

.

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + + +
4	151ST MEETING
5	ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE
6	(ACNW)
7	+ + + + +
8	TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 2004
9	+ + + + +
10	ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
11	+ + + + +
12	
13	The Advisory Committee met at 10:00 a.m.
14	at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint
15	North, Room T2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Michael T.
16	Ryan, Acting Chairman, presiding.
17	<u>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</u> :
18	MICHAEL T. RYAN Acting Chairman
19	JAMES CLARKE Consultant
20	ALLEN G. CROFF Invited Expert
21	GEORGE M. HORNBERGER Member
22	RUTH F. WEINER Member
23	
24	
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

,

	2
1	ACNW STAFF PRESENT:
2	JOHN T. LARKINS, Executive Director
3	NEIL COLEMAN
4	HOWARD J. LARSON, Designated Federal Official
5	MICHAEL LEE
6	GEOSPHERE TRANSPORT WORKING GROUP:
7	JAMES DAVIS, U.S. Geological Survey
8	RICHARD PARIZEK, Pennsylvania State University,
9	NWTRB member
10	DONALD SHETTEL, Geoscience Management Institute, via
11	videoconference
12	INES TRIAY, U.S. Department of Energy
13	ALSO PRESENT:
14	ROBERT ANDREWS, U.S. Department of Energy
15	BILL ARNOLD, Sandia National Laboratory, Bechtel
16	SAIC Company
17	PAUL BERTETTI, Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory
18	Analysis
19	ANDY CAMPBELL, NMSS
20	KEITH COMPTON, NMSS
21	TIM MCCARTIN, NMSS
22	JAMES WINTERLE, Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory
23	Analysis
24	
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

		3
1.	I-N-D-E-X	
2	Agenda Item	Page
3	1) Opening Statement	4
4	2) Keynote Presentation	10
5	2.1) Views on radionuclide transport	10
6	James Davis, USGS, Menlo Park, CA	
7	2.2) Discussion	48
8	3) Regulatory Overview of Radionuclide	61
· 9	Transport Issues	
10	3.1) Presentation by Keith Compton,	61
11	3.2) Discussion	70
12		
13		

	3
1	I-N-D-E-X
2	Agenda Item Page
3	Opening Statement 4
4	Keynote Presentation
5	Views on radionuclide transport 10
6	James Davis, USGS, Menlo Park, CA
7	Discussion 48
8	Regulatory Overview of Radionuclide 61
9	Transport Issues
10	Keith Compton 61
11	Discussion
12	DOE Assessment, Robert Andrews 84
13	CNWRA Modeling of Site-Scale Saturated Zone
14	Flow at Yucca Mountain
15	James Winterle
16	Discussion 151
17	Neptunium-237 Sorption
18	Paul Beretti
19	Discussion
20	Characteristics of Saturated Zone Transport
21	at Yucca Mountain
22	Bill Arnold, DOE 206
23	Discussion
24	Adjourn
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	4
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:03 a.m.)
3	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: The meeting will
4	come to order, please. Thank you. This is the 151st
5	meeting of the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste.
6	The meeting will come to order. This is the first day
7	of the 151st meeting.
8	My name is Michael Ryan, Vice-Chairman of
9	the ACNW. Chairman John Garrick is unable to attend.
10	The other members of the committee present are George
11	Hornberger and Ruth Weiner. Also present are
12	consultants Allen Croff and Jim Clarke.
13	During today's meeting, the committee will
14	conduct a working group on the geosphere transport of
15	radionuclides at the proposed Yucca Mountain
16	high-level waste repository.
17	John Larkins is the designated federal
18	official for today's initial session. I believe that
19	he is not present at the moment. So, Howard Larson,
20	you will serve as the designated federal official for
21	today's opening session. Thank you.
22	The meeting is being conducted in
23	accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory
24	Committee Act. We have received no requests for time
25	to make oral statements from members of the public
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

regarding today's sessions. Should anyone wish to address the Committee, please make your wishes known to one of the Committee staff. It is requested that speakers use one of the microphones, identify themselves, and speak with sufficient clarity and volume so that they can be readily heard.

Before starting the first session, I would like to cover some brief items of current interest. First, Dr. Latif Hamdan officially rejoined the staff on June 7, 2004 as senior staff scientist. Dr. John Flack will join the ACRS-ACNW office staff as a senior technical adviser in July and should be present at this meeting.

Dr. Bruce D. Marsh has recently been added as an ACNW consultant. Dr. Marsh is professor of igneous petrology in the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. His research interests also include geophysics and magma dynamics. Dr. Marsh brings with him an impressive set of academic credentials, and the committee looks forward to working with him.

I would also like to recognize our remote locations. And we are set up from San Antonio at the Center for Nuclear Waste Research. Welcome to the center. Can you see and hear effectively?

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.neairgross.com

	6
1	DR. SHETTEL: Yes. We can see and hear
2	effectively.
3	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Wonderful.
4	Technology is working with us. Thanks very much.
5	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Also Las Vegas.
6	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Also Las Vegas is
7	available as well. So thank you very much.
8	Without further ado, I will turn the
9	working session over to Dr. George Hornberger. Dr.
10	Hornberger?
11	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you, Mike.
12	As Mike said, today we are going to have
13	a working group meeting on geosphere transport of
14	radionuclides. The part 63, the regulation, requires
15	that the NRC evaluate any license application to
16	ensure that there are multiple barriers that are
17	effective in the system. And the geosphere does have
18	to function. It is supposed to function as part of
19	the overall system to provide safety.
20	And so we convened this working group
21	meeting to hear the latest information that is
22	available. And basically for the NRC, the question
23	will be as stated in the agenda. For Yucca Mountain,
24	do the conceptual models, mathematical
25	implementations, and site data, provide confidence
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

トン

.

	7
1	that the geosphere can retard the transport of
2	radionuclides.
3	We have a distinguished panel. Most of
4	the panel is here. And Neil tells me that we have one
5	remote panelist, but he's not really a remote
6	panelist, just a panelist who is joining us remotely
7	from Las Vegas.
8	I will actually let Sharon Steele
9	introduce the panel members for the record.
10	MS. STEELE: Okay. Thank you.
11	For the record, it is my pleasure to read
12	the bios of the panel members. First, to my far left
13	is Dr. James A. Davis. He's a senior research
14	hydrologist with the U.S. Geological Survey. He has
15	directed a long-term research program on the fate and
16	transport of contaminant metals and radionuclides in
17	groundwater.
18	He has served as Program and Division
19	Chair of the Geochemistry Division of the American
20	Chemical Society and as an Associate Editor of the
21	journal Water Resources Research. Dr. Davis has also
22	served on the technical direction team of the Sorption
23	Project for the Nuclear Energy Agency, OECD, in Paris.
24	To Dr. Davis' right is Dr. Richard
25	Parizek. He is a professor of geology and
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

geoenvironmental engineering at Penn State. He is President of Richard R. Parizek and Associates, a firm of consulting hydrogeologists and environmental geologists. He is also a registered professional geologist.

On February 11, 1997, President Bill Clinton appointed Dr. Parizek to the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. In 1990, he was appointed to an administrative law judgeship on the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. He left that position upon appointment to the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board.

