
**Title 40 CFR Part 191
Subparts B and C
Compliance Recertification Application 2014
for the
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant**

**Consideration of the Presence of Resources
(40 CFR § 194.45)**



**United States Department of Energy
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant**

**Carlsbad Field Office
Carlsbad, New Mexico**

**Compliance Recertification Application 2014
Consideration of the Presence of Resources
(40 CFR § 194.45)**

Table of Contents

45.0 Consideration of the Presence of Resources (40 CFR § 194.45)..... 45-1

 45.1 Requirements 45-1

 45.2 Background..... 45-1

 45.3 1998 Certification Decision 45-1

 45.4 Changes in the CRA-2004 45-2

 45.5 EPA’s Evaluation of Compliance for the 2004 Recertification..... 45-2

 45.6 Changes or New Information Between the CRA-2004 and the CRA-2009
 (Previously: Changes or New Information Since the 2004 Recertification)..... 45-2

 45.7 EPA’s Evaluation of Compliance for the 2009 Recertification..... 45-3

 45.8 Changes or New Information Since the CRA-2009 45-3

 45.9 References..... 45-4

This page intentionally left blank.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CCA	Compliance Certification Application
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CRA	Compliance Recertification Application
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FEP	feature, event, and process
PA	performance assessment
PABC	performance assessment baseline calculation
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

This page intentionally left blank.

1 **45.0 Consideration of the Presence of Resources (40 CFR § 194.45)**

2 **45.1 Requirements**

§ 194.45 Consideration of the Presence of Resources

Any compliance application shall include information that demonstrates that the favorable characteristics of the disposal system compensate for the presence of resources in the vicinity of the disposal system and the likelihood of the disposal system being disturbed as a result of the presence of those resources. If performance assessments predict that the disposal system meets the containment requirements of §191.13 of this chapter, then the Agency will assume that the requirements of this section and §191.14(e) of this chapter have been fulfilled.

3

4 **45.2 Background**

5 40 CFR § 194.45 (U.S. EPA 1996a) implements the assurance requirement that the disposal
6 system be sited so that the benefits of the disposal system's natural barriers compensate for the
7 increased probability of disruptions to the disposal system resulting from exploring and
8 developing existing resources. In promulgating this requirement, the U.S. Environmental
9 Protection Agency (EPA) determined that performance assessment (PA) provides a rigorous
10 analytical methodology to determine whether the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) site has
11 compensating features that outweigh the presence of resources (U.S. EPA 1996b). In accordance
12 with the compliance criteria, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) must demonstrate that the
13 PA has incorporated the potential effects of human activities near the WIPP prior to disposal, and
14 of drilling and excavation mining over the regulatory time frame.

15 **45.3 1998 Certification Decision**

16 In the Compliance Certification Application (CCA) (U.S. DOE 1996), Chapter 7.0, Section 7.5,
17 the DOE describes the measures taken to comply with the requirements of section 194.45. The
18 CCA, Chapter 7.0, Section 7.5 states that the results of the PA, taking into account the potential
19 for resource exploration, met the containment requirements of the EPA as dictated by the
20 disposal regulations and compliance criteria. The CCA, Chapter 7.0, Section 7.5.2 states that the
21 DOE concluded that the favorable characteristics of the WIPP compensate for any possible
22 disturbance.

23 The EPA found that the information contained in the CCA, Chapter 7.0, Section 7.5, and
24 portions of the CCA cross-referenced in Chapter 7.0, Section 7.5, demonstrates that the DOE
25 accounted for potential resource exploration and met the EPA's requirements based on the
26 results of the PA. Furthermore, the DOE's Final Environmental Impact Statement for the WIPP
27 indicates that resource considerations were taken into account during the disposal system's site
28 selection process (U.S. DOE 1980, Volume 1, Section 7.3.7). Based on these factors, the EPA
29 concluded that the DOE complied with the requirements of section 194.45. A complete
30 description of the EPA's 1998 Certification Decision for section 194.45 can be obtained from
31 U.S. EPA 1998a and U.S. EPA 1998b.

