



WBS: 1.2.22.4.1

QA: QA

TDR-WIS-PA-000006 REV 00

September 2002

**Total System Performance Assessment-
License Application
Methods and Approach**

**INFORMATION COPY
LAS VEGAS DOCUMENT CONTROL**

Prepared for:
U.S. Department of Energy
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office
P.O. Box 364629
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89036-8629

Prepared by:
Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC
1180 Town Center Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144

Under Contract Number
DE-AC28-01RW12101

SECURITY REVIEW

This product contains no potentially sensitive information. It contains no information that could define a target. It contains no information that could define a specific location. It contains no information that identifies vulnerabilities.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

**Civilian Radioactive Waste Management System
Management & Operating Contractor**

Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Methods and Approach

TDR-WIS-PA-000006 REV 00

September 2002

AUTHORS

**J. McNeish (Lead)
G. Freeze
N. Graves
J. Helton
D. Kalinich
B. Knowlton
R. MacKinnon
J. McCord
S. Mishra
J. Pelletier
B.S. Ramarao
R. Rechard
D. Sevougian**

CHECKERS

**R. Zimmerman (Lead)
H. Anderson
K. Gilkerson
T. Jones
L. Lechel
D. Mohr
C. Smith**

REVIEWERS

**H. Adkins
R. Andrews
N. Biggar
J. Birkholzer
J. Burford**

REVIEWERS (cont.)

**A. Eddebarh
D. Franklin
R. Kimble
J. King
S. Kuzio
J. Linhart
H. Loo
P. Pasupathi
M. Peters
K. Prince
A. Smith
T. Summers
D. Thomas
M. Voegele
J. Younker**

TECHNICAL SUPPORT


**L. Mays (Lead)
P. Brown
M. Gershin
P. Meacham
C. Passos
J. Withrow**

GRAPHICS

**J. Lloyd (Lead)
R. McKinley
D. Miller
R. Sandgren
D. Young**

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Prepared by:



Jerry McNeish
Manager
Total System Performance Assessment Department

9.13.02
Date


Checked by:



Robert Zimmerman
Process Manager
Performance Assessment Strategy and Scope Sub-Project

9/13/02
Date

Approved by:



Peter Swift
Manager
Performance Assessment Strategy and Scope Sub-Project

9/13/02
Date

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHANGE HISTORY

<u>Revision Number</u>	<u>Interim Change No.</u>	<u>Effective Date</u>	<u>Description of Change</u>
0	0	09/17/02	Initial issue.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. PURPOSE	1
1.1 OVERVIEW OF TSPA-LA	1
1.2 GOALS OF THE TSPA-LA METHODS AND APPROACH DOCUMENT	3
1.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	4
1.4 RISK MANAGEMENT	5
1.5 ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT	6
1.6 OTHER IMPORTANT CONVENTIONS UTILIZED IN THE DOCUMENT	7
2. QUALITY ASSURANCE	11
2.1 SOFTWARE CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT	11
2.2 MODEL CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT	14
2.3 CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT OF TSPA MODEL INPUTS	15
3. PROCESSES FOR TSPA-LA	21
3.1 UNCERTAINTY	22
3.1.1 Aleatory and Epistemic Uncertainty	22
3.1.2 Team Approach for Treating Uncertainty in Model Form and Parameters	24
3.2 FEATURES, EVENTS, AND PROCESSES	25
3.2.1 Interface Team for FEPs	26
3.2.2 FEP Analysis for TSPA-LA	27
3.3 MODEL FORM UNCERTAINTY: ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL MODELS	30
3.3.1 Interface Team for ACMs	31
3.3.2 Identification and Screening of ACMs	31
3.3.3 ACM Evaluation for Use in TSPA-LA	32
3.3.4 ACM Impact Analysis in TSPA-LA	33
3.3.5 FEPs	33
3.3.6 Documentation	33
3.4 MODEL FORM UNCERTAINTY: ABSTRACTIONS FOR USE IN TSPA-LA	34
3.4.1 Interface Team for Abstraction	35
3.4.2 Identify New and Revised Abstractions	35
3.4.3 Develop Model Abstraction	35
3.4.4 Incorporate Abstraction into TSPA-LA	36
3.4.5 Documentation	36
3.5 PARAMETER UNCERTAINTY: TSPA MODEL PARAMETERS AND DEVELOPMENT OF PARAMETER DISTRIBUTIONS	37
3.5.1 Parameter Development Team	37
3.5.2 Identify TSPA Model Parameters	38
3.5.3 Develop Fixed Parameter Values	39
3.5.4 Develop Distributions for Parameter Uncertainty	39
3.5.5 Documentation of TSPA Parameters	42

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
4. SCENARIO CLASSES FOR LA.....	47
4.1 NOMINAL SCENARIO CLASS.....	49
4.2 IGNEOUS SCENARIO CLASS.....	50
4.3 SEISMIC SCENARIO CLASS.....	51
4.4 HUMAN INTRUSION STYLIZED ANALYSIS	51
5. TSPA-LA MODEL COMPONENTS.....	57
5.1 MODEL COMPONENTS.....	58
5.2 TSPA-LA ARCHITECTURE.....	72
5.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF SCENARIO CLASSES.....	79
5.3.1 Nominal Scenario Class	79
5.3.2 Disruptive Event Scenario Classes.....	80
6. CONTROL OF THE TSPA-LA MODEL	95
6.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE TSPA MODEL.....	95
6.2 MANAGEMENT CONTROL	95
6.3 PHYSICAL CONTROL OF FILES.....	97
6.4 CHANGE CONTROL AND CHECKING.....	98
6.5 MANAGING TSPA-LA MODEL INPUTS (TSPA INPUT DATABASE).....	100
6.6 CONTROL OF TSPA-LA MODEL RESULTS.....	100
7. TSPA-LA MODEL VALIDATION	107
7.1 THE MODELING PROCESS: AN OVERVIEW.....	107
7.1.1 Conceptual, Mathematical, and Numerical Models.....	107
7.1.2 Computer Code and Associated Inputs	108
7.1.3 Model Predictions: Corroboration with Independent Data	108
7.1.4 Different Stages of Model Validation	108
7.2 THE TSPA MODEL: VALIDATION	109
7.2.1 Stage 1: Model Formulation Validation/Calibration.....	109
7.2.2 Stage 2: Computer Code and Input Verification.....	110
7.2.3 Stage 3: Model Prediction Validation	111
7.3 STABILITY AND RELIABILITY OF TSPA MODEL RESULTS	114
7.3.1 Tests for Stability	115
7.3.2 Tests for Reliability.....	116
8. TSPA-LA ANALYSES.....	121
8.1 APPROACH TO UNCERTAINTY ANALYSES.....	121
8.1.1 Nominal Scenario Class	121
8.1.2 Igneous Scenario Class.....	123
8.1.3 Seismic Scenario Class.....	124
8.1.4 Combined Results	124
8.1.5 Groundwater Protection Analyses.....	125

TABLE OF CONTENTS (concluded)

	<u>Page</u>
8.2	APPROACH TO SENSITIVITY ANALYSES 126
8.2.1	Regression-Based Analyses 127
8.2.2	Entropy-Based Analyses 128
8.2.3	Classification-Tree-Based Analysis 129
8.2.4	Implementation Issues 131
8.3	APPROACH TO SUPPORT THE MULTIPLE BARRIER ANALYSES 131
8.3.1	Description of Barriers 132
8.3.2	Description of Barrier Capability 133
8.3.3	Technical Basis for Describing Barrier Capability 134
9.	SUMMARY 151
9.1	SUMMARY OF APPROACH 151
9.2	SUMMARY OF TRANSPARENCY AND TRACEABILITY 151
9.3	SUMMARY OF UNCERTAINTY TREATMENT IN TSPA-LA ANALYSES 153
9.4	SUMMARY OF HOW THE APPROACH SATISFIES YUCCA MOUNTAIN REVIEW PLAN ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA 153
10.	REFERENCES 155
10.1	DOCUMENTS CITED 155
10.2	CODES, STANDARDS, REGULATIONS, AND PROCEDURES 164
	APPENDIX A ACRONYMS A-1
	APPENDIX B NRC/DOE KTI AGREEMENTS ADDRESSED IN THIS DOCUMENT B-1
	APPENDIX C TSPA-LA MODEL DOCUMENT OUTLINE C-1
	APPENDIX D TSPA-LA ANALYSIS DOCUMENT OUTLINE D-1
	APPENDIX E TSPA-LA SIMULATION LIST E-1
E.1	TESTING SIMULATIONS (VALIDATION AND CONFIDENCE BUILDING) E-1
E.2	BASE CASE SIMULATIONS E-2
E.3	SEQUENTIAL ONE-ON BARRIER/PROCESS SIMULATIONS E-2
E.4	BARRIER/PROCESS NEUTRALIZATION E-3
E.5	DSNF AND NAVAL FUEL SENSITIVITY SIMULATIONS E-3
	APPENDIX F EXAMPLE TSPA-LA INPUT PARAMETER TABLE F-1
	APPENDIX G TSPA-LA DOCUMENT HIERARCHY G-1

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
1.1-1	TSPA-LA Documentation Hierarchy..... 10
2.2-1	General Overview of the TSPA-LA Model Development and Analysis Process..... 19
2.3-1	Overview of the TSPA-LA Model Information Flow..... 20
3.2-1	Steps in the FEP Analysis and Scenario Selection Process 44
3.2-2	Schematic Illustration of the FEP Screening Process 45
3.5-1	Example Parameter Entry Form..... 46
4.1-1	Schematic Illustration of the Components of the Nominal Scenario Class 53
4.2-1	Schematic Illustration of the Igneous Scenario Classes Two Modeling Cases: a) Volcanic Eruption, and b) Igneous Intrusion 54
4.3-1	Schematic Illustration of the Seismic Scenario Class 55
4.4-1	Schematic Illustration of the Stylized Human Intrusion Analysis 56
5-1	Schematic Representation of the Development of Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Including the Nominal, Igneous, and Seismic Scenario Classes..... 83
5-2	Schematic Representation of the Model Components of the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Nominal Scenario Class 84
5-3	Schematic Representation of the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Model Components of the Volcanic Eruption Modeling Case..... 85
5-4	Schematic Representation of the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Model Components of the Igneous Intrusion Groundwater Transport Modeling Case..... 86
5-5	Schematic Representation of the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Model Components of the Seismic Scenario Class 87
5.1-1	Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Model Components and Submodels 88
5.2-1a	Detailed Representation of Planned Information Flow in the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application..... 89
5.2-1b	Detailed Representation of Planned Information Flow in the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application..... 90
5.2-2	Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Code Configuration: Information Flow Among Component Computer Codes..... 91
5.3-1	Information Flow within the Volcanic Eruption Model..... 92
5.3-2	Information Flow within the Igneous Intrusion Groundwater Transport Model 93
5.3-3	Information Flow within the Seismic Groundwater Transport Model..... 94
6.1-1	Example of the Relationship among the TSPA-LA Master Case, Base Cases, and Sensitivity Cases 101
6.2-1	Flowchart Illustrating the Management Control Process for the TSPA-LA Model..... 102
6.2-2	Example TSPA Model Change Approval Form 103
6.4-1	Example TSPA Model Checklist 104
6.5-1	Illustration of Information Flow among the TDMS, TSPA File Server, and TSPA Input Database 105
6.6-1	Example TSPA Plot Checklist 106

LIST OF FIGURES (concluded)

	<u>Page</u>
7.1-1	Generalized Performance Assessment Approach 118
7.1-2	Model Validation Stages 119
8.1.1-1	Example of an Expected Dose Time History, along with Running 5 th , 50 th and 95 th Percentile Curves 135
8.1.1-2	Example of Key Radionuclides and their Contributions to Expected Dose 136
8.1.1-3	Example of Side-by-Side Histogram of Dose at Selected Times..... 137
8.1.1-4	Example of Side-by-Side Histogram of Time to Reach Specified Dose 138
8.1.1-5	Example of Cumulative Drip Shield Failures 139
8.1.1-6	Example of Cumulative Waste Package Failures 140
8.1.1-7	Example of Waste Package Opening Area 141
8.1.1-8	Example of Water Flow Rates into Drift, Through the Drip Shield and into Waste Package 142
8.1.1-9	Example of Fractional Cladding Failures..... 143
8.1.1-10	Example of Mean Release Rates for a Key Radionuclide 144
8.1.1-11	Example of EBS Release Rates from Different Waste Types 145
8.1.1-12	Example of UZ Release from Different Infiltration Bins 146
8.2.2-1	Example Bubble Plot Showing Episodic Factor Quintiles (x-axis) vs Dose Quintiles (y-axis)..... 147
8.2.2-2	Example Scatter Plot for Two Variables..... 147
8.2.3-1	Example Classification Tree Showing Decision Rules for Separating High- dose and Low-dose Producing Realizations..... 148
8.2.3-2	Example Partition Plot Showing Clustering of High- and Low-Outcomes in the Parameter Space of the Two Most Important Variables 148
8.3.2-1	Graphical Depiction of Barrier Effectiveness Showing Distribution of Tc-99 in the Disposal System after (a) 10,000 Years and (b) 100,000 Years 149
G-1	Unsaturated Zone Flow Document Hierarchy G-2
G-2	EBS Environment Document Hierarchy G-3
G-3	Waste Package and Drip Shield Degradation Document Hierarchy..... G-4
G-4	Waste Form Degradation and Mobilization Document Hierarchy G-5
G-5	Engineered Barrier System Flow and Transport Document Hierarchy G-6
G-6	Unsaturated Zone Transport Document Hierarchy G-7
G-7	Saturated Zone Flow and Transport Document Hierarchy G-8
G-8	Biosphere Document Hierarchy G-9
G-9	Disruptive Events Igneous Scenario Class Document Hierarchy..... G-10
G-10	Disruptive Events Seismic Scenario Class Document Hierarchy G-11

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
2.1-1 TSPA-FEIS Software Codes	12
2.3-1 TSPA-FEIS Input Files (WAPDEG, FEHM, Seepage, SZ_Convolute).....	15
3.2-1 FEP AMRs Documenting Screening Information in Support of TSPA-SR	26
4-1 Latin Square Diagram for an Analysis with Two Disruptive Scenario Classes.....	49
5.1-1 Summary of Potential Key Model Changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA	59
E.1-1 Discretization Test Simulations	E-1
E.1-2 Examples of Process Testing Simulations	E-1
E.2-1 Base Case Simulations	E-2
E.3-1 Example of a Nominal Case Set of Sequential One-On Barrier/Process Simulations....	E-3
E.4-1 Examples of Barrier/Process Neutralization Simulations	E-3
E.5-1 Examples of DSNF and Naval Fuel Sensitivity Simulations.....	E-4
F-1 Seepage Input Parameters to the TSPA-LA Model (example)	F-2
G-1 Key Documents that Directly Support TSPA-LA.....	G-12

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1. PURPOSE

Total System Performance Assessment—License Application (TSPA-LA) Methods and Approach provides the top-level method and approach for conducting the TSPA-LA model development and analyses. The method and approach is responsive to the criteria set forth in Total System Performance Assessment Integration (TSPA-I) Key Technical Issue (KTI) agreements, the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449]), and 10 CFR Part 63. This introductory section provides an overview of the TSPA-LA, the projected TSPA-LA documentation structure, and the goals of the document. It also provides a brief discussion of the regulatory framework, the approach to risk management of the development and analysis of the model, and the overall organization of the document. The section closes with some important conventions that are utilized in this document.

1.1 OVERVIEW OF TSPA-LA

The general total system performance assessment process has developed over time through its application on numerous projects by various international organizations involved in radioactive waste management and in consultation with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The TSPA must be based on a thorough understanding of the relevant processes that may affect performance, site-specific information, and relevant laboratory data concerning the engineered materials. The TSPA approach allows an analysis of the system that appropriately incorporates and quantifies the uncertainty in such a long-term projection of repository performance. The TSPA-LA aims to provide a defensible analysis of system behavior incorporating models and parameters that are based on scientific observations in order that the ability of the repository system to comply with applicable radiation protection standards can be assessed.

The TSPA process can be visualized as a series of levels going up a pyramid. The base of the pyramid is built using the data and information collected by scientists and engineers involved in site characterization and engineering design. This information is used to develop appropriate models which describe the features, events, and processes that may be present in the proposed repository system. The base is large because it represents the composite of the information gathered by the repository program over a period of more than 20 years. This information provides the basis for the development and testing of conceptual models. A conceptual model is a set of hypotheses (including assumptions, simplifications, and idealizations) used to describe the essential aspects of a system or subsystem for a given purpose. An example is a description of the movement of water molecules as they move in rock pores or fracture openings. There may be several alternative conceptual models that provide a reasonable description of a particular system or subsystem.

The specific aspects for describing a process on a larger scale are then extracted and incorporated into computer models to deal with each of the relevant features, events, and processes. An example is a model for all water flow above the water table, which would incorporate flow interactions between the rock matrix and the rock fractures as well as many other specifics needed to describe how water flows throughout the rock mass. This abstraction or progressive simplification to a more compact and usable form is depicted by the slightly smaller width of the pyramid. The models that eventually analyze the evolution through time of all the various

components of the system are generally the most compact or abstracted models of all. These abstracted models start with the results of the detailed process level modeling and create a representation that captures all the salient features of the process model, and the associated uncertainties.

To capture the full detail of the uncertainty and variability in the behavior of the repository system, the total system performance assessment must be probabilistic, using multiple calculations (as opposed to deterministic or a single calculation using a single value for each parameter in the system). The models are run many times using many combinations of parameters. Each of the combinations of parameters has some definite possibility of representing the actual performance of the proposed repository. These probabilistic analyses are intended to reflect the range of behaviors or values for parameters that could be appropriate, knowing that perfect or complete knowledge of the system will never be available and that the system is inherently variable.

The aspects of the total system performance analyses to be contained in the TSPA-LA model and documentation are defined in several sources including the features, events, and processes (FEPs) analyses, KTI agreements, the current draft of the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449]), and 10 CFR Part 63. In addition, the TSPA-LA model and documentation will build on and address issues raised in the previous iterations of TSPAs for Yucca Mountain and by additional reviews, both internal and external (e.g., U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, and Performance Assessment International Review Team (*An International Peer Review of the Yucca Mountain Project TSPA-SR, Total System Performance Assessment for the Site Recommendation* (OECD and IAEA 2002 [158098])).

The TSPA-LA documentation structure consists of the TSPA-LA Model Document and the TSPA-LA Analysis Document (see Figure 1.1-1). These documents support the portions of the License Application documentation that describe the postclosure performance of the system. There are a large number of supporting documents as well, shown on the figure as Analysis and Model Reports (AMR). The figure also depicts four major blocks of time: (1) producing the inputs and supporting AMRs (through May 2003), (2) developing the TSPA-LA Model Document including theory, testing, and validation, (3) developing the TSPA-LA Analysis Document including the compliance analyses, and (4) supporting the License Application document (primarily Chapter 2).

The following describes the general content of these TSPA-LA documents.

- **TSPA-LA Model Document**-This documentation will follow project procedure AP-SIII.10Q, *Models*, and provide information about the TSPA-LA model. The documentation will include both a summary paper copy of top-level information about the model, as well as annotations in the model file itself. The latter will allow the reviewer to view various components of the model, and then link to the appropriate supporting information for ease of traceability. This approach will also reduce the potential for transcription errors from the TSPA-LA model file in the TSPA software to the summary paper copy. The paper documentation will discuss the conceptual model, software architecture, inputs, assumptions, and model testing. A key part of the documentation will be the discussion on the validation or confidence in the model.

- **TSPA-LA Analysis Document**-This document will follow AP-SIII.9Q, *Scientific Analyses*, and will provide the analyses of the postclosure performance of the repository system to assess compliance with appropriate regulations. As such, the detailed analyses of the simulations (both individual and multiple realization results) will be presented. The document will discuss the results from the scenario classes, and provide uncertainty importance analyses of the results. Multiple barrier discussion will also be provided in this document.

In addition to the two TSPA-LA specific documents just described, the hierarchy of AMRs provide the underlying basis for the TSPA-LA model. Further, the FEPs database and associated documentation are an integral part in the overall documentation. These will be described in numerous FEP documents (one for each major component of the model), and in a database summary document. *The Enhanced Plan for Features, Events, and Processes (FEPs) at Yucca Mountain*, (hereafter referred to as *Enhanced FEPs Plan*) developed in 2002 (BSC 2002 [158966]) describes the overall approach to this documentation. The major aspects of the plan are summarized later in this document (Section 3.2).

Information from the TSPA-LA documentation suite will be utilized to provide the appropriate information for the LA documentation. The LA documentation is expected to synthesize and provide the TSPA analyses at a general level, less detailed than that provided in the TSPA-LA documentation.

1.2 GOALS OF THE TSPA-LA METHODS AND APPROACH DOCUMENT

Specific goals of the TSPA-LA Methods and Approach document are:

- To describe the upper-level approach and processes for development and testing of the TSPA-LA model, and its documentation, in a controlled environment. The basis for the type of analyses to be developed will be determined from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulation (10 CFR Part 63), the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449]), and KTI agreements.
- To describe the systematic approach to collecting and utilizing information (e.g., data, abstractions) from the supporting organizations. In particular, the consistent treatment and documentation of FEPs, model abstractions, alternative conceptual models (ACMs), and parameters and their uncertainty are described.
- To provide a brief approach to ensure the TSPA-LA model and documentation are traceable and transparent to potential users of the information. The approach builds on the data tracking, model checking, and graphical representation of information that have been used in previous TSPAs.
- To provide the approach for the analysis of barriers with the TSPA-LA model.
- To provide limited documentation of the changes in the approach from the TSPA-SR to the TSPA-LA, such as model components, scenario classes, and sensitivity analysis techniques.

- To provide summary-level guidance to the science and design elements within the project regarding inputs that will be required for the TSPA-LA.
- To incorporate comments from external reviewers in the modeling approach.

Three important caveats apply to these goals:

1. The *TSPA-LA Methods and Approach* document should not be viewed as a final design document for the TSPA-LA. Rather, it provides documentation of the current approach, and an early opportunity for comment. The final design of the TSPA-LA may differ from what is described in this document.
2. The information contained in this document regarding the configuration of the model and the plans for further development must be understood to be preliminary and interim. The technical integration work necessary to finalize the inputs and the character of the abstractions to be utilized in the TSPA-LA is ongoing.
3. The controlling Administrative Procedures supercede any guidance provided in this document. If conflicts between this document and applicable procedures are identified, this will be immediately raised to the appropriate responsible manager.

1.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

A licensing requirement for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste at the proposed Yucca Mountain geologic repository is the evaluation of postclosure performance. The NRC, in their regulation 10 CFR Part 63, requires that a performance assessment analysis be performed for this evaluation. A performance assessment is defined as (10 CFR 63.2) "an analysis that:

- (1) Identifies the features, events, processes (except human intrusion), and sequences of events and processes (except human intrusion) that might affect the Yucca Mountain disposal system and their probabilities of occurring during 10,000 years after disposal;
- (2) Examines the effects of those features, events, processes, and sequences of events and processes upon the performance of the Yucca Mountain disposal system; and
- (3) Estimates the dose incurred by the reasonably maximally exposed individual [RMEI], including the associated uncertainties, as a result of releases caused by all significant features, events, processes, and sequences of events and processes, weighted by their probability of occurrence."

The NRC regulation (10 CFR Part 63) forms the basis for the regulatory framework guiding the development of the TSPA-LA model, and subsequent TSPA analyses for the LA. The regulatory time period of analysis for the compliance evaluation is 10,000 years. However, the TSPA analyses are intended to extend beyond 10,000 years to 20,000 years. This is intended to provide a basis for evaluating whether uncertainties in results after 10,000 years affect conclusions regarding compliance during the regulatory performance period. Likewise, the FEPs for these analyses will not go beyond 10,000 years. The TSPA for the Final Environmental Impact

Statement (FEIS) (hereafter referred to as TSPA-FEIS model) evaluated doses over longer time periods (up to 1 million years).

1.4 RISK MANAGEMENT

The development and documentation of the TSPA-LA requires coordination and integration with a large number of project resources. This complexity adds risk to the process of developing and documenting the model; risk in terms of technical risk as well as schedule risk. Inputs need to be delivered in appropriate form and on time to support the TSPA-LA model development. Testing and validation of the developing model needs to be accomplished in the appropriate time frame to support analyses and documentation in the LA. Late-changing external requirements also need to be managed appropriately to avoid compromising the planned technical and schedule goals.