Please note that when members of the Technical Review Board speak extemporaneously, they're speaking on behalf of themselves and not on behalf of the board. When stating a board position, it will be identified as such. And that position will generally be published and available on the NWTRB Web site.

Over to my far right is Dr. Ines Triay. She is the Deputy Chief Operating Officer for the Department of Energy's Environmental Management Program. Her work is heavily focused on coordinating the environmental management's high-level radioactive waste program and providing technical expertise to the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste. Previously she managed the department's Carlsbad field office in New Mexico, where her work focused on solving problems associated with radioactive waste.

Dr. Triay began her career as а postdoctoral staff member in the Isotope and Nuclear Chemistry Division at Los Alamos National Lab. She progressed through many positions to Acting Deputy Director of the Chemical Science and Technology Division and to group leader for the Environmental Science and Water Technology Group.

At Los Alamos, she researched and developed various techniques for removal of radionuclides from the environment and led the team that was responsible for the first transuranic waste to be shipped to the waste isolation pilot plant, or WIPP, which began operations in March of 1999.

Joining us from Las Vegas is Dr. Don Shettel. He is Chairman, Vice President, and Senior Geochemist with Geosciences Management 20 Institute, Incorporated in Boulder City, Nevada.

He has been a scientific consultant on high-level disposal nuclear waste since 1986. Currently he is a consultant to the State of Nevada 25 and has consulted with Nye County in the past. He has

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

also consulted with Chatham County, North Carolina on 1 low-level radioactive waste disposal, the Saskatchewan 2 Environmental Research Council for High-Level Waste 3 4 Disposal in Canada, and with the Minnesota Department 5 of Natural Resources and Mineral Exploration. Before consulting, Dr. Shettel was a 6 7 senior research geochemist with Exxon Production Resource Company in Houston, Texas and a senior 8 geoscientist with Bendex Field Engineering Corp. in 9 10 Grand Junction, Colorado, where he worked on the National Uranium Resource Evaluation Program. 11 12 Dr. Shettel has advanced degrees, Master's 13 of Science and Ph.D. in geochemistry and mineralogy from Penn State, and a Bachelor's of Science in 14 geology from the University of Michigan. 15 16 That's it. 17 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thanks very much. I'm very pleased that we have this panel 18 19 joining us. I think what we are going to do now is 20 just start right in, jump in. Jim Davis is going to do the keynote presentation on a new approach to 21 22 modeling retardation by sorption at the field scale. Thank you, George. 23 DR. DAVIS: 24 I want to thank George and the other 25 members of the working group for inviting me. NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

10

I hope to present this new approach that we have used in a modeling for potential performance assessment demonstration of a low-level waste site, but I think the approach that we used could have some scope for thinking about a new way of thinking about modeling and the geosphere transport problem at Yucca Mountain.

I do want to acknowledge my co-author, Gary Curtis, who has done the reactive transport modeling simulations I will be showing. There is also an army of other people that have helped, especially with the fieldwork. This research was supported by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Office of Regulatory Research.

15 Next slide, please. Now, whether it's low-level waste or high-level waste, the goal here is 16 to get to a performance assessment evaluation. 17 At 18 least part of that assessment is evaluating when radionuclides 19 reach receptive audience or а 20 population. With respect to the saturated zone of an aquifer, we would like to do this with a reactive 21 22 transport model that takes into account both groundwater flow and dispersion. And in the ideal 23 24 case, we would be able to incorporate as much 25 information as we know about the chemistry and even

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

www.nealrgross.com

	12
1	the microbiology that would influence the transport of
2	whatever contaminant or radionuclide that we're
3	interested in that causes a risk.
4	So the ideal situation is we build in some
5	very detailed knowledge of our reaction processes and
6	we would be able to put that together with a flow
7	model that worked at the field scale. That is ideal.
8	And we will see where we have to make simplifications
9	in the process in order to reach an answer.
10	Next slide, please. I am going to speak
11	solely about sorption during my talk. Well, there is
12	a small part where I may be talking about reduction,
13	but for the most part, I'm going to be talking about
14	sorption and how chemistry affects sorption.
15	If we look at the classical definition of
16	retardation with a linear distribution coefficient, we
17	see when you have transport down a column, if you have
18	a nonreactive tracer, this is the concentration of the
19	nonreactive tracer that has been introduced in a
20	pulse. And its dispersion or mixing causes its
21	concentration to vary along the front. Then a sorbing
22	solute is retarded. And its transport is not as fast
23	as the nonreactive tracer.
24	We can describe the retardation in terms
25	of the porosity and the bulk density and a
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON D.C. 20005 3701
l	

distribution coefficient, K_d , if this parameter holds constant. The K_d is defined as the absorbed quantity of the absorbing radionuclide divided by the dissolve concentration of the radionuclide.

Next slide, please. Now, the problem with elements that have complex chemistry, some radionuclides have very simple aqueous chemistry. For example, cesium and strontium, when they are dissolved in water, they are dissolved as the ions. They typically do not form other types of aqueous species.

The actinide elements, however, have a very complex aqueous chemistry. And that causes K_d values for the sorption of elements like uranium to be quite dependent on the chemistry of the water. So, for example, what is shown here is the log of the K_d for uranium absorption onto amorphous iron oxide or ferrihydrite. And you can see over this rather large pH range it varies by a large amount, by many orders of magnitude.

But the thing I really want to point out is not so much the overall pH dependence but the very important dependence on the carbonate concentration, which is shown here where all of these solutions are equilibrated with either air, the partial pressure carbon dioxide in air, or an atmosphere that is one

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

percent CO_2 .

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, one percent CO_2 is a very common value for groundwater systems, which actually can go much higher than this as well under natural conditions and even higher in contaminant plumes. But the important thing is to look at how much for a system in that is a one percent CO_2 , a common value groundwater, what that does to the pH dependence in the region between seven and eight, which is a very commonly observed pH range in natural waters. The K. for uranium varies by four orders of magnitude. So this is a problem for an approach where we would assume a constant K_d value.

Next slide, please. This is a graph of the uranium aqueous speciation for a specific set of conditions; that is, ten micromolar uranium, which is about two parts per million of uranium. This is relevant to concentrations you will see later in the talk.

And if you go back one slide, the reason the absorption or the K_d comes down at this high pH range, next slide, is because of the formation of aqueous carbonate complexes, which effectively pull the uranium off the surface. The uranium would rather be dissolved in solution with these carbonate ions

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	15
1	than absorbed on the surface.
2	So these red ones are the carbonate
3	complexes. The blue ones are multi-nuclear species
4	that complicate the uranium aqueous chemistry as you
5	get up to higher concentrations. This is all again
6	equilibrated with the partial pressure of carbon
7	dioxide in air.
8	Next slide, please. And, as I pointed
9	out, though, the speciation is also dependent on the
10	partial pressure of carbon dioxide itself. Here we
11	have a plot of constant pH of 7 or one micromolar
12	uranium, which is about 238 parts per billion. And
13	here we show the speciation as a function of the
14	partial pressure carbon dioxide.
15	So at -2, this is the log. So this is the
16	one percent value I was talking about before. And
17	this is ten percent CO_2 out here. This is the range
18	that we observed in the field system I am going to be
19	talking about in a minute. So, even at constant pH,
20	as you vary this partial pressure of carbon dioxide,
21	the speciation is changing in solution.
22	Next slide, please. So in terms of
23	conceptual models for describing sorption in solute
24	transport, the common practice by consultants and for
25	low-level waste situations is to assume that a
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

constant K_d can be used because this is a simple way to move forward. This approach, however, it should be noted is valid only if you have linear absorption in constant chemistry throughout the space in time that you are modeling.

tried to introduce Some have more 6 7 complexity by introducing a different type of nonlinear isotherm, such as a Freundlich isotherm, but 8 9 this also only applies at constant chemistry. So this doesn't really fully take into account what we 10 observed in contaminant plumes. 11

In contaminant plumes, we have variable chemistry and we have complicated aqueous speciation reactions that affect the amount of absorption in addition to the nonlinear absorption.