1 **45.4 Changes in the CRA-2004**

2 The DOE did not report any significant changes to the information on which the EPA based the
3 1998 Certification Decision. The Compliance Recertification Application (CRA) of 2004 (CRA-
4 2004) (U.S. DOE 2004), Chapter 7.0, Section 7.5, contains all the changes related to resource
5 considerations since 1998. The DOE made some minor changes to the list of features, events,
6 and processes (FEPs) considered in the CRA-2004, but the changes did not affect the outcome of
7 the PA. (See the CRA-2004, Appendix SCR, Table SCR-1.)

8 In the CRA-2004, Chapter 7.0, Section 7.5, the DOE demonstrated that:

- 9 • The effects of mining and drilling over the regulatory time frame have been incorporated into
10 the PA according to the requirements of sections 194.32, 194.33, and 194.43.
- 11 • The PA incorporates the effects on the disposal system of any activities that occur in the
12 vicinity of the disposal system or are expected to occur in the vicinity of the disposal system
13 during the 10,000-year regulatory period, according to the requirements of section 194.32.
- 14 • The results of the PA demonstrate compliance with the containment requirements of section
15 191.13 (U.S. EPA 1993).

16 The results of the recertification PA are documented in the CRA-2004, Chapter 6.0, Section 6.5,
17 and in supplemental information on the CRA-2004 Performance Assessment Baseline
18 Calculation (PABC) (Leigh et al. 2005). In addition, the impacts of resource development
19 outside the controlled area were considered in the development of the WIPP's conceptual
20 models, as well as in the site selection process.

21 **45.5 EPA's Evaluation of Compliance for the 2004 Recertification**

22 The EPA's review of the activities and conditions in and around the WIPP site did not identify
23 any significant changes since the 1998 Certification Decision related to the presence of
24 resources.

25 Based on a review and evaluation of the CRA-2004; supplemental information in the CCA,
26 Appendices GCR, IRL, and DEL provided by the DOE in the CRA-2004; and an assessment of
27 changes since 1998, the EPA determined that the DOE continued to comply with the
28 requirements in section 194.45.

29 **45.6 Changes or New Information Between the CRA-2004 and the CRA-2009** 30 **(Previously: Changes or New Information Since the 2004 Recertification)**

31 Section 194.45 states, "If performance assessments predict that the disposal system meets the
32 containment requirements of Section 191.13 of this chapter, then the Agency will assume that the
33 requirements of this section and §191.14(e) of this chapter have been fulfilled." Therefore,
34 provided that the PA appropriately incorporates processes relating to resource discovery and
35 production, and predicts releases that are below limits established by the EPA, compliance with
36 section 194.45 will have been demonstrated. This conditional logic relies heavily upon whether

1 or not the PA is structured to appropriately represent resource-related activities at the WIPP site.
2 To accomplish this, the DOE used a structured methodology to identify and select FEPs that may
3 have an impact on the disposal system. This process was documented in CRA-2009 (U.S. DOE
4 2009) Section 32, “Scope of Performance Assessment,” and Appendix SCR-2009. There were
5 no changes in screening decisions for resource-related FEPs for the CRA-2009.

6 While there were no screening changes for FEPs related to the presence of resources, there were
7 two changes relating to the implementation of the presence of resources in PA models. These
8 changes included a new drilling rate (LAMBAD) (see Appendix DATA-2009 and Appendix
9 PA-2009, Section PA-2.1.1) and a change in the duration of direct brine releases through the PA
10 parameter MAXFLOW (see Appendix PA-2009, Section PA-2.1.1). These changes were not
11 significant, but were made to incorporate the most recent information available relating to the
12 exploitation of resources (see “Consideration of Drilling Events in Performance Assessment,”
13 Section 33). Besides these two drilling-related parameters, there were no planned changes
14 adopted by the DOE since the CRA-2004 that impact the previous position and bases for
15 demonstrating compliance with this section. The PA calculations responsive to section 191.13
16 showed predicted releases to be well within the regulated limits and demonstrated that the
17 favorable characteristics and isolating capability of the WIPP outweigh the risks associated with
18 the presence of resources at the site. Therefore, the requirements of section 194.45 were met.