To support the reduction of input risks (e.g., late receipt of abstractions, delays in qualification of supporting data, etc.), the schedule for receipt of inputs is being closely managed with weekly critical path meetings. As delays are encountered, the situation is rapidly assessed and an alternative approach to the activity is put in place. This may mean that the type and volume of new or updated information to be incorporated into the TSPA-LA will be changed. This will be assessed on a case by case, risk-informed basis, with the potential modification of the uncertainty in a particular component being an outcome (e.g., a distribution may need to be modified to account for additional uncertainty). Consistency of data feeds (parameters, abstractions, FEPs, uncertainty) is being built into the development process (see Section 3). Integration of these data feeds with the TSPA requirements will be accomplished through ongoing communication with the appropriate organizations.

Software qualification is another potential source of risk to successful completion of a TSPA-LA model. The procedure for software qualification, AP-SI.1Q, *Software Management*, is currently undergoing revision and should provide a streamlined approach to qualification of updates to software. The TSPA-LA model will be based primarily on existing software utilized during the site recommendation process, so there will be a limited number of cases with completely new software, as opposed to updated software.

The potential for discovery of errors in TSPA-LA at a late date exists. The primary approach to reduce the risk from such occurrences is to build in quality from the outset. Enhancements to the processes for development, checking, and testing of the model and its documentation have been developed based on lessons learned in the development of the TSPA-SR (See Section 6 for details). The thoroughness in checking and testing of any model changes are likely to enhance the potential for early discovery of any potential errors in the TSPA-LA.

Additional risks (e.g., computer crashes, late changes in types of analyses required, etc.) will be managed in a preemptive fashion when possible. Recovery plans are in place for loss of data (Dunlap 2002 [159697]). Modularization of the model will help analysts remain flexible to analysis changes that are required at a later date. However, unforeseen complications in the development of the model or analyses will need to be managed as they arise, and may entail scope changes (i.e., reduction to recoup schedule), schedule changes (e.g., increasing schedule

time for particular activities, or making previously sequential activities occur in parallel), or modification of staffing levels.

The TSPA-SR model and documentation underwent significant evaluation and review. There were a number of issues raised with that documentation set (Doering 2001 [156966]; BSC 2001 [156961]; Hosmer and King 2001 [157923]; and BSC 2001 [158980]). The issues included documentation errors (e.g., typos, referencing errors, clarity) and modeling discrepancies. Process steps have been taken to mitigate the issues in this next iteration of the TSPA (See Section 6 for model development processes).

1.5 ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT

This Methods and Approach Document contains information intended to provide the strategy and a top-level description of how the TSPA-LA model and analyses will be developed and documented. The sections of the document are organized as follows.

- **Section 2. Quality Assurance** - This section discusses the general configuration management of data, software, and models to be utilized in developing the TSPA-LA.
- **Section 3. Processes for TSPA-LA** - The approach to consistent development of parameters, abstractions, alternative conceptual models, and uncertainty from supporting organizations is briefly described in this section. The process is described in more detail in the *Guidelines for Developing and Documenting Alternative Conceptual Models, Model Abstractions, and Parameter Uncertainty in the Total System Performance Assessment for the License Application* (BSC 2002 [158794]).
- **Section 4. Scenario Classes for LA** - The scenario classes, and the corresponding modeling cases, for TSPA-LA are described in this section. The scenario classes are (1) nominal scenario class, and (2) disruptive event scenario classes (igneous and seismic). The modeling cases in the igneous scenario class are the volcanic eruption modeling case and the igneous intrusion groundwater transport modeling case. The primary modeling case for the seismic scenario class considers extreme vibratory ground motion. Fault displacement may be included in the extreme vibratory ground motion modeling case if it is screened in for TSPA-LA, or it may be treated as a separate modeling case.
- **Section 5. TSPA-LA Model Components** - The current approach and architecture for the TSPA-LA model components are described in this section. The use of scenario classes in TSPA-LA is also described.
- **Section 6. Control of the TSPA-LA Model** - The TSPA-LA model development, testing, and analysis will be controlled using a desktop process currently undergoing review. The process will implement controls to reduce the potential for significant errors in the development of the model. This section describes this process.
- **Section 7. TSPA-LA Model Validation** - The approach to validation of the TSPA-LA model is presented in this section. Successful validation, or confidence in the TSPA-LA model, will require a substantial effort, both from the abstraction modelers and the TSPA modelers. The section details the approach to enhance confidence in the model and the approach to evaluation of the stability and reliability of the TSPA results.

- **Section 8. TSPA-LA Analyses** - The types of analyses to be conducted for the TSPA-LA are described in this section. Example figures are also provided. Detailed lists of simulations are provided in Appendix E. The section also specifically describes the multiple barrier analyses to be conducted.
- **Section 9. Summary** - This section provides a brief summary highlighting aspects important to the success of the document, and to subsequent TSPA-LA model development and documentation, and to the subsequent TSPA-LA analysis and documentation.
- **Section 10. References** - This section consists of references for cited documents, codes, standards, regulations, and procedures.

The following appendices are included:

- **Appendix A. Acronyms** - This appendix includes a list of key acronyms used in this document.
- **Appendix B. NRC/DOE KTI Agreements Addressed in this Document** - This appendix presents the KTI agreements that are addressed in this document, including TSPA 1.01, TSPA 1.02, TSPA 4.01, TSPA 4.03, and TSPA 4.05 (Meserve 2001 [156977]) and indicates where in the document the KTI is addressed.
- **Appendix C. TSPA-LA Model Document Outline** - The TSPA-LA model will be described in a TSPA-LA Model Document, including inputs, outputs, and validation of the model. The table of contents for the model document is presented in this appendix. The content may change as the development of the TSPA-LA proceeds.
- **Appendix D. TSPA-LA Analysis Document Outline** - The table of contents for the TSPA-LA Analysis Document is included in this appendix. The content may change as the development of the TSPA-LA proceeds.
- **Appendix E. TSPA-LA Simulation List** - This appendix outlines the types of simulations to be conducted for the TSPA-LA, and gives as much detail about those simulations as is known at the time of completion of this document.
- **Appendix F. Example TSPA-LA Input Parameter Table** - This appendix provides a tabular listing of example input for the model.
- **Appendix G. TSPA-LA Document Hierarchy** - The appendix provides tabular and graphical depiction of the primary supporting documents for the TSPA-LA.

1.6 OTHER IMPORTANT CONVENTIONS UTILIZED IN THE DOCUMENT

An important consideration for this document is that it presents the methods and approach for, rather than results of, the TSPA-LA. It provides planning guidance to assist TSPA-LA personnel and supporting organizations in developing, analyzing, and documenting the TSPA-LA model. As noted in several places in the document, the plans for TSPA-LA may change and require modification to the approach presented herein. Also, the guidance is currently being evaluated in terms of what part of the guidance may be proceduralized, if any. The detailed approach

indicated herein is intended to implement the primary Administrative Procedures used to develop and analyze the TSPA. The forms and checklists provided to assist in this process (some examples are provided later in this document) are provided merely as example forms for the type of information that needs to be recorded as the model development and analyses progress.

This report contains several conventions to facilitate transparency of the documentation. The Document Input Reference System (DIRS) numbers are associated with references cited in the text of this document. An example for the Technical Work Plan is BSC 2002 [159071]. Exceptions for the use of DIRS numbers in the text are for regulations (e.g., 10 CFR 63.2), administrative procedures (AP) (e.g., AP-SIII.10Q), and software (e.g., STN: 1000-4.06-00). Unless otherwise specified, references to software are not referring to a specific version, but direct the reader to an appropriate user's manual or the current software configuration management listing. Only the first occurrence of software references include the DIRS. The DIRS numbers are included in Section 10 for all references. In addition, the reference list is sorted by the DIRS numbers. Appendix G contains information about documents currently planned to be developed for LA, in support of the TSPA-LA. The documents listed in Appendix G are not yet developed, and thus do not have DIRS numbers and are not included on the reference list, unless an SR version of the document exists and is referenced elsewhere in this document.

The previous TSPA iteration for the Site Recommendation included a suite of models and analyses beginning with the TSPA-SR, with additional development for the Supplemental Science and Performance Analyses (SSPA) and subsequent changes to evaluate the final Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standard. The incorporation of the final EPA standard, 40 CFR Part 197, and the analysis of the effect of changes introduced as the rule was finalized are presented in the *Total System Performance Assessment- Analyses for Disposal of Commercial and DOE Waste Inventories at Yucca Mountain – Input to Final Environmental Impact Statement and Site Suitability Evaluation* (Williams 2001 [157307]).

The Total System Performance Assessment (TSPA) analyses conducted and documented prior to promulgation of the NRC final rule 10 CFR Part 63, were based on the NRC proposed rule (64 FR 8640 [101680]). Slight differences exist between the NRC's proposed and final rules which were not within the scope of the TSPA-FEIS Report (Williams 2001 [157307]), or the Preliminary Site Suitability Evaluation (PSSE) (DOE 2001 [155734]), and the documents supporting these reports. These differences include (1) the possible treatment of "unlikely" features, events and processes (FEPs) in evaluation of both the groundwater protection standard and the human-intrusion scenario of the individual protection standard, and (2) the definition of the water demand of the RMEI. Additional sensitivity analyses to support the Site Recommendation were developed to evaluate the impact of these regulatory differences on the post-closure performance assessment results previously conducted. The results of those sensitivity analyses are documented in the *Total System Performance Assessment Sensitivity Analyses for Final Nuclear Regulatory Commission Regulations* (Williams 2001 [156743]). Those sensitivity analyses indicated that although the numerical results of the previous TSPAs changed slightly, once the requirements of the NRC final 10 CFR Part 63 were incorporated into updates to the technical bases for the TSPA, the overall conclusions of the analyses were the same.

The suite of models and analyses that formed the bases for the SR iteration of the TSPA are now being fully updated to comply with the final 10 CFR Part 63, conform to the guidance in the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449]), and address NRC Key Technical Issue Agreement Items. The potential updates to the bases for the TSPA-LA are outlined in Section 5 of this report. The TSPA-LA will then be completed based on those updates.

The updates do not represent wholesale revision to the TSPA-SR; rather, they generally correspond to work intended to enhance confidence in the results of the TSPA-SR. The work comprises efforts to enhance confidence in the results of TSPA-SR, either through incorporation of additional data, or refinement of models, including, for example, more detailed models where bounding approaches might have been used previously. The work reflects Key Technical Issue agreements with the NRC staff, which are also designed to enhance confidence in the TSPA calculations and their bases. The updates also will be responsive to the continued evolution of the program's technical bases, and incorporate, as appropriate, further enhancements defined as the program moves toward completion of the license application documentation.

The starting point for the TSPA-LA model configuration and change control is the TSPA-FEIS model, the final model in the suite developed for the Site Recommendation; however, the model contains few changes beyond what is in the TSPA-SR and the uncertainty analysis based model for the SSPA. So, the convention to be used in this document is to call the full suite of modeling and analysis the TSPA-SR, but the model file itself that is being updated for the TSPA-LA is the TSPA-FEIS model file.




Figure 1.1-1. TSPA-LA Documentation Hierarchy

2. QUALITY ASSURANCE

Following appropriate, controlled processes and procedures is paramount to developing a traceable and defensible TSPA-LA model and analysis. Accordingly, the Quality Assurance (QA) Program applies to the development of the TSPA-LA Methods and Approach Document. The TSPA responsible manager has evaluated the technical document in accordance with AP-2.21Q, *Quality Determinations and Planning for Scientific, Engineering, and Regulatory Compliance Activities*. The AP-2.21Q activity evaluation has determined that the preparation and review of this technical document is subject to the requirements in *Quality Assurance Requirements and Description* (DOE 2002 [159475]). As such, this document was developed, checked, and reviewed in accordance with AP-3.11Q, *Technical Reports*. Note that AP-2.21Q has been superseded by AP-2.27Q, *Planning for Science Activities*, and the technical work plan for this document will be updated accordingly.

The control of electronic management of data was also evaluated in accordance with AP-SV.1Q, *Control of the Electronic Management of Information in Technical Work Plan for: TSPA-LA Methods and Approach Document* (BSC 2002 [159071]). The evaluation determined that the current work practices and procedures are adequate for the control of electronic management of data for this activity.

In addition, an important part of the process for developing the TSPA-LA is appropriate configuration management. Configuration management is the process of identifying and defining the configuration items in a system, controlling the release and change of the items in the system, reporting the status of the items in the system, and verifying the completeness and correctness of the items in the system. The first process in the configuration management system called configuration identification is the unique identification of all the items to be managed in the system. Configuration identification consists of selecting the items to be managed and recording their functional and physical characteristics. The second process is configuration change control. Configuration change control is the mechanism for approving or disapproving all proposed changes to the system that is being managed. Configuration change control ensures that changes to any configuration items are approved and controlled so that consistency among components is maintained. The TSPA responsible manager will manage any proposed changes to the TSPA-LA model. The third process is called configuration status accounting. Information contained in the status accounting system will document the evolution of the TSPA-LA model in a transparent and traceable manner. The last process is review. The review consists of checking the configuration items to verify that they match the requirements. It is anticipated that the TSPA-LA model will undergo several technical and QA reviews prior to qualification per the applicable Administrative Procedures (AP). Configuration management for software, model, and model inputs utilized in TSPA-LA model are discussed in the following subsections.

2.1 SOFTWARE CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT

All software codes used to support the TSPA-LA model will be qualified and placed under the controls of the software configuration management (SCM) program per AP-SI.1Q, *Software Management*. Procedurally, qualified software is software that has successfully completed the verification and validation phases but has not been baselined. Baselined software is software

that has been formally reviewed, can only be changed through a formal change process, and is ready for project use. Each qualified software code in Software Configuration Management (SCM) is uniquely identified with a tracking number. The SCM database also includes information on the software name, version, and operating platform it was qualified for. All software documentation including the media will be linked to this unique software tracking number, which will allow cross-referencing of the baseline elements to the overall software qualification package.

To support the TSPA-LA model, a number of software codes will be implemented. The codes will be used for both providing supporting information, and directly implementing the TSPA-LA model. The former software codes are referred to as process models and are developed and operated external to and prior to running the TSPA model. The latter software codes are generally referred to as abstractions, and are run directly within the TSPA model. This document is focussed on the TSPA-LA model, with less emphasis on those external process models though they are mentioned for completeness.

The TSPA-FEIS model will be used as the basis for the TSPA-LA model. Currently the TSPA-FEIS model contains both qualified and unqualified software, and is the culmination of the work done for the TSPA-SR, Supplemental Science and Performance Analyses, and the FEIS. During initial TSPA-LA model development, changes to the TSPA-FEIS model and the associated software codes are expected to occur, which are discussed in Section 5.1. Some new software may be developed or older versions of codes updated.

The software codes for the TSPA-FEIS model are listed in Table 2.1-1 (see Williams 2001 [157307]). The SCCD and WAPDEG were updated from the versions used in the SSPA (BSC 2001 [154659]), Section 2.3-1). A brief description of the primary function of the software is also provided in this section. The documentation for each code is available in SCM. Unless noted, the codes described below are directly linked to GoldSim during the TSPA analyses.

Table 2.1-1. TSPA-FEIS Software Codes

Code and Version	Software Tracking Number
GoldSim V 7.17.200	STN:10344-7.17.200-00
ASHPLUME V1.4LV.dll	STN:10022-1.4LV-dll-00
CWD V1.0	STN:10363-1.0-00
FEHM V2.10NT	STN:10086-2.10-02
GVP V1.02	STN:10341-1.02-00
MKTable V1.0	STN:10505-1.00-00
Patch Fail Lag V1.0	STN:10532-1.0-00
SCCD V2.01	STN:10343-2.01-00
SEEPAGEDLLMK2 UU V1.0	STN:10534-1.0-00
SOILEXP V1.0	STN:10492-1.0-00
SZ Convolute V2.1	STN:10207-2.1-00
WAPDEG V4.06	STN:10000-4.06-00

Note: The software listed in this table was utilized for the TSPA-FEIS analyses documented in Williams (2001 [157307])

GoldSim - GoldSim is a Windows-based program that is the modeling software for simulating the TSPA-LA model. Probabilistic simulations are represented graphically in GoldSim. Models are created in GoldSim by manipulating graphical objects, where these objects represent the features, events, and processes (FEPs) controlling the system being simulated. GoldSim is flexible in its ability to incorporate a variety of data tables, other software modules, and information in defining the overall system model.

ASHPLUME - This software will be used to model volcanic ash dispersion and deposition to evaluate the consequences of extrusive volcanic events through the proposed repository. The software estimates the distribution of ash and radioactive waste released into the biosphere during hypothetical volcanic events that intersect the repository. ASHPLUME uses a variety of eruption and environmental parameters as input and returns ash and radioactive waste concentrations at select locations on the ground surface as output. This code is called by GoldSim.

CWD - This code calculates cumulative probability distributions for the occurrence and size of manufacturing defects in the closure welds of the waste packages given the non-detection probability and the fraction of defects to be considered. The calculations are based on the abstraction of defect density and size distributions. This code is called by GoldSim.

FEHM - This code is a Finite Element, Heat and Mass transfer code utilized for flow and transport calculations. External to GoldSim, the code will be used to develop saturated-zone breakthrough curves at various distances from the proposed repository. Internal to GoldSim, at each timestep in the TSPA model, FEHM reads a set of pre-generated flow fields and performs the unsaturated zone particle transportation simulation. GoldSim uses the results of the Unsaturated Zone (UZ) particle transport simulation as input for the saturated zone model.

GVP - The Gaussian Variance Partitioning software was developed to incorporate measurement uncertainty and corrosion rate variability into the calculations of waste package degradation. To assess waste package failure distributions over time in the repository, only a fraction of the total variance is considered to be due to variability in the waste package degradation simulations. Gaussian Variance Partitioning is applied to separate the contributions of uncertainty and variability from the composite distribution. The approach to uncertainty and variability in the waste package degradation modeling may be modified for TSPA-LA.

MKTable - This code processes data used in simulating long-term degradation of the waste package in the repository. This code is called by GoldSim.

Patch Fail Lag - The software reads in the waste package failure curve, waste package failed patch curve, and drip shield failed patch curve. It then determines the time at which the first waste package fails. The waste package and drip shield failed patch curves are then shifted backwards in time by the time of first waste package failure. The software passes the shifted curves back into the GoldSim TSPA Model.

SCCD - This code was developed to model stress corrosion crack initiation and then propagation in the closure welds of manufacturing defects and incipient weld cracks. A reference table stress intensity factor as a function of crack depth is modified by SCCD and used as input into WAPDEG. This code is called by WAPDEG during its operation within GoldSim. The resulting waste package failure histories are then returned to GoldSim.

SEEPAGEDLLMK2 UU - This code calculates the seepage into the drifts across the repository. Spatial variability and uncertainty are accounted for in the seepage calculation.

SOILEXP - This code calculates the cumulative soil removal factor used to calculate radionuclide concentration in volcanic ash deposits. The code receives input from GoldSim, calculates the cumulative soil removal for the time interval being simulated and passes the result back to GoldSim for use in dose calculations. This code is used only in eruptive modeling case calculations.

SZ Convolute - This code calculates the mass flux response curves during the time interval immediately after a climate change at the saturated zone (SZ) outflow boundary based on the saturated zone generic response curves and unsaturated zone radionuclide source terms for the analyses.

WAPDEG - This code was developed to simulate waste package degradation using a stochastic approach. The WAPDEG DLL evaluates and applies initiation thresholds of various corrosion and other degradation processes as a function of time-dependent exposure conditions. The penetration rate of active degradation process as a function of time is also evaluated. WAPDEG generates output of time histories of failures and subsequent degradation for waste packages.

2.2 MODEL CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT

The proposed Yucca Mountain repository is comprised of a complex system of engineered and natural barriers. To better understand these barriers, detailed external process models have been developed to evaluate the overall performance of the repository. Software codes are used to implement these models. The specific information on these codes and a detailed model description is contained in the individual process model documentation. The TSPA department uses the key results of this documentation to model the repository system. The system is represented in the TSPA in a comprehensive integrated model implemented using the GoldSim software code. All of the submodels implemented in GoldSim as well as the external process models will be developed and validated in accordance with AP-SIII.10Q, *Models*. Output files from process level submodels that are required as GoldSim input files will be submitted to the Technical Data Management System (TDMS) per AP-SIII.3Q, *Submittal and Incorporation of Data to the Technical Data Management System*, and are uniquely identified with a data tracking number (DTN). The development of the TSPA-LA model will also be controlled in GoldSim. During development, the GoldSim model file and its external files will be stored on a controlled directory. Any proposed changes or modifications to the controlled model file will be reviewed and approved by the TSPA Department Manager prior to the change being implemented. All changes to the model will be checked. For specific details on the model development, model

checking and model change control, see Section 6, Control of the TSPA-LA Model. Figure 2.2-1 provides a high-level view of the model development and analysis process.

2.3 CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT OF TSPA MODEL INPUTS

The TSPA-LA model is a computer model that will integrate the process models and abstractions developed for the proposed repository. All parameters implemented in the model will be controlled, captured and submitted to the TDMS as part of the TSPA-LA model file. Figure 2.3-1 provides an overview of the TSPA-LA model information flow from initial data development, to external process models, to the implementation in GoldSim, and back to the TDMS. The qualification status of all the inputs can be found in the TDMS database. Again, the starting point and basis for the TSPA-LA model is the TSPA-FEIS model. The TSPA-FEIS model is not a validated model, and contains both "Q" and "non-Q" inputs. Each TSPA-FEIS input file and the file description is listed in Table 2.3-1. This table provides the initial input files as a starting point for the TSPA-LA model, but these files are expected to be modified prior to finalizing the TSPA-LA model. The TSPA-LA model will be validated; therefore, prior to finalizing the TSPA-LA model, all the parameters will be controlled and the software used in the model will be qualified.