In this case, we have maybe two choices. We have surface complexation models, which I will show in a minute, coupling the quantification of absorption with the aqueous speciation; or we can try to describe the distribution of K_d values that might occur as a result of the change in the chemistry.

Next slide, please. The surface complexation models are simply a way of describing absorption with a mass law, which is the same way we describe our equilibrium chemistry, our solubilities.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	17
1	It's the way thermodynamics works, by determining
2	stability constants and then describing the equilibria
3	that result by a mass law.
4	And in surface complexation modeling, we
5	accomplish the same way of describing absorption by
6	writing reactions that involve specific sites on the
7	surface particles, reacting with an aqueous species
8	that is a master component for the equilibrium
9	calculation, and then you have a stability constant
10	that is equal to the concentrations of these species.
11	And so this is a surface species, just
12	like this is an aqueous species. And so we can
13	calculate the amount of this surface species that
14	exists at a particular pH value via this constant.
15	The important thing is that; whereas,
16	absorption is a function of pH, if we had done our
17	model correctly, this constant is not as independent
18	of pH, just like uranium aqueous concentration with
19	acetate, that stability constant we can look up in the
20	literature. That is independent of other values. We
21	want this value to be independent of the chemistry;
22	whereas, K_d , as I have shown, is a very sensitive
23	function of the pH.
24	Next slide, please. And then we can
25	couple these constants that we determined for
	NEAL R. GROSS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

absorption. And then there is only one shown here. There may be more than one in the model.

We can couple these in an equilibrium calculation with thermodynamic data for aqueous speciation or thermodynamic data for solubilities. And so we can couple our absorption reactions together with our thermodynamic database that we have for describing equilibrium.

And so, for example, this constant could be coupled together with the constant for formation of the uranyl carbonate complex. And so you can see by that mechanism that if we add bicarbonate to the system, it starts to form this species, which competes with the formation of this. And, therefore, you can decrease absorption by forming this complex. So now ideally this constant should also be independent of pH in the carbonate concentration.

Next slide. Now, I mentioned 18 Okay. before at the beginning that ideally we would like to 19 20 incorporate all of our knowledge of reaction mechanisms into a solute transport model, but this 21 22 becomes very difficult because our knowledge is constantly advancing. 23

For example, the species that I have just shown on the surface, while commonly thought to be the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

24

1 absorbed uranium species, we are now showing in surface spectroscopy studies -- for example, in this 2 study that I was a part of, we absorbed uranium onto 3 4 the iron oxide mineral hematite in the presence of 5 And at all pH values, we found using access air. spectroscopy that uranium when it's absorbed always 6 7 has a carbonate, one or two carbonate, anions attached 8 to it. 9 So it's not a bare uranium ion, uranyl cation that absorbs on the surface. 10 In fact, it's something more complicated than that. And this was 11 12 true at all pH values. So our previous knowledge of how uranium 13 absorbed on the surface is incorrect. And now we are 14 15 working in systems with silicate. We are finding that uranyl silicate complexes also form on iron oxide 16 17 surfaces. 18 So our knowledge about the actual chemical species that occur on the surface is advancing now as 19 20 a result of advances in spectroscopy. With the Syncatron accelerator radiation, the detection limits 21 are dropping. And we are able to determine more and 22 23 more about the details of these surface reactions. 24 Next slide, please. So that makes things 25 little difficult because our knowledge, our а NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

scientific knowledge, is advancing. And we can't constantly be to the minute or to the day adapting our codes.

So as far as applying the surface complexation model in natural systems, the approach that most people have taken has been to take the most advanced knowledge that we have, which is based on studying absorption onto pure mineral phases that are representative of what might be present in a soil or a sediment and developing the surface complexation model and then trying to extrapolate that to the natural system, either by adding up the contributions of individual mineral phases present in a soil sample or what have you.

What we have done in this study that I am going to show that is different is we have backed off of that need to know all of the details and incorporated that into the model. We are using what I would call as an engineering approach to develop the surface complexation model.

What we do is we collect data relevant to field conditions using the field materials. And then we make various simplifications to the model that allow us to move forward with a fairly precise and accurate assimilator of the absorption as a function

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

of aqueous conditions. I will show what I mean.
Basically, this is the new part that I am going to,
"new" in parentheses, be talking about.
Next slide, please. Now, the site that I
am going to describe where we did our work is the
Naturita UMTRA site, which is located in southwestern
Colorado along the San Miguel River. There was a mill
there that operated for 20 years, from '38 to '58.
And shown here is an aerial photo from 1974.
Here you see the tailings. The river in
this slide is flowing down this way. We have this
reach. There is a two-kilometer reach here, where the
aquifer is recharged by the river up along here, just
above the edge of the slide. And then the groundwater
flows down through the reach and discharges along this
area.
This is a funny thing you see from space,
a former go-cart track that was, in fact, built on
tailings. So all of the dust was being kicked up and
breathed by the kids riding around on this go-cart
track, I guess, back in the '50s.
Next slide, please. There are a lot of
houses out there. The foundations are built with
tailings also. Very interesting place.
This is another aerial view of the
NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealroross.com

~

Naturita site in 1996. This is where the mill yard was formally located. Now, at this point, the DOE UMTRA program, the tailings had been removed in 1979, but here the surface remediation was occurring. And parts of the vadous zone were being dug up in the mid '90s and carted off to a landfill. So that's why you can see that there are pits out here at the site. This is where the tailings used to be.

I am going to talk a lot about a one-time uncontaminated sediment sample we collected here and work with. So that was up-gradient of all of the contamination.

