4		Remote Sensing Systems	7-40
27	7.2.3		Monitoring Program Description	7-41
28	7.2.3.1		Geomechanical Monitoring Program.....	7-42
29	7.2.3.2		VOC Confirmatory Monitoring Program	7-44
30	7.2.3.3		Groundwater Surveillance Program.....	7-45
31	7.2.3.4		Observation of Drilling Activities	7-45
32	7.2.3.5		Subsidence Monitoring	7-46
33	7.2.4		Reporting.....	7-47
34	7.2.5		Compliance Monitoring Parameter Data Results	7-47
35	7.3		Passive Institutional Controls	7-48
36	7.3.1		Requirements for Passive Institutional Controls	7-49
37	7.3.2		Objectives for Passive Institutional Controls	7-50
38	7.3.3		Implementation of the Passive Institutional Controls Program.....	7-50
39	7.3.3.1		Definition of Passive Institutional Design Appropriate for the	
40			WIPP	7-53
41	7.3.3.1.1		Markers	7-54
42	7.3.3.1.2		Records	7-60
43	7.3.3.2		Implementation of Programs to Collect Information.....	7-63
44	7.3.3.3		Passive Institutional Controls Timelines	7-64
45	7.3.4		Effectiveness of Passive Controls in Reducing the Rate of Human	
46			Intrusion.....	7-69

1	7.3.4.1	Expected Effectiveness	7-70
2	7.3.4.2	Credit Taken in Performance Assessment Calculations	7-71
3	7.4	Multiple Barriers	7-71
4	7.4.1	Requirements for Multiple Barriers	7-72
5	7.4.2	Objectives for Multiple Barriers.....	7-72
6	7.4.3	Implementation of Multiple Barriers.....	7-72
7	7.4.3.1	Engineered Alternatives Cost and Benefit Study.....	7-72
8	7.4.3.2	Incorporation into Repository Design.....	7-77
9	7.5	Resource Considerations.....	7-78
10	7.5.1	Resource Considerations Prior to 40 CFR Parts 191 and 194.....	7-79
11	7.5.2	Implementation of Resource Considerations	7-79
12	7.6	Waste Removal	7-80
13	7.6.1	Requirements for Waste Removal.....	7-80
14	7.6.2	Implementation of Waste Removal.....	7-81
15	7.6.2.1	Planning and Permitting.....	7-82
16	7.6.2.2	Initial Above Ground Setup and Shaft Sinking	7-82
17	7.6.2.3	Underground Excavation and Facility Setup	7-82
18	7.6.2.4	Waste Location and Removal Operations.....	7-82
19	7.6.2.5	Closure and D&D of the Facility	7-82
20	REFERENCES		7-83
21	8.0	INDIVIDUAL AND GROUNDWATER PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS	8-1
22	8.1	Individual Protection Requirements	8-1
23	8.1.1	Compliance Assessment of Undisturbed Performance	8-2
24	8.1.2	Dose Calculation	8-5
25	8.1.2.1	Transport Pathway	8-5
26	8.1.2.2	Bounding Analysis.....	8-6
27	8.1.3	Dose Calculation Results.....	8-7
28	8.1.4	Statistical Assessment	8-9
29	8.1.5	Parameter Values.....	8-10
30	8.1.6	Summary of Compliance with the Individual Protection Standard.....	8-10
31	8.2	Groundwater Protection Requirements.....	8-10
32	8.2.1	Criteria for USDW Determination	8-11
33	8.2.1.1	Groundwater Quantity	8-11
34	8.2.1.2	Groundwater Quality	8-14
35	8.2.2	Comparison with Underground Source of Drinking Water Determination Criteria.....	8-14
36	8.2.3	Comparison with the National Primary Drinking Water Standards.....	8-16
37	8.2.3.1	Transport Pathway	8-16
38	8.2.3.2	Combined ²²⁶ Ra and ²²⁸ Ra	8-16
39	8.2.3.3	Gross Alpha Particle Activity Including ²²⁶ Ra But Excluding Radon and Uranium	8-18
40	8.2.3.4	Annual Dose Equivalent to the Total Body or Any Internal Organ from the Average Annual Concentration of Beta Particle and Photon Radioactivity from Man-Made Radionuclides.....	8-18
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			

1	8.3 Compliance Summary.....	8-19
2	REFERENCES	8-20
3	9.0 PEER-2004 REVIEW	9-1
4	9.1 Regulatory Requirements.....	9-3
5	9.2 Peer Review Process.....	9-4
6	9.2.1 Peer Review Plan.....	9-5