Table 2.3-1. TSPA-FEIS Input Files (WAPDEG, FEHM, Seepage, SZ_Convolute)

WAPDEG Files	Size (bytes)	Date	Description
WD4DLL.wap	335	04/06/01	List of input files to WAPDEG dll
WDgA22SR00.cdf	12,524	05/12/00	Corrosion rate for Alloy 22
WDgA22x0p5.cdf	12,524	05/12/00	Corrosion rate for Alloy 22*0.5
WDgA22x2p5.cdf	12,524	05/12/00	Corrosion rate for Alloy 22*2.5
WDgTi7SR00.cdf	12,526	05/24/00	Corrosion rate for titanium
WDhist.inp	1,002	05/17/01	List of inputs Make History WAP
WDKlinM.fil	1,436	01/14/00	Stress intensity factor versus depth profiles for middle lid
WDKlinO.fil	1,439	01/14/00	Stress intensity factor versus depth for outer lid
WDRHcnt.fil	411	02/24/00	Critical threshold RH versus exposure temperature
csnf HTOM high bin2.ou	172,601	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 2
csnf HTOM high bin3.ou	822,551	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 3
csnf HTOM high bin4.ou	10,067,228	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 4
csnf HTOM high bin5.ou	5,471,675	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 5
csnf HTOM low bin1.ou	9,287,822	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, low infiltration, bin 1
csnf HTOM low bin2.ou	5,249,759	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, low infiltration, bin 2
csnf HTOM mean bin2.ou	916,541	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 2
csnf HTOM mean bin3.ou	4,584,788	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 3
csnf HTOM mean bin4.ou	10,661,318	05/17/01	CSNF, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 4
csnf LTOM high bin2.ou	167,813	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 2
csnf LTOM high bin3.ou	2,851,669	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 3
csnf LTOM high bin4.ou	10,064,532	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 4
csnf LTOM high bin5.ou	5,176,080	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 5
csnf LTOM low bin1.ou	12,772,351	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, low infiltration, bin 1
csnf LTOM low bin2.ou	5,487,599	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, low infiltration, bin 2
csnf LTOM mean bin2.ou	2,899,595	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 2
csnf LTOM mean bin3.ou	5,176,080	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 3
csnf LTOM mean bin4.ou	10,184,347	07/26/01	CSNF, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 4
hlw HTOM high bin2.ou	179,783	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 2

Table 2.3-1: TSPA-FEIS Input Files (WAPDEG, FEHM, Seepage, SZ_Convolute) (Continued)

WAPDEG Files	Size (bytes)	Date	Description
hlw HTOM high bin3.ou	845,161	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 3
hlw HTOM high bin4.ou	10,294,658	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 4
hlw HTOM high bin5.ou	5,639,255	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 5
hlw HTOM low bin1.ou	9,625,376	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, low infiltration, bin 1
hlw HTOM low bin2.ou	5,428,245	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, low infiltration, bin 2
hlw HTOM mean bin2.ou	943,407	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 2
hlw HTOM mean bin3.ou	4,684,804	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 3
hlw HTOM mean bin4.ou	10,934,500	05/17/01	HLW, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 4
hlw LTOM high bin2.ou	167,813	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 2
hlw LTOM high bin3.ou	2,851,669	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 3
hlw LTOM high bin4.ou	10,064,532	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 4
hlw LTOM high bin5.ou	5,176,080	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 5
hlw LTOM low bin1.ou	12,772,351	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, low infiltration, bin 1
hlw LTOM low bin2.ou	5,487,599	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, low infiltration, bin 2
hlw LTOM mean bin2.ou	2,899,595	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 2
hlw LTOM mean bin3.ou	5,176,080	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 3
hlw LTOM mean bin4.ou	10,184,347	07/26/01	HLW, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 4
FEHM Files	Size (bytes)	Date	Description
afm pch1.dpdp	3,715	01/05/00	fracture porosity & half-spacing file
bf2.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
bf3.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
ch1.txt,	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
ch6.txt,	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
chv.txt,	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
chz.txt,	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
fehmn.files	291	02/15/00	input control file
fehmn.gold	1,278	05/04/01	commands for FEHM .bat files
ff0100.ini,	15,937,540	10/11/99	flow field file
ff0200.ini,	15,937,540	10/11/99	flow field file
ff0300.ini	15,937,540	10/11/99	flow field file
ff1100.ini,	15,938,094	10/14/99	flow field file
ff1200.ini,	15,938,094	10/14/99	flow field file
ff1300.ini	15,938,094	10/14/99	flow field file
ff2100.ini,	15,938,094	10/14/99	flow field file
ff2200.ini,	15,938,094	10/14/99	flow field file
ff2300.ini	15,938,094	10/14/99	flow field file
ff3000.ini	15,938,094	09/08/00	flow field file
ff3500.ini	15,938,094	09/08/00	flow field file
ff4000.ini	15,938,094	09/08/00	flow field file
ff5000.ini	15,938,094	09/08/00	flow field file
fm pchm1.dat	1,630	07/29/00	Input file containing time step ptrk info
fm pchm1 1E5.dat	1,630	07/29/00	FEHM input files for run durations
fm pchm1 1E6.dat	1,630	07/29/00	FEHM input files for run durations
fm pchm1 2E4.dat	1,630	07/29/00	FEHM input files for run durations
fm pchm1 3E5.dat	1,630	07/29/00	FEHM input files for run durations
fm pchm1.grid	2,335,583	01/04/00	grid file
fm pchm1.stor	29,301,805	01/04/00	stiffness matrix file
fm pchm1.zone	980,781	01/04/00	zone file
fm pchm1.zone2	1,082,426	03/03/00	zone file
fm pchm1.zone2.0100	1,082,424	03/03/00	zone file
fm pchm1.zone2.0200	1,082,426	03/03/00	zone file
fm pchm1.zone2.0300	1,082,424	03/03/00	zone file
pch1.rock	3,349	01/04/00	rock properties file
pp1.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
pp2.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file

Table 2.3-1. TSPA-FEIS Input Files (WAPDEG, FEHM, Seepage, SZ_Convolute) (Continued)

op3.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
---------	----	----------	--------------------------------


Table 2.3-1. TSPA-FEIS Input Files (WAPDEG, FEHM, Seepage, SZ_Convolute) (Continued)

FEHM Files	Size (bytes)	Date	Description
pp4.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
ptrk.multrtz	2,030,063	08/22/00	particle tracking file
ptrk.multrtz.0100	2,030,069	08/22/00	particle tracking file for multiple realizations
ptrk.multrtz.0200	2,030,063	08/22/00	Particle tracking file for multiple realizations
ptrk.multrtz.0300	2,030,060	04/12/01	Particle tracking file for multiple realizations
tsw4.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
tsw5.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
tsw6.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
tsw7.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
tsw8.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
tsw9.txt	77	03/13/00	colloid size distribution file
UZ_Params_Multi_sr	176,012	05/10/00	UZ sampled parameters file
UZ_Params_Multi_1000rtz.sr	176,012	05/10/00	UZ sampled parameters file for multiple realizations
UZ_Params_Multi_100rtz.sr	176,012	05/10/00	UZ sampled parameters file for multiple realizations
UZ_Params_Multi_3000rtz.sr	176,012	05/10/00	UZ sampled parameters file for multiple realizations
UZ_Params_Multi_300rtz.sr	176,012	05/10/00	UZ sampled parameters file for multiple realizations
UZ_Params_Multi_5000rtz.sr	176,012	05/10/00	UZ sampled parameters file for multiple realizations
Seepage Files	Size (bytes)	Date	Description
CSNF HT high pf bin2.txt	103,535	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 2
CSNF HT high pf bin3.txt	517,319	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 3
CSNF HT high pf bin4.txt	6,059,069	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 4
CSNF HT high pf bin5.txt	3,236,471	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 5
CSNF HT low pf bin1.txt	6,384,185	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, low infiltration, bin 1
CSNF HT low pf bin2.txt	3,532,031	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, low infiltration, bin 2
CSNF HT mean pf bin2.txt	576,431	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 2
CSNF HT mean pf bin3.txt	2,867,021	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 3
CSNF HT mean pf bin4.txt	6,472,853	05/14/01	CSNF, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 4
CSNF LT2 high pf bin2.txt	103,535	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 2
CSNF LT2 high pf bin3.txt	1,758,671	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 3
CSNF LT2 high pf bin4.txt	6,206,849	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 4
CSNF LT2 high pf bin5.txt	3,192,137	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 5
CSNF LT2 low pf bin1.txt	7,876,763	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, low infiltration, bin 1
CSNF LT2 low pf bin2.txt	3,384,251	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, low infiltration, bin 2
CSNF LT2 mean pf bin2.txt	1,788,227	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 2
CSNF LT2 mean pf bin3.txt	3,192,137	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 3
CSNF LT2 mean pf bin4.txt	6,280,739	07/24/01	CSNF, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 4
HLW HT high pf bin2.txt	103,535	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 2
HLW HT high pf bin3.txt	517,319	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 3
HLW HT high pf bin4.txt	6,059,069	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 4
HLW HT high pf bin5.txt	3,236,471	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, high infiltration, bin 5
HLW HT low pf bin1.txt	6,384,185	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, low infiltration, bin 1
HLW HT low pf bin2.txt	3,532,031	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, low infiltration, bin 2
HLW HT mean pf bin2.txt	576,431	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 2
HLW HT mean pf bin3.txt	2,867,021	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 3
HLW HT mean pf bin4.txt	6,472,853	05/14/01	HLW, HTOM, medium infiltration, bin 4
HLW LT2 high pf bin2.txt	103,535	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 2
HLW LT2 high pf bin3.txt	1,758,671	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 3

Table 2.3-1. TSPA-FEIS Input Files (WAPDEG, FEHM, Seepage, SZ_Convolute) (Continued)

HLW LT2 high pf bin4.txt	6,206,849	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 4
HLW LT2 high pf bin5.txt	3,192,137	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, high infiltration, bin 5
HLW LT2 low pf bin1.txt	7,876,763	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, low infiltration, bin 1
HLW LT2 low pf bin2.txt	3,384,251	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, low infiltration, bin 2
Seepage Files	Size (bytes)	Date	Description
HLW LT2 mean pf bin2.txt	1,788,227	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 2
HLW LT2 mean pf bin3.txt	3,192,137	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 3
HLW LT2 mean pf bin4.txt	6,280,739	07/24/01	HLW, LTOM, medium infiltration, bin 4
master bf.in	543	05/03/01	input control file
master nbf.in	561	07/24/01	input control file
SeepFlowMean.dat	439	04/02/01	mean seepage flow distribution data
SeepFlowSD.dat	425	04/02/01	seepage flow S.D. distribution data
SeepFrac.dat	404	04/02/01	seepage fraction distribution data
SZ_Convolute Files	Size/bytes	Date	Description
SZ 01 01	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 1, Region 1 BTCs
SZ 01 02	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 1, Region 2 BTCs
SZ 01 03	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 1, Region 3 BTCs
SZ 01 04	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 1, Region 4 BTCs
SZ 02 01	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 2, Region 1 BTCs
SZ 02 02	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 2, Region 2 BTCs
SZ 02 03	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 2, Region 3 BTCs
SZ 02 04	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 2, Region 4 BTCs
SZ 03 01	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 3, Region 1 BTCs
SZ 03 02	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 3, Region 2 BTCs
SZ 03 03	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 3, Region 3 BTCs
SZ 03 04	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 3, Region 4 BTCs
SZ 04 01	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 4, Region 1 BTCs
SZ 04 02	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 4, Region 2 BTCs
SZ 04 03	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 4, Region 3 BTCs
SZ 04 04	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 4, Region 4 BTCs
SZ 05 01	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 5, Region 1 BTCs
SZ 05 02	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 5, Region 2 BTCs
SZ 05 03	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 5, Region 3 BTCs
SZ 05 04	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 5, Region 4 BTCs
SZ 06 01	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 6, Region 1 BTCs
SZ 06 02	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 6, Region 2 BTCs
SZ 06 03	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 6, Region 3 BTCs
SZ 06 04	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 6, Region 4 BTCs
SZ 07 01	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 7, Region 1 BTCs
SZ 07 02	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 7, Region 2 BTCs
SZ 07 03	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 7, Region 3 BTCs
SZ 07 04	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 7, Region 4 BTCs
SZ 08 01	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 8, Region 1 BTCs
SZ 08 02	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 8, Region 2 BTCs
SZ 08 03	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 8, Region 3 BTCs
SZ 08 04	3,604,849	07/25/01	RN Type 8, Region 4 BTCs
SZ_Convolute2.dat	432	06/02/01	input file

Notes: Bin "X" denotes one of the five infiltration bins in the TSPA model. For TSPA-LA, the appropriate files will all be submitted to TDMS. See acronym list (Appendix A) for other acronym definitions.



00239DC_Figure007b ai

Figure 2.2-1. General Overview of the TSPA-LA Model Development and Analysis Process




Figure 2.3-1 Overview of the TSPA-LA Model Information Flow

3. PROCESSES FOR TSPA-LA

A major licensing requirement for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste at the proposed Yucca Mountain geologic repository is the evaluation of postclosure performance. The NRC, in their regulation, 10 CFR Part 63, requires that a performance assessment (PA) analysis be performed for this evaluation. The definition of a performance assessment, as defined by the NRC in 10 CFR 63.2, was provided in Section 1.3.

The EPA and NRC, in their regulations (40 CFR Part 197 and 10 CFR Part 63, respectively) specifically acknowledge that uncertainty in dose (item 3 in the definition of a performance assessment, from 10 CFR 63.2) is a key issue and call for including uncertainty in order to develop a "reasonable expectation" of compliance. Reasonable expectation is defined in 10 CFR 63.304 as:

"Reasonable expectation means that the Commission is satisfied that compliance will be achieved based upon the full record before it. Characteristics of reasonable expectation include that it:

- (1) Requires less than absolute proof because absolute proof is impossible to attain for disposal due to the uncertainty of projecting long-term performance;
- (2) Accounts for the inherently greater uncertainties in making long-term projections of the performance of the Yucca Mountain disposal system;
- (3) Does not exclude important parameters from assessments and analyses simply because they are difficult to precisely quantify to a high degree of confidence; and
- (4) Focuses performance assessments and analyses on the full range of defensible and reasonable parameter distributions rather than only upon extreme physical situations and parameter values."

Hence, identifying, categorizing, quantifying, evaluating, and documenting uncertainties (as discussed in Sections 3.2 through 3.5) are important tasks of a performance assessment (hereafter referred to as a total system performance assessment [TSPA] to emphasize the inclusion of all subsystems of the Yucca Mountain disposal system). Much progress in accomplishing these tasks was made in performing the *FY 01 Supplemental Science and Performance Analyses, Volume 1: Scientific Bases and Analyses* (BSC 2001 [155950]) and *FY01 Supplemental Science and Performance Analyses, Volume 2: Performance Analyses* (BSC 2001 [154659]), collectively referred to as the SSPA. Performing these tasks in a consistent manner is also important for regulatory review. Processes for building upon the progress in the SSPA and providing additional consistency for TSPA-LA have been developed in *Guidelines for Developing and Documenting Alternative Conceptual Models, Model Abstractions, and Parameter Uncertainty in the Total System Performance Assessment for the License Application* (BSC 2002 [158794]) (referred to as the *Guidelines Document* hereafter) and are summarized in this section.

Section 3.1 introduces key terms and the team concept that will be used to treat uncertainty consistently in TSPA-LA. The concepts of aleatory and epistemic uncertainty are discussed. As

repeated often in radioactive waste disposal literature, the three major sources of uncertainty in analyses of geologic disposal systems are uncertainty in (1) completeness (i.e., uncertainty in capturing all applicable features, events, and processes (FEPs) of item 1 of the PA definition in Section 1.3); (2) model form (i.e., uncertainty about the hypotheses and appropriate model definition in evaluating the dose and calculating the probability of FEP occurrence); and (3) parameters (i.e., uncertainty in the appropriate parameter values to use in the selected models for consequence and probability).

Section 3.2 describes the current status of FEPs and enhancements planned for the TSPA-LA as outlined in *The Enhanced Plan for Features, Events, and Processes (FEPs) at Yucca Mountain* (BSC 2002 [158966]) (referred to as *Enhanced FEPs Plan* hereafter). Sections 3.3 and 3.4 discuss the basic processes established in the treatment of model form uncertainty (divided further into alternative conceptual models and model abstractions). Section 3.5 discusses parameter uncertainty.

3.1 UNCERTAINTY

By way of introduction, 10 CFR 63.114 states:

“Any performance assessment used to demonstrate compliance with 10 CFR 63.114 must:...(b) Account for uncertainties and variabilities in parameter values and provide for the technical basis for parameter ranges, probability distributions, or bounding values used in the performance assessment.”

The uncertainty referred to in this part of the regulation concerns the lack of knowledge in parameter values, which is also called epistemic uncertainty. Another type of uncertainty is addressed in the regulation, whereby 10 CFR 63.2 states:

“Performance assessment means an analysis that: ... (3) Estimates the dose incurred by the reasonably maximally exposed individual, including the associated uncertainties, as a result of releases caused by all significant features, events, processes, and sequences of events and processes, weighted by their probability of occurrence.”

The uncertainty referred to in this part of the regulation, associated with chance occurrences, is also called aleatory uncertainty. This section distinguishes between the two types of uncertainty mentioned (aleatory and epistemic) and introduces the team approach to treating uncertainty such that the performance assessment consistently and adequately provides the technical basis for parameter ranges and distributions.

3.1.1 Aleatory and Epistemic Uncertainty

A TSPA for a radioactive waste disposal facility is a complex undertaking, requiring large amounts of information and a variety of mathematical models. Full documentation of a TSPA can require thousands of pages. Yet, at a conceptual level, the computational implementation of a TSPA can be viewed as involving the answers to four basic questions (Helton 1996 [107823], Kaplan and Garrick 1981 [100557]). First, “What occurrences can take place at the facility

under consideration?" From the answer to this question follows the second question, "How likely are these occurrences to take place?" and the third question, "What are the consequences of individual occurrences?" Finally, the fourth question asks, "How much confidence exists in the answers to the first three questions?"

Standing above these questions in a TSPA is a process referred to as the screening of features, events, and processes (FEPs). It is from this screening, which is initially informal and ultimately very structured, that the information emerges that is needed to answer the preceding questions. In particular, the FEPs process gathers, assesses, and winnows the information that ultimately leads to the formal computational structure and associated calculations that provide the quantitative answers to the last three questions (i.e., probabilities, doses, uncertainty assessments).

The first and second questions involve the occurrence and likelihood of events that take place in the future. Such occurrences are assumed to have a random character in the sense that their likelihood of taking place over various intervals of time can be estimated, but it is not possible to determine whether or not they will actually occur. Such uncertainty is often given the designation "aleatory." Examples of aleatory uncertainty include the occurrence of seismic events, igneous events, and particular spatial patterns of corrosion. Alternative designations for aleatory uncertainty include Type A, stochastic, irreducible, and objective uncertainty. In concept and within the resource limitations of a particular analysis, aleatory uncertainty can be better characterized through additional study but cannot be removed by such study.

The third question relates to the models used to analyze physical behavior of the system under consideration, as well as the determination of the consequences of the various occurrences that could take place in the system. Such models can be viewed as functions that predict consequences for particular occurrences or sequences of occurrences. Such models are often quite complex (e.g., systems of nonlinear ordinary or partial differential equations). Models that are constructed by combining many individual models are common in performance assessment for radioactive waste disposal. Often, much of the human and computational resources expended in a large performance assessment are devoted to the development, parameterization, and numerical evaluation of models used to predict the consequences associated with particular occurrences (e.g., undisturbed conditions, human intrusion, seismic events, igneous events, ...).

The fourth question relates to a type of uncertainty that is distinct from aleatory uncertainty. This second type of uncertainty is involved with the degree of appropriateness or validity that can be assigned to the assumptions and quantities used in the TSPA model. Such uncertainty is often given the designation "epistemic." Epistemic uncertainty arises from a lack of knowledge about a parameter because the data are limited or because there are alternative interpretations of the available data. The parameter is not variable because of an intrinsic characteristic of the entity under study but because an analyst does not know what the precise value of the parameter should be. For example, there is substantial epistemic uncertainty in many quantities used in TSPA for the proposed repository (e.g., solubilities, distribution coefficients, permeabilities). Often, quantities used in performance assessments are expected values over spatial or temporal variation, with significant epistemic uncertainty existing with respect to the appropriate values to use for these expected values. Further, there can also be epistemic uncertainty in quantities used

to characterize aleatory uncertainty (e.g., rates at which igneous and seismic events occur). This type of inexactness is also called Type B, state of knowledge, reducible, and subjective uncertainty. Epistemic refers to the state of knowledge about a parameter. The state of knowledge about the exact value of the parameter can increase through testing and data collection such that the uncertainty is "reducible." Epistemic uncertainty also includes model uncertainty (i.e., what is the appropriate model or model structure to use in a particular modeling context?).

Most performance assessments use probability to characterize both aleatory and epistemic uncertainty (Helton et al. 2000 [159062]; SNL 1996 [126532]; PLG 1983 [107813]; PLG 1983 [148063]; PLG 1982 [107812]; NRC 1990 [107798]). Indeed, the use of probability to characterize both aleatory and epistemic uncertainty can be traced to the beginnings of the formal development of probability in the late seventeenth century (Bernstein 1996 [105742]; Hacking 1975 [107512]; Shafer 1978 [159070]). Other representations of uncertainty exist (e.g., evidence theory, possibility theory, fuzzy set theory) but are not widely used in performance assessment and will not be discussed here. Consistent with other performance assessments for complex systems, the performance assessment for the proposed repository uses probability to characterize both aleatory and epistemic uncertainty.

Distinguishing between these two types of uncertainty is not necessary for the estimation of mean dose, but is important in many instances to understand the results and how the uncertainties in dose might be better characterized (or possibly reduced) by the collection of more data (Apostolakis 1990 [107506]; Barnett and O'Hagan 1997 [158964]; Cullen and Frey 1999 [107797]; Helton 1994 [107739]; Helton 1997 [107496]; Helton and Burmaster 1996 [107498]; Parry and Winter 1981 [159059]; Paté-Cornell 1996 [107499]). The desire to maintain a separation between aleatory and epistemic uncertainty affects the design of the analyses (e.g., separate analysis of volcanic disruption and no volcanic disruption). It may also affect the design of individual model components (e.g., the model component for corrosion of the waste package). Because of this influence, choices will be made during TSPA-LA development concerning which uncertainties will be treated as aleatory and which will be treated as epistemic in developing submodels or components of the TSPA and designing the TSPA analysis (e.g., selecting scenarios to propagate through the TSPA system model). If the TSPA does not maintain a separation between aleatory and epistemic uncertainty for a specific parameter, then the total uncertainty is expressed as a combined distribution. The description of parameter uncertainty of all the remaining parameters (designated as either epistemic parameters or combined epistemic/aleatory parameters) is discussed in Section 3.5.

3.1.2 Team Approach for Treating Uncertainty in Model Form and Parameters

The TSPA-LA must integrate information from many sources and document the uncertainty from these numerous sources. An external review of TSPA-SR (*Evaluation of Uncertainty Treatment in the Technical Documents Supporting TSPA-SR* (YMP 2001 [155343])) found

numerous examples of parameters where the documentation adequately explained the various sources of uncertainty (e.g., measurement error or experiment representativeness); however, in other situations this documentation was lacking. To maintain consistency in the interface with other organizations as well as consistency in the integration and documentation of the technical basis for parameter ranges and distributions, the Performance Assessment Strategy and Scope group has established a team leader in parameter uncertainty, the Parameter Team Lead (PTL), and a team leader for model form uncertainty, the Abstraction Team Lead (ATL). A separate team is formed for individual uncertain parameters or groups of related uncertain parameters. Each team has two additional members, (1) a Subject Matter Expert (SME) from the appropriate department, who is most knowledgeable about individual underlying process models and their uncertain parameters, and (2) a TSPA analyst from the TSPA Department, who is knowledgeable about the use of the parameter(s) in the TSPA. The SME and TSPA analyst may be different for each team, and each model may therefore have its own team. The ATL (or PTL) will be a common member on all of the teams. These primary team members are supported by various other personnel. Sections 3.3 through 3.5 provide more details as they pertain to model form and parameter uncertainty.

3.2 FEATURES, EVENTS, AND PROCESSES

The development of a comprehensive list of FEPs potentially relevant to the postclosure performance of the proposed repository is an ongoing, iterative process based on site-specific information, design, and regulations. Features are physical, chemical, thermal, or temporal characteristics of the site or repository system. Examples of features are the waste package and fracture systems. Processes are typically phenomena and activities that have gradual, continuous interactions with the repository system or subsystem. An example of a process is percolation of water into the unsaturated rock above the repository. Events may be interrelated with processes, but in general, events are discrete occurrences. An example of an event is volcanism.

For TSPA-SR, FEPs analysis and subsequent scenario development followed a five-step process:

1. Identification of FEPs
2. Classification of FEPs
3. Screening of FEPs
4. Formation of Scenario Classes
5. Screening of Scenario Classes

These five steps are further described in Section 2.1.1.1 of the *Total System Performance Assessment for the Site Recommendation* (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246]). Specific details of the initial FEP analysis (identification, classification, and screening) for TSPA-SR were documented in Sections 2 through 4 of *The Development of Information Catalogued in REV 00 of the YMP FEP Database* (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365]) (referred to as *FEP Database Report* hereafter). A series of FEP Analysis Model Reports (AMRs), listed in Table 3.2-1, were developed to document the technical basis for inclusion or exclusion of FEPs from TSPA-SR. This table presents the latest revision, which may postdate the TSPA-SR. The relevant information in these FEP AMRs was subsequently transferred to a Yucca Mountain Project

(YMP) FEP Database (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365], Section 5) to provide a navigational tool for reviewing and analyzing FEPs.

Table 3.2-1. FEP AMRs Documenting Screening Information in Support of TSPA-SR

Subject Area	Reference
Unsaturated Zone Flow and Transport	(BSC 2001 [154826])
Saturated Zone Flow and Transport	(CRWMS M&O 2001 [153931])
Biosphere	(BSC 2001 [153921])
Disruptive Events	(CRWMS M&O 2000 [151553])
Waste Package Degradation	(CRWMS M&O 2001 [153937])
Waste Form Degradation	
- Miscellaneous	(CRWMS M&O 2001 [153938])
- Cladding	(CRWMS M&O 2000 [153947])
- Colloid	(CRWMS M&O 2001 [153933])
Near Field Environment	(CRWMS M&O 2001 [153935])
Engineered Barrier System Degradation, Flow, and Transport	(CRWMS M&O 2001 [153001])
System-Level and Criticality	(CRWMS M&O 2000 [144180])

The FEP analysis and scenario development approach that was adopted for the TSPA-SR was based on the methodology developed by the NRC (Cranwell et al. 1990 [101234], Section 2). The approach is fundamentally the same as that used in many performance assessments, including the most recent analysis of the proposed repository by the NRC (Wescott et al. 1995 [100476], Chapter 3). The approach has also been used by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (DOE 1996 [100975], Section 6.2), and by scientists working on repository programs in other countries (Bonano and Baca 1994 [105014]).