Next slide, please. So our approach for 13 developing and testing the surface complexation model 14 characterize the and 15 was to groundwater flow geochemistry at the site, measure uranium absorption 16 uncontaminated sediment sample that we 17 the on collected, fit a sorption model to that sorption data, 18 and then to test that model in the field using the 19 same uncontaminated sediment samples suspended in 20 wells in the uranium contaminated area and also 21 removing contaminated sediments from the aquifer and 22 studying the uranium that was absorbed on those 23 sediments as a test of the model. Then, finally, we 24 modeling and 25 did reactive solute transport а

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

www.nealrgross.com

	23
1	comparison of constant K _d and SCM approaches.
2	Next slide, please. SCM stands for
3	surface complexation model. Sorry.
4	So here these red dots are all of the
5	wells that we put in at the site. Again, the
6	groundwater recharge occurs here at this reach. There
7	was also a database that ran from 1986 to 1996 from
8	the Department of Energy wells that they had there
9	before they started their surface remediation. That
10	data set was extremely valuable to our study.
11	Again, it's a two-kilometer reach. And
12	the flow direction is this way. We have a bedrock
13	flow boundary on this side and the river boundary on
14	this side.
15	Next slide, please. Now I am going to
16	show some of the concentration contours that existed
17	in 1999 at our first sampling. These are the uranium
18	concentration contours, ranging from two to ten
19	micromolars. So that's 400. Two is 450 ppb and 10 is
20	2.3 parts per million. This is the original area of
21	contamination. So you can see that the uranium has
22	moved out of that area and is discharging to the
23	river.
24	The pH throughout this region is
25	relatively constant, around 7.1. The alkalinity
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.neairgross.com

varies considerably. That has to do with the fact that there is calcite in the vadous zone material. And these tailings were either acid-extracted or base-extracted and then placed on the ground. As precipitation fell on the tailings, the water would go into the vadous zone and dissolve calcite to create these alkalinity plumes. There are alkalinity gradients that are associated with the contamination itself.

The result, if you take these pH values and these alkalinity values that were measured, the 11 result, the range in pressure of carbon dioxide that existed in the aquifer was approximately one to ten And at any point in the aquifer, the percent. dissolved calcium concentration was controlled by the solubility of calcite. 16

Next slide, please. The groundwater is poised in a suboxic condition. There is very little dissolved oxygen. And this is true even up-gradient of the contamination. So there are biological reactions.

As the river water comes in, it is quickly the oxygen is removed by degradation of organic There is no nitrate in the aquifer. carbon. And some evidence of manganese reduction there is

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	25
1	occurring.
2	Then down-gradient, where it was a
3	lower-lying area and there was a lot more this is
4	mostly barren. And down here there were a lot of
5	cottonwood trees. And so there is a lot more.
6	Vegetation became vegetation on the ground. There is
7	evidence of iron reduction occurring in the aquifer.
8	No sulfide was detected in the aquifer.
9	Next slide, please. So this cross-section
10	is to give you an idea of the texture of the material,
11	very cobbly, high-gradient mountain stream. The
12	material used in our experiments was actually dug out
13	with a backhoe from beneath the water table. But this
14	gives you an idea of the texture.
15	We used the material that was less than 3
16	millimeters, which was 15 percent by weight of the
17	sediment but had 85 percent of the uranium absorption.
18	The sediment was primarily quartz and feldspars with
19	calcite, iron oxides, and some clay.
20	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim, give us a sense
21	of the scale.
22	DR. DAVIS: Right here?
23	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes.
24	DR. DAVIS: That is about 10-12 feet
25	there.
	NEAL R. GROSS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

	26
1	Next slide, please. But all of the
2	material came from below that.
3	Next slide, please. So this is a plot of
4	the experiments that we did with the uncontaminated
5	material. They were batch experiments done with
6	artificial groundwater with equilibration for four
7	days.
8	What is plotted here is the log of the
9	uranium K_d versus the dissolved uranium concentration.
10	So it's plotted as an isotherm. You might often be
11	used to seeing these plotted as a function of pH, but
12	we can't do that here because of the calcite in the
13	sediments.
14	For each partial pressure carbon dioxide
15	that we used in this experiments, you get one pH value
16	at equilibrium. So each of these partial pressures of
17	carbon dioxide, which were imposed on the system, gave
18	us a different pH value.
19	You can see as you go to higher partial
20	pressures of carbon dioxide, the absorption is
21	dropping or the K_d is dropping. Again, this is log of
22	the K_d . So this is one and this is ten. There is
23	also a dependence on the K _d on the uranium
24	concentration itself. As the uranium concentration
25	goes up, then the K_d is dropping.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

Now, again, these experiments were done to 1 mimic natural conditions. This is not like a research 2 3 study to just get at these relationships. All of 4 these conditions actually exist out in the aquifer. 5 Next slide, please. Now, just as a tangent now, you can see the difficulty that we might 6 7 have in applying a forward model, instead of this engineering approach. Here is an example of what the 8 material looks like. 9 10 Whether you are looking at a quartz grain 11 or a feldspar grain, what we have on top of these 12 grains are extremely thick coatings, several hundreds of nanometers thick of illite/smectite clay. 13 And embedded within those lots of 14 are iron oxide 15 particles, some of them goethite and some of them 16 ferrihydrite that is formatting goethite. The scale bar here is 100 nanometers. And 17 18 this is sitting on the top of a quartz particle, then down here a scale bar of nine nanometers. You can see 19 20 the goethite rods. And there are many of them. If 21 you look here backed away, there are many of these 22 goethite rods immersed in this clay. 23 So if we were going to try to construct a 24 forward prediction of uranium absorption, we would absorbed 25 have to know how the uranium onto NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

illite/smectite clay, how it absorbed onto goethite, how it absorbed onto ferrihydrite, and how we have to try to enumerate the surface area of each of these types of minerals present. It is a very difficult thing to do to get an accurate prediction from these measurements made in the lab with single mineral phases.

Next slide, please. So, again, in this study, we wanted to take an approach where we fit the data with an inverse surface complexation model. And, to simplify it further, we have no electrical double layer, which is a common component of the other types of approaches, to use either a diffuse layer model or a triple layer model to take into account the effect of surface charge on absorption.

This model has no electrical double layer. And we are able to describe the absorption that we measured in the lab as a function of pH and partial pressure of carbon dioxide in the uranium concentration using these two surface reactions.

21 So we have these two surface reactions. 22 Next slide. And we couple those together with the 23 thermodynamic data for the aqueous speciation. Go 24 back one, please. And the result is that we can now 25 describe these data fairly accurately.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

29

Next slide and go on. So that is how we developed the model. Next I want to talk about the tests we did of the model. We did two types of tests. One was to suspend uncontaminated sediments, the same ones that we had used in our batch experiments in the lab, suspend them in bags in the uranium contaminated part of the aquifer.

So these red dots are wells that we 8 suspended that material. There is a range of chemical 9 10 conditions in each of these wells. The samples were suspended for 3 to 15 months, but we saw no time 11 dependence. In fact, we probably could have suspended 12 them for a period of time from four days to a week and 13 14 gotten the same results.

Next slide, please. The other type of tests we did of the model was to remove contaminated sediments from the aquifer. This was very difficult to do because of the cobbles. We never were able to obtain cores, which we wanted to obtain. We were driving the drillers crazy trying to do that. But we were able to obtain material from each of these holes 21 as we were putting the wells in place, sometimes by collecting cuttings from the saturated zone. 23

And on each of those samples, we measured the amount of uranium that was absorbed by an isotopic

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

24

exchange technique in the laboratory. So from the measurement of the dissolved uranium in the water and this measurement of the absorbed uranium, we could calculate an *in situ* K_d and compare that to what our model said should be there.

Next slide, please. So this slide shows in a general way a comparison of the K_d values measured for the field samples with our model predicted values. The model predicted ones are the clear, and the measured are the shaded.

