

APPENDIX E
DESCRIPTION OF THE DESIGN ANALYSIS MODEL

M

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

M

1 parameter x is reported as 0.5 (SNL/NM, 1993), resulting in an average reaction
2 which generates seven moles of hydrogen for every ten moles of water consumed.

3
4 At each time step, brine in a disposal room (if available) is assumed to react with
5 iron (or steel) to generate hydrogen at a rate of 0 to 0.6 moles of hydrogen per
6 drum per year, depending on the percent saturation within the disposal panel
7 (Brush, 1995). Any brine remaining at the end of a given time step is available for
8 corrosion during the following time step. This corrosion process continues as long
9 as brine (water) and corrodible metal are present in the panel. The corrosion
10 process is self-limiting since the hydrogen that is generated contributes to the
11 pressurization of the room, which in turn inhibits brine inflow.

- 12
13 • Microbial and Radiolytic Gas Generation—Microbial activity by a potentially broad
14 range of microbes, which may be aerobic, anaerobic, halophilic, or halotolerant, is
15 assumed to consume cellulosic materials and perhaps other organic materials in the
16 waste as well. Since microbial activity and radiolysis utilize the same organic
17 substrates, gas generation rates are assumed to represent both microbial and
18 radiolytic gas generation. The total potential for microbial gas generation, along with
19 the rate of generation, have been modeled based on the data provided in Brush
20 (1995). The is based on the following assumptions:

- 21
22 - Brine inflow is also necessary to sustain significant gas generation from
23 microbial degradation of organic waste. Water is required to foster microbe
24 growth, but it is not known whether microbe activity consumes or creates
25 water. Therefore, it is assumed that microbial degradation results in gas
26 generation without any effect on brine accumulation (Brush, 1995).
27
28 - The gases generated during biodegradation are assumed to be methane,
29 carbon dioxide, and nitrogen in the ratio of 15:20:12 (Lappin et al., 1989).
30
31 - Microbial gas generation rates are assumed to vary from 0.1 to 1.0 moles
32 of gas per drum per year, depending on the percent saturation within the
33 disposal panels (Brush, 1995).
34
35 - Based on the median stoichiometry for microbial gas generation presented
36 in Sandia National Laboratories/New Mexico (SNL/NM) (1993), it is
37 assumed that 0.835 moles of gas are generated for every one mole of
38 cellulose that are consumed.

- 39
40 • Dissolution of Gases in Brine—The moles of hydrogen, oxygen, and carbon dioxide
41 dissolved in the brine present in a panel are evaluated at each time step. The
42 moles of gas dissolved are calculated from phase equilibria relations using Henry's
43 Law constants in brine (Reid et al., 1987). The Henry's Law constants and gas
44 solubilities are evaluated from experimental correlations. The dissolution of nitrogen
45 and methane is not considered since the brine already contains significant amounts
46 of these gases (DOE, 1983).

- 47
48 • Brine Inflow—The following assumptions are made regarding brine flow into the
49 disposal facility:



- An initial brine inflow rate of 0.597 cubic meters (m³) per panel per year (Deal et al., 1994) is assumed. This is based on a constant room pressure of 1 atmosphere.
- The rate of brine inflow is assumed to linearly decrease as fluid (brine and gas) pressure in the room increases, and approaches zero when the pressure in the room reaches lithostatic pressure (14.8 MPa). Lithostatic rather than hydrostatic pressure is used since measurements of far-field pore pressures exceed hydrostatic (Lappin et al, 1989). This approach couples brine inflow to creep closure and gas generation, because all of these processes affect fluid pressure in the room, which in turn affects brine inflow.

- CO₂/Brine/Cement Interactions—Carbon dioxide (CO₂) generated by microbial or radiolytic processes will partition into any brine present in the room. This dissolved CO₂ will then react with portlandite to produce calcite plus water according to the reaction shown below. Portlandite is a major phase in Portland cement and is present in cementitious waste materials as well as sludges.

- Carbon dioxide will react with portlandite (if present) to yield calcite and water according to the reaction:



- The reaction rate is assumed to be proportional to the volume of free brine in the room, and the reaction stops when either all of the portlandite or the brine/water in the room is consumed.

- At each time step, water that is generated by the above reaction is added to the total number of moles of water in the room, and portlandite that is destroyed by the above reaction is subtracted from the number of moles of portlandite in the room.