19 **45.7 EPA’s Evaluation of Compliance for the 2009 Recertification**

20 During the EPA’s review of the activities and conditions in and around the WIPP site, no
21 significant changes were identified that relate to the presence of resources since the 1998
22 Certification or 2004 Recertification decisions.

23 The EPA concluded that the PABC-2009 (Clayton et al. 2010) predicted releases within the
24 regulatory limits; therefore, the favorable characteristics of the site continue to outweigh risks
25 associated with the presence of resources. In addition, the impacts of resource development
26 outside the controlled area were considered in the development of the WIPP’s conceptual
27 models, as well as in the site selection process. The EPA did not receive any public comments
28 on the DOE’s continued compliance with the Consideration of the Presence of Resources
29 requirements of section 194.45 (U.S. EPA 2010a).

30 Therefore, based on a review and evaluation of the CRA-2009 and its supplemental information,
31 the EPA determined that the DOE continued to comply with the requirements for section 194.45
32 (U.S. EPA 2010b).

33 **45.8 Changes or New Information Since the CRA-2009**

34 The DOE monitors resource-related activities within the WIPP vicinity, and updates parameters
35 and/or models as appropriate to assure that current practices are accurately represented in the
36 WIPP PA (U.S. DOE 2012). Since the last recertification application, the rate of drilling for
37 petroleum resources has increased to 67.3 boreholes per square kilometer over 10,000 years.
38 This is represented as PA parameter (LAMBAD) (Kicker and Herrick 2013), and is an increase
39 from the value of 59.8 boreholes per square kilometer used in the PABC-2009. Additionally, the
40 representation of borehole plugs has changed slightly, based on minor changes in the number of

1 plugs emplaced per borehole in recently plugged and abandoned boreholes near the WIPP (U.S.
2 DOE 2012). The WIPP PA parameter GLOBAL:PBRINE has been updated to reflect over 15
3 years of additional data in the immediate vicinity of the WIPP with regard to the occurrence of
4 pressurized brine while drilling (Kirchner et al. 2012). Finally, the PA parameter
5 BOREHOLE:TAUFAIL has also been updated based on the results of experiments conducted
6 since the last certification application (Herrick et al. 2012). These parameter updates have a
7 minimal impact upon PA results, which continue to show predicted releases well within the
8 regulated limits established in section 191.13.

9 Conventional mining for potash is continuing within the vicinity of the WIPP. The effects of
10 mining are accounted for in the WIPP PA as prescribed by section 194.32(b). The
11 implementation of the mining scenario in the WIPP PA is described in Appendix PA-2014,
12 Section PA-3.9.

13 A solution mining project operated by Intrepid Potash Corporation has begun just outside the
14 Delaware Basin boundary since the CRA-2009. The initiation and operation of this activity does
15 not affect the current representation of mining in the WIPP PA, and therefore no changes have
16 been made to the WIPP models. The description, screening argument, and screening decision for
17 this activity are presented in Appendix SCR-2014, Section SCR-5.2.2.3.

18 Because the WIPP PA results show that predicted releases are below the limits established by
19 section 191.13, and because these calculations account for the exploitation of resources present,
20 it has been demonstrated that the favorable characteristics and isolating capability of the WIPP
21 outweigh the risks associated with the presence of resources at the site. Therefore, the
22 requirements of section 194.45 are met.

23 **45.9 References**

24 (*Indicates a reference that has not been previously submitted.)