Subsequent to the completion of the FEP AMRs and the YMP FEP Database to support TSPA-SR, several internal and external FEP reviews were performed, as summarized in Section 3.1 of *Enhanced FEPs Plan* (BSC 2002 [158966]). The *Enhanced FEPs Plan* (BSC 2002 [158966]), was developed to address those FEP reviews, and to identify specific enhancements to the FEP analysis approach to support LA. These enhancements include a team approach for consistency (Section 3.2.1) and specific aspects of the FEP analysis (Section 3.2.2). The FEP AMRs will be updated as necessary for the TSPA-LA.

3.2.1 Interface Team for FEPs

A team approach will be used to provide for consistency in the identification and screening of FEPs for the TSPA-LA (see Section 3.2 of *Enhanced FEPs Plan* (BSC 2002 [158966])). FEP Team members will include a FEP Team Lead (FTL), and FEP experts, selected from within the Performance Assessment Strategy and Scope subproject group.

The FTL will manage the process of implementing the *Enhanced FEPs Plan* (BSC 2002 [158966]), with support from the FEP experts. A FEP AMR Lead and one or more SMEs will be identified for each of the subject areas listed in Table 3.2-1. The FEP AMR Leads are

responsible for ensuring that relevant FEPs are treated appropriately within their FEP AMRs. The SMEs are the personnel most knowledgeable about individual FEPs and are responsible for developing explicit screening discussions for documentation in the FEP AMRs. The FEP AMR Leads and SMEs will be designated by various other subproducts within the Performance Assessment Project. The FEP Team will work closely with the FEP AMR Leads and SMEs.

3.2.2 FEP Analysis for TSPA-LA

For TSPA-LA, the FEP analysis and scenario development approach is the same as for TSPA-SR, but the five steps listed in Section 3.2 are described slightly differently so that they correspond more directly with the review methods and acceptance criteria in the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449], Section 4.2.1.2.1). The five steps for FEP analysis and scenario development for LA are illustrated in Figure 3.2-1 and are outlined below:

1. Identify and classify FEPs potentially relevant to the long-term performance of the disposal system.
2. Screen the FEPs using regulatory probability and consequence criteria to identify those FEPs that should be included in the TSPA analysis and those that can be excluded from the analysis.
3. Form scenario classes from the retained (included) FEPs, as appropriate.
4. Screen the scenario classes using the same criteria applied to the FEPs to identify any scenario classes that can be excluded from the TSPA.
5. Specify the implementation of the scenario classes in the computational modeling for the TSPA, and document the treatment of included FEPs.

FEP analysis and documentation, which includes Steps 1 and 2 above, is further described in this section. These steps address Scenario Analysis Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2, respectively, as outlined in the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449], Section 4.2.1.2.1.3). Scenario development, which includes Steps 3 and 4 above, is further described in Section 4. These steps address Scenario Analysis Acceptance Criteria 3 and 4, respectively, as outlined in the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449], Section 4.2.1.2.1.3). Implementation of the scenarios in TSPA models (Step 5 above) is described in Section 5.3.

The current status of FEP analysis is summarized below. Specific enhancements under consideration for TSPA-LA described in the *Enhanced FEPs Plan* (BSC 2002 [158966], Section 3.2) are also noted.

Step 1: Identification and Classification of FEPs—An initial list of FEPs relevant to Yucca Mountain was developed from a comprehensive list of FEPs from radioactive waste disposal programs in other countries (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365], Section 2.1) and was supplemented with additional YMP-specific FEPs from project literature, technical workshops, and reviews (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365], Sections 2.2 through 2.4). The YMP FEP list may be expanded if additional FEPs are identified during the LA process.

The all-inclusive FEP identification approach produced approximately 1,800 specific FEPs, and resulted in considerable redundancy in the FEPs list, because the same FEPs were frequently identified by multiple sources. To eliminate the redundancy and to create a more efficient aggregation of FEPs to carry forward into the screening process, each of the specific FEPs was classified according to a process and criteria described in Section 3.2 of the *FEP Database Report* (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365]). The classification process was designed to produce a subset (referred to as primary FEPs) of the approximately 1,800 initially identified FEPs that captured all of the issues relevant to the postclosure performance of the proposed repository. For TSPA-SR, the classification process resulted in 323 primary FEPs (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Appendix B), each of which encompassed a single process or event, or a few closely related or coupled processes or events that could be addressed by a specific screening discussion.

Subsequent to TSPA-SR, an updated list of 328 primary FEPs was produced. This updated FEP list corresponds to REV 00 ICN 01 of the *FEP Database Report* (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365]). The origin of the additional FEPs and other changes from TSPA-SR are summarized in Section 5.5 of the *FEP Database Report* (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365]). These new FEPs were added to enhance traceability. They did not result in any changes to TSPA or process models.

The current version of the YMP FEP Database STN 10418.2-00 (BSC 2002 [159684]) contains the same 328 FEPs as REV 00 ICN 01, and the technical information consistent with the list of FEP AMRs in Table 3.2-1.

Enhancements to Step 1 for TSPA-LA include:

- Develop a hierarchical classification scheme that facilitates navigation within the database for reviewers and, where possible, parallels the structure used to describe TSPA-LA. This will improve transparency and traceability, but will not change the number or screening of FEPs.
- Refine the existing FEP list for consistency with the new classification scheme and for a more consistent level of detail between FEPs. This will not change the technical content of the overall FEP list, but may result in a minor change in the number of FEPs due to re-organization of certain FEPs.
- Provide an ongoing systematic process for configuration management, evaluation and tracking of potential new FEPs and changes to existing FEPs.

Step 2: Screening of FEPs—Each of the 328 FEPs is screened for inclusion or exclusion in the TSPA on the basis of probability or consequence criteria, developed from 10 CFR Part 63. The criteria are outlined below:

- **Probability (10 CFR 63.114(d)).** Consider only events that have at least one chance in 10,000 of occurring over 10,000 years. FEPs not meeting this criterion may be excluded (screened out) from the TSPA on the basis of low probability. For example, meteorite impact was excluded because of low probability.
- **Consequence (10 CFR 63.114(e) and (f)).** Specific FEPs must be evaluated in detail if the magnitude and time of radiological exposures or radionuclide releases would be

significantly changed by their omission. FEPs not meeting this criterion may be excluded (screened out) from the TSPA on the basis of low consequence. For example, erosion and sedimentation were excluded because of low consequence, even though they are certain to occur.

FEPs that are inconsistent with specific analysis requirements in 10 CFR Part 63 may also be excluded (screened out) from the TSPA. The most notable examples are FEPs that are inconsistent with regulatory specification of the human intrusion analysis and/or the characteristics of the receptor.

For certain FEPs, the 10 CFR Part 63 regulations provide guidance on whether the FEP is to be included or excluded. For example, for the reference biosphere, 10 CFR 63.305 states that the DOE should not project changes in society, the biosphere (other than climate), human biology, or increases or decreases of human knowledge or technology. Therefore, any FEPs related to these types of changes to the reference biosphere are excluded by regulation. Similar specifications exist for the characteristics of the reasonably maximally exposed individual (RMEI) (10 CFR 63.312) and for the human intrusion analysis (10 CFR 63.322).

The FEP screening process for TSPA-SR, illustrated in Figure 3.2-2, was performed by SMEs and documented in the FEP AMRs for the TSPA-SR (Table 3.2-1). The initial database began from an Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)-Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) international database of generic FEPs potentially relevant to TSPA (Safety Assessment Management (SAM) 1997 [139333]). Specific guidelines for the basis of screening decisions and the content of screening documentation are outlined in the *FEP Database Report* (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365], Section 4.2). Of the 328 primary FEPs, 176 were included in the TSPA-SR analyses.

Enhancements to Step 2 under consideration for TSPA-LA include:

- Update screening discussions for consistency with final 10 CFR Part 63, where necessary.
- Enhance screening arguments to ensure adequate technical basis for excluded FEPs, where necessary (i.e., make specific reference to criteria in 10 CFR 63.114(d) through (f) and ensure that the technical bases for NRC expectations in the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449], Section 4.2.1.2.1.3) have been addressed).
- Enhance documentation for included FEPs, where necessary. This includes explicit references to included FEPs in technical AMRs and documentation of the mapping of included FEPs to TSPA model components.

General FEP Analysis Enhancements for TSPA-LA—Updates to the screening decisions are anticipated for a few FEPs based on post-TSPA-SR analyses including (1) *SSPA*, Volume 1 (BSC 2001 [155950]) and Volume 2 (BSC 2001 [154659]); (2) *Total System Performance Assessment—Analyses for Disposal of Commercial and DOE Waste Inventories at Yucca Mountain—Input to Final Environmental Impact Statement and Site Suitability Evaluation* (Williams 2001 [157307]), also referred to as the *TSPA FEIS Report*; and (3) *Total System*

Performance Assessment Sensitivity Analyses for Final Nuclear Regulatory Commission Regulations (Williams 2001 [156743]). Two examples are provided below:

- Seismic (vibratory ground motion) effects on rockfall and the associated effects of rockfall on drip shields and waste packages. These were excluded in TSPA-SR, but will be included as part of a new seismic scenario in TSPA-LA (see Section 4.3).
- Seismic (vibratory ground motion) direct shaking effects on drip shields, waste packages, cladding, and pallets. Only seismic vibration of cladding was included in TSPA-SR (as part of the nominal scenario class). Seismic vibration will be included as part of a new seismic scenario class in TSPA-LA (see Section 4.3).

Other enhancements identified in the *Enhanced FEPs Plan* (BSC 2002 [158966], Section 3.2), include:

- Updates to the FEP AMRs documenting new and changed FEPs and screening discussions. These will be delivered in support of TSPA-LA.
- Upgrades to the FEP Database to improve navigational capabilities and ensure consistency with the changes to the classification scheme and to the technical content of any of the FEPs. The final YMP FEP Database will be prepared to be consistent with the FEP AMRs that support TSPA-LA.
- Updates to the *FEP Database Report* (Freeze et al. 2001 [154365]) documenting changes to FEP analysis approach for LA. This will accompany the final YMP FEP Database in support of TSPA-LA.

3.3 MODEL FORM UNCERTAINTY: ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL MODELS

Development of alternative conceptual models (ACMs) is a technique to specifically acknowledge model form uncertainty. In 10 CFR 63.114(c), the NRC specifically requires the DOE to “Consider alternative conceptual models of features and processes that are consistent with available data and current scientific understanding and evaluate the effects that alternative conceptual models have on the performance of the geologic repository.” This consideration of ACMs is also incorporated into KTI 4.01, as noted in Appendix B (Meserve 2001 [156977]). The *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794]) outlines a process for evaluating ACMs that is overseen by the ATL and discussed in Section 3.3.1. The *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794]) introduces a process to consistently document the creation and screening of ACMs by various SMEs. This portion of the process is reviewed in Section 3.3.2. Those ACMs thought reasonable (based on, for example, precedent established by other analysts) and significantly different (based on, for example, differences in results) are passed on to TSPA analysts for their evaluation. This process is reviewed in Section 3.3.3. The impact of ACMs on TSPA-LA is reviewed in Section 3.3.4. The need to reevaluate FEP screening is mentioned in Section 3.3.5, and general aspects of the documentation are reviewed in Section 3.3.6.

3.3.1 Interface Team for ACMs

To provide consistency in addressing ACMs, the *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794]) identifies two essential participants on the ACM interface team: the ATL and the SME. Various TSPA analysts and process modelers will provide technical support at the request of the ATL and SME. The term, "Abstraction Team Lead," is intentional because the person directing the consideration of alternative conceptual models can be the same individual that is used to address model abstraction issues. One ATL has been designated to address all ACMs from across the various subject areas to provide for consistency in the guidance given to the multiple SMEs on the appropriateness of proposed ACMs. The goal of establishing an ATL is to provide even-handedness in introducing ACMs. The ATL will be vigilant in selecting ACMs such that their use neither introduces specious ACMs nor neglects to introduce important ACMs in the TSPA-LA. The process provides for review and concurrence by the ATL and the SME prior to implementation of the alternative conceptual models in the TSPA-LA. It also specifies that the implementation of ACMs in the TSPA-LA be checked and reviewed by both the ATL and SME.

3.3.2 Identification and Screening of ACMs

The first activity in identifying and screening ACMs is to determine whether any ACMs are consistent with available data and scientific understanding. The consistency with available data and scientific understanding, and the reasonableness of ACMs, was previously considered and documented by the SMEs as part of the TSPA-SR process, although in varying degrees of detail (e.g., the various process model reports (PMRs) list several ACMs that were not incorporated to TSPA analyses, and external reviewers have identified ACMs not incorporated to TSPA analyses). This first activity requires the SMEs, in consultation with the ATL and TSPA analysts, to carefully examine the existing models; to identify previously considered ACMs; and to reevaluate their consistency with data in light of current project knowledge and supporting documentation used for the TSPA-SR, SSPA, and the TSPA-FEIS. For example, the consideration of stress corrosion cracking can be represented by more than one ACM. Since it was appropriate for the site recommendation, only the conservative model was chosen for use in TSPA-SR (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246]). However, for TSPA-LA uncertainty in models will be considered and possibly analyzed, so the use of previously considered ACMs is being re-evaluated.

The SME will also review the model sensitivities/key parameters identified in the TSPA-SR, SSPA or other project documents (to be provided by the ATL) to identify where the use of ACMs would be most appropriate and suitable for implementation into TSPA-LA. That is, the SMEs should allocate their time to those ACMs that past experience has shown are an important influence on the results (according to a risk-informed approach). However, the intent is not to exclude ACMs that might show an impact simply because the original ACM did not show an impact. The SME will also reexamine FEPs to determine the appropriateness of modifying an existing screening decision (i.e., change from exclude to include) or identifying areas where an alternative treatment is appropriate.

The SME will determine if one or more conceptual models differ significantly from the existing conceptual model, are consistent with available data and current scientific understanding, and are reasonable. The definition of ACM in 10 CFR 63.114(c) includes the phrase "consistent with available data and current scientific understanding." Thus, a proposed model should be disqualified if it is verifiably inconsistent with any of the information. (Any model of a real system could eventually be shown not to agree with all the data in every instance since it is not the real system, but rather a model; hence, each ACM must be consistent with the available data in those areas that are important to the analysis.) The screening would first be done qualitatively, based on the technical judgment of the SME. If ACMs could not be screened out with a qualitative evaluation, then it would be necessary to develop the appropriate mathematical and computational models. However, the ACM may often be a variation of some base-case, in which case existing qualified computational software could be used.

The initial examination of ACMs will be documented in the corresponding model report. This documentation will include a list of the ACMs reviewed by the SME, the decision made regarding consistency with available data and scientific understanding and reasonableness, and the basis for the decisions made. If, in the judgement of the SME, only one conceptual model is consistent with all information, then uncertainty from associated ACMs is not significant. Additional uncertainty may be incorporated if more than one ACM is deemed appropriate for use, but they are not all passed individually to the TSPA model.

3.3.3 ACM Evaluation for Use in TSPA-LA

The responsible SME will evaluate whether any retained ACMs for the process being modeled should be developed further. For example, the SME may present results from process models to demonstrate that the ACMs do or do not produce significantly different results for the subsystem model. The ATL will review the SME recommendations. The ATL is responsible for determining which, if any, ACMs to implement in the TSPA-LA and for recommending the approach for implementation. If all ACMs predict behavior similar to the existing subsystem component used in the TSPA-FEIS, then ACM uncertainty is insignificant. In this case, the ATL will determine which one of the ACMs and existing subsystem components to carry forward to the TSPA-LA. The ATL will advise the SME of the determination, the determination will be documented in the model report by the SME, and a brief summary of this determination will be included in the TSPA-LA documentation by the ATL.

If differences in results from ACMs appear to be significant at the subsystem level, the next usual activity is for the SME (and process modelers) to develop appropriate model abstractions (see Section 3.4 for additional information on abstractions), based on the ACMs, for inclusion in the TSPA-LA. However, it is possible that building abstractions would not be necessary; conceivably, an underlying process model might not exist for the phenomena under consideration (e.g., curve fits to experimental data) and, consequently, abstractions would have been used directly in the evaluation at the subsystem level. The abstraction of phenomena into TSPA-LA is the same for each ACM and is discussed more completely in Section 3.4. Also, the OCRWM QA procedures require using validated models in the TSPA-LA, so eventually each abstraction of an ACM that is actually used in TSPA-LA would have to be validated (the definition of validation does not preclude having multiple valid ACMs; ACMs only used in

preliminary analysis and later rejected and not used in producing results presented in TSPA-LA do not have to be validated). The major difference when multiple models are used to abstract phenomena is that differences between ACMs need to be evaluated at the total system level as discussed in the next section.

In some cases, the number of ACMs can be large. Although the general approach for modeling in TSPA-LA is to improve realism by reducing the number of conservative assumptions for parameter values, for ACMs the ATL and SME may still have to select what is perhaps the best ACM to use rather than quantitatively propagate multiple ACMs. Conservatism at the subsystem level (e.g., in the choice of a conservative ACM) will be used to define the best ACM to incorporate into TSPA-LA. In any case, the ATL and SME will provide a basis for that judgment, which will be documented in the relevant AMR.

3.3.4 ACM Impact Analysis in TSPA-LA

Should the total system level impact of any ACMs appear important enough to quantify for the TSPA-LA, one of two approaches will be used. For those ACMs for which little controversy exists (i.e., it is the SMEs judgment that any of the representations would be generally considered reasonable to the scientific community at large), TSPA analysts will incorporate the ACMs directly into the TSPA-LA. A parameter will be used to select between the two or more alternatives. This selection parameter will have a distribution assigned based on confidence as to the applicability of the various ACMs based on the SMEs judgment. Documentation of the technical basis for selection and weighting of ACMs will be included in the appropriate AMR.

The project plans to use weights to include multiple ACMs, in most cases; however, for especially controversial alternatives, the TSPA analyst may choose to run the full TSPA multiple realization simulation for each alternative and report the results. With this approach, it may be necessary to consider combinations of the ACMs. The project would first attempt to consider interactions (e.g., nonlinear coupling) of ACMs qualitatively, but if qualitative arguments are insufficient, the TSPA will also run various combinations of the ACMs to determine their significance to system performance.

3.3.5 FEPs

Guidance for the treatment of FEPs during consideration of ACMs is not different from guidance for FEPs in general. However, the SME must keep in mind that decisions concerning ACMs are not independent of decisions concerning FEPs. For example, if an ACM is already screened out by the FEP process, the SME should not include it. If the SME no longer believes it should be screened out, or if the ACM results in a different mechanism for including the FEP, the FEP should be further evaluated as a potential new FEP or a potential change to an existing FEP.

3.3.6 Documentation

A primary goal of the *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794]) was to ensure that sufficient documentation was generated such that the NRC will understand all the uncertainty that contributes to how the mean dose is calculated in the TSPA, and whether the uncertainty comes

from parameters or ACMs. Using the documentation, the NRC also should be able to assess whether the DOE has appropriately included ACMs.

For TSPA-SR, the description of the consideration and treatment of ACMs was placed in the appropriate AMRs. Similarly for TSPA-LA, all ACMs will be documented in the respective model reports in accordance with AP-SIII.10Q, *Models*. This documentation will likely be in the form of an attachment or distinct section to the model report, such that the updated documentation is more transparent than the existing documentation. The documentation for any ACM implemented into the TSPA-LA will include a qualitative description, unambiguous mathematical description of the model, and some form of validation. More detailed guidance on AMR documentation will be provided in an update to the *Scientific Processes Guidelines Manual* (BSC 2001 [157635]).

The TSPA-LA Model Document, prepared in accordance with administrative procedure AP-SIII.10Q, *Models*, will document how each ACM was implemented in the TSPA-LA. Additionally, an Appendix to the TSPA-LA Model Document will list each of the ACMs used or implemented in the TSPA-LA and provide a brief description.

3.4 MODEL FORM UNCERTAINTY: ABSTRACTIONS FOR USE IN TSPA-LA

As stated by the EPA in the preamble to 40 CFR Part 197 (66 FR 32074 [155216], p. 32102): "Simplifications and assumptions are involved in these modeling efforts out of necessity because of the complexity and time frames involved, and the choices made will determine the extent to which the modeling simulations realistically simulate the disposal system's performance. If choices are made that make the simulations very unrealistic, the confidence that can be placed on modeling results is very limited."

Often the term *abstraction* is applied to any simplification done to move from the real world, to a conceptual model, to a mathematical model, to a computational model, and then to the applied model. However, on the YMP, the term is used to distinguish between models that include details of the physical and chemical phenomena of a process under consideration (i.e., process models), and total system submodels (i.e., abstraction models) that are generally less complex than the process model but ideally capture the essence of the process model that is important to the total system model. The use of model abstractions can be a method to gain computational speed at the system level. The use of model abstractions is particularly appropriate when the abstraction does not pertain to a key or sensitive parameter or sensitive model component in a performance assessment. Several possible techniques or combination of techniques can be used to simplify the process model for use in the total system model as described in the *TSPA-SR* documentation (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Appendix A, Section A.2). These include: (1) discretization of results from process models into lookup tables, (2) development of response surfaces (i.e., polynomial fits to results), (3) description of results as probability distributions, (4) development of linear transfer functions, and (5) reduction of dimensionality. Applicable standards will be utilized for submodel or abstraction development (e.g., ASTM C1174-97 [105725] will be used for waste package and waste form materials behavior submodels).

3.4.1 Interface Team for Abstraction

To provide consistency in implementation, documentation, and propagation of uncertainty and variability from the process model to the abstraction model, and in validation of the methods used in abstraction, the *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794]) identifies two essential participants on the interface team for abstractions. As with the guidance on ACMs, these participants are the ATL and the SME. The guidelines indicate that one ATL will be designated to address all model abstraction issues across the various subject areas. The ATL will also serve as the team lead for addressing ACMs because of the interrelationship of these two subject areas.

3.4.2 Identify New and Revised Abstractions

The FEP screening process for TSPA-SR provides an initial basis for the models and model abstractions required in the TSPA-LA. It is expected that completely new abstractions will be rare. Rather, an important purpose of revised abstractions will be to characterize uncertainty better and remove conservatism. Hence, to support management of schedule risks described in Section 1.4, the need for new abstractions will consider their overall significance. With this strategy in mind, the ATL and TSPA analysts will meet to review the abstractions used in the TSPA-SR and TSPA-FEIS to identify any new or additional abstractions needed for the TSPA-LA. This identification will consider the findings of the TSPA-SR, SSPA, and previous sensitivity studies to identify the importance of various model components and consider the level of complexity or detail needed from the model abstraction by considering the level of resolution (simplification) of the other TSPA model components that the model abstraction feeds. Model abstractions that address key model components and/or key parameters will likely need a greater degree of detail than those that do not.

The ATL will initiate an interface meeting with the appropriate SMEs to discuss TSPA needs (e.g., a list of model components where additional model abstraction may be warranted) and learn of changes in model components proposed by the SMEs. The SME may identify technical issues in proceeding with a recommended model abstraction or may propose alternatives that would be more suitable for model abstraction. The SME will provide such information to the ATL for further consideration. For example, in some cases, the SME may advise that addressing parameter uncertainty and variability may be difficult if the current abstraction is used in which case new abstractions or a more detailed representational model may be required.

3.4.3 Develop Model Abstraction

In constructing the model abstraction, the SME (and process modelers) must consider the level of resolution of the process model and the level of resolution in the TSPA-LA model components. Consequently, the SME (and process modeler) will work in consultation with the ATL (and TSPA analysts) during the model abstraction development. This includes discussion regarding selection of any conservative components, parameter uncertainties, and evaluation of linear and nonlinear models when conservatism is used. The EPA notes in the preamble to 40 CFR Part 197 (66 FR 32074 [155216], p. 32102), "Inappropriate simplifications can mask the effects of processes that will in reality determine disposal system performance, if the

uncertainties involved with these simplifications are not recognized.” Consequently, the model abstractions used in the TSPA-LA must capture the important uncertainty and variability of the underlying process model. A description of how this uncertainty and variability was captured must be described in the corresponding model report. Often this uncertainty and variability will be captured through parameter distributions (Section 3.5); hence, the SME should also solicit input from the PTL to consider the feasibility of developing defensible parameter distributions.

The SME (and process modeler) are responsible for developing, validating, and documenting the model abstraction in the respective model report per the requirements of AP-SIII.10Q. The basis of the abstraction and the techniques used to develop the abstraction will be documented in such a way that they are clearly identifiable and explained to an external reviewer.