Where it says "NABS," that is the background sediment, Naturita aquifer background sediment. So that is the uncontaminated samples. This is the K_d, but notice it is plotted in a geometric scale. And then over here are values for contaminated sediments.

With the exception of these wells down here, the final two, we got within a factor of two between the model and the measurements, measurements made in the field.

These two down here, I probably won't have time to talk about it until in the discussion section if someone is interested. We believe these are down where we have measurements of ferrous iron in the aquifer. And we believe that, in addition to absorbed

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	31
1	Uranium-6, there is also reduced Uranium-4 present on
2	these sediments.
3	Next slide, please. Now I want to make a
4	point here. We have variability in the K_d value for
5	the uncontaminated sediments. The K_d varied by a
6	factor of 22. That is one sediment put into 17
7	different wells, each well having a different
8	chemistry. And so because of the different chemistry,
9	we got a variation in K_d of 22.
10	If you take the contaminated sediments,
11	which are 14 different sediments collected spatially
12	throughout the site, and put them into one water
13	sample, which is an artificial groundwater
14	equilibrated with lab air, you only get a factor of
15	2.5.
16	So my point here is that the K _d variation
17	that we are observing in the aquifer is primarily due
18	to the variation in water chemistry, not due to a
19	large range in the variability in the absorptive
20	properties of the sediments.
21	Next slide, please. So that is summarized
22	here. I am not going to go into it, but we have
23	observed exactly the same thing at another site, in an
24	aquifer at Cape Cod, where we have a large variation
25	in K_d primarily due to gradients in pH values. Again,
·	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

32 we have made this kind of comparison, and we find that 1 the K_d variation at the kilometer scale is primarily 2 due to aqueous chemistry and not due to changes in the 3 4 properties of the sediment. 5 Next slide, please. So now I am going to go to some transport modeling and some simulations. 6 Here are 1-D simulations, now where the absorption is 7 described by this what we call the semi-empirical 8 9 absorption model. 10 And what we have done here, the initial condition in this column is the background conditions 11 12 in the aquifer, pH 7.1 and low alkalinity. And then we change the inlet at time equals zero to a different 13 condition, where we either vary the pH, the uranium 14 15 concentration, or the alkalinity and while leaving the other two variables constant at their average value. 16 So, for example, here at the inlet, we 17 change to an average uranium and alkalinity. And we 18 vary the pH over the whole range observed in 459 water 19 20 chemistry measurements throughout the site. The range that we looked at was from the minimum value to the 21 maximum value. And the average value is shown here in 22 23 the black. What you see here is the pH variation we 24

see at the site is not affecting the transport very

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

25

	33
1	much. That maybe isn't too surprising because we
2	don't see a huige pH variation at the site. The
3	variable uranium concentration has a much larger
4	effect. At the higher uranium concentrations, we have
5	less retardation.
6	So the maximum concentration is shown out
7	here. So the variable uranium concentration has this
8	much effect on transport, but we see that the largest
9	effect is the variable alkalinity that we observe at
10	the site. This definitely has the largest impact on
11	how fast the uranium is being transported. Again, the
12	variations that we are looking at here are based on
13	the actual field observations.
14	Next slide, please. Now, if we look more
15	closely at the effects of alkalinity on the model K_d
16	value, what is shown here now, for a constant pH of
17	7.1 is variable uranium concentration and alkalinity.
18	And you can see that the K_d is going down as we
19	increase the uranium concentration or as we increase
20	the alkalinity. These are model response curves.
21	Now and for the rest of the talk, I am
22	going to be talking about cobble-corrected K_d values.
23	Now our laboratory measurements were made on the less
24	than three-millimeter material. And now we have
25	corrected up the surface area to consider the entire
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	34
1	porous medium. I can talk more about how we did this
2	at the end if someone is interested.
3	Now I want to point out these
4	concentrations here at an alkalinity of about 11 and
5	10 micromolar uranium, this is about the peak of
6	alkalinity and uranium in the aquifer. Our model says
7	that that should have a K_d of about .32, which would
8	result in a retardation factor of 3.9.
9	Next slide, please. Now, if you put those
10	values into a column, now where we have the initial
11	condition is the background conditions and then we put
12	in a pulse of one pore volume, if we model it with a
13	constant K_d , we predict retardation of about 3.9, as
14	I said, but with a surface complexation model, we
15	predict a lot more retardation. And that is because
16	the alkalinity disperses in the column. And this
17	causes the uranium to absorb more strongly; whereas,
18	that is not taken into account in the constant K_d
19	approach.
20	Next slide, please. You can see that
21	here. This maybe is too complicated to get into in
22	detail. Basically, what happens, as we see in the key
23	to figure, is that we have a plot of alkalinity,
24	uranium, and then simulated K_d values.
25	What happens in this one pore volume
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com
injection is that the alkalinity is not retarded and the uranium is. So the alkalinity is separating from the uranium at the beginning, and then the alkalinity moves off. There is a uranium peak that follows at the end of the alkalinity pulse. And by two pore volumes, they have completely separated. So this is why this increases the uranium retardation in that simulation.

Next slide, please. Now, in the aquifer, we don't have a one pre volume injection. We had the tailings in the mill yard here. And they were there for decades. We had rain falling on the tailings. And that was our input. That is a continuous input, not a one pore volume input.

So now I am going to describe the 2-D reactive transport modeling that we have done. We have the source area, this brown area, this region in the aquifer. The hydraulic conductivity was estimated from age dating and from transport of chloride that was observed as a function of time in the DOE data set. There was a chloride plume from a salt roaster located at a specific place here. And we could see with time the chloride, how fast it had moved to the aquifer.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So we used those two things to estimate

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

35

1	the hydraulic conductivity in the aquifer. And then
2	we had contaminated recharge bringing uranium and
3	alkalinity into the aquifer at a rate the recharge
4	was one percent of the annual precipitation. So it
5	was a continuous input.
6	Next slide, please. These showed results,

the comparison between the observed uranium and alkalinity values, compared with our simulations using the surface complexation model for 62 years of simulated transport.

A conservative tracer would take about 33 years to travel the whole 2 kilometers in this aquifer on average. There is not one velocity because the flow model -- there is a velocity flow field here in the flow model. And their velocities are faster in certain places, especially close to the river, and slower over here near the bedrock surface, which is why some of the highest concentrations are here. And they are less influenced by the river.

You can see we have reasonable agreement between the observed uranium contours and the simulated uranium contours using this absorption model that we developed in the lab with uncontaminated sediment.

Next slide, please. And the important

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

11

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

36

1 thing is to notice that K_d varies not only in space.
2 It also varies in time because of the evolving
3 chemical conditions in the aquifer. And the model is
4 able to handle that.

The important thing about this K_d's is this distribution of random is not а distribution of K_d values. This has spatial character. And the spatial character arises from the changing chemical conditions as a function of time and space.

Next slide, please. We have evaluated the model. I'm not going to go into that in any detail except to state the conclusions. We have done a sensitivity study. And the conclusion of that and what we wanted to do was to compare the sensitivity of our absorption parameters to what we understood about the hydraulic connectivity.