7	9.2.2 Size and Composition of Peer Review Panels.....	9-5
8	9.2.3 Technical Qualifications of Panel Members	9-6
9	9.2.4 Independence of Panel Members	9-7
10	9.2.5 Training of Peer Review Panel Members.....	9-7
11	9.2.6 Peer Review Panel Report.....	9-7
12	9.2.7 Quality Assurance Records Management	9-8
13	9.2.8 Quality Assurance Oversight.....	9-8
14	9.3 Peer Reviews Conducted After Promulgation of 40 CFR Part 194.....	9-8
15	9.3.1 Conceptual Models Peer Review	9-9
16	9.3.1.1 Adequate Models	9-13
17	9.3.1.1.1 Disposal System Geometry.....	9-13
18	9.3.1.1.2 Salado.....	9-13
19	9.3.1.1.3 Impure Halite	9-13
20	9.3.1.1.4 Disturbed Rock Zone	9-13
21	9.3.1.1.5 Actinide Transport in the Salado	9-14
22	9.3.1.1.6 Transport of Dissolved Actinides in the Culebra.....	9-14
23	9.3.1.1.7 Cuttings/Cavings.....	9-14
24	9.3.1.1.8 Multiple Intrusions.....	9-14
25	9.3.1.1.9 Climate Change.....	9-14
26	9.3.1.1.10 Creep Closure.....	9-15
27	9.3.1.1.11 Shaft and Shaft Seals	9-15
28	9.3.1.1.12 Dissolved Actinide Source Term.....	9-15
29	9.3.1.1.13 Colloidal Actinide Source Term.....	9-15
30	9.3.1.2 Inadequate Models.....	9-16
31	9.3.1.2.1 Peer Review Panel Concerns – Culebra	
32	Hydrogeology	9-16
33	9.3.1.2.2 Peer Review Panel Concerns – Repository Fluid	
34	Flow; First Concern	9-16
35	9.3.1.2.3 Peer Review Panel Concern – Repository Fluid	
36	Flow; Second Concern.....	9-16
37	9.3.1.2.4 Peer Review Panel Concern – Repository Fluid	
38	Flow; Third Concern	9-17
39	9.3.1.2.5 Peer Review Panel Concern – Repository Fluid	
40	Flow; Fourth Concern.....	9-17
41	9.3.1.2.6 Peer Review Panel Concern – Salado Interbeds.....	9-17
42	9.3.1.2.7 Peer Review Panel Concern – Units Above the	
43	Salado	9-17
44	9.3.1.2.8 Peer Review Panel Concerns – Transport of	
45	Colloidal Actinides in the Culebra; First Concern ..	9-18

1	9.3.1.2.9	Peer Review Panel Concern – Transport of Colloidal Actinides in the Culebra; Second Concern.....	9-18
2			
3			
4	9.3.1.2.10	Peer Review Panel Concerns – Transport of Colloidal Actinides in the Culebra; Third Concern .	9-18
5			
6	9.3.1.2.11	Peer Review Panel Concerns – Exploration Boreholes; First Concern	9-18
7			
8	9.3.1.2.12	Peer Review Panel Concerns – Exploration Boreholes; Second Concern.....	9-19
9			
10	9.3.1.2.13	Peer Review Panel Concern – Exploration Boreholes; Third Concern	9-19
11			
12	9.3.1.2.14	Peer Review Panel Concerns – Exploration Boreholes; Fourth Concern.....	9-19
13			
14	9.3.1.2.15	Peer Review Panel Concerns – Spallings; First Concern.....	9-19
15			
16	9.3.1.2.16	Peer Review Panel Concern – Spallings; Second Concern.....	9-20
17			
18	9.3.1.2.17	Peer Review Panel Concern – Spallings; Third Concern.....	9-20
19			
20	9.3.1.2.18	Peer Panel Concern – Direct Brine Release; First Concern.....	9-20
21			
22	9.3.1.2.19	Review Panel Concern – Direct Brine Release; Second Concern	9-20
23			
24	9.3.1.2.20	Peer Review Panel Concern – Direct Brine Release; Third Concern	9-21
25			
26	9.3.1.2.21	Peer Review Panel Concerns – Castile Formation Brine Reservoirs; First and Second Concerns	9-21
27			
28	9.3.1.2.22	Peer Review Panel Concern – Castile Formation Brine Reservoirs; Third Concern.....	9-21
29			
30	9.3.1.2.23	Peer Review Panel Concern – Gas Generation; First Concern	9-21
31			
32	9.3.1.2.24	Peer Review Panel Concern – Gas Generation; Second Concern	9-22
33			
34	9.3.1.2.25	Peer Review Panel Concern – Gas Generation; Third Concern.....	9-22
35			
36	9.3.1.2.26	Peer Review Panel Concern – Chemical Conditions; First Concern.....	9-22
37			