3.4.4 Incorporate Abstraction into TSPA-LA

To incorporate an abstraction into TSPA-LA, the TSPA analyst will obtain a controlled copy of any software and parameters needed to implement the model abstraction. Then, the TSPA analyst will integrate the model abstraction into the TSPA-LA model. The TSPA analyst will document the integration of the abstraction in the TSPA-LA Model Document. The ATL iterates with the TSPA analyst until the model abstraction is properly implemented and documented. If any changes are made to the abstraction for the purpose of integration, the TSPA analyst will ensure compliance with any applicable procedures. When the TSPA analyst’s tasks are completed, the ATL and the SME perform a joint review of the integration activities, model report documentation, and abstraction results. The ATL also ensures that the development, description of the propagation of uncertainty and variability, and validation of the model abstraction are documented in the supporting model report.

3.4.5 Documentation

For TSPA-LA, the technical basis for an abstraction and the development and validation of the model abstraction will be documented in the corresponding model reports in accordance with AP-SIII.10Q, *Models*. As previously described for ACMs, this documentation will be provided as an attachment or distinct section to the model report such that the description is transparent. The documentation will include a qualitative description, an unambiguous mathematical description of the model abstraction, and validation of the model. Detailed guidance on the documentation will be provided in an update to the *Scientific Processes Guidelines Manual* (BSC 2001 [157635]).

As noted above, the TSPA-LA Model Document will document how the model abstraction was used in the TSPA-LA. The TSPA-LA Model Document will note any changes from the model abstraction (as documented in the respective model report), that were needed to integrate the model abstractions within the TSPA-LA. Applicable standards will be utilized for submodel or abstraction development (e.g., ASTM C1174-97 [105725] for waste package and waste form materials behavior submodels).

3.5 PARAMETER UNCERTAINTY: TSPA MODEL PARAMETERS AND DEVELOPMENT OF PARAMETER DISTRIBUTIONS

The NRC in 10 CFR 63.114(b) requires the DOE, in its TSPA, to "Account for uncertainties in parameter values and provide for the technical basis for parameter ranges, probability distributions, or bounding values used in the performance assessment." The *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449], Section 4.2) stipulates that the TSPA-LA model will be reviewed, in part, to identify whether the parameter ranges and distributions are technically defensible and whether they appropriately represent uncertainty. This review of parameter distributions will consider the relevant information and the corresponding uncertainty in the underlying information. In turn, the review will evaluate the effects of the parameter uncertainty on performance of the repository. This review will include an evaluation of the potential for inappropriate characterization of risk ("risk dilution") (i.e., the lowering of the risk, or dose, from an unsupported parameter range and distribution).

Internal and external reviews of YMP documents developed for the site recommendation, including the *TSPA-SR* (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246]), found inconsistencies in the processes and methods used to develop and document all types of uncertainties, including parameter uncertainty. These reviews are summarized and evaluated in *Uncertainty Analyses and Strategy Letter Report* (Williams 2001 [157389]). In addition, this document (Williams 2001 [157389]) identifies strategies to meet the 10 CFR 63.114(b) requirement cited above in the TSPA-LA. A key component of these strategies was to develop guidance on the treatment of parameters and parameter uncertainty. This guidance is documented in Section 4 of the *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794]) and summarized here. The guidance will be implemented in the TSPA-LA to provide for consistent treatment in categorizing, quantifying, evaluating, and documenting parameters and parameter uncertainties. As mentioned at the end of Section 3.1.1, the parameter uncertainty here will focus on epistemic uncertainty, as the aleatory uncertainty will be addressed as applicable in the supporting process and abstraction models.

3.5.1 Parameter Development Team

The process of characterizing parameter uncertainty must be tailored to the amount and type of information available to support the parameter development and the use of the parameter in the TSPA models. Hence, a team approach will be used to provide for consistency in the identification and development of parameter uncertainty in TSPA-LA (see *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794], Sections 1.3.1 and 4.2)). Key Parameter Development Team members will include the Parameter Team Lead (PTL) and SMEs. The PTL will manage the process of implementing the guidelines and will work closely with the SMEs to identify parameters and assure the uncertainty in the parameter is appropriately quantified for the TSPA-LA. The PTL will be assisted in this process by one or more experts in statistical analysis and uncertainty analysis.

The SMEs are generally the principal scientists that are most knowledgeable about individual process models and their uncertain input parameters. The SMEs will provide the technical expertise to identify, implement, and document the treatment of parameter uncertainty using the

processes identified in the *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794]). The PTL and SMEs will be supported by process modeler(s), TSPA analyst(s), and the TSPA-LA Input Database Administrator. The process modeler will assist the SME in the development, and documentation of appropriate parameters. The TSPA analyst will integrate the parameters into the TSPA-LA. The TSPA Data Base Administrator will work with the PTL to document the parameters in a controlled database that is directly linked to the TSPA GoldSim model. The functional roles for the different team members are as follows:

- **Parameter Team Lead (PTL)**—Individual assigned responsibility to lead the process for ensuring the consistent treatment and documentation of parameter values, parameter distributions, and parameter uncertainty used in the TSPA-LA model. The PTL will have access to experts in statistical analysis and uncertainty analysis to add their expertise to the process.
- **Subject Matter Expert (SME)**—Personnel who are most knowledgeable about individual process models and uncertain parameters associated with the process models. The SME is responsible for identifying and developing parameters (including values, distributions, and uncertainty) consistent with the *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794]) for use in the TSPA-LA.
- **Process Modeler**—Personnel assigned to assist the SME in developing and implementing process models for use in the TSPA-LA model.
- **TSPA Analyst**—Personnel assigned to integrate parameters, ACMs and model abstractions in the TSPA-LA model.
- **TSPA Database Administrator**—Personnel assigned to set up and administer the parameter database, operate the software used to maintain the parameter database, enter parameter values and verify parameter value entry (approved by the PTL) into the parameter database.

These functional roles may or may not correspond directly with the existing or future PA Project organizational structure. However, it is expected that individuals selected for the PTL role and experts in statistical analysis and uncertainty analysis will be designated by, and report to, the TSPA Department and PA Strategy and Scope subproject managers. The SMEs will be designated by, and report to, the various PA Project departments and the respective subproject managers. This allows for the input and documentation to the TSPA-LA model to be controlled within the PA Project.

3.5.2 Identify TSPA Model Parameters

To initiate the process of identifying TSPA model parameters and for any newly developed models for TSPA-LA, the PTL and TSPA analysts will describe the computational model (implemented mathematical model) in the TSPA and identify the set of TSPA model simulation settings and model input parameters that are necessary to perform the calculations.

TSPA model simulation settings will be officially tracked when a TSPA-LA model simulation is warehoused in Technical Data Management Systems (TDMS). Model input parameters will be categorized by the PTL as fixed (e.g., single value) or uncertain. Example input parameters are listed in Appendix F.

The TSPA for Yucca Mountain has historically included a large number of parameters defined by probability distributions (approximately 300) (see Table F-1 for examples of such parameters that are identified as uncertain). Though the uncertainty in most of these parameters is not important to explain the variation in the overall dose calculation, the approach of including a large number of parameters with uncertain values will be continued to ensure that TSPA-LA is able to identify parameters that might become more important because of changes in the system models or because of changes in the values or distributions for parameters.

3.5.3 Develop Fixed Parameter Values

In those few instances when a model-configuration parameter is fixed at a single value in TSPA-LA, either the mean of the distribution (as developed below) will be used, or a recognized "best estimate" as defined by the Parameter Development Team will be used.

3.5.4 Develop Distributions for Parameter Uncertainty

The TSPA analyst will describe the pertinent TSPA model component and pertinent parameters to the SME and PTL. In turn, the SME describes the pertinent information for developing model parameters and their uncertainty to the TSPA analyst and PTL. The SME is responsible to evaluate all relevant sources of information in order to fully characterize the uncertainty in the parameter value. The source of underlying information will be documented on a Parameter Entry Form (example shown in Figure 3.5-1) or equivalent memorandum.

The Parameter Development Team (PTL, SME, and TSPA analyst) will develop a parameter distribution for uncertain parameters as follows.

Step 1—SME evaluates the sources of information available to support the development of the parameter in question. These sources may consist of either direct observations (based on testing or other analyses) or more quantitative analyses including the output of process or abstraction models. Because the approach for quantifying TSPA input parameter uncertainty may depend on the type of parameter considered, two determination paths, Step 2 or Steps 3 and 4 are presented.

Step 2—In many cases sufficient information exists for the PTL, working with the SME and TSPA analyst, to directly develop the parameter used as input to the TSPA-LA model as well as the uncertainty in that parameter. Examples of this include radionuclide solubilities, sorption coefficients, corrosion rates, etc. In these instances, the parameter uncertainty used as input to the TSPA model can be directly evaluated based on the observations, considering the spatial and temporal representations of the observations. As an example, the team might construct an empirical piecewise-linear cumulative distribution function. Other distributions such as the normal or gamma may be developed using the method of maximum likelihood or moments and

test for their goodness-of-fit using a chi-square or Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistical test. Alternatively, the team might assume each observation is an estimate of the mean and then, assuming a Bayesian viewpoint, fit a Student-t or normal distribution using the method of moments such that the uncertainty in the true mean could be described. If a distribution is developed at this step, proceed to Step 5.

Step 3—In cases where the TSPA input parameter is based on the output (i.e., abstraction) from analyses using detailed process models, the approach to quantify parameter uncertainty depends on the type and structure of the underlying process model. Besides developing functional abstractions as alluded to in Section 3.3 and 3.4, some process models can be run for multiple realizations and the result abstracted as a parameter distribution. An example of this in the TSPA-SR is the biosphere dose conversion factors. Other, more complicated process models will only be run for a sufficient number of discrete cases to adequately capture the range of outcomes. Examples of this include the drift-scale thermal-hydro-chemical model, and the unsaturated zone flow model. When distributions must be supplied for the parameters of the functional abstractions alluded to in Sections 3.2 and 3.4, the PTL requests that the SME provide estimates that subjectively account for the range of possible outputs. This range must consider other sources of uncertainty in the input to the model. Specifically, these subjective estimates include:

1. The range of the parameter (i.e., the minimum and maximum values taken by the parameter), if possible, and
2. One of the following (in decreasing order of preference):
 - a. Percentile points for the distribution of the parameter (e.g., the 25th, 50th [median], and 75th percentiles),
 - b. Mean value and standard deviation of the distribution, or
 - c. Mean value.

The range and distribution for the parameter must take into account the model form and the treatment of input uncertainty in the TSPA analysis (see Section 4.1.2 of the *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794])). For example, if the abstracted component of the TSPA model does not discretize spatially or temporally, then the parameter distribution must account for this temporal or spatial variability (aleatory uncertainty) in a suitably averaged manner. The PTL is responsible for assuring consistency in the application of the methods and the appropriateness of the estimates. To set a range too narrowly or broadly could bias the mean and violate the intent of 10 CFR 63.304(4):

"...Characteristics of reasonable expectation include that it: ...(4) Focuses performance assessments and analyses on the full range of defensible and reasonable parameter distributions rather than only upon extreme physical situations and parameter values..."

Step 4—The PTL, in consultation with the SME and TSPA analyst, will construct a distribution depending upon the kind of subjective information that has been provided in Step 3. The construction will be in accordance with published results from informational entropy theory to

the extent practicable (see Section 4.1.2 of the *Guidelines Document* (BSC 2002 [158794])). The Project anticipates that only a small subset of the many types of distributions possible will be necessary. Examples of the type of distribution suggested from the application of maximum entropy include the following as explained by Harr (1987 [100580]) and Tierney (1990 [125989]):

1. Uniform probability distribution function (PDF) based on the subjective range of the parameter provided in Step 3,
2. Piecewise-linear cumulative distribution function (CDF) based on the range and subjective percentiles provided in Step 3,
3. Exponential PDF (truncated) based on the subjective range and mean value,
4. Normal PDF based on the subjective mean value and standard deviation,
5. Normal PDF (truncated) based on the subjective range, mean value and standard deviation.

Step 5—The SME and TSPA analyst of the Parameter Development Team will review the distribution suggested by the PTL and, as appropriate, revise the distribution to fully evaluate the uncertainty. The Project will rely upon the expertise residing in the Parameter Development Team to apply any specific methods appropriate to incorporate any other information pertinent to the parameter. Concurrence by all three members of the team is signified by signatures on a Parameter Entry Form (example in Figure 3.5-1) or equivalent memorandum. Normally, the PTL mediates informal disputes in assigning a distribution. If the PTL cannot resolve a dispute, the TSPA Department Manager will facilitate informal dispute resolution. If the dispute must be resolved formally, the dispute over the Parameter Entry Form may be resolved, using the procedure for *Resolution of Differing Professional Opinion* (AP-ENG-004 [159727]).

After completing the parameter development as documented on the Parameter Entry Form (see Figure 3.5-1) or equivalent memorandum, the SME will include this form or memorandum as part of the Analysis or Model Report, as previously mentioned. In addition, the SME will submit the form or memorandum and an attachment that describes the sources of information ("roadmap") as part of the DTN submittal to the Technical Data Management System (TDMS) to provide sufficient information to understand the DTN so that another user (specifically, personnel supporting the TSPA inputs database) can easily access that individual parameter.

Finally, to facilitate populating the TSPA-LA inputs database, the SME will also provide a copy of the completed Parameter Entry Form to alert the TSPA-LA Database Administrator that a parameter assignment has been completed and stored in TDMS. The TSPA-LA Database Administrator will then assign personnel supporting the TSPA-LA Inputs Database to obtain (from TDMS) the endorsed values and distribution for the parameter using the appropriate DTN along with the Parameter Entry Form and attached roadmap. If the road-map instructions do not allow the parameter to be identified and accessed in a reasonable period of time, the TSPA-LA Database Administrator will notify the PTL that this problem exists. The PTL will then work with the SME to revise the road-map information so that the parameter can be efficiently identified and accessed.

Ideally, the parameter set used in the TSPA-LA will be judiciously chosen by the SMEs developing the various abstractions to be statistically independent. Thus, the correlation between parameters will be minimal. For example, although the SME could use either (1) an average thermal conductivity and volumetric capacity parameter, or (2) solid thermal conductivity, matrix porosity, and lithophysal porosity parameters, the latter parameter set would be better since the correlation between parameters would be less. However, this simple choice is not always possible. In any case, the SME will be responsible for describing any correlations between parameters.


As the Parameter Development Team reviews and develops parameter distributions, they will focus attention on the reasonableness of the assumptions. They will be particularly watchful that the parameter distributions are not overly conservative or overly optimistic. The emphasis here is on representativeness of the uncertainty based on available information. By stressing reasonableness in the parameter distribution definitions, the likelihood of causing risk dilution (i.e., the underestimation of risk, or dose, due to the choice of insufficiently supported optimistic inputs) to the TSPA-LA should be reduced. A proactive approach to producing reasonable parameter distributions for input to the TSPA-LA analysis should reduce the potential for risk dilution. The most likely parameter distributions to cause risk dilution are those based in part on subjective inputs as the basis for their specification. These parameters will be identified by the Parameter Development Team for further inspection, including the examination of the TSPA-LA results for risk dilution.

The steps described in this subsection are intended to control the development of parameters and the associated uncertainty. Because the appropriate personnel are integrating regularly to determine the required parameter information, it is anticipated that the specified steps will be accomplished in a single meeting between the appropriate personnel as experience is gained, without too large of a burden of iterations and documentation between the personnel.

3.5.5 Documentation of TSPA Parameters

All TSPA-LA model parameters (both uncertain and certain) will be developed using the process described in Sections 3.5.3 and 3.5.4 and will be documented in the appropriate individual model or analysis report (AMR) by the SME according to AP-SIII.10Q, *Models* or AP-SIII.9Q *Scientific Analyses*. Each individual AMR will include an identification of process model parameters (Section 4 of the AMR), a detailed discussion of the uncertainties associated with the AMR inputs (Section 6 of the AMR), and a detailed discussion of all outputs developed in the AMR (Section 8 of the AMR). The discussion of AMR inputs and outputs will address the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* acceptance criteria (CNWRA 2002 [158449], Section 4.2) that requires providing the technical bases for parameter values, assumed ranges, probability distributions, and bounding assumptions used in conceptual models, process models, and alternative conceptual models, considered in the TSPA-LA. More detailed guidance on AMR documentation will be provided in an update to the *Scientific Processes Guidelines Manual* (BSC 2001 [157635]). The PTL will work with SMEs revising AMRs for LA to implement the process outlined in Sections 3.5.3 and 3.5.4 for documenting model/analyses input and output parameters.

The output parameters (technical product output) from process model AMRs provide the inputs for the TSPA-LA model. Like the process model AMRs, the TSPA-LA Model Document will be prepared in accordance with AP-SIII.10Q, *Models*. The TSPA-LA Model Document (see Appendix C for a draft outline) will include an identification of TSPA-LA model input data and parameters in Section 4, a brief discussion of the uncertainties associated with the TSPA-LA model inputs (with references to supporting documentation for detailed discussion of the uncertainty in a particular parameter) in Section 6, and a detailed discussion of outputs developed in the TSPA-LA model in Section 8. The discussion of TSPA-LA Model Document inputs and outputs will address the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449]) acceptance criteria that requires providing the technical bases for parameter values, assumed ranges, probability distributions, and bounding assumptions used in conceptual models, process models, and alternative conceptual models incorporated into the TSPA-LA.




PSWIFT1NRC 125NRC 9/28/98 11

00239DC_Figure006a at

Source: Modification of DOE 2002 [155943], Figure 4-156

Figure 3.2-1. Steps in the FEP Analysis and Scenario Selection Process



00239DC_Figure005b ai

Source: DOE 2002 [155943], Figure 4-157

Figure 3.2-2. Schematic Illustration of the FEP Screening Process

4. SCENARIO CLASSES FOR LA

A scenario is a well-defined, connected sequence of FEPs that describes a possible future condition of the proposed repository system. A scenario class is a set of related scenarios that share sufficient similarities that they can usefully be aggregated for the purposes of screening or analysis. The objective of scenario development is to define a limited set of scenario classes and scenarios that can reasonably be analyzed quantitatively while still maintaining comprehensive coverage of the range of possible future states of the disposal system. There are an essentially infinite number of possible future states, and for scenario development to be useful, it must generate scenario classes that are representative of the range of futures that are potentially relevant to the licensing of the facility.

The number and breadth of scenario classes depends on the resolution at which scenarios have been defined. Coarsely defined scenarios result in fewer, broad scenario classes, whereas narrowly defined scenarios result in many narrow scenario classes. In turn, the number and breadth of scenarios depends on the resolution at which FEPs have been defined. There is no uniquely correct level of detail at which to define scenario classes, scenarios, and FEPs. Decisions regarding the appropriate level of resolution for the analysis are made based on consideration of the importance of the scenarios, their effects on overall performance, and the resolution desired in the results. For efficiency, scenario classes, scenarios, and FEPs should be aggregated at the coarsest level at which a technically sound argument can be made, while still maintaining adequate detail for the purposes of the analysis.

As described in Section 3.2.2, FEP analysis and scenario development for TSPA-LA will follow the same process that was used for TSPA-SR. FEP analysis includes Steps 1 and 2 of this process, which were summarized in Section 3.2.2. Scenario development includes Steps 3 and 4 of this process. The status of these scenario development steps to support TSPA-LA is summarized below. These steps directly address Scenario Analysis Acceptance Criteria 3 and 4, respectively, as outlined in the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449], Section 4.2.1.2.1.3). These steps also indirectly address Event Probability Acceptance Criteria 1 through 5 from the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449], Section 4.2.1.2.2.3).

Step 3: Formation of Scenario Classes—All FEPs retained during the formal identification and screening steps (Steps 1 and 2, summarized in Section 3.2.2) are used for TSPA scenario class development.

The nominal scenario class is developed using all screened in FEPs that are expected to occur after closure (i.e., FEPs that have a probability of occurrence near 1.0, but that may have uncertain consequences). The nominal scenario class represents the most plausible evolution of the repository system and includes both favorable future conditions and potentially adverse future conditions. The disruptive event scenario classes are developed using combinations of screened in FEPs that have a low probability of occurrence (but greater than the screening probability criterion of one occurrence in 10,000 in 10,000 years) but may produce potentially adverse future conditions (i.e., radiological exposures or radionuclide releases would be significantly changed by their omission). Disruptive event FEPs are typically, but not necessarily, unlikely FEPs, which are defined in 10 CFR 63.342 to have a probability of occurrence of less than one chance in 10 and at least one chance in 10,000 of occurring in

10,000 years. Disruptive event scenario classes typically also include the nominal FEPs and represent low-probability perturbations to the expected evolution of the repository system.

For TSPA-SR, the disruptive event scenario class consisted of two igneous modeling cases: igneous intrusion and volcanic eruption (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Section 2.1.2). Because only igneous modeling cases were included, it was also referred to as the igneous scenario class. As noted in Section 3.2.2, the expected inclusion of additional seismic FEPs (i.e., the effects of extreme vibratory ground motion due to unlikely seismic events on rockfall, drip shields and waste packages) for TSPA-LA will result in a seismic scenario class as one of the disruptive event scenario classes.

Human intrusion is a special case of a disruptive scenario class that is defined by regulation (10 CFR 63.321 and 10 CFR 63.322). Because of the regulatory guidance, the human intrusion case will be referred to as a stylized analysis for TSPA-LA rather than a scenario class. The approach to evaluation of this stylized case is described in Section 4.4.

Step 4: Screening of Scenario Classes—Scenario screening is used to identify scenario classes that contain a combination of FEPs whose combined probability of occurrence (or consequence) is low enough to permit exclusion from the TSPA, even though the probability (or consequence) of the individual FEPs requires them to be included. For a scenario class to be screened out, the combined low probability (or consequence) should not result from an inappropriately narrow scenario definition that artificially reduces the probability (or consequence) below the regulatory cutoff (CNWRA 2002 [158449], p. 4.2-9).

For TSPA-SR, detailed screening was performed on FEPs (as described in Section 3.2.2, Step 2). The scenario classes formed in Step 3 above were composed of those screened in FEPs. No additional exclusions were made during scenario screening. For TSPA-LA, additional screening is anticipated for the disruptive event scenario classes. The Latin Square method (NRC 2000 [153033], Section 3.2.5) is used to illustrate the combined probabilities of occurrence or non-occurrence of the igneous scenario class (I and I') and the seismic scenario class (S and S') (Table 4-1). The probabilities (P) of occurrence and non-occurrence for each scenario class sum to one. The probabilities of occurrence (I and S) are both expected to be quite low, such that the probabilities of non-occurrence (I' and S') are near 1 (i.e., greater than 0.99).

Table 4-1 shows that the combined occurrence of the seismic and igneous scenario classes is expected to be screened out based on low probability. This probability-based screening relies on the independence of the seismic and igneous scenario classes. Although some seismicity is associated with igneous activity, the extreme seismic events considered in the seismic scenario class are expected to be shown to have tectonic rather than magmatic origins, and therefore be independent from igneous activity. However, a final screening decision for the combined occurrence of a seismic event (that produces significant drift collapse) preceding an igneous event will not be made until the associated probabilities and consequences have been fully evaluated. Table 4-1 also indicates the probability of the nominal scenario class, which is represented by the combined non-occurrence of the two disruptive scenario classes.

Table 4-1. Latin Square Diagram for an Analysis with Two Disruptive Scenario Classes

	I S $[P < 10^{-4}$ in 10,000 yrs] Expected to be Screened Out	I S' $[P \cong P(I)]$ Igneous Scenario Class
	I S $[P \cong P(S)]$ Seismic Scenario Class	I S' $[P = 1 - P(I) - P(S)]$ Nominal Scenario Class

Each of the TSPA-LA analysis cases (Nominal Scenario Class, Igneous Scenario Class, Seismic Scenario Class, and Human Intrusion Stylized Analysis) are described in more detail in Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4, respectively.

4.1 NOMINAL SCENARIO CLASS

The nominal scenario class contains a single modeling case that is composed of the set of expected FEPs, as determined by a formal FEP screening procedure described in Section 3.2.2. The TSPA-SR FEP screening basis and decisions are summarized in Appendix B of *TSPA-SR* (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246]), but will be updated in the FEP AMRs (Table 3.2-1) to support TSPA-LA. The nominal scenario class for TSPA incorporates the important effects and system perturbations caused by climate change and repository heating that are projected to occur over the 10,000-year compliance period (Figure 4.1-1).