And here is a rough guide. The model is more sensitivity to the hydraulic connectivity than the surface complexation parameters. So that is an important thing to understand. We are less certain about this value than we are about these others or at least this has a bigger impact.

24 We had no electrical double layer model I 25 mentioned. So we tested the result of matching this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

And we also used rate laws developed from 5 kinetic studies, batch studies, in the lab to see 6 7 whether our local equilibrium assumption was valid. We again got identical results, whether we used the 8 kinetic transport model or a local equilibrium model. 9 Next slide, please. Where am I on time? 10 ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: You're doing pretty 11 If you could wrap in, say, five more minutes, 12 well. 13 that would be good.

DR. DAVIS: Okay. So we have done simulations of future uranium migration. In particular, in this project we were working with NRC staff to do an actual performance assessment of a receptor. And so this was done by Ralph Cady in the NRC Office of Regulatory Research and is in our NUREG report.

We have also compared constant K_d versus 21 surface complexation transport simulations, starting 22 from the observed conditions in the field, simulating 23 24 transport for 500 years, and comparing peak concentrations, flux to the river, and cleanup time. 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Next slide, please. This shows the range 1 of $K_{\rm d}$ values and retardation factors that we used in 2 the constant K_d approach. have this 3 So we 4 distribution of K_d values predicted. This is predicted by the model given the aqueous chemistry in 5 the aquifer. And then these are the distribution 6 actually measured with contaminated sediments by the 7 8 isotopic exchange. The results, the ones I'm going to 9 show are from the isotopic exchange distribution. Next slide, please. 10 So this shows simulated cleanup times for an observation point 11 12 that's up-gradient in the contaminant plume at the current time for this point in space right here. 13 And the question is, how long would it take to get to the 14 10-1 standard, which is about 15 drinking water micromolar or 10⁻⁷ molar? 16 And you can see that the red slides are 17 for the constant K_d simulations. This uses the range 18 of K_d values, again, that were found for all the 19 20 contaminated sediments. This is the highest K_a out here. So it takes longer to clean up at this point. 21 And this is the lowest K_d , which pumps 22 But the main thing is that the slope is quite 23 fast. different for the surface complexation model. Again, 24 25 that gets into the fact that as uranium moves, the NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

39

40 1 alkalinity is changing. And so things don't really have the same kind of slope as you get in a constant 2 K_d simulation. 3 4 Next slide, please. This shows simulated peak concentrations at an observation point. This was 5 the observation point used for the performance 6 7 assessment analysis that was done by Ralph Cady. This again shows the initial condition, which was the 8 9 current condition in 1999, and this shows the peak 10 concentrations. 11 K, simulations, the For the peak 12 concentrations are always the same. And it has to do 13 with this peak, this highest uranium concentrations passing through this observation point. 14 15 And the K_d just determines how fast it gets to the observation point. It doesn't change the 16 peak concentration; whereas, with 17 the surface 18 complexation model, you actually get a smaller peak concentration as a result of a change in chemical 19 20 conditions in the aquifer. 21 Next slide, please. This last one is to show results for concentrations in a pumped well. 22 23 This was again part of the performance assessment. 24 This well was pumped for domestic use at a rate that 25 I don't remember. NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	41
1	The thing that is interesting here is that
2	the constant K _d simulations don't bracket what
3	actually happens with the surface complexation model.
4	You actually get a higher concentration of uranium
5	coming in at an earlier time in these simulations than
6	you do for any of the K_d simulations. And the reason
7	is as you pump this well, higher alkalinity water
8	starts to come into towards the well and then exists
9	there at the current time. So that this higher
10	alkalinity water comes in and changes the properties
11	relative to any of the constant K_d simulations.
12	Next slide, please. So I will show the
13	conclusions of this slide, and then I just have a
14	couple of slides for discussion about how this might
15	be interesting to think about in terms of the
16	geosphere at Yucca Mountain.
17	The conclusions from our work are that
18	current reactive transport models can accommodate the
19	surface complexation concept. We don't think the use
20	of the constant K_d concept is really required from a
21	technology point of view. The codes can accommodate
22	this concept.
23	The real issue is how do we parameterize
24	these models? And that is what has been I think
25	different about our approach, the way we have
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON. D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealroross.com

	42
1	approached the problem of parameterizing.
2	We think that this kind of modeling can
3	reduce uncertainty with respect to sorption because we
4	think that we can bound this more carefully than can
5	currently be done, at least with constant K_d
6	simulations.
7	I think an important conclusion for two
8	field sites that we have looked at is that the spatial
9	variability in groundwater chemical conditions was
10	more important in influencing the range of K_d values
11	that we observed compared to variability in the
12	properties of the aquifer materials themselves. And
13	this was at a kilometer scale.
14	You are talking about moving from one
15	geological formation to another. It's at the 100
16	kilometer scale. Of course, we haven't tested that,
17	something like that. And our conclusion would likely
18	not be valid or may not be valid.
19	Then, finally, predictions based on a
20	range of constant K _d values do not always bracket
21	simulations result obtained using the semi-empirical
22	surface complexation model. Random sampling of a K_d
23	distribution may overlook spatial character of the
24	distribution.
25	Those are the conclusions from our study
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	43
1	of the Naturita UMTRA site. I have just a couple of
2	more slides. I thought we would talk about how this
3	might be relevant to neptunium.
4	This is a plot of neptunium speciation as
5	a function of pH with a system equilibrated with air
6	for one micromolar neptunium. You can see that
7	analogous to the uranium, neptunium does form these
8	aqueous carbonate complexes, although they are not as
9	strong as the uranium carbonated complexes.
10	Next slide, please. And in studies of
11	neptunium absorption, there is a similarity in that
12	the neptunium absorption is sensitive to the partial
13	pressure of carbon dioxide.
14	And in modeling that, this was work done
15	by Kohler, et al. published in 1999, neptunium
16	absorption on hematite with no carbon dioxide present
17	with atmospheric carbon dioxide and almost two
18	percent. And with the almost two percent, you see the
19	absorption coming down these squares, the green
20	squares.
21	And then shown here are surface
22	complexation model simulations. I just want to point
23	out that to simulate this data, they had to assume
24	that neptunium formed a complex at the surface with
25	carbonate attached to it, which is the same thing that
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	44
1	we observed in our spectroscopic data for uranium.
2	So there is again a chemical analogy here
3	that an exact surface complexation model may require
4	these ternary surface complexes involving carbonate.
5	Next slide, please. This just shows some
6	numbers for variable integrated carbon in groundwater,
7	a comparison of the ranges that we have at the
8	Naturita site to what has been described for the Yucca
9	Mountain hydrologic system.
10	We have in comparison to the Naturita site
11	a much larger range of total dissolved inorganic
12	carbon and a larger range in the partial pressure
13	carbon dioxide, although the upper numbers here may be
14	among the most important to look at. And they are
15	somewhat similar.
16	Next slide, please. And using those data
17	and their model for the Np, absorption of neptunium on
18	montmorillonite, surface complexation model with a
19	diffuse double layer model, and using this site water
20	chemistry, Dave Turner at the center and others,
21	including Paul Bertetti, have done a neptunium K_d
22	contour map, which they published, and showing ranges
23	in the neptunium K_d as if the aquifer were composed of
24	the montmorillonite.
25	And the ranges go from 25 to I'm not

And the ranges go from 25 to -- I'm not

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

sure what the upper numbers are, but in this region down-gradient of the proposed repository, the K_d ranged by a factor of 4, so perhaps not a huge range, but one thing to note is that there certainly is a sparsity of data in this area directly down-gradient in terms of the water chemistry.

