WM s/f
WMGT r/f
NMSS r/f
RBrowning
MBell
JBunting
MKnapp
TJohnson & r/f
MFliegel
PDR

MEMO/SETH/TJ/86/01/30

JAN 3 1 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: Seth Coplan, Section Leader, WMRP

FROM: Myron H. Fliegel, Section Leader
WMGT

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF NNWSI EXPLORATORY SHAFT PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS STUDY

In accordance with DOE's request for additional information regarding NRC flood analyses, we have reviewed the subject report. A flooding analysis in the exploratory shaft area is enclosed.

This review was performed by Ted Johnson, who may be contacted at x74490.

/S/

Myron H. Fliegel, Section Leader
WMGT

Enclosure:
As Stated

(F)(H)
86100101

8603310141 860131
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDR

WM ~~Record File~~ 102

WM Project 11
Docket No.
PDR ✓
LPDR ✓ (N)

Distribution:

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

OFC	:WMGT MF for	:WMGT MF	:	:	:	:
NAME	:TJohnson	:MFliegel	:	:	:	:
DATE	:86/01/31	:86/01/31	:	: 87030035(F) H	:	: 866

(8)

Review of Flooding Analyses
Exploratory Shaft Performance Analysis Study
NNWSI

Background

By letter dated July 15, 1985, from Donald L. Vieth to John J. Linehan, the Department of Energy (DOE) transmitted "Exploratory Shaft Performance Analysis Study" (Reference 1) to the NRC staff. This information was to be reviewed by the NRC staff prior to the August 27-28 meeting regarding the exploratory shaft (ES) technical design. At the above meeting, DOE was informed that the flood analyses presented in the report did not adequately represent an upper bound of the flooding potential at the ES site, and that some of the conclusions reached in the report may not be correct or conservative. These concerns were explained at the meeting; however, DOE indicated that a written explanation and analysis of the flood potential would be helpful. The following analysis has been developed in response to DOE's request.

Discussion and Analysis

The DOE analysis of the flood potential at the ES site indicates that no significant flooding consequences would occur, even if all of the surface runoff from many rare floods entered the ES and flowed into the respository room. It was also concluded by DOE that the flood scenarios assumed establish an upper bound of the flood potential at the ES site over a 10,000-year period (Reference 1).

The NRC staff generally does not disagree with DOE regarding several conservatisms in the flood analysis; the scenarios presented are considered to be unanticipated and extremely unlikely. The NRC staff does, however, conclude that there are scenarios (which may not be extremely unlikely) which could produce volumes of surface runoff in the ES area in excess of the upper bound limits established by DOE.

1. Indentification of Controlling Flood Scenario

   DOE has recognized that flooding could be a serious problem under certain conditions. These conditions were identified in Reference 1, where DOE states: ..."Because the ES is located on the side of a wash, there is a potential for runoff to enter the shaft following heavy rainfall. In the short term this occurrence should be prevented by engineered drainage structures which will carry the runoff down the wash past the shaft. Over the longer term these

structures could be destroyed by erosion, and landslips and settlement could result in impoundment of water near the shaft. In the extreme case that all of the runoff in the wash should flow into the shaft backfilled with coarse rockfill, much of the northeastern part of the repository downgrade from the ES could be flooded.

The probability of flooding part of the repository by flow through the ES is low but not negligible if the shaft is not sealed in some manner..."

The NRC staff concludes that the above scenario, where erosion and subsidence establish a ponding area near the ES, will likely be the controlling scenario in the assessment of flooding potential at the ES site. In addition, the potential for flooding, erosion and subsidence were identified in Reference 2, where engineering measures such as riprap and diversion channels were proposed for construction in the ES area.

2. Use of Routine Flood Events

In order to show that flooding consequences would be minimal over a 10,000-year period, DOE analyzed the effects of many rare flood events, including 97, 100-year floods; 20, 500-year floods; and 1 potential maximum flood. DOE calculated that these floods would produce a total volume of water in the ES area of about 9.4×10^5 M^3 (Reference 1).

The NRC staff adopted a simpler and more realistic approach in the determination of potential surface runoff. This approach was to calculate the total runoff over a 10,000-year period from expected, routine rainfall events. The approach taken consisted of the following:

1. The drainage area of Coyote Wash in the ES area was determined to be 120 acres (Reference 1)

2. The total average annual rainfall in the site area was determined to be approximately 6 inches per year (Reference 1) Much of this rainfall occurs as thunderstorm precipitation (References 4 and 5). No climatic changes over the 10,000-year period were assumed to occur.

3. The amount of runoff occurring over the drainage area tributary to the ES area was conservatively assumed to

equal the rainfall. The terrain in the area is very steep and rocky (Reference 2), and the amount of runoff expected to occur from steep, rocky terrain is normally very great, especially during heavy thunderstorm events (Reference 3). Additionally, the flood runoff estimates presented in Reference 4, when compared with the rainfall estimates presented in Reference 5, indicate that runoff/rainfall relationships during thunderstorm events could be very high. In order to obtain an approximation of the total runoff over a 10,000-year period, calculations were performed as follows:

Runoff = 120 acres x 43,560 ft^2/acre x 6.0 inches/year x 1 ft - 12 inches x 10,000 years

Runoff = 2.6×10^{10} ft^3 = 7.4×10^8 M^3

However, if the amount of runoff were assumed to be equal to only 10% of the rainfall, or 0.6 inches, the runoff volume would be 7.4×10^7 M^3. It can be seen that even the smaller runoff volume is much greater than the runoff volume assumed in the DOE analysis. If one considers that approximately equal volumes of water could enter other shafts and ramp entrances over a 10,000-year period, it can be seen that the total volume of water entering the repository could be several orders of magnitude larger than those volumes assumed in the performance analysis. A detailed analysis of the drainage areas and potential for inflow is needed to accurately assess these other entrances.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The analyses presented above should be considered to be very preliminary and should not be considered to be a refined method for computing flood volumes at the site. These analyses were conducted only to demonstrate that DOE has not established a conservative upper bound of flood potential in the ES area and that the magnitude of surface runoff entering the repository could be considerably larger than that assumed by DOE.

We suggest that additional refined calculations be performed by DOE (using scenarios such as those presented above) to determine the upper bound of potential inflows into the repository through all potential entrances.

Alternately, we suggest that engineering measures be adopted to prevent the occurrence of the assumed scenarios and to prevent the inflows of surface water into the repository through surface shafts and ramps.

References

1. U.S. Department of Energy, Sandia National Laboratories, "Exploratory Shaft Performance Analysis Study", July, 1985.

2. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, "Draft Environmental Assessment, Yucca Mountain Site, Nevada Research and Development Area, Nevada", December, 1984.

3. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Design of Small Dams, 1977.

4. Squires, R.R. and Young, R.L., "Flood Potential of Fortymile Wash and Its Principal Southwestern Tributaries, Nevada Test Site", USGS Water Resources Investigation Report 83-4001, 1984.

5. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Weather Service, "Precipitation - Frequency Atlas of the Western United States, Volume VII-Nevada", 1973.