38	9.3.1.2.27	Peer Review Panel Concerns – Chemical Conditions; Second and Third Concerns	9-22
39			
40	9.3.1.3	Post-CCA Conceptual Models Peer Review.....	9-23
41	9.3.1.3.1	Conceptual Models Supplementary Peer Review – October to December 1996.....	9-23
42			
43	9.3.1.3.2	Conceptual Models Second Supplementary Peer Review – January 1997.....	9-24
44			
45	9.3.1.3.3	Conceptual Model Third Supplementary Peer Review – April 1997.....	9-26
46			

1		9.3.1.3.4 Salado Flow Conceptual Models Peer Review –	
2		March 2003.....	9-29
3		9.3.1.3.5 Spallings Model Peer Review – September 2003.....	9-31
4	9.3.2	Waste Characterization Analysis Peer Review	9-39
5	9.3.2.1	General Results	9-40
6	9.3.2.2	Waste Characterization Peer Review Panel Concerns.....	9-40
7		9.3.2.2.1 Peer Review Panel Concern – Radionuclide	
8		Inventory and Release Limits	9-40
9		9.3.2.2.2 Peer Review Panel Concern – Solubility; First	
10		Concern.....	9-41
11		9.3.2.2.3 Peer Review Panel Concern – Solubility; Second	
12		Concern.....	9-41
13		9.3.2.2.4 Peer Review Panel Concern – Colloids	9-41
14		9.3.2.2.5 Peer Review Panel Concern – Production of Gas;	
15		First Concern	9-41
16		9.3.2.2.6 Peer Review Panel Concerns – Production of Gas;	
17		Second and Third Concerns.....	9-41
18		9.3.2.2.7 Peer Review Panel Concern – Compressibility	9-42
19		9.3.2.2.8 Peer Review Panel Concern – Strength	9-42
20		9.3.2.2.9 Peer Review Panel Concern – Porosity	9-42
21		9.3.2.2.10 Peer Review Panel Concern – Metals.....	9-42
22		9.3.2.2.11 Peer Review Panel Concern – Chelating Agents.....	9-42
23	9.3.3	Engineered Alternatives Cost/Benefit Study Peer Review	9-43
24	9.3.3.1	General Results	9-45
25	9.3.3.2	Engineered Alternatives Cost/Benefit Study Peer Review Panel	
26		Concerns	9-45
27		9.3.3.2.1 First Peer Review Panel Concern – Results of the	
28		Engineered Alternatives Identification/Screening	
29		Process	9-50
30		9.3.3.2.2 Second Peer Review Panel Concern – Results of	
31		the Engineered Alternatives	
32		Identification/Screening Process	9-50
33		9.3.3.2.3 Third Peer Review Panel Concern – Results of the	
34		Engineered Alternatives Identification/Screening	
35		Process	9-51
36		9.3.3.2.4 Peer Review Concern – Evaluation of Factors 1	
37		and 2: Impacts on Long-Term Repository	
38		Performance and Uncertainty in Compliance	
39		Assessment	9-52
40		9.3.3.2.5 First Peer Review Panel Concern – Evaluation of	
41		Factor 3: Impact of Engineered Alternatives on	
42		Worker and Public Risk.....	9-52
43		9.3.3.2.6 Second Peer Review Panel Concern – Evaluation	
44		of Factor 3: Impact of Engineered Alternatives on	
45		Worker and Public Risk.....	9-53

1		9.3.3.2.7	Third Peer Review Panel Concern – Evaluation of	
2			Factor 3: Impact of Engineered Alternatives on	
3			Worker and Public Risk.....	9-53
4		9.3.3.2.8	Peer Review Panel Concern – Evaluation of Factor	
5			4: Waste Removal Impact.....	9-53
6		9.3.3.2.9	Peer Review Panel Concern – Evaluation of	
7			Factor 5: Impact of Engineered Alternatives on	
8			Transportation Risk	9-54
9		9.3.3.2.10	Evaluation of Factor 6: Impact of Engineered	
10			Alternatives on Public Confidence	9-54
11		9.3.3.2.11	Evaluation of Factor 7: Total System Cost and	
12			Schedule Estimates	9-54
13		9.3.3.2.12	Peer Review Panel Concern – Evaluation of	
14			Factor 8: Impact on Other Waste Disposal	
15			Programs.....	9-54
16	9.3.4		Engineered Systems Data Qualification Peer Review	9-54
17	9.3.5		Natural Barriers Data Qualification Peer Review	9-57
18	9.3.6		Waste Form and Disposal Room Data Qualification Peer Review.....	9-60