- Diffusion of Gases into the Host Formation—Since undisturbed Salado brines at lithostatic pressure have significant amounts of dissolved N₂ and CH₄ (DOE, 1983), it is assumed that diffusion of these gases is negligible due to the lack of concentration gradients necessary to drive diffusive transport. Diffusion H₂ and CO₂ into the host rock are considered.

- Advection of Gases into the Host Formation, Across Seals, and into the Overlying and Underlying Anhydrite Beds—The host formation, panel and shaft seals, and the intact anhydrite beds are modeled as parallel routes for the advection of gases out of the panel. The following assumptions and information are being used for modeling purposes:

- The permeability of the intact halite ranges from 1 x 10⁻²³ m² to 1 x 10⁻¹⁸ m² with an expected permeability of 3.4 x 10⁻²¹ m² (Rechard et al., 1990).



- 1 - The permeability of the intact anhydrite beds is estimated to be 2 to 3 orders of
2 magnitude greater than the halite (10^{-18} m^2), and as such is assumed to be the
3 most probable pathway for gas advection (Lappin et al., 1989).
4

5 Other assumptions include:
6

- 7 - The halite between each room and the anhydrites is fractured such that there
8 is hydrological communication between the rooms and the disturbed anhydrite
9 units.
10
11 - The anhydrite beds above and below the repository are extensively fractured
12 due to excavation of the drifts and panels, and therefore all rooms and drifts
13 within each panel are in equilibrium with respect to gas pressure.
14
15 - The disturbed anhydrites above and below the repository are assumed to be
16 saturated with brine at the time of WIPP decommissioning.
17
18 - The intact anhydrites, and the halite layers above and below the repository
19 (outside the disturbed rock zone), are assumed to be saturated with brine at
20 pore pressures of 10.36 MPa (70% of lithostatic) and 14.8 MPa (lithostatic),
21 respectively. The pressures in the intact Salado are chosen to provide the
22 largest driving force for brine migration as a modeling assumption. Since there
23 are measured values of the pore pressure approaching lithostatic, it has been
24 chosen as the value for the far-field pressure of the brine.
25
26 - When the panel fluid pressure exceeds the assumed intact anhydrite pore
27 pressure, the brine in the disturbed anhydrite is assumed to be driven into the
28 undisturbed anhydrite.
29
30 - The flow of brine from the disturbed anhydrites to the intact anhydrites and
31 Salado layers, is assumed to be governed by Darcy's equation of flow through
32 porous media.
33
34 - The volume from which the brine is expelled is assumed to provide an additional
35 void volume for panel gases to occupy.
36

37 A program simulating two-phase flow is used to derive a parametric equation for the
38 advection rate into the intact anhydrites when the panel fluid pressure exceeds
39 11.3 MPa [brine pore pressure of 10.36 MPa plus a threshold pressure of 0.94 MPa
40 (Davies, 1989)]. Concurrently with gas advection into the anhydrites, the advection
41 of panel gases into the four shaft seals (conductance varying with time) is also
42 simulated. A viscosity correlation which is valid at both low and high pressures is
43 used to estimate the viscosity of the gas mixture for use in the advection
44 calculations.
45

- 46 • Gas Compressibility—The Lee-Kessler Equation of State (Reid et al., 1987) is used
47 to estimate the compressibility of the gas mixture in a panel at each time step based
48 in the mole fractions of each gas present. The fluid pressure is updated at each
49 time step based on the resulting value of compressibility. The fluid pressure is then



1 used to estimate molar advection rates of gases, volume of brine inflow, creep
2 closure rates, and gas solubilities in brine during the next time step.
3

- 4 • Waste/Backfill Composite Compaction and Resulting Mechanical Resistance to
5 Closure—Stress/density relationships have been obtained for each waste form and
6 backfill material from literature and experimental data. For each engineered
7 alternative, an average density (based upon the mass fraction and density of each
8 component) is calculated at various stress levels of compaction. The density of the
9 waste/backfill composite is evaluated at each time step. The effective stress
10 corresponding to this density is evaluated using the stress/density relationships of
11 the composite. This effective stress is then used as input to the Chabannes
12 equation (see discussion on creep closure above) as the mechanical component of
13 resistance to creep closure.
14