Next slide, please. Finally, I will just make a note that another possible bad actor is fulvic acids. This is a paper published in 2000 using Chalk River fulvic acids and Chalk River subsurface material, packing a column.

This shows the transport of neptunium under the given conditions in the absence of the fulvic acids. So you had a retardation factor of about three for those conditions. And then when you put in fulvic acids that were ten times what they were in the aquifer, you were able to reduce the retardation by a huge amount, almost to the point of no retardation at all.

Now, this, of course, is very influenced by this concentration of fulvic acid they put in. But I just wanted to point out that there is another thing that could be affecting aqueous speciation and retardation of neptunium.

Next slide, please. So just as discussion

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

45

points about how what we did at Naturita might be relevant to Yucca Mountain, I put up these. There is some uncertainty, at least, in understanding neptunium retardation in the saturated zone as part of the Yucca Mountain modeling.

Because it relies on a log-normal distribution of abstracted K_d values -- I guess I am referring here now to the center's approach in the modeling -- the distribution of abstracted K_d values is based on montmorillonite as a model for the alluvium for the scaling of surface area.

So the difference between what we have done and what the center has done, they have done an excellent job of evaluating the effect of water chemistry on K_d for this montmorillonite surface.

In our approach at Naturita, we worked with actual sediments and the aqueous chemistry distribution to arrive at the K_d values. So we had less of a problem I think in this abstraction process of going from the pure montmorillonite to the real material.

There is also what you can do is measure the range in K_d 's and then sample this log-normal distribution when you do the performance assessment simulations. However, if you would back up a couple

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

[47
1	of slides, please, that ignores the spatial character
2	which is part of the range.
3	It's not a random set of pH and alkalinity
4	conditions that causes this contouring of K_d values.
5	In fact, this K_d contour here is 25. This is well
6	below the median. This is on the lower end of the
7	distribution.
8	So if you sample a distribution,
9	log-normal distribution, for all of these chemistries,
10	you may, in fact, be building too much retardation
11	into the model for this section of the aquifer because
12	you're treating it as a random thing when, in fact,
13	you have actual pH and alkalinity values here that
14	could be considered.
15	Next slide, please. One more. And then,
16	finally, I don't know, actually, the extent fulvic
17	acids have been considered as part of the Yucca
18	Mountain problem. I just brought it up because of
19	that one paper that seems to have some relevance.
20	Thank you very much.
21	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you, Jim.
22	We started a few minutes late, and we're
23	running a little late. We have a little bit of
24	flexibility built into our schedule, but I definitely
25	would like to break by noon. So we will take time for
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	48
1	some questions and discussions, but to the extent that
2	we can keep them focused, it would be good.
3	Ruth?
4	MEMBER WEINER: First, I want to thank you
5	for a really fascinating presentation. That was just
6	really great. I would just limit myself to one
7	question.
8	You started in Naturita with a
9	contaminated site. And you have made some
10	adjustments, some suggestions about moving to the
11	Yucca Mountain site. Is there anything that could be
12	done in the Yucca Mountain site that would be
13	analogous to the contamination that you started with
14	at Naturita? Is there something that you can do in
15	the surface, take samples, whatever?
16	DR. DAVIS: Well, yes. Obviously the
17	testing that we did that we were capable of doing
18	because of the contamination that was there aided our
19	model evaluation and maybe validation if you want to
20	call it that in that we were able to go out and put
21	uncontaminated sediments into contaminated
22	groundwater. We were able to pull out contaminated
23	sediments. So it enabled a good, better testing of
24	our model.
25	The model could at an uncontaminated site,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

like Yucca Mountain, be built by abstracting enough sediments and making enough groundwater measurements. So the thing that might be limiting the construction of a model is I mean, there are
sediments and making enough groundwater measurements. So the thing that might be limiting the construction of a model is I mean, there are
So the thing that might be limiting the construction of a model is I mean, there are
construction of a model is I mean, there are
sediments now becoming available because of the early
growing program.
And the question is, is there enough water
chemistry available immediately down-gradient at the
site?
MEMBER HORNBERGER: Michael?
ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: I'll defer.
MEMBER HORNBERGER: Allen?
DR. CROFF: You have talked mostly about
saturated, saturated entirely, I think. Given that
Yucca Mountain, parts of it, are unsaturated or
spasmodic flow, periodic flow, would this approach
work or how might it work or what adjustments would
have to be made to make it work?
DR. DAVIS: Well, that's a good question.
We have no experience making it work in unsaturated
systems, but the adjustments that would have to be
made are the same kinds of adjustments that would have
to be made and used in either a constant K_d or a
distribution K_d approach except that you would have to
understand the water chemistry in the water that was
NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealroross.com

	50
1	flowing in the unsaturated zone. And you have to
2	understand the surface area system. Those are the
3	difficult things to understand to apply a model like
4	this into the unsaturated zone.
5	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Ines?
6	DR. TRIAY: I have three questions, the
7	first one along the lines of what has been asked for
8	the unsaturated zone. What has been the validation
9	that you have done with respect to these experiments
10	that are more wet chemistry, bench chemistry, type of
11	experiments, based on batch type of experiments versus
12	experiments that are performed under flowing
13	conditions, whether it is saturated or unsaturated?
14	And that is my first question.
15	The second question that I have
16	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Can he take them one
17	at a time maybe?
18	DR. TRIAY: I'm sorry. Yes. That's fine.
19	MEMBER HORNBERGER: We will come back.
20	DR. TRIAY: I was just wondering whether
21	he wanted to hear all of the questions.
22	DR. DAVIS: With respect to flowing
23	conditions, we have done also column experiments. I
24	didn't describe them, but we have a pretty good
25	agreement in the prediction of transporting columns
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

,

with this model.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Then the other part of the validation I described in the top, where we put uncontaminated sediments into the groundwater system itself for periods of months, up to 15 months.

So I showed so those data, where we put uncontaminated sediments in the groundwater at the site and then pulled them up after a period of time and measured the amount of absorbed uranium on that and compared that to what we predicted with the model. And we got within a factor of 2 for 17 different wells.

DR. TRIAY: So my second question, then, is so I guess that your point is, then, that this type of surface complexation model could be applied under flowing conditions and you can get the data from batch experiments and apply it under flowing conditions and predict radionuclide migration. Is that a fair statement?