19	9.3.7		Passive Institutional Controls Peer Review.....	9-61
20	9.4		Peer Reviews Conducted in Addition to Those Required by 40 CFR Part	
21			194.27(a).....	9-63
22	9.4.1		NAS WIPP Panel Reviews.....	9-66
23		9.4.1.1	Letter Report of May 1, 1979	9-67
24		9.4.1.2	Letter Report of September 10, 1979.....	9-67
25		9.4.1.3	Continuing Evaluation of the Carlsbad Site.....	9-67
26		9.4.1.4	Review of the Criteria for the Site Suitability, Design,	
27			Construction, and Operation of the Proposed Waste Isolation	
28			Pilot Plant (WIPP); Progress Report: July 1, 1978, to	
29			December 31, 1979	9-67
30		9.4.1.5	Review of the Criteria for the Site Suitability, Design,	
31			Construction, and Operation of the Proposed Waste Isolation	
32			Pilot Plant (WIPP); Interim Report: July 1, 1978, to July 31,	
33			1982.....	9-67
34		9.4.1.6	Review of the Scientific and Technical Criteria for the Waste	
35			Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).....	9-68
36		9.4.1.7	Letter Report of April 1987 on Planned Sorbing-Tracer Field	
37			Tests	9-68
38		9.4.1.8	Report of March 3, 1988 on Brine Accumulation in the WIPP	
39			Facility	9-68
40		9.4.1.9	Letter Report of December 1988 on Experiments of Room	
41			Closure Rates	9-69
42		9.4.1.10	Review Comments on DOE Document DOE/WIPP 89-011:	
43			Draft Plan for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Test Phase:	
44			Performance Assessment and Operations Demonstration	9-69
45		9.4.1.11	Letter Report of April 1991, Summary of Recommendations...	9-69
46		9.4.1.12	Letter Report of June 1992	9-69

1	9.4.1.13	The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant: A Potential Solution for the	
2		Disposal of Transuranic Waste (NAS 1996)	9-69
3	9.4.1.13.1	Findings.....	9-70
4	9.4.1.13.2	General Conclusions and Recommendations.....	9-71
5	9.4.1.13.3	Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations on	
6		Department of Energy Studies.....	9-71
7	9.4.1.14	Improving Operations and Long-Term Safety of the Waste	
8		Isolation Pilot Plant – Final Report (April 2001).....	9-75
9	9.4.1.14.1	Findings and Recommendations	9-76
10	9.4.1.15	Characterization of Remote-Handled Transuranic Waste for the	
11		Waste Isolation Pilot Plant – Final Report (2002)	9-79
12	9.4.1.15.1	Committee’s Assessment of Department of	
13		Energy’s Proposed Characterization Plan	9-80
14	9.4.1.15.2	Department of Energy’s Response.....	9-81
15	9.4.2	Performance Assessment Peer Review Panel	9-81
16	9.4.3	Shaft Seal Design Independent Review	9-83
17	9.4.4	Engineered Alternatives Task Force Report Peer Review	9-86
18	9.4.4.1	Quality of Technical Work	9-87
19	9.4.4.2	Utility of a Single Figure-of-Merit	9-88
20	9.4.4.3	Use of Relative versus Absolute Risk.....	9-88
21	9.4.5	Blue Ribbon Panel Peer Review	9-89
22	9.4.6	Advisory Committee on Nuclear Facility Safety Review	9-92
23	9.4.7	Performance Assessment Review Team	9-95
24	9.4.8	INTRAVAL.....	9-96
25	9.4.9	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Conceptual Model Uncertainty Group	
26		Review	9-98
27	9.4.10	Environmental Evaluation Group Reviews.....	9-100
28	9.4.10.1	EEG-2 (1978): Review Comments on the GCR, Waste	
29		Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Site, Southeastern New Mexico,	
30		SAND78-1596, Volumes I and II	9-103
31	9.4.10.2	EEG-3 (1979): Radiological Health Review of the Draft	
32		Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0026-D) Waste	
33		Isolation Pilot Plant, U.S. Department of Energy	9-103