- 15 • Development of a Zone of Enhanced Porosity Surrounding the Panel—The creep
16 of the host rock creates an additional void volume within a zone of enhanced
17 porosity which the panel gases will occupy. The rate and extent of creep closure
18 will govern the magnitude of this void volume. This void volume is calculated at
19 each time step as the product of the porosity of the Intact Salado (0.001) (Marietta
20 et al., 1989, Table 3-9) and the difference between the initial panel volume and the
21 panel volume at the current time step.
22

23 - It is assumed that the zone of enhanced porosity does not contain brine.
24

25 - It is assumed that all the pores in this zone are interconnected.
26

- 27 • Future Human Intrusion Into the Repository—Three human intrusion events
28 (reference figure if there is one included in the report) were evaluated to determine
29 the relative effectiveness of each engineered alternative in reducing radionuclide
30 releases. The three scenarios, the modeling procedure for each scenario, and the
31 assumptions behind them are described as follows:
32

- 33 - The E1 scenario (Marietta et al., 1989) (see Figure 4-2) (SNL/NM, 1993)
34 assumes a borehole penetration through a waste-filled panel and continuing into
35 or through a pressurized brine pocket existing in the underlying Castile
36 Formation. This event was modeled using a parametric equation relating flow
37 rate through the waste/backfill composite to the hydraulic conductivity of the
38 composite. This equation was developed by statistically regressing data
39 resulting from a series of computer runs using the flow and transport code
40 SWIFT III (Reeves et al., 1986).
41

42 (M)

43 The modeling associated with the E1 scenario is performed on a room basis,
44 since only the area surrounding the actual borehole allows the brine to come in
45 contact with the waste. In order to verify this, the SWIFT III was used to
46 determine the velocities of the fluid flow through the waste/backfill composite.
47 A bounding brine velocity was chosen such that in 5,000 years a fluid particle
48 would not be able to move a distance equal to the height of the room. This
49 velocity defined a radius of influence used to calculate an effective wash-through
50 volume. This volume was simulated as an ellipsoid, with the major axis along

1 the borehole and the other axes into the room. If the conductivity of the
2 waste/backfill composite was such that the effective radius was greater than the
3 width of the room, the width of the room was chosen for one of the axes since
4 the halite was considered to be impermeable. The other axis was allowed to
5 continue to the edge of the room, but in no case did the effective radius exceed
6 half of the length of one room. The assumption of an infinite reservoir of brine
7 in the Castile allows a constant pressure of 16 MPa to be prescribed for the
8 brine pocket.
9

- 10 - The E2 scenario (Marietta et al., 1989) (see Figure 4-3) (SNL/NM, 1993) is one
11 in the report for intrusion scenarios) assumes a borehole just penetrating into the
12 repository, not passing through. This scenario is modeled using an analytical
13 solution to the radial flow equation through a porous media, simulating the
14 borehole and the panel as concentric circles. The halite is considered to be an
15 impermeable boundary that is located at a sufficient distance to allow the volume
16 of the cylinder to be the volume of a panel. Simplifying assumptions regarding
17 the flow of gas and brine are made. In actuality, the gas phase would be
18 located towards the top of the panel and the brine phase would be located
19 towards the bottom of the panel. In fact, the amount of brine predicted by the
20 model to be present in the panel at 5,000 years would not be enough to fill the
21 borehole to reach the Culebra. The gas being less viscous and towards the top
22 of the panel, would tend to escape preferentially to the brine, thereby reducing
23 the room pressure.
24

25 For the purposes of comparing EAs, a hypothetical "fluid" with the properties of
26 brine is used. This fluid is comprised of the appropriate volumetric proportions
27 of gas and brine, which are predicted by the model for each alternative. This
28 fluid is assumed to saturate the room and be transported to the Culebra through
29 the borehole. The amount of radionuclides within the brine portion of the fluid
30 that is released are then compared for each alternative.
31

- 32 - The E1E2 scenario (Marietta et al., 1989) (see Figure 4-3) (SNL/NM, 1993)
33 assumes a combination of the first two scenarios; two boreholes penetrate the
34 repository in the same panel. One borehole provides a pathway for brine flow
35 from the Castile brine pocket directly into the panel. This borehole is capped
36 above the repository such that no brine can move vertically to the Culebra. The
37 other borehole (occurring later in time) provides a pathway from the repository
38 to the Culebra Dolomite. This pathway consists of a flow path through the panel
39 from the E1 borehole to the E2 borehole. No credit is taken for any processes
40 which may occur or change during the interim between the first and second
41 boreholes. This scheme results in a pressurized flow path directly through a
42 segment of the waste/backfill composite.
43