The nominal scenario class includes the following general processes:

- Unsaturated zone flow
- Engineered barrier system environment (including near-field thermal, physical, and chemical environments)
- Waste package and drip shield degradation
- Waste form degradation
- Engineered barrier system flow and transport
- Unsaturated zone transport
- Saturated zone flow and transport
- Biosphere

The technical basis for the conceptualization of the TSPA-SR nominal scenario class is summarized in *TSPA-SR* (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Sections 3.2 through 3.9) and the *Yucca Mountain Science and Engineering Report* (DOE 2002 [155943], Section 4.2).

For TSPA-LA, the nominal scenario class is expected to include certain enhancements based on post-TSPA-SR analyses using the supplemental TSPA model (BSC 2001 [155950]; BSC 2001 [154659]) and the revisions for the final regulations (Williams 2001 [157307]; Williams 2001 [156743]). These enhancements for the TSPA-LA nominal scenario class are summarized in Table 5.1-1. Additional discussion of the implementation of the nominal scenario class in TSPA-LA is provided in Section 5.3.1.

4.2 IGNEOUS SCENARIO CLASS

The igneous scenario class (Figure 4.2-1) includes two distinct modeling cases: (1) volcanic eruption at the repository location and (2) igneous intrusion (or magmatic flooding) of some of the emplacement drifts in the repository. The technical basis for the conceptualization of the TSPA-SR igneous modeling cases are summarized in *TSPA-SR* (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Section 3.10) and the *Science and Engineering Report* (DOE 2002 [155943], Section 4.3.2.1).

Both modeling cases assume that the eruptive event consists of a magmatic penetration of the repository facility after permanent closure. The conceptualization of the volcanic eruption modeling case assumes that the magma flow intersects and destroys waste packages, bringing waste to the surface through one or more eruptive conduits. For TSPA-SR, the atmospheric transport model (ASHPLUME) of radionuclides bound in the particles of volcanic ash, dispersed the particles downwind and ultimately deposited them on the ground at the RMEI location.

The igneous intrusion modeling case assumes that a hypothetical igneous dike intersects drifts of the repository and that the associated waste packages are damaged, exposing the waste within to percolating water. For TSPA-SR, models accounted for the additional waste package failures and analyzed the transport of radionuclides through the groundwater pathway to the location of the RMEI.

For TSPA-LA, the igneous modeling cases are expected to include certain enhancements based on post-TSPA-SR analyses using the supplemental TSPA model (BSC 2001 [155950]; BSC 2001 [154659]) and the revisions for the final regulations (Williams 2001 [157307]; Williams 2001 [156743]). These enhancements for the TSPA-LA igneous modeling cases are summarized in Table 5.1-1. Additional details of the implementation of the igneous modeling cases in TSPA-LA is provided in Section 5.3.2.

The probability of the igneous intrusion modeling case is equal to the probability of an intrusive event (i.e., a swarm of one or more dikes intersecting the repository). This is also referred to as the event probability. The probability of the volcanic eruption modeling case is equal to the intrusive event probability times the conditional probability of a conduit or vent forming within a drift (also referred to as the vent or conduit probability).

4.3 SEISMIC SCENARIO CLASS

Potential seismic effects on the underground facilities and waste packages were screened out of TSPA-SR (except for damage to cladding from vibratory ground motion). However, based on revised screening decisions (see Section 3.2.2), a seismic scenario class is expected to be included in TSPA-LA. The seismic scenario class will be based on a seismic probabilistic risk assessment. The general methodology is described in a letter report to the NRC (Brocoum, 2001 [159576]). Details of the implementation are described in Section 5.3.2. The seismic scenario class is expected to be composed of a single modeling case that includes the following processes (Figure 4.3-1):

- Effects of extreme vibratory ground motion on rockfall
- Effects of ground-motion-induced rockfall on drip shields, and on waste packages if a drip shield fails as a structural barrier
- Effects of direct ground-motion-induced shaking on drip shields, waste packages, cladding, and pallets.

Note that for TSPA-SR, seismic vibration of cladding was included as part of the nominal scenario class, but for TSPA-LA it will be included in the seismic scenario class. Direct effects of fault displacement, changes in fractures, faults, or hydrologic response are expected to be excluded from TSPA-LA based on current analyses.

The probability of the seismic scenario class is equal to the mean frequency of exceedance of extreme vibratory ground motion at the repository, which is based on the ground motion hazard curve from the *Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analyses for Fault Displacement and Vibratory Ground Motion at Yucca Mountain, Nevada* (CRWMS M&O 1998 [103731]). The implementation of the seismic scenario class in TSPA-LA is expected to take the form of response surfaces that relate the level of ground motion to drip shield and waste package failed area as a function of wall thickness. The effective failed areas will include the combined effects of both rockfall and shaking. Additional details of the implementation of the seismic scenario class in TSPA-LA is provided in Section 5.3.2.

4.4 HUMAN INTRUSION STYLIZED ANALYSIS


The NRC regulation establishing the human intrusion standard, 10 CFR 63.321, requires compliance in licensing with the 15-mrem dose limit for individual protection if the DOE determines that, within the 10,000-year regulatory compliance period, the waste packages would degrade sufficiently that a human intrusion could occur without recognition by the driller. If the human intrusion is projected to occur more than 10,000 years after disposal, the dose analysis of the human intrusion case need not be presented in the TSPA-LA, only in an Environmental Impact Statement and the dose limits for the human intrusion standard would not apply.

In 10 CFR 63.322, a stylized human intrusion is specified that considers an "intruder" to be someone drilling a land-surface borehole using a drilling apparatus (under the common

techniques and practices that are currently employed in exploratory drilling for groundwater in the region around Yucca Mountain). In the stylized analysis, it is specified that the intruder drills directly through a single degraded waste package and subsequently into the uppermost aquifer underlying the proposed repository. The intrusion then causes the subsequent compromise and release to groundwater of the waste in the penetrated waste package. Figure 4.4-1 provides a schematic of this stylized condition.

The compressive strength and ductility of the metals from which the drip shields and waste packages are fabricated differ significantly from the rock that would surround them (BSC 2001 [155950], Appendix A). Drillers would notice these differences. For example, the drilling assembly is expected to buckle and bend when the bit attempts to penetrate the titanium drip shield and waste package (drill bits that are designed for rock do not easily penetrate metal, particularly titanium). The drillers should, therefore, recognize that they have attempted to drill into some material other than rock for at least as long as the drip shield or waste packages are intact. Analyses predict that the first failures of the waste package material, Alloy 22, due to general corrosion occur after approximately 30,000 years (BSC 2001 [155950], Appendix A). Therefore, the earliest time a human intrusion could occur without recognition by a driller is 30,000 years. Consequently, documentation of the human intrusion stylized analysis in the TSPA-LA will be limited to a description of the technical basis and analyses to support the determination of the time of occurrence of the human intrusion. This will be conducted and documented external to the TSPA-specific documentation (e.g., in a Waste Package AMR).

Because the dose from the human intrusion is expected to occur after the 10,000-year regulatory compliance period, dose analysis of the stylized human intrusion case is not required for TSPA-LA. Instead, the human intrusion dose analysis is presented in *Final Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada* (DOE 2002 [155970]) in accordance with 10 CFR 63.321(b)(2). Details of this analysis are documented in the *TSPA-FEIS Report* (Williams 2001 [157307], Section 6.4) and is based on prescribed assumptions about the human intrusion stylized analysis given in 10 CFR 63.322.



Source: Modification of DOE 2002 [156958], Figure 3-17

Figure 4.1-1. Schematic Illustration of the Components of the Nominal Scenario Class





Figure 4.2-1. Schematic Illustration of the Igneous Scenario Classes Two Modeling Cases: a) Volcanic Eruption, and b) Igneous Intrusion



Drawing Not To Scale
00239DC_Figure004c.ai

Source: Modification of DOE 2001 [155734], Figure 3-64

Figure 4.3-1. Schematic Illustration of the Seismic Scenario Class




Figure 4.4-1. Schematic Illustration of the Stylized Human Intrusion Analysis

5. TSPA-LA MODEL COMPONENTS

Eight principal model components in the TSPA-LA model will be combined to evaluate the proposed repository system performance for nominal and disruptive event scenario classes. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the individual model components and model architecture for the TSPA-LA model and outline how these models will be implemented for the three scenario classes. As noted in the *Yucca Mountain Review Plan* (CNWRA 2002 [158449]), the model abstraction review process ends with a review of how the abstracted models are implemented in the TSPA model. This section provides information to facilitate this review and in particular describes how the models from different parts of the repository system are integrated together.

Figures 5-1 through 5-5 depict the general flow of information for the principal model components and scenario classes of the TSPA-LA. The model components, listed in the general order information is passed from model to model, include:

- Unsaturated zone flow
- Engineered barrier system environment
- Waste package and drip shield degradation
- Waste form degradation and mobilization
- Engineered barrier system flow and transport
- Unsaturated zone transport
- Saturated zone flow and transport
- Biosphere.

The scenario classes include the nominal (undisturbed) scenario class and the disruptive event scenario classes.

Nominal Scenario Class—The nominal scenario class exercises the model components to describe the anticipated sequence of processes that are likely to occur during the lifetime of the proposed repository (i.e., those with a probability of occurrence of close to one).

Disruptive Event Scenario Classes—The two disruptive event scenario classes exercise the model components to describe the sequence of events and processes that, if they occur, could have a significant consequence to public health, but whose probability of occurrence is very small. These classes consider volcanic eruption, igneous intrusion, and seismic ground motion and fault displacement (if screened in) as events that have low probability of occurrence during the time period of evaluation.

The igneous scenario class includes (1) igneous intrusion resulting in indirect releases via groundwater, and (2) volcanic eruption resulting in direct releases via ash dispersal and deposition.

The seismic scenario class includes seismic ground motion and fault displacement (if screened in) resulting in indirect releases via groundwater.

The nominal and disruptive scenario classes together contribute to the expected annual dose (Figure 5-1). Figures 5-2 to 5-5 show the individual flow-of-information wheels for the nominal scenario class, the two igneous disruptive modeling cases, and the seismic scenario class. These figures provide a visualization of how information flows between principal model components within each of the scenario classes and modeling cases. Note that the nominal, igneous intrusion, and seismic modeling cases utilize many of the same models and parameters, so these wheels look very similar.

An outline of the following sections is as follows. Section 5.1 describes the individual model components along with their key inputs and outputs. The model components for TSPA-LA will be similar to those described in the *SSPA Volume 1* (BSC 2001 [155950]), *SSPA Volume 2* (BSC 2001 [154659]), and *TSPA-FEIS Report* (Williams 2001 [157307]). The section also presents a table summarizing the updates planned for the LA model. Section 5.2 provides an overview of how information flows between the models and the computer code architecture that facilitates the information flow. Section 5.3 describes the implementation of the three scenario classes: nominal, igneous, and seismic.

5.1 MODEL COMPONENTS

The TSPA-LA model components will be similar to the TSPA-SR and TSPA-FEIS model components with differences resulting primarily from improved quantification of uncertainties, incorporation of new information and understanding, and developments to address KTI agreements and improve technical bases. The project made many of these improvements during the *SSPA* (BSC 2001 [155950]; BSC 2001 [154659]) and for the *TSPA-FEIS Report* (Williams 2001 [157307]), and much of the work since then has focused on quality assurance and validation of these models. The principal TSPA-LA model components (UZ Flow, Engineered Barrier System (EBS) Environment, Waste Form Degradation and Mobilization, Waste Package and Drip Shield Degradation, EBS Flow and Transport, UZ Transport, SZ Flow and Transport, and Biosphere) and their supporting submodels are illustrated in Figure 5.1-1. The principal model components are in the top row of the figure, with submodels pictured below the principal model component level. Submodels represent a further division of the principal model components. Note that submodels have arrows on the left side illustrating links to the parent model component. Arrows on the right side of submodels illustrate input feeds from submodels of other principal model components. Only those models that provide direct input to the TSPA model are shown. Figure 5.1-1 also illustrates the Disruptive Events models (i.e., nominal model components plus the atmospheric transport model for volcanic eruption modeling case, and repository level impacts depending on the disruptive event under consideration).

Potential key updates to the TSPA-FEIS model for the LA model for each component are summarized in Table 5.1-1. The models are all part of the TSPA-LA model, and run in the GoldSim model framework. Note, model changes may include revised model input and output distributions and changes to mathematical models. These changes should improve representation of important processes and uncertainty at the principal model component level and in the TSPA-LA model. Also, note that there are no key model changes planned in saturated zone flow and transport. A description of the hierarchy of major documents for each TSPA-LA model

component and their submodels is provided in Appendix G. The document hierarchy is shown in Figures G-1 through G-10. The models and their corresponding model reports are listed in Table G-1. Appendix G, as noted in Section 1, is an evolving plan for document development, and thus does not contain DIRS numbers or references. Nearly all of the TSPA-FEIS model components will be updated and improved for the TSPA-LA, some more than others.

Table 5.1-1. Summary of Potential Key Model Changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA

TSPA Model Component	Submodel	Description of Changes
UZ Flow	Mountain-Scale Flow	Changes in UZ flow grid to accommodate changes in repository layout and increased resolution in the repository area. Number of grid points increases from 100,000 to 250,000. The number of flow fields may increase to improve treatment of uncertainty in flow fields due to fraction of flowing fractures.
	Seepage	Data from long-term liquid-release experiments will be incorporated to reduce the estimation uncertainty in seepage-relevant parameters and obtain estimates for the previously untested lower lithophysal zone of the Topopah Spring Tuff unit. An updated distribution of the flow-focusing factor for seepage is expected to be implemented that is based on simulations of unsaturated-zone flow using heterogeneous permeability fields. Will change response surface for ambient seepage to be a function of underlying physical parameters such as permeability and fracture alpha. Will develop a new and separate response surface for the thermal period (approximately first 2000 years of simulation period).
EBS Environment	Thermal Hydrologic Environment	The model for thermal properties of the host rock is expected to be updated to integrate new information obtained for the Topopah Spring lower lithophysal unit and to account for uncertainty and spatial variability of thermal properties. Model is expected to be revised to incorporate waste package loading sequence and variable (temporal and spatial) ventilation efficiency. Location of percolation flux above drift for input to seepage model is expected to change based on new UZ flow model analyses. Cold-trap effect (drift-scale condensation) and drip-shield condensation are expected to be included if they cannot be screened out from TSPA-LA model.
	Chemical Environment	The model will improve the representation of evolution of solids and water during the thermal period due to evaporation and deliquescence of water occurring in the emplacement drifts. Additional anions and cations are expected to be added to accommodate analysis and modeling of waste package localized corrosion. Sorpton (K_d s) in the invert will be set to zero.

Table 5.1-1. Summary of Potential Key Model Changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA (Continued)

TSPA Model Component	Submodel	Description of Changes
Waste Package and Dnp Shield Degradation	Waste Package/Dnp Shield Degradation (WAPDEG)	<p>Stress Corrosion Cracking (SCC) of Alloy 22 Will update representation for the fraction of weld flaws in waste packages that can propagate through wall thickness by SCC. The value for repassivation slope at SCC crack tip is expected to be updated. The representation of uncertainty in the residual stress profile for the closure weld region of the outer waste package barrier is expected to be improved. The representation of uncertainty in the residual stress profile for the closure weld region of the inner waste package barrier is expected to be improved. The distribution of the threshold stress for crack initiation is expected to be updated. SCC initiation at preexisting flaws is expected to be modeled with the more conservative of the threshold stress and threshold stress intensity approaches.</p> <p>General Corrosion The TSPA-LA model is expected to take into account temperature dependence of the general corrosion rate of the Alloy 22 outer waste package barrier.</p> <p>Localized Corrosion Localized corrosion model is expected to include additional dependency on chemical environment.</p>
	Igneous Waste Package Damage Model	Model is expected to be developed to define extent of waste package damage due to deleterious chemical and physical environments.
Waste Form Degradation and Mobilization	Radionuclide Inventory	An updated radionuclide screening analysis using new screening criteria is expected to introduce new radionuclides into groundwater dose (e.g., Cs-135).
	In-Package Chemistry	The model is expected to be updated to take into account the effect of waste form and iron degradation products on in-package chemistry. A time-dependent function for water volume in package is expected to be developed.
	Cladding Degradation	The model is expected to incorporate new probability distributions for creep rupture and stress corrosion cracking parameters. Unzipping model is expected to be eliminated. Localized corrosion perforation rate is expected to be based on chlorides and ferric chlorides. Modification of model for failure due to seismic ground motion and implementation in seismic scenario is expected.
	Waste Form Degradation Rate	No major changes planned.
	Dissolved Concentration Limits	Model is expected to be modified to increase the range for the uncertainty in the effect of the controlling mineral phases for plutonium, neptunium, and thorium and to account for the effects of colloids.
	Colloids	Commercial spent nuclear fuel (CSNF) and/or DOE spent nuclear fuel (DSNF) colloids are expected to be added.
	Igneous Impact on Waste Form	Current cladding, in-package chemistry, waste form degradation and solubility models are expected to be modified to account for the effects of igneous intrusion.

Table 5.1-1. Summary of Potential Key Model Changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA (Continued)

TSPA Model Component	Submodel	Description of Changes
EBS Flow and Transport	EBS Flow	May develop model to predict area of waste package surface drpped on as a function of in-drift seepage and drnp shield degradation to accommodate localized corrosion model needs.
UZ Transport	Dnft Shadow Transport	Diffusive coupling between EBS and UZ is expected to be modified.
	UZ Transport Model	Modify FEHM particle tracker matrix diffusion approach.
Biosphere	Biosphere	New eruptive biosphere dose conversion factor (BDCF) models will be implemented, consisting of an improved inhalation modeling component and a steady-state component. Also, groundwater protection dose will be based on FGR-11 (Eckerman et al. 1988 [101069])
Disruptive Events	Seismic Scenario Model	New model is expected to be developed and implemented to determine release resulting from ground motion and fault displacement (if screened in) and subsequent potential damage to drnp shield, waste package, and cladding.
	Igneous Scenario Model	Several model parameters are expected to change for both eruption and intrusion modeling cases including wind speed, number of conduits intersecting drifts, and vent probability. Number of waste packages impacted by igneous intrusion event is expected to be based on process model analyses that will delineate two primary zones in a drnft. Zone 1 will contain complete waste package destruction and Zone 2 will contain an aggressive corrosion of Alloy 22 during intrusive event and possible mechanical disruption of waste package. Tephra redistribution model is expected to be added to the eruptive scenario.

Model components and submodels illustrated in Figure 5.1-1 are described in the following sections. Note that submodels have arrows on the left side illustrating links to the parent model component. Arrows on the right side of submodels illustrate input feeds from submodels of other model components. The documentation hierarchy supporting the development of principal model components and their submodels is presented in Appendix G, both graphically and in tabular form. Note that the diagrams presented in Appendix G reflect how information flows between the supporting documentation. This flow of information between documents may be discretized differently than the flow of information between models as depicted in Figure 5.1-1. In the former case, the information flow supports model development and analyses, whereas in the latter case information flow enables model implementation.

Unsaturated Zone (UZ) Flow

The UZ flow model component will define the temporal and spatial distribution of water flow through the unsaturated tuffs above and below the proposed repository horizon and the temporal and spatial distribution of water seeps into the waste emplacement drifts. The UZ component of the TSPA includes five submodels of flow in the UZ:

- Climate
- Infiltration
- Mountain-scale UZ water flow
- Drift seepage
- Drift-scale coupled processes

A brief description of these submodels is provided below. See Table 5.1-1 for a summary of potential UZ submodel changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA.

Climate refers to the meteorological conditions that characteristically prevail in a particular region. Climate conditions at Yucca Mountain must be known to determine the hydrology within and around Yucca Mountain. The climate submodel will provide future histories of the following output variables.

- Precipitation and air temperature will serve as inputs to the infiltration submodel.
- Water table rise for future climates will serve as a bottom boundary condition for the mountain-scale UZ flow model and the thermal hydrologic models.
- The climate and infiltration models will also be used to scale changes in SZ groundwater flux for future climates to the SZ flow and transport models.

The climate model is formulated using paleoclimate and paleoenvironmental reconstructions based on microfossil evaluations in Owens Lake cores and calcite isotope records from Devil's Hole. The sequence and duration of past climate periods are identified from the records and applied to the Yucca Mountain site, which has a similar climate setting. The temperature and precipitation records of present-day meteorological stations at colder and wetter sites are selected to represent future climate states. In addition, paleohydrologic data (e.g., paleospring deposits) are used to estimate how the water table fluctuates with climate. Water table changes, plus calculated infiltration changes, will be used to estimate changes in SZ groundwater flux for future climates.

The infiltration submodel provides net infiltration of meteoric water at the surface, which will be used as a top boundary condition for the mountain-scale-flow submodel and the multi-scale thermal-hydrologic (MSTH) submodel (a submodel in the EBS environment model). Net infiltration is the penetration of water through the ground surface to a depth where it can no longer be withdrawn by evaporation or transpiration by plants. Infiltration occurs once water has entered bedrock or has penetrated below the root zone in soil. The main components of net infiltration are precipitation, evapotranspiration (evaporation plus transpiration), and surface-water runoff and run-on. These components will be incorporated into a watershed-scale, volume-balanced model using a snowpack submodel, an evaporation and net radiation submodel, one-dimensional (vertical) root-zone infiltration submodels, and a two-dimensional surface-water, flow-routing submodel (CRWMS M&O 2000 [151940], Section 3.5).

UZ water flow refers to the percolation of groundwater through rocks above the water table. The mountain-scale UZ flow model provides flow fields (spatial distributions of fracture and matrix saturations and percolation fluxes) to the UZ radionuclide transport model. This model is based on a steady-state moisture flow assumption, a volume-averaged modeling approach with dual-permeability model representation of fractures and tuff matrix, and a multilayer three-dimensional grid block approximation, with each hydraulic unit characterized by averaged and calibrated rock properties. Calibrated property sets will be developed for upper-bound, mean, and lower-bound infiltration rates of the modern (present-day) climate, to match observed ambient conditions of matrix liquid saturation, water potential and temperature data, perched water data, pneumatic data, and geochemical data. Major faults will be included in the model explicitly. In fault zones, fracture density and permeability are higher than in the rest of the model, which enables them to act as preferential flow paths in parts of the model. The mountain-scale UZ flow model will also provide calibrated sets of hydrologic properties to the seepage and thermal hydrologic models.

Seepage is the movement of liquid water into emplacement drifts. The seepage submodel provides seepage flux into the drifts during thermal and ambient periods. Seepage flux will be used by the EBS Environment and EBS Flow and Transport TSPA model components. The seepage submodel requires percolation flux as input and this input is expected to be provided by the MSTH model.

Heat input from radioactive decay drives coupled chemical processes. Boiling and resultant precipitation of naturally occurring minerals may result in the reduction of fracture apertures. Regions in which condensate waters accumulate and then readily flow may result in dissolution and precipitation of minerals, potentially increasing fracture apertures in one location while reducing them in another. These processes may also influence the water chemistry entering the emplacement drifts. The Drift-Scale Coupled Processes model will be used to provide boundary conditions for EBS chemical environment simulations. This model will represent the thermally driven evolution of water chemistry and gas composition in the near-field host rock over time. This model abstracts results from a fully coupled two-dimensional thermal-hydrologic-chemical (THC) chimney model that will be applied at two representative locations in the proposed repository, one in the lithophysal unit and one in the non-lithophysal unit. Abstraction results will be in the form of response surfaces and used in chemical environment model simulations to represent time-dependent water and gas compositions that enter the emplacement drifts located in each of these units.

It is important to note that the UZ flow models do not include potential effects of changes in the hydrology induced by disruptive events (e.g., seismic and igneous events). The justification for excluding these disruptive events will be documented through the FEP screening process.

EBS Environment

EBS environments refer to the thermal-hydrologic and chemical environments within the emplacement drifts. These environments are important to proposed repository performance because they help determine degradation rates of the engineered barrier components, quantities and species of mobilized radionuclides, and transport of radionuclides and fluids through the

drift into the UZ. Table 5.1-1 summarizes potential EBS environment model changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA.

Heat from the waste form will strongly influence local conditions around the waste packages and within the drifts. The thermal-hydrologic environment in the emplacement drifts depends on the decay-heat characteristics of the individual waste packages. The in-drift thermal-hydrologic environment for TSPA simulations will be computed using the MSTH model. This model quantifies processes such as lateral heat losses associated with proximity to repository edges, spatially and temporally (e.g., because of climate changes) variable infiltration rates, waste emplacement in different host rock units, in-drift heat transfer effects, and waste packages.