34	9.4.10.3	EEG-8 (1980): The Significance of Certain Rustler Aquifer	
35		Parameters for Predicting Long-Term Radiation Doses from	
36		WIPP	9-103
37	9.4.10.4	EEG-9 (1981): An Approach to Calculating Upper Bounds	
38		on Maximum Individual Doses from the Use of	
39		Contaminated Well Water Following a WIPP Repository	
40		Breach	9-103
41	9.4.10.5	EEG-10 (1981): Radiological Health Review of the Final	
42		Environmental Impact Statement, (DOE/EIS-0026), Waste	
43		Isolation Pilot Plant, U.S. Department of Energy	9-103
44	9.4.10.6	EEG-11 (1982): Calculated Radiation Doses from	
45		Radionuclides Brought to the Surface If Future Drilling	
46		Intercepts the WIPP Repository and Pressurized Brine.....	9-103

1	9.4.10.7	EEG-12 (1982): Potential Release Scenario and Radiological Consequence Evaluation of Mineral Resources at WIPP 9-103	9-103
2			
3	9.4.10.8	EEG-22 (1983): EEG Review Comments on the Geotechnical Reports Provided by DOE to EEG Under the Stipulated Agreement Through March 1, 1983; and EEG-23 (1983): Evaluation of the Suitability of the WIPP Site 9-103	9-103
4			
5			
6			
7	9.4.10.9	EEG-29 (1985): Evaluation of the Safety Analysis Report for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Project..... 9-103	9-103
8			
9	9.4.10.10	EEG-40 (1989): Review of the Final Safety Analysis Report (Draft), DOE Waste Isolation Pilot Plant 9-104	9-104
10			
11	9.4.10.11	EEG-41 (1989): Review of the Draft SEIS, DOE Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, April 1989 9-104	9-104
12			
13	9.4.10.12	EEG-50 (1992): Implications of Oil and Gas Leases at the WIPP on Compliance with EPA TRU Waste Disposal Standards..... 9-104	9-104
14			
15			
16	9.4.10.13	EEG-57 (1994): An Appraisal of the 1992 Preliminary Performance Assessment for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.. 9-104	9-104
17			
18	9.4.10.14	EEG-61 (1996): Review of the WIPP Draft Application to Show Compliance with EPA TRU Waste Disposal Standards 9-104	9-104
19			
20	9.4.10.15	EEG-62 (1996): Fluid Injection for Salt Water Disposal and Enhanced Oil Recovery as a Potential Problem for the WIPP: Proceedings of a June 1995 Workshop and Analysis, by Matthew K. Silva (Silva 1996) 9-104	9-104
21			
22			
23			
24	9.4.10.16	EEG-64 (1997): Review of the Draft Supplement to the WIPP Environmental Impact Statement DOE/EIS-0026-S-2, by Robert H. Neill, James K. Channell, Peter Spiegler, and Lokesh Chaturvedi (Neill et al. 1997)..... 9-105	9-105
25			
26			
27			
28	9.4.10.17	EEG-66 (1998): Individual Radiation Doses from Transuranic Waste Brought to the Surface by Human Intrusion at the WIPP by James K. Channell and Robert H. Neill (Channell and Neill 1998)..... 9-105	9-105
29			
30			
31			
32	9.4.10.18	EEG-68 (1998): Evaluation of the WIPP Project's Compliance with the EPA Radiation Protection Standards for Disposal of Transuranic Waste by Robert H. Neill, Lokesh Chaturvedi, Dale F. Rucker, Matthew K. Silva, Ben A. Walker, James K. Channell, and Thomas M. Clemo (Neill et al. 1998) 9-107	9-107
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38		9.4.10.18.1 Solubility..... 9-107	9-107
39		9.4.10.18.2 Spallings..... 9-108	9-108
40		9.4.10.18.3 Air Drilling..... 9-108	9-108
41		9.4.10.18.4 Fluid Injection..... 9-108	9-108
42		9.4.10.18.5 Anhydrite Fracturing..... 9-108	9-108
43		9.4.10.18.6 Solution Mining 9-109	9-109
44		9.4.10.18.7 Groundwater Flow and Radionuclide Transport through the Culebra 9-109	9-109
45			
46		9.4.10.18.8 BRAGFLO 2D/3D Modeling 9-109	9-109