44 (M)

45 The flow rate through the waste is obtained from an analytical solution to the
46 one-dimensional flow equation through porous media, assuming the two
47 boreholes are separated by the length of one room (300 feet [ft]; 91.44 m). Any
48 effects of the pressure in the room being greater than the pressure of the Castile
49 brine pocket, are neglected due to the assumption of an infinite brine pocket.
It should be noted that the E2 scenario is a part of the E1E2 scenario. This

1 happens when the second borehole breaches the repository, potentially
2 releasing any gases and brine initially located there. This is neglected because
3 the amount of brine originally located in the panel would be extremely small in
4 comparison to the volume produced from the Castile brine pocket.
5

6 The following assumptions have been applied to all human intrusion scenarios:
7

- 8 • The intrusion occurs 5,000 years after decommissioning.
- 9
- 10 • The diameter of the borehole is 0.355 m based upon a survey of current
11 standard drilling practices in the Delaware Basin (SNL/NM, 1993).
12
- 13 • The hydraulic conductivity of the waste/backfill composite is the weighted
14 geometric mean of the properties of the three types of waste and backfill.
15
- 16 • The borehole conductivity is 1×10^{-3} m/second (clean sand/gravel) obtained from
17 Freeze and Cherry (1979, Table 2-2).
18
- 19 • Waste element solubilities are assigned from Attachment 1 of Appendix G (the
20 table is in the Appendix on Radionuclide Solubilities) based on the pH of any
21 brine present in the disposal facility.
22

23 The activity of each radionuclide at the time of intrusion is computed using the
24 solutions to differential equations that represent mass balances for each radionuclide.
25 Based upon the radionuclide solubilities in brine and the volume of brine released, the
26 cumulative activity of each radionuclide released to the Culebra was determined. The
27 objective of these human intrusion simulations is to calculate a number which is similar
28 in functional form to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Summed
29 Normalized Release (EPA, 1993 [40 CFR 191]); the difference being that the DAM
30 calculates the cumulative release of radionuclides into the Culebra. Alternately, the
31 EPA Summed Normalized Release specifies calculation of the cumulative activity of
32 each radionuclide across the regulatory boundary, and in addition, employs scenario
33 probability weighting to each release (EPA, 1993).
34

35 The DAM does not consider probabilities of occurrence of scenarios; the scenario is
36 assumed to occur and the effectiveness measure is evaluated. The value generated
37 by the DAM is the singular raw score for the effectiveness of each alternative design.
38 Calculation of the measure of relative effectiveness is performed by dividing the
39 effectiveness measure for the alternative by the effectiveness measure for the baseline
40 case (see Section 3.1.2). The baseline case uses "as received" waste with no backfill.
41 "As received" waste is defined as follows:
42

- 43 • Sludges with some cement added as solidifying agents [i.e., current processes
44 at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS) for Content
45 Code 111], but not a concreted monolith (DOE, 1994b).
46
- 47 • Solid organics and inorganics are in unshredded form, wrapped in multiple
48 layers of plastic, inside a 90-mil rigid liner in a steel drum [i.e., current packaging
49 at RFETS and most other sites (DOE, 1994b)].



1 The improvement resulting from a waste form modification or a repository design
2 alteration is determined by comparison with the baseline case. For the baseline case,
3 the assumptions are as follows:
4

- 5 • Each room is assumed to be filled to capacity (considered to be 6,421 drums)
6 with "as received" waste no backfill.
- 7
- 8 • The initial room dimensions used in the calculations are 13 feet (3.96 m) high
9 by 300 feet (91.44 m) long by 33 feet (10.06 m) wide (Lappin et al., 1989).
- 10
- 11 • A two-foot high clearance is assumed to be left above the waste/backfill
12 composite in all rooms and drifts in the panel.
- 13
- 14 • The panel capacity (including the seven disposal rooms and the surrounding
15 access drifts) is assumed to be approximately 12.5 times the capacity of one
16 individual room.
- 17
- 18 • The panel and shaft seals are assumed to be in place.
19