The MSTH model will provide temperature, relative humidity (RH), liquid saturation and flow rate, and liquid evaporation rate at several in-drift locations. These results will serve as inputs to chemical environment, EBS flow and transport, waste package and drip shield degradation, and waste form degradation and mobilization models. The MSTH model is expected to provide percolation flux to the seepage submodel for the thermal and ambient periods.

Inputs to the MSTH model will come from a variety of sources. The hydrologic property data sets developed for the UZ flow model will also be applied to the MSTH model. There will be calibrated mountain- and drift-scale property sets for low, nominal, and high infiltration rates and for flow around and flow through the perched water zones below the repository. The calibrated drift-scale property sets will be applied to the MSTH model. Repository design specifications needed as input include mass loading, repository layout, and heat output over time.

The purpose of the chemical environment model is to provide a quantitative description of the major time-dependent chemical compositional parameters required by the drip shield and waste package degradation models, the waste form dissolved concentration submodel, and EBS radionuclide transport model. In particular, this model will determine the aqueous solution compositions and types of precipitates (including salts) that may form as water is evaporated within the drift. The model will assess the effects on water chemistry of accumulated precipitates, the effects of heat and RH on water vapor condensation, and the dissolution of precipitates/salts previously deposited on drip shield, waste package, and other EBS component surfaces. The evaluation will include changes in aqueous solution compositions resulting from evaporation driven by temperature gradients within the drift (e.g., from package surface to drift wall) and from interactions with grout.

Several processes and interactions among in-drift gas, water, and EBS components potentially affect the in-drift chemical environment. The chemical environment model is based on the following results and interpretations:

- Water and grout interactions—The effect on water chemistry of chemical reactions between water that enters the drift and grout materials used to stabilize rock bolts.
- Salts precipitation and salts dissolution—The types of precipitates that may form as water is evaporated within the drift.
- Deliquescence—The types of aqueous solutions that may form due to deliquescence by salt precipitates and small dust particles.

- Microbial activity and effects—The ultimate abundance of microbes within the drift environment is estimated (bounded) based on nutrient and energy limitations within the drift.
- Corrosion and degradation of EBS components—This submodel will evaluate changes to water chemistry resulting from chemical reactions between the aqueous seepage that enters the drift and metallic components and their corrosion products encountered along the flow paths.

Results of chemical environment model simulations will be incorporated in the TSPA-LA model as abstracted EBS fluid composition response surfaces for various regions of the EBS. These response surfaces will set the chemical environment within the GoldSim EBS cells. By coupling time histories of chemical environment compositional parameters to each cell environment, the chemical environment model will be effectively coupled to the waste package degradation model, waste form mobilization model, and EBS transport model.

The chemical environment model will have several connections with other TSPA model components. This model takes input from the UZ seepage model, UZ drift-scale coupled processes model and the EBS thermal-hydrologic model and provides output to the drip shield and waste package corrosion models, the waste form degradation and mobilization model (degradation, radionuclide solubility, colloid stability), and EBS transport.

Waste Package and Drip Shield Degradation

The waste package and drip shield together form the primary component of the EBS. The TSPA-LA model component for evaluating degradation of the waste package and drip shield is the Waste Package DEGradation (WAPDEG) model. WAPDEG is based on a stochastic simulation approach and provides a description of waste package and drip shield degradation, which occurs as a function of time and proposed repository location for specific design and thermal-hydrologic-chemical exposure conditions. Table 5.1-1 summarizes potential waste package and drip shield degradation model changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA. Several degradation processes potentially affect waste package and drip shield performance. WAPDEG integrates and relates submodels that provide results and interpretations for the following degradation processes:

- Humid-air general corrosion, a relatively uniform thinning of materials, occurs when the RH at the surface of the drip shield and waste package in the emplacement drift exceeds a threshold value.
- Aqueous general corrosion, a relatively uniform thinning of materials, occurs when a material surface is wetted, as from seepage or drips.
- Localized corrosion is induced by local variations in the electrochemical potential or driving force for corrosion on a micro-scale over small regions.
- Stress corrosion cracking (SCC) is a crack propagation process caused by the combined and synergistic interaction of mechanical stress and corrosion reactions.
- Microbially-induced corrosion is caused by the metabolic activity of microorganisms.

- Thermal aging and phase instability is caused by prolonged exposure to elevated temperature environments, resulting in microstructure changes of waste package and drip shield materials, potentially changing their corrosion behavior, such as by enhancing general corrosion.
- Manufacturing and material defects, including defects due to improper heat treatment, can augment corrosion processes and result in early failure of waste packages.

These degradation processes are a function of the material properties of the drip shield and waste package, and the sequence of events that is anticipated to occur subsequent to repository closure. Three main types of degradation will be considered directly: humid-air general corrosion, aqueous general corrosion, and SCC. Two additional corrosion processes, microbially-induced corrosion, and thermal aging and phase instability, will be considered to enhance general corrosion on the waste package. Localized corrosion will be evaluated for the predicted environmental conditions in the proposed repository, and may be implemented in the TSPA-LA, if necessary.

A key input to the SCC model is information regarding defects, incipient cracks, and manufacturing defects. Preexisting manufacturing flaws in the closure lid welds are the most likely sites for SCC failure. The frequency and size distributions for manufacturing flaws in the closure welds will likely be based on relevant published data such as data for stainless steel pipe welds in nuclear power plants.

The primary models supplying input to drip shield and waste package degradation abstractions are the EBS environment models and the in-package chemistry model. Inputs to the drip shield degradation model will consist of emplacement drift temperature and RH profiles as a function of time. Inputs to the waste package degradation model consist of: emplacement drift temperature and RH profiles as a function of time, chemical composition of gases and dripping water, mineral deposits (precipitates and salts), and in-package chemical conditions.

In addition, the waste package/drip shield models will be coupled to disruptive scenario class models (e.g., rockfall, igneous intrusion, and seismic) if it is found necessary to determine waste package and drip shield lifetimes under these conditions.

Output from the drip shield and waste package degradation models will be a time-dependent quantitative assessment of the drip shield and waste package degradation and failure. Results will include: the time to initial breach for the drip shield and the waste package; time to first breach of the waste package by stress-corrosion crack failure; and the degree of drip shield and waste package failure as a function of time. The time of the first breach of the waste package corresponds to the start of waste form degradation within the breached package.

The processes leading to early waste package failure are under evaluation as well, and may result in an early waste package failure model for TSPA-LA.

Waste-Form Degradation and Mobilization

The purpose of the waste form degradation and mobilization model is to evaluate the rate of degradation of cladding and waste matrix, the dissolved concentration of radioisotopes, and the

migration of radioisotopes through remaining portions of the waste package. Specifically, the waste form degradation and mobilization model consists of the following submodels that:

- Provide the radionuclide inventory
- Evaluate in-package water chemistry (In-Package Chemistry Abstraction)
- Evaluate the rate of Zircaloy cladding degradation (for CSNF) (Clad Degradation Abstraction)
- Evaluate the matrix degradation rates for CSNF, DSNF, and high-level radioactive waste (HLW) waste forms (Waste Form Matrix Degradation Abstractions)
- Evaluate the radionuclide concentrations for aqueous phases (Dissolved Radionuclide Concentration Abstraction)
- Evaluate the waste form and EBS colloidal phases (Colloidal Radionuclide Concentration Abstraction).

Table 5.1-1 summarizes potential waste form degradation and mobilization model changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA.

The waste form degradation and mobilization model for TSPA-LA will be applicable to three generic waste form categories: (1) CSNF, (2) DSNF, and (3) HLW glass. These three categories are contained and disposed of in two types of waste packages—CSNF waste packages and codisposal waste packages, with the latter containing both DSNF and HLW glass. As was done in the TSPA-SR, releases from naval spent nuclear fuel (SNF) will be conservatively represented by CSNF releases.

For both the CSNF and codisposal waste packages, the waste form degradation model will describe the evolution of the chemical environment in the packages, corrosion of the protective cladding leading to perforations and cladding failure in the case of CSNF, dissolution of the exposed fuel matrix, and mobilization of the radionuclides. The calculated radionuclide release rates from waste forms will, in turn, be provided to the EBS flow and transport model, which will calculate the radionuclide releases from the EBS.

The waste form degradation and mobilization model for CSNF, DSNF, and HLW is primarily designed for the nominal scenario class but will also be used as a source term for the igneous and seismic scenario classes. The submodels will be computationally linked in a sequential manner. The submodels are described in the following paragraphs.

The model abstraction for the waste inventory defines the source term for the CSNF and codisposal waste packages in terms of both the quantity and spectrum of radioisotopes. This information will be used with the abstraction for waste form degradation to determine the mobilization of the radionuclides. The computer implementation of the inventory abstraction will be a simple table lookup of the quantity of radionuclides at the time of waste emplacement for the CSNF and codisposal waste packages.

The in-package chemistry component will model the evolution of the water chemistry inside the failed waste package as a function of water inflow rate and waste package and waste form corrosion rate. The water chemistry characteristics of importance will primarily be pH, ionic

strength, and total carbonate concentration. Additional chemistry characteristics may include concentrations of fluoride and chloride and partial pressure of oxygen and carbon dioxide. This water chemistry information will be used by five other waste form degradation and mobilization submodels, which will be dependent on the in-package water chemistry. Specifically, the waste-form matrix degradation rate for CSNF and HLW, the dissolved concentration of radioisotopes, stability of colloids, and degradation of CSNF cladding will be dependent on water chemistry parameters. As was done in the TSPA-SR, the DSNF degradation rate is expected to be represented by a constant rate independent of chemistry changes.

The cladding degradation component determines the fraction of fuel rods in the CSNF waste packages with perforated cladding as a function of various failure mechanisms induced by physical and chemical processes. Because these mechanisms vary with time, the rate at which the rods fail (by perforation) will determine the rate at which the CSNF waste matrix is exposed to water. Cladding failure mechanisms include: initial perforations within the reactor or during storage, perforations from creep when in dry storage (or disposal at high temperatures) or stress corrosion cracking (SCC) from high stress when temperatures are 300°C or greater, perforations as a result of ground motion and accelerations induced by an earthquake, and perforations from localized corrosion as a result of halogen anions (e.g., fluoride or chloride) inside the waste package.

The waste form matrix abstraction will estimate the rates at which the CSNF, DSNF, and HLW forms dissolve as a function of the inflow conditions and in-package chemistry. The abstractions for waste form degradation are based on laboratory data obtained under various flow conditions. The DSNF have multiple waste types that will be grouped into 10 groups for the purposes of the TSPA analyses, similar to what was done for the SR, except that naval SNF will not be included as one of the groups. These DSNF groups will be compared with the bounding case utilized in the TSPA-LA in a series of sensitivity analyses (see Appendix E, Section E.5). Naval SNF will be compared with CSNF as a sensitivity analysis.

The dissolved radionuclide concentration submodel provides the radionuclide solubilities that will be used in the release calculations. This submodel will be applied in both the waste package and invert.

The function of the waste form and EBS colloidal radionuclide concentration submodel is to calculate the concentration of colloid-associated radionuclides. Colloid transport is potentially important for radionuclide elements that have low solubility and can be entrained in, or sorbed onto, waste form, engineered barrier, or geologic barrier materials that form colloidal particles. Three major types of colloids, based on the source of the colloid substrate material, are recognized to be important, waste form colloids, corrosion-product colloids, and groundwater colloids.

Key inputs to the waste form degradation and mobilization models will include (1) a set of initial materials within the waste package and their major element composition and thermodynamic/kinetic coefficients, (2) time-dependent water fluxes in the drift provided by the EBS flow submodel, and (3) waste package temperatures provided by EBS thermal-hydrologic environment submodel (MSTH).

EBS Flow and Transport

The primary goal of the EBS flow and transport component is to calculate the rate of radionuclide release from the EBS to the UZ. This quantity is determined by seepage, the presence of water films, drip shield and waste package degradation, cladding and waste form degradation, EBS thermal and chemical environments, and the design of the EBS.

The EBS radionuclide flow and transport submodel will include one-dimensional advective and diffusive transport, as well as retardation due to sorption and precipitation. This model will be input directly into the TSPA model and will make use of the compartment or cell modeling capability within GoldSim. Note that there are no submodels for this component in Figure 5.1-1 as this model is implemented directly in GoldSim. Table 5.1-1 summarizes potential EBS flow and transport model changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA.

The radionuclide transport pathway from the waste form, downward to the edge of the EBS (i.e., the interface between the drift wall and the UZ) beneath the waste packages, will be defined, using GoldSim cells arranged vertically. Implementation will include the following aspects:

- The EBS water flow submodel will define the amount of flow at a number of locations in the drift, including through the drip shield, the waste package, and the invert.
- Diffusive transport will be modeled from the waste form to the waste package outer barrier through thin films on internal structures within waste packages.
- Sorption of radionuclides on corrosion products from internal waste package structures will be considered.
- The invert will be comprised of a granular material that will act as a diffusive barrier.
- The bottom boundary condition for the GoldSim implementation of the transport model will be established based on continuity of radionuclide concentration and flux exiting the drift and entering the UZ.

The EBS flow submodel has three major inputs. The first input is the drift seepage submodel that defines the fluid flux into the EBS as a function of time, location within the proposed repository, and climate state. The second input is the drip shield and waste package degradation model that defines the type, number, and timing of breaches in these components. The third input is the abstraction of the thermal-hydrologic response of the EBS environment that defines the time-dependent temperature, RH, and evaporative fluxes in the EBS.

The EBS transport submodel has four major inputs. The first input is the output from the EBS flow abstraction that defines the fluid fluxes through the waste package and invert as a function of the time-dependent conditions in the EBS. The remaining inputs are the waste form dissolution rates, radionuclide solubility limits, and colloidal concentrations that are required to define the mobilized concentration of radionuclides for advective and diffusive transport.

UZ Transport

The UZ radionuclide transport component calculates the migration of radionuclides from the EBS of the proposed repository, through the UZ, to the water table. Consistent with the mountain-scale flow model, the UZ transport model will use a dual continuum model in which fracture and matrix transport are coupled through advective and diffusive transport mechanisms. Transport from the repository to the water table will be calculated in three-dimensions using the FEHM computer code. The FEHM particle tracking algorithm simulates aqueous-phase and colloid-facilitated radionuclide transport processes through the UZ, including:

- Advective transport (within and between fracture and matrix continua), which is the movement of dissolved or colloidal material along with the bulk flow of water. In many of the hydrogeologic units, advection through fractures is expected to dominate transport behavior.
- Hydrodynamic dispersion, which refers to the spreading of radionuclides as they transport, caused by localized variations in the flow field and by diffusion.
- Matrix diffusion, which is the movement of dissolved or colloidal material in the matrix from a zone of high concentration to a zone of low concentration
- Sorption, which is the uptake of radionuclides by the solid rock in contact with water containing dissolved radionuclides.
- Radionuclide decay, which is the spontaneous breakdown or disintegration of radionuclides.

The UZ transport component will be incorporated into TSPA-LA in the same manner as was done for the TSPA-SR and TSPA-FEIS, that is, by coupling the transport model directly to the TSPA model. As in the TSPA-SR, probability distributions will be sampled for key uncertain input parameters. Table 5.1-1 summarizes potential UZ transport model changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA.

An important improvement to the UZ transport model component for TSPA-LA will be the drift-scale transport submodel. This submodel will better represent the transport conditions beneath the emplacement drifts. Flow in the UZ tends to be diverted by an opening such as an emplacement drift. This diversion leads to the absence of downward flow beneath the drift, which produces a shadow zone of reduced water flux and water saturation. As a result, radionuclide transport may be substantially delayed in the region underneath the drift.

The UZ radionuclide transport model will take as its input radionuclide mass flux from the EBS flow and transport model. Mountain-scale UZ flow fields (spatial distributions of fracture and matrix saturations and percolation fluxes) will transport the released radionuclides to the SZ. As its output, it will provide radionuclide mass flux at the water table to the SZ flow and transport model.

SZ Flow and Transport

The SZ flow and transport component of the TSPA-LA will be used to evaluate the migration of radionuclides from their introduction at the water table below the proposed repository to the point of release to the biosphere (e.g., water supply well). Radionuclides can move through the SZ either as solute (i.e., in the dissolved state) or associated with colloids (i.e., particles small enough to remain suspended indefinitely in water). For TSPA-LA, two models of SZ flow and transport will be used: a three-dimensional process level model that will be used to calculate flow fields and the transport of individual radionuclides important to dose, and a one-dimensional flow tube model that will be used to calculate the transport of daughter radionuclides (radionuclides that form by the decay of other radionuclides) of lesser importance.

The three-dimensional SZ flow and transport model will be implemented outside of GoldSim using the FEHM computer program. Transport in the SZ will be modeled using a particle-tracking method. In concept, particles will be released at a source point beneath the proposed repository into the flow field produced by the three-dimensional SZ flow model.

The three-dimensional transport model will not be used directly in the TSPA model. It will be used to perform a series of probabilistic transport simulations for a unit mass flux source to obtain breakthrough curves at 18-km. Transport simulations will produce a set of radionuclide mass unit breakthrough curves that will be used for TSPA-LA calculations. The convolution integral method will be used to quantify radionuclide transport to the biosphere. The convolution integral method will take a radionuclide source mass from the bottom of the UZ transport model for a given time step, and combine it with the appropriate breakthrough curve for that radionuclide, giving the masses and times that the radionuclides reach the 18-km boundary. The method will be implemented for TSPA-LA using numerical integration over the time of interest. Changes in recharge associated with climate variations will be approximated as a step from one steady-state flow condition to the next. The principal output of the convolution integral method will be the mass flux (as a function of time) at the 18-km boundary for each radionuclide and for each realization.

For some of the daughter radionuclides considered in LA, a one-dimensional SZ transport model will be used to account for decay and ingrowth during transport. The one-dimensional model will be incorporated directly in the TSPA-LA model as a series of pipes.

The SZ flow and transport models (breakthrough curves and one-dimensional transport model) will receive input from three other models. These other models include (1) the climate model, (2) the infiltration model, which provides input to scale the groundwater flux for future climates, and (3) the UZ particle tracking model, which will provide the magnitude and distribution of radionuclide source terms.

The SZ flow and transport models will not be directly coupled to the EBS thermal-hydrologic model or to the disruptive scenario models. Consequently, the SZ models will neglect the effects of the temperature field generated by the repository decay heat and any potential changes in the hydrostratigraphy induced by seismicity and igneous activity. Justification for this approach is provided in FEPs analyses.

Biosphere

The biosphere component of TSPA-LA will be used to predict radionuclide transport in the biosphere and the resulting exposure of the RMEI if there is a release of radioactive material after closure of the proposed repository. Two basic mechanisms of radionuclide release to the biosphere will be analyzed: (1) through the SZ via groundwater usage, and (2) through the air in the event of dispersal by a volcanic eruption. These two release scenarios correspond to the two modes of radionuclide introduction into the biosphere.

The primary result of the biosphere modeling for TSPA-LA will be the construction of biosphere dose conversion factor (BDCF) distributions, for both the groundwater-release modeling case and the volcanic-ash-release modeling case. These BDCFs include ingestion, inhalation, and external exposure pathways. In the groundwater-release modeling case, the dominant pathway is the ingestion of contaminated water and foods, while for the volcanic-ash-release modeling case, inhalation is the most important pathway. Table 5.1-1 summarizes the proposed biosphere model changes from TSPA-FEIS to TSPA-LA.

The biosphere component will be incorporated into the TSPA-LA calculations by the following methodology:

1. The first step of the process involves the calculation of the BDCF distributions, which represent radionuclide-dependent annual dose per unit activity concentration in groundwater or in volcanic ash for the RMEI specified by the regulation.
2. The second step of the process incorporates the water-usage volume that is specified in 10 CFR 63.312 as 3,000 acre-feet per year (only applies to groundwater-release modeling case).
3. The third step is within the TSPA-LA model and involves the calculation of the amount of each radionuclide reaching the geosphere/biosphere interface in a given year (only applies to groundwater-release modeling case).
4. The fourth step involves converting the amount of each radionuclide into a concentration, by dissolving the entire amount into the water-usage volume (only applies to groundwater-release modeling case).
5. The fifth step is the calculation of the annual dose incurred by the RMEI. Annual doses are calculated in the TSPA model for all radionuclides under consideration.

The biosphere is the last component in the chain of TSPA-LA components and, thus, has no output coupling. Upstream from the biosphere, there are two connections: (1) for the nominal scenario class, seismic scenario class, and igneous intrusion groundwater transport modeling case, the biosphere is coupled to the saturated zone flow and transport model; and (2) for the volcanic eruption modeling case, the biosphere is coupled to the volcanic dispersal model.

5.2 TSPA-LA ARCHITECTURE

Information transfer between the various model components in Figure 5.1-1 is depicted in Figures 5.2-1a and 5.2-1b. These two figures give a general, schematic description of how information will flow in the TSPA-LA, showing the principal pieces of information that will be

passed between various model components and their submodels. These figures and the information presented in Section 5.1 may need to be updated as the details of the models are finalized. The decoupling of physical and chemical processes into separate models and passing information between them is facilitated by a natural division of the proposed repository system into a series of sequentially linked spatial domains (e.g., the UZ between the ground surface and the emplacement drifts, waste package, host rock near the drift, UZ between the drift and the water table, SZ, and biosphere). This decoupling of processes and division into spatial domains will allow the TSPA-LA model architecture and information flow to function as a sequential calculation in which each spatially based model may be run in succession, with output from an upstream spatial domain serving as the input for the spatial domain immediately downstream. This division works particularly well for radionuclide transport, which is the primary consideration of the TSPA models. For example, the three transport models (EBS radionuclide transport, UZ radionuclide transport, and SZ radionuclide transport) work together, with output as "mass versus time" from each upstream model serving as the input of mass versus time for the model immediately downstream.

It is important to note that within the TSPA model, most engineered-system calculations are performed for a limited number of waste package locations. In the model, each of these locations is representative of a group of waste packages with similar environmental characteristics. Radionuclide releases, for example, are calculated for a representative waste package and then scaled up by the number of failed waste packages in the group. (Note that the waste packages in a group do not all fail at the same time, because additional variability is included in the waste package degradation calculation.)

For the TSPA-Viability Assessment (VA), waste package groups were based on physical location (six potential repository subregions), waste type (CSNF, codisposal waste, or DSNF), and seepage (either (1) always exposed to seepage, (2) exposed to seepage during the wettest two climates, (3) exposed to seepage only during the wettest climate, or (4) never exposed to seepage) (*Total System Performance Assessment-Viability Assessment Analyses Technical Basis Document* (CRWMS M&O 1998 [100371], Section 11.2.1.3). For the TSPA-SR and TSPA-FEIS, the waste package groups were based on infiltration and assigned to five "infiltration bins" rather than physical location, because radionuclide dissolution and release depend more directly on infiltration than on the location within the proposed repository (CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Section 3.3.2). The other two discriminators are similar to before, though with fewer subdivisions. The TSPA-LA currently plans to base waste package groups on infiltration as was done in the TSPA-SR (see the five infiltration bins in Figure 5.2-1a); however, other options are also being considered. One approach is being considered to make the process more transparent and permit improved representation of spatial variability in thermal-hydrologic-chemical processes within the emplacement drifts and to account for lithophysal/nonlithophysal differences in mechanical and chemical properties. The new binning procedure would subdivide the repository into five bins of approximately equal area based on values of percolation at the repository horizon that exists for the medium infiltration scenario during the glacial transition climate. The criteria for selecting the approach include ease of implementation in TSPA-LA, transparency of approach, and technical defensibility of approach.

The information flow and sequential calculation approach described above will be implemented directly for the nominal scenario class and altered slightly for disruptive event scenario analyses. The igneous intrusion modeling case will utilize many aspects of the nominal scenario class and simply overlay an intrusive event and its effects on the system, as characterized by its probability and physical properties (e.g., number of waste packages damaged by intrusion, extent of damage to waste packages). After these effects are incorporated into the model, releases will be handled as in the nominal scenario class. The seismic scenario class will also utilize many aspects of the nominal scenario class and will be implemented in similar fashion by modifying the number and damage state of waste packages damaged by shaking, rockfall and fault displacement (if screened in). The volcanic eruption modeling case will be implemented by disconnecting the groundwater transport link and calculating direct volcanic effects (i.e., radionuclides carried by ash plumes from volcanic eruptions) using the code ASHPLUME directly linked to GoldSim.

The overall information flow and sequential calculation approach will form the basis for the architecture of the TSPA-LA computer code. The executive driver program, or integrating shell, that will link all the various component codes is GoldSim. GoldSim is a probabilistic sampling program that will tie all the model components, codes, and inputs/outputs together in a coherent structure that will allow for consistent parameter sampling among the model components. The GoldSim program will be used to conduct either single- or multiple-realization runs of the system. The multiple realization runs will yield a probability distribution of annual dose in the biosphere that will show uncertainty in annual dose based on uncertainty in all the model components.