1	9.4.10.18.9 Brine Reservoirs.....	9-110
2	9.4.10.18.10 Waste Issues.....	9-110
3	9.4.10.18.11 Assurance Requirements.....	9-110
4	9.4.10.18.12 Individual Protection Requirements	9-111
5	9.4.10.18.13 Environmental Standards for Ground water	
6	Protection.....	9-111
7	9.4.10.19 EEG-69 (1998): Sensitivity Analysis of Performance	
8	Parameters Used in Modeling the WIPP by Dale F. Rucker	
9	(Rucker 1998)	9-111
10	9.4.10.19.1 Borehole Intrusion Rate	9-111
11	9.4.10.19.2 Probability of Brine Encounter at WIPP.....	9-112
12	9.4.10.19.3 Castile Brine Reservoir Parameters	9-112
13	9.4.10.19.4 Solubility Modeling of Actinides.....	9-112
14	9.4.10.19.5 Flow and Transport Modeling within the Culebra.....	9-113
15	9.4.10.20 EEG-75 (1999): Evaluation of Risk and Waste	
16	Characterization Requirements for the Transuranic Waste	
17	Emplaced in WIPP during 1999 by James C. Channell and	
18	Ben A. Walker (Channell and Walker 2000).....	9-113
19	9.4.10.20.1 Conclusions.....	9-114
20	9.4.10.20.2 Recommendations.....	9-114
21	9.4.10.21 EEG-77 (2000): Plutonium Chemistry Under Conditions	
22	Relevant for WIPP Performance Assessment: Review of	
23	Experimental Results and Recommendations for Future	
24	Work by Virginia Oversby (Oversby 2000)	9-114
25	9.4.10.22 EEG-82 (2001): Evaluation of Proposed Panel Closure	
26	Modifications at WIPP by Lawrence E. Allen, Matthew K.	
27	Silva, James K. Channell, John F. Abel, and Dudley R.	
28	Morgan (Allen et al. 2001).....	9-115
29	9.4.10.23 EEG-83 (2002): Identification of Issues Relevant to the First	
30	Recertification of WIPP by Lawrence E. Allen, Matthew K.	
31	Silva, James K. Channell (Allen et al. 2002).....	9-116
32	9.4.10.24 EEG-85 (2003): Analysis of Emplaced Waste Data and	
33	Implications of Non-Random Emplacement for Performance	
34	Assessment for the WIPP by Lawrence E. Allen and James K.	
35	Channell (Allen and Channell 2003)	9-118
36	9.4.10.25 EEG-86 (2003): Contact Handled Transuranic Waste	
37	Characterization Requirements at the Waste Isolation Pilot	
38	Plant by Matthew K. Silva, James C. Channell, Ben A.	
39	Walker, and George Anastas (Silva et al. 2003).....	9-119
40	9.4.10.25.1 Acceptable Knowledge	9-119
41	9.4.10.25.2 Headspace Gas Sampling and Analysis.....	9-119
42	9.4.10.25.3 Drum Age Criteria	9-119
43	9.4.10.25.4 Real Time Radiography	9-119
44	9.4.10.25.5 Visual Examination for Retrievably Stored	
45	Waste	9-120
46	9.4.10.25.6 Visual Examination for Newly Generated Waste	9-120