25 Clayton, D.J., C. Camphouse, J.W. Garner, A.E. Ismail, T.B. Kirchner, K.L. Kuhlman, and M.B.
26 Nemer. 2010. Summary Report of the CRA-2009 Performance Assessment Baseline
27 Calculation. ERMS 553039. February 11, 2010. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.*

28 Herrick, C.G., M.D.Schuhen, D.M. Chapin, and D.C. Kicker. 2012. Determining the
29 Hydrodynamic Shear Strength of Surrogate Degraded TRU Waste Materials as an Estimate for
30 the Lower Limit of the Performance Assessment Parameter TAUFAIL. ERMS 558479.
31 Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.*

32 Kicker, D.C. and C.G. Herrick. 2013. Parameter Summary Report for the 2014 Compliance
33 Recertification Application (Revision 0). ERMS 560298. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National
34 Laboratories.*

35 Kirchner, T., T. Zeitler, and R. Kirkes. 2012. Evaluating the Data in Order to Derive a Value
36 for GLOBAL:PBRINE. Memorandum to Sean Dunagan dated December 11, 2012. ERMS
37 558724. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. *

- 1 Leigh, C., J. Kanney, L. Brush, J. Garner, R. Kirkes, T. Lowry, M. Nemer, J. Stein, E. Vugrin, S.
2 Wagner, and T. Kirchner. 2005. *2004 Compliance Recertification Application Performance*
3 *Assessment Baseline Calculation* (Revision 0). ERMS 541521. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National
4 Laboratories.
- 5 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 1980. (October). 2 vols. DOE/EIS-0026. ERMS 238835
6 and ERMS 238838. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Energy.
- 7 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 1996. *Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Certification*
8 *Application for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant* (October). 21 vols. DOE/CAO-1996-2184.
9 Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Area Office.
- 10 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2004. *Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Recertification*
11 *Application for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant* (March). 10 vols. DOE/WIPP 2004-3231.
12 Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.
- 13 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2009. *Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Recertification*
14 *Application for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant* (March). DOE/WIPP-09-3424. Carlsbad, NM:
15 Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 16 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012. Delaware Basin Monitoring Annual Report.
17 DOE/WIPP-12-2308. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 18 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1993. “40 CFR Part 191: Environmental
19 Radiation Protection Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-
20 Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes; Final Rule.” *Federal Register*, vol. 58 (December
21 20, 1993): 66398–416.
- 22 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1996a. “40 CFR Part 194: Criteria for the
23 Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant’s Compliance with the 40
24 CFR Part 191 Disposal Regulations; Final Rule.” *Federal Register*, vol. 61 (February 9, 1996):
25 5223–45.
- 26 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1996b. Response to Comments: 40 CFR Part
27 194: Criteria for the Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant’s
28 Compliance with the 40 CFR Part 191 Disposal Regulations (January 31). EPA 402-R-96-001.
29 Washington, DC: Office of Air and Radiation.
- 30 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1998a. “40 CFR Part 194: Criteria for the
31 Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant’s Compliance with the
32 Disposal Regulations: Certification Decision; Final Rule.” *Federal Register*, vol. 63 (May 18,
33 1998): 27353–406.
- 34 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1998b. Compliance Application Review
35 Documents for the Criteria for the Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot
36 Plant’s Compliance with the 40 CFR 191 Disposal Regulations: Final Recertification Decision
37 (May). Washington, DC: Office of Radiation and Indoor Air.

1 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2010a. “2009 Compliance Recertification
2 Application (2009 CRA) Compliance Application Review Document (CARD) No. 45,
3 Consideration of the Presence of Resources.” EPA Docket FDMS Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-
4 OAR-2009-0330. Washington, DC: Office of Radiation and Indoor Air.
5 <http://www.epa.gov/radiation/wipp/2010recertification.html>.*

6 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2010b. “40 CFR Part 194 Criteria for the
7 Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant’s Compliance with the
8 Disposal Regulations: Rectification Decision; Final Notice.” *Federal Register*, vol. 75
9 (November 18, 2010): 70584 - 595. [https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2010/11/18/2010-
10 28806/criteria-for-the-certification-and-recertification-of-the-waste-isolation-pilot-plants-
11 compliance](https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2010/11/18/2010-28806/criteria-for-the-certification-and-recertification-of-the-waste-isolation-pilot-plants-compliance)http://www.epa.gov/radiation/docs/wipp/recertification2/finaldecision_fr.pdf.*