Because of the need to conduct multiple realizations of the total system behavior, GoldSim is generally designed to model various components in a simplified fashion. The four ways that model components may be coupled into GoldSim, from most complex to least complex, include the following:

- External function calls to detailed process software codes (e.g., UZ transport software or waste package degradation software)
- Cells, which are basically equilibrium batch reactors that, linked in series, can provide a reasonably accurate description of transport through selected parts of the system (e.g., the engineered barrier system)
- Response surfaces, which take the form of multidimensional tables representing the results of modeling with detailed process models before running the TSPA code (e.g., thermal hydrologic input)
- Functional or stochastic representations of a model component built directly into the GoldSim architecture.

The method used for each TSPA-LA model component is described briefly below.

As in the TSPA-SR, much of the computational work that will go into the TSPA-LA model will be done outside of GoldSim before running the actual total system computations. For example, the UZ flow fields will be computed using TOUGH2 (LBNL 2000 [114091]), a three-dimensional, finite-volume numerical simulator representing the entire UZ model domain (for

the dual-permeability model). Other model components that will also be run using computer codes outside of GoldSim include drift-scale thermal hydrology (NUFT (CRWMS M&O 2000 [155731])), in-drift and in-package chemistry (EQ3/6 (CRWMS M&O 1998 [149359])), and SZ radionuclide transport (FEHM). The results of these detailed process-level runs will provide multidimensional tables that will be read into GoldSim at run time. Examples of these multidimensional tables include liquid flux and velocity fields for the UZ and temperature versus time at location within the EBS.

Figure 5.2-2 provides another representation of the TSPA-LA code architecture (i.e., the actual computer codes used and the connections [information transfer] between codes). It includes both the codes run before the GoldSim program and those run in real time, that are coupled to (external function calls), or within (cells and tables), the GoldSim program. As shown in Figure 5.2-2, some response surfaces generated by codes external to GoldSim only provide data to other codes external to GoldSim. Other response surfaces, such as liquid saturation, temperature, and seepage flux, will provide data directly into GoldSim as response surfaces that influence such things as waste form degradation rates.

Coupling of the various models will be affected by the climate model, which will impact almost all the other models in one way or another, because it will alter water flow throughout the system. The climate will be assumed to shift in a series of step changes between three different climate states in the first 10,000 years: present-day climate, monsoon climate (about twice the precipitation of the present day climate), and glacial transition climate (colder than monsoon but similar precipitation). These climate shifts will be implemented as a series of steady-state flow fields in the UZ and SZ (including changes in the water table elevation). Within the GoldSim program, these shifts require coordination among the coupled submodels because they must all simultaneously change to the appropriate climate state.

In general terms, the coding methods and couplings to be used for the major components will be similar to those used for the TSPA-SR and are discussed below.

Unsaturated Zone Flow, Mountain Scale-This process will be modeled directly with the three-dimensional, site-scale, UZ flow model using a volume-centered, integral-finite-difference, numerical flow simulator called TOUGH2. Steady-state flow will be assumed, and three-dimensional flow fields will be generated for three different infiltration boundary conditions, three different climate states, and several values of rock properties. These "pregenerated" flow fields (i.e., developed externally and before the GoldSim simulations) will then be placed in a library of files to be read by the finite element heat and mass code (FEHM) for UZ transport during the real time GoldSim simulations. Fracture and matrix liquid fluxes, along with liquid saturation, will be passed to FEHM in these tables. To generate the library of flow fields, an inverse model, ITOUGH2 (Finsterle 1999 [104367]) will be used to calibrate the model-predicted ambient liquid saturations and other properties to measured liquid saturations and other properties in the matrix. This calibration will be done when generating the flow fields for the three different infiltration (developed using INFIL (USGS 2001 [139422])) conditions and the different fracture properties at present-day climate conditions. For future-climate conditions, flow fields will be generated based on the present-day climate calibrations. Climate change will be modeled within TSPA-LA UZ calculations by assuming a series of step changes in boundary conditions, meaning that different flow fields will be provided at the appropriate time with the assumption of instantaneous pressure equilibrium. Based on the particular history of climate

changes sampled by the TSPA model at the beginning of a given realization, the UZ flow field library will be interrogated for a different flow field every time during the simulation that a step change is indicated. This change in a flow field will be assumed to apply instantaneously to the transport model. The UZ flow fields will also be provided to the TOUGH2 drift-scale seepage models, to the SZ models, and to the EBS transport models. UZ hydrologic properties are passed to the EBS thermal hydrologic model.

Unsaturated Zone Flow, Seepage of Water into Emplacement Drifts (i.e., Drift Scale)-This process will be also modeled externally before the GoldSim simulations using TOUGH2 on a finely discretized grid around the drift and then abstracted for use in GoldSim. Simulations will be conducted for both ambient and thermal periods over a heterogeneous fracture permeability field for a range of percolation rates (from the mountain scale UZ flow model), and fracture permeability and fracture "alpha" values. These simulations will produce, for both the thermal and ambient periods, two uncertain response surfaces, one for seepage flux into the drift as a function of long-term percolation flux and another for the number of packages that are dripped on (by seeps) as a function of long-term percolation flux. Long-term percolation flux for both ambient and thermal periods is expected to come from the MSTH model at locations sufficiently far above the emplacement drifts to ensure that it is unperturbed by the thermal field.

EBS Environment, Thermal Hydrology-This process will be modeled with the finite-difference computer program NUFT in one, two, and three dimensions before the GoldSim TSPA-LA simulations. Time-dependent thermal-hydrologic variables will be abstracted from these simulations for each of the repository level bins. Abstracted outputs will include:

- Waste package surface temperature and waste package surface RH for seven different package types within discrete environments. These values will be provided to drip shield, waste package, and waste form models in GoldSim.
- Average waste form temperature and liquid saturation in the invert in each of the five repository level bins. Waste form surface temperature will be assumed to be equal to the waste package surface temperature. These temperature and saturation values will be provided to the waste form degradation and EBS transport models in the GoldSim program.
- Average drift wall temperature, RH, evaporation rate, and liquid saturation in the invert in the proposed repository. These values will be provided to the EBS chemical environment models. The outputs will be in the form of response surfaces or multidimensional tables.
- Long-term percolation flux above the drift. These values will be used as inputs to the seepage response surface.

EBS Environment, Drift-Scale Thermal-Hydrologic-Chemical Processes-These processes will be modeled with the computer program TOUGHREACT (LBNL 2001 [153101]) in two-dimensions before the TSPA-LA GoldSim simulations. Simulations will be run for two representative repository locations. Time histories of drift seepage composition and gas composition (representative values for CO₂ and the major aqueous species) will be abstracted from these simulations in tabular form and used as input tables (boundary conditions) for the EBS chemical environment model simulations discussed next.

EBS Environment, Engineered Barrier System Chemical Environment-The chemical environment variables will be modeled with the computer program EQ3/6. Batch-reaction calculations with EQ3/6 will be performed for the boundary condition seepage and gas compositions provided by the drift-scale THC model and a range of representative seepage fluxes and evaporation rates. Output will be response surfaces of various chemical composition parameters. These values will be provided to GoldSim directly as input tables for the waste package/drip shield degradation, invert radionuclide-dissolved concentration, and invert colloid models within GoldSim. The tables provide water composition values for specific input values of carbon dioxide fugacity, temperature, RH, and the ratio of water evaporation flux to incoming water flux.

Waste Package and Drip Shield Degradation-This process will be modeled within GoldSim using the WAPDEG computer code, which includes corrosion-rate variability both on a given package and from package to package. The code will be linked to GoldSim and run at the start of each realization to provide output in the form of several tables of the cumulative number of package failures per time, average patch area per package versus time, average crack area per package versus time, and average pit area per package versus time.

Waste Form Degradation and Mobilization, Cladding Degradation-This process will be modeled within GoldSim using functional relationships that lead to a percentage value of failed cladding versus time. Other cladding degradation modes such as mechanical failure will also be modeled within the GoldSim program. The major inputs to the cladding process model are measured characteristics (examples: oxide thickness, fission gas release) of commercial spent fuel which were collected and fit with first or second order equations. The input parameters for the abstraction will be (1) peak waste package surface temperature, (2) water ingress rate into the waste package, and (3) temperature and chemical composition of the water inside the waste package.

Waste Form Degradation and Mobilization-This process will be modeled by equations within the GoldSim program using empirical degradation rate formulas developed from available data and experiments for the three different waste form types: CSNF, DSNF, and HLW. Output from the waste form degradation model will be the mass of waste form exposed per time and the volume of water in contact with this waste form versus time, which will be used directly in the GoldSim waste form cells. There will be several waste form cells in the GoldSim program, corresponding to different waste form types and seepage cases. The amount of inventory that can ultimately enter each waste form cell will be a linear function of the number of packages emplaced in each inventory, seepage, and thermal hydrologic environment.

Engineered Barrier System Flow and Transport-This process will be modeled directly within GoldSim at run time, using the algorithm embedded in GoldSim cells. The modeling will be based on an idealized representation (basically a linked series of equilibrium batch reactors) of drip shield, waste package, waste form, and invert, and how radionuclides move through them via diffusion and advection both as solutes and as colloids. Output from EBS transport will be radionuclide mass flux (for each of the modeled radionuclides) at each time step, passed during the GoldSim simulations to the directly coupled, three-dimensional, dual-permeability, FEHM particle tracker used for UZ transport. As was implemented in the TSPA-SR, it is expected that the repository area will be divided into five bins based on infiltration; however, this aspect of the

model is being evaluated and an alternative approach may be utilized. The mass releases from these five source-term groups will enter the grid blocks in FEHM that reside within the corresponding areas of the regions. The number of grid blocks receiving release will be dependent on the number of packages failed. A key part of EBS transport will be waste form or radionuclide mobilization, which will be a direct function of both seepage flux and radionuclide solubility in the groundwater. Solubility for the various radionuclides will be input directly into the GoldSim program in various forms (e.g., probability density functions, point values, and explicit functions). Several colloid types will also be modeled in the EBS transport component utilizing GoldSim functions.

Unsaturated Zone Transport-This process will be modeled at run time using the directly coupled, three-dimensional, dual-permeability, finite-element code FEHM, which will be accessed as an external function by the GoldSim program. Flow fields and property sets will be accessed directly by FEHM from table files residing in the TSPA-LA Input Database (see Section 6 for a discussion of input controls and the database). The UZ transport model is based on the UZ flow model and will use the same flow fields (generated by the TOUGH2 UZ flow code) and the same climate states. As with UZ flow, a dual-permeability model will be assumed, and transport will be modeled with the FEHM particle tracker in three dimensions. The FEHM particle tracker transports particles on the same dual-permeability TOUGH2 spatial grid as used in the flow model (using the same material properties, infiltration, and liquid saturation). When the climate shifts, a new TOUGH2 flow field will be provided from the run-time file directory, and the particles will be assumed to be instantly traveling with the new velocities. In addition, for multiple-realization runs, a matrix of uncertain UZ transport property values will be created before simulation time by the GoldSim program and then accessed by FEHM during the simulations. The FEHM code will step through the uncertainty matrix row by row, where each row represents one realization of the uncertain UZ transport parameters, including K_d s (K_d is the measure of the partitioning of the mass of a given radionuclide sorbed or residing on the immobile rock phase to the mass dissolved in the aqueous phase) for each radionuclide, matrix diffusion coefficients, dispersivity, and K_c values (K_c is the measure of the partitioning of the mass of a given radionuclide sorbed or residing on colloidal particles to the mass dissolved in the aqueous phase). Output from the FEHM code at each time step will be mass flux from the fractures and matrix at the water table. The location of these output grid points will be a vertical function of the climate state, increasing in elevation for wetter climates. The fracture and matrix mass fluxes from FEHM will be combined appropriately for each of the four SZ capture zones in four GoldSim mixing cells and then fed to the SZ convolution integral SZ_Convolute at each GoldSim time step.

Saturated Zone Flow and Transport-This process will be modeled using two models of SZ flow and transport. The three-dimensional process level model (FEHM) will be used to calculate the transport of individual radionuclides important to dose. A one-dimensional flow tube model implemented in GoldSim will be used to calculate the transport of daughter radionuclides (radionuclides that form by the decay of other radionuclides) of lesser importance. The models will extend from four source regions at the bottom of the repository at the water table to approximately 18-km distance down gradient. The three-dimensional flow and transport simulations will be done outside the GoldSim program for each of the selected radionuclides over the multiple realizations (at least 100) of uncertain SZ model parameters. These uncertain parameters will likely include effective porosity in the alluvium, K_d in the tuff and alluvium, irreversible and reversible colloidal parameters, longitudinal dispersivity, transverse dispersivity,

point source location, horizontal anisotropy and fraction of flow path in the alluvium. The horizontal placement of the point source in each of the four source regions varies stochastically from realization to realization, reflecting uncertainty in the location of releasing waste packages and transport pathways in the UZ. Output from the radionuclide transport simulations will be a set of mass breakthrough curves versus time at approximately 18 km from the repository in the predominant direction of groundwater flow for a constant mass release-rate source term. These breakthrough curves will reside in files in the GoldSim run time directory and will be accessed when needed by the SZ_Convolute external function (which convolutes, or integrates, the real source term with the pregenerated unit breakthrough curves) called by the GoldSim program.

Biosphere-Annual dose to the RMEI will be modeled using BDCFs that convert radionuclide concentrations in groundwater (or volcanic ash) to dose. The BDCFs will be developed outside the TSPA model, using a code that will be developed (ERMYN) in accordance with the *Technical Work Plan for Biosphere Modeling and Expert Support* (BSC 2002 [158379]). The factors will then be entered as stochastic elements in the TSPA model. These factors are multiplied by the radionuclide concentrations in the SZ (or by concentrations in volcanic ash) to compute annual doses, which are the end products of the calculations.

Disruptive Events-Igneous (eruptive and intrusive cases) and seismic events are modeled as separate scenario classes. The igneous scenario class includes the igneous intrusion groundwater transport and volcanic eruption modeling cases. The igneous intrusion groundwater transport modeling case is modeled within the TSPA model. This case utilizes many aspects of the nominal scenario and simply overlays an intrusive event, as characterized by its probability and physical properties (e.g., number of waste packages damaged by intrusion, extent of damage to waste packages, etc). After these effects are incorporated to the model, releases are handled as in the nominal scenario. The volcanic eruption case (i.e., radionuclides carried by ash plumes from volcanic eruptions) is modeled using the code ASHPLUME that is directly coupled to the TSPA model at run time. Similar to the igneous intrusion groundwater transport modeling case, the seismic scenario class utilizes many aspects of the nominal scenario and simply overlays a seismic event, as characterized by its probability, level of ground motion or fault displacement (if screened in), and damage to the EBS (e.g., number of waste packages damaged by ground motion, extent of damage to waste packages, etc.).

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF SCENARIO CLASSES

5.3.1 Nominal Scenario Class

The nominal scenario class includes all relevant processes that must be integrated to yield an assessment of system performance. Each of the TSPA model components and the flow of information described in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 will be used to evaluate the nominal performance of the proposed repository (see Figure 5-2). The nominal scenario class will incorporate FEPs that are expected to occur throughout the period of interest (i.e., the expected FEPs). The FEPs that have a low (less than 1.0) probability of occurring over the period of interest (i.e., the disruptive FEPs), will be considered in the disruptive event scenario classes that are analyzed both separately and in combination with the nominal case.

5.3.2 Disruptive Event Scenario Classes

Igneous Scenario Class-The two modeling cases considered for TSPA-LA are the volcanic eruption and igneous intrusion groundwater transport modeling cases. They are described in this section.

The volcanic eruption modeling case will consider the direct transport of waste to the ground surface from the repository in a volcanic eruption. This modeling case will begin with an eruptive event, which will be characterized in the TSPA by both its probability and its physical properties such as volume of the eruption, composition of the magma, and properties of the pyroclastic ash. Interactions of the eruption with the proposed repository will be described in terms of the damage to the EBS and the waste package. Characteristics of the waste form in the eruptive environment will be described in terms of waste particle size. Atmospheric transport of waste in the volcanic ash plume begins with entrainment of waste particles in the pyroclastic eruption and will be affected by wind speed and direction. BDCFs will be developed for exposure pathways relevant to atmospheric deposition of contaminated ash with detailed attention to important pathways, rather than for the groundwater pathways considered for nominal performance. As a final step, the volcanic eruption BDCFs will be used to determine radiation doses resulting from exposure to contaminated volcanic ash at approximately 18 km from the proposed repository in the predominant direction of groundwater flow.

Implementation of the volcanic eruption event in TSPA-LA is illustrated in Figure 5.3-1. Information about eruption characteristics, the probability of eruptive conduits forming within the proposed repository, and the proposed repository response to eruption will be used to develop a distribution of parameter values characterizing uncertainty in the extent of damage to waste packages and the amount of waste available to be entrained in the eruption. Entrainment of waste and atmospheric transport of contaminated ash will be modeled using ASHPLUME, yielding a distribution of results characterizing uncertainty in the concentration of waste particles on the ground surface. BDCFs calculated for the volcanic eruption modeling case will be used to calculate doses.

The igneous intrusion groundwater transport modeling case will consider an igneous intrusion that travels down the drifts and remains underground. Although the intrusion damages waste packages and other components of the EBS, FEPs analyses have concluded that it does not significantly alter the long-term flow of water through the mountain (CRWMS M&O 2000 [151553], Section 6.2.16). As shown in Figure 5.3-2, the igneous intrusion groundwater transport model will use information about the probability of intrusion, the characteristics of the intrusion, and the response of the proposed repository to calculate damage to waste packages. Groundwater transport away from the damaged packages will be calculated using the nominal scenario class models, and doses to humans from contaminated groundwater are determined using nominal BDCFs.

As in the TSPA-SR, the probability of future igneous activity in the Yucca Mountain region that will be used in the TSPA-LA is based on the *Probabilistic Volcanic Hazard Analysis for Yucca Mountain, Nevada* (CRWMS M&O 1996 [100116]) conducted in 1995 and 1996. Ten experts in the field of volcanology evaluated available data on past volcanic activity in the region and provided expert judgment on the probability of future igneous activity. Their judgments

(elicitations) were then combined to produce an integrated assessment of the volcanic hazard that reflects a range of alternative scientific interpretations. Details of the identification of the experts, presentation of available data to them, and the elicitation process are available in the summary report of the probabilistic volcanic hazard analysis (CRWMS M&O 1996 [100116]).

Specific information developed to support the TSPA-LA models for igneous disruption of the proposed repository includes the following:

- The geometry of an intrusion: dike width, length in the proposed repository, azimuth, and the number of dikes that could occur as part of a single intrusive event.
- The geometry of an eruption: conduit diameter at the proposed repository depth, and the number of conduits (also called eruptive centers and vents) that intersect drifts and that could be associated with a single intrusive event.
- Physical and chemical properties of the magma: temperature, density, volatile content.
- Intrusive properties: magmatic ascent velocity, magmatic phase changes as drifts are encountered.
- Eruptive properties: pyroclastic ascent velocity, eruption power, eruption duration, eruption volume (mass discharge rate), ash particle size and shape, ash density.
- Dike and proposed repository interactions: environmental conditions in the drift, response of the waste package, extent of the magmatic damage in the drifts (including the number of waste packages damaged by both intrusion and eruption), behavior of the waste form in the eruptive environment.
- Atmospheric properties: wind speed and direction, ash dispersion, air density and viscosity.


Seismic Scenario Class-The seismic scenario class considers the potential effects from an earthquake that occurs near the repository. Although the subsequent ground motion and potential fault displacement at the repository horizon may damage waste packages and other components of the EBS, FEPs analyses indicate that these seismic hazards will not significantly alter the long-term flow of water through the mountain. This will be documented in a FEPs AMR. As shown in Figure 5.3-3, this scenario class begins with a seismic event. Seismic waves subsequently propagate to the repository causing ground motion at the repository horizon, which will be characterized in the TSPA-LA by its probability and amplitude. Fault displacement may also occur. These seismic hazards may cause damage to drip shields, waste packages, and cladding. Radionuclides are then released from damaged waste packages and subsequently transported by the groundwater to the biosphere. Groundwater transport away from the damaged packages will be calculated using the nominal scenario class models, and doses to humans from contaminated groundwater are determined using nominal BDCFs.

Specific information developed to support the TSPA-LA model for seismic damage to the proposed repository will include the following:

- The annual frequency of occurrence for mean ground motion events and the mean fault displacement hazard curves. This information has been documented in the probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) report (CRWMS M&O 1998 [103731]).

- Ground motion seismic design inputs, which will be determined from: (1) the PSHA analysis for Yucca Mountain, and (2) a ground motion model for specific locations at the site. The PSHA analysis determines ground motions for a hypothetical site that has the dynamic characteristics of rock found at a depth of 300 meters beneath Yucca Mountain. The ground motion model for specific locations at the site starts with the results of the PSHA analysis for a particular annual mean frequency of exceedance and determines the ground motion at depth by including the effect(s) of the overlying rock and/or soil on ground motions. Fault displacement design inputs will be determined from the PSHA analysis for Yucca Mountain and the site-specific fault displacement hazard curves at the emplacement drifts.
- The response of the waste package, drip shield, and cladding as a function of levels of ground motion, rockfall, and fault displacement for degraded component states that correspond to the 10,000 year compliance period. Detailed structural response calculations will be performed for the drip shield and waste package under loads from rockfall and vibratory ground motion. A more simplified approach may be used for cladding, based on a fragility curve that quantifies the conditional probability of cladding failure.
- Damage from seismic events will be represented as a failed area on the surfaces of the drip shield and waste package, and as a failed cladding area on the fuel rods. These failed areas allow flow through the drip shield and transport from the waste package. This release mechanism (via a failed area) is similar to the nominal scenario class, although the processes generating the failed areas are different. For the nominal scenario class, general corrosion generates failed patch areas on the waste package and drip shield and localized corrosion generates stress corrosion cracks on the waste package. For the seismic scenario class, structural response to rockfall and vibratory ground motion may result in structural deformation and residual stress that leads to failed areas from accelerated stress corrosion cracking. In either class, the presence of failed areas provides the potential for diffusive and advective transport out of the waste package, through the EBS, and into the unsaturated zone.


In summary, the TSPA-LA model for the seismic scenario class is very similar to the TSPA-LA model for the nominal scenario class, with two major exceptions: (1) the failed area for the drip shield or waste package is determined by sampling a failed area response curve, rather than by calculations with WAPDEG for expected degradation and corrosion processes; and (2) a single seismic event sufficient to induce degradation of the engineered barriers occurs at a random time during each realization.



00239DC_Figure009d ai


Source: Modified from CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 2.1-5.

Figure 5-1. Schematic Representation of the Development of Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Including the Nominal, Igneous, and Seismic Scenario Classes




Source: Modified from CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 2.1-6.

Figure 5-2. Schematic Representation of the Model Components of the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Nominal Scenario Class




Source: Modified from CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 3.10-2.

Figure 5-3. Schematic Representation of the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Model Components of the Volcanic Eruption Modeling Case




Source: Modified from CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 3.10-3.

Figure 5-4. Schematic Representation of the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Model Components of the Igneous Intrusion Groundwater Transport Modeling Case




Source: Modified CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 3.10-3.

Figure 5-5. Schematic Representation of the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Model Components of the Seismic Scenario Class



00238DC_Figure009g.ai


Figure 5.1-1. Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Model Components and Submodels



Source: Modified from CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 2.2-2a.


NOTE: The Figure is in two parts with the detail of the waste package and waste form models shown in Figure 5.2-1b.

Figure 5.2-1a. Detailed Representation of Planned Information Flow in the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application




Source: Modified from CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 2.2-2b.

Figure 5.2-1b. Detailed Representation of Planned Information Flow in the Total System Performance Assessment-License Application




Source: Modified from CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 2.2-3.

Figure 5.2-2. Total System Performance Assessment-License Application Code Configuration: Information Flow Among Component Computer Codes




Source: CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 3.10-6

Figure 5.3-1. Information Flow within the Volcanic Eruption Model



Source: CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 3.10-11.

Figure 5.3-2. Information Flow within the Igneous Intrusion Groundwater Transport Model



Source: Modified from CRWMS M&O 2000 [153246], Figure 3.10-11.

Figure 5.3-3. Information Flow within the Seismic Groundwater Transport Model