1		9.4.10.25.7 Coring Sampling and Analysis	9-120
2		9.4.10.25.8 Level II Management and Waste Certification	
3		HWFP Requirements	9-120
4		9.4.10.25.9 Characterization Support HWFP Requirements ..	9-120
5		9.4.10.25.10 EPA Non-Radiological Requirements	9-120
6		9.4.10.25.11 EPA Radiological Requirements	9-121
7		9.4.10.25.12 NRC Container Properties	9-121
8		9.4.10.25.13 NRC Nuclear Properties	9-121
9		9.4.10.25.14 NRC Gas Generation Requirements	9-121
10		9.4.10.25.15 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Waste Acceptance	
11		Criteria	9-121
12	9.4.11	Fracture Expert Group Review.....	9-122
13	9.4.12	Fanghänel Review – WIPP Thermodynamic Model for Trivalent	
14		Actinides.....	9-124
15	9.4.13	Independent Technical Review of the Bin and Alcove Test Programs....	9-126
16	9.4.14	Performance Assessment Reviews	9-129
17	9.4.14.1	1990 Performance Assessment Report	9-130
18	9.4.14.2	1991 Performance Assessment Report	9-131
19	9.4.14.3	1992 Performance Assessment Report	9-131
20	9.4.14.3.1	Environmental Protection Agency Review of the	
21		1992 Performance Assessment Report	9-132
22	9.4.14.3.2	New Mexico Attorney General Review of the	
23		1992 Performance Assessment Report	9-132
24	9.4.14.3.3	NMED Review of the 1992 Performance	
25		Assessment Report	9-132
26	9.4.14.4	Department of Energy Response to Comments on the 1990,	
27		1991, and 1992 Performance Assessment Reports	9-133
28	9.4.15	Technical Support Group Reviews.....	9-133
29	9.4.15.1	Review of Experimental Plan for Tracer Testing in the	
30		Culebra Dolomite.....	9-135
31	9.4.15.2	Performance Assessment Parameters	9-135
32	9.4.16	NEPA Reviews.....	9-136
33	9.4.17	International Peer Review by the Nuclear Energy Authority/ International Atomic Energy Agency International Review Group,	
34		1996-97 (NEA/IAEA 1997)	9-138
35	9.4.17.1	Objective of the Review.....	9-140
36	9.4.17.2	Scope.....	9-140
37	9.4.17.3	Conclusions.....	9-141
38	9.4.17.3.1	Observations on the Specificity of the Waste	
39		Isolation Pilot Plant Case.....	9-141
40	9.4.17.3.2	Evaluation with Respect to the Terms of	
41		Reference	9-141
42	9.4.18	GEOTRAP.....	9-144
43	9.4.19	Institute for Regulatory Science Reviews	9-146
44	9.4.19.1	Requirements for Disposal of Remote-Handled Transuranic	
45		Waste at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (2002) (RSI 2002) ...	9-146
46			

1	9.4.19.2 Desirability of Performing Certain Transuranic Waste	
2	Characterization Tests (RSI 2003).....	9-148
3	REFERENCES	9-150