DR. DAVIS: Well, it's a fair statement as long as the local equilibrium assumption applies. It will depend on the flow rate. So you can certainly increase the flow rate. It's an equilibrium model. So as long as --

DR. TRIAY: The kinetics is not

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	52
1	dominating.
2	DR. DAVIS: If the kinetics is not
3	dominating, then yes.
4	DR. TRIAY: So then that brings me to my
5	second question. Have you done some sensitivity
6	analysis based on the surface complexation model to
7	try to make a definitive conclusion as to whether or
8	not sorption coefficients can or cannot be used to
9	describe radionuclide migration?
10	What I mean by that is the surface
11	complexation model take some resources to develop,
12	especially for actinides, for the obvious reasons.
13	You have to get a tremendous amount of data. And you
14	have to get a tremendous amount of data as you vary
15	groundwater chemistry and, of course, when you start
16	varying groundwater chemistry, the actinides sometimes
17	behaving in a manner that is not ideal from the point
18	of view of solubility.
19	So you have to really control your
20	environment when you are trying to develop the surface
21	complexation models for actinides, like plutonium,
22	neptunium, americium, and the like.
23	So based on what you know now, is it your
24	opinion that the sorption coefficients that are more
25	readily obtainable for the actinides are inadequate to
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	53
1	predict radionuclide migration?
2	DR. DAVIS: Well, that's a difficult
3	question because inadequate would depend on the
4	criteria that one is judging inadequacy. It also
5	depends on a performance assessment point of view how
6	important is a K_d value to the assessment.
7	If in the case of iodine and technetium
8	you were able to conclude that there is no danger, the
9	dose is small enough with a K_d of zero, then obviously
10	you would not need a surface complexation model for
11	technetium and iodine.
12	So for neptunium, if there is a dependence
13	on the assessment or the safety assessment on the K_d
14	value, then my opinion is that yes, these types of
15	models would give more certainty and scientific
16	credibility to the values of retardation that are
17	simulated in reactive transport modeling in the
18	saturated zone.
19	I agree with you that it costs more, but
20	I also think that the costs are not as great as
21	thought if you use this engineering semi-empirical
22	approach to compare it to the more scientifically
23	based approaches that require a complete understanding
24	of the electrical double layer and so forth.
25	DR. TRIAY: What I meant by "resources,"
	NEAL R. GROSS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON. D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealroross.com
1	

I didn't mean costs in terms of funding, although that is probably true, but I meant more that sometimes it is just not possible to look at all of the range that you would need in order to come up with arable surface complexation model for some of the actinides because the actinides start becoming insoluble and getting to complexation with some of the trace components in the groundwater to the point that, all of a sudden, you are studying something different.

That way you think that you are studying some resources, not from the point of view of money necessarily but from the point of view of it is difficult because we don't understand the solubility of the actinides to the point that you can actually know that all that you are varying is the age versus carbonate concentration, nitrate, so on and so forth.

So that's the concern that I have, you know, to what extent can you really do this for that very rich chemistry that the actinides exhibit at near neutral pH.

21 DR. DAVIS: Well, in particular, I assume 22 you are talking about plutonium.

DR. TRIAY: Right.

DR. DAVIS: I think our studies have involved uranium. And we are beginning to work with

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

	55
1	neptunium. We don't think we have solubility issues
2	with those.
3	But yes, you do have to be able to work
4	experimentally under conditions where you are not
5	precipitating a base.
6	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Let's take that as a
7	discussion point. Jim, do you have a question?
8	DR. CLARKE: I, too, thought it was an
9	excellent presentation. Thank you for that.
10	This is just a fairly basic question.
11	This approach can be extended in a straightforward way
12	to several radionuclides. Would it shed any light on
13	competitive absorption? Any thoughts on that?
14	DR. DAVIS: The competitive adsorption
15	between radionuclides?
16	DR. CLARKE: Yes.
17	DR. DAVIS: Well, we have been working at
18	relatively low concentrations for radionuclides. The
19	competing that goes on for the surfaces is really from
20	the major cations in the groundwater, the calcium and
21	magnesium.
22	By using this approach, we take them into
23	but we work with an artificial groundwater of the
24	same composition and range of compositions that exists
25	in the aquifer. So we are taking that into account.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	56
1	It becomes lumped into our absorption constant, the
2	competitive processes, with those major ions.
3	Now, if you're talking about competing
4	between radionuclides, you would need pretty high
5	concentrations approaching solubilities, I think,
6	before those would become important.
7	Really, that's I think outside of the
8	geosphere. That must be more of a near phenomenon
9	that could be important near the waste package itself.
10	DR. CLARKE: Okay. Thanks.
11	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Dick?
12	DR. PARIZEK: Yes. Dick Parizek.
13	Again, a very, very interesting
14	presentation. In your discussion, you didn't consider
15	colloid transport particularly?
16	DR. DAVIS: No.
17	DR. PARIZEK: Right? That's excluded?
18	DR. DAVIS: That's correct, yes.
19	DR. PARIZEK: It's interesting. Looking
20	at the river, it's like a conceptual model here. You
21	say, "Well the river was a source of recharge above
22	the tailing pile." Then it became a discharge area
23	further down. It's sort of like the Forty Mile Wash
24	example.
25	You have infiltration, which is episodic.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

.

	57
1	It would be climate-driven in terms of pluvials,
2	monsoonals. You have differences in that. As you go
3	maybe on the west side of the alluvium, you have more
4	of the bedrock interface. And you also show sort of
5	a chemistry in the slower portion of the aquifer along
6	the valley wall versus near the river.
7	So the chemistries ought to be really
8	complicated in your model, even under the present data
9	source. For Forty Mile Wash, you expect also
10	complicated chemistries. And so you would need a lot
11	of data, I would think, on water chemistry as well as
12	the hydraulic conductivity variability to make a good
13	and reliable forecast.
14	Would you agree with that? It's sort of
15	capturing, I think, the main points you were trying to
16	bring up for us.
17	DR. DAVIS: Well, the richer the database
18	on the water chemistry, the hydraulic conductivity,
19	obviously the better your model is. The model itself
20	is developed from the batch data. So there you don't
21	have to collect thousands of data points. You collect
22	hundreds of data points. And then the question is how
23	many sediments are you going to collect to be
24	representative of the aquifer.
25	In our case, because we were worried about
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1it, we collected a ton literally, 2,000 pounds, or2aquifer material, which we screened to determine the3weight percentage of different size sediments and set4forth. That was more because there were no other data5on the size fractionation available for the aquifer6The complex chemistry you are talking7about, the contours near the river, that is a result8of delusions more than chemical reactions, just so you9understand that. That is the river water coming into10the aquifer and exiting back.11DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is12that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever13reason.
 aquifer material, which we screened to determine the weight percentage of different size sediments and set forth. That was more because there were no other data on the size fractionation available for the aquifer. The complex chemistry you are talking about, the contours near the river, that is a result of delusions more than chemical reactions, just so you understand that. That is the river water coming into the aquifer and exiting back. DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever is reason.
 weight percentage of different size sediments and set forth. That was more because there were no other data on the size fractionation available for the aquifer. The complex chemistry you are talking about, the contours near the river, that is a result of delusions more than chemical reactions, just so you understand that. That is the river water coming into the aquifer and exiting back. DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever reason.
 forth. That was more because there were no other data on the size fractionation available for the aquifer The complex chemistry you are talking about, the contours near the river, that is a result of delusions more than chemical reactions, just so you understand that. That is the river water coming into the aquifer and exiting back. DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever reason.
 on the size fractionation available for the aquifer The complex chemistry you are talking about, the contours near the river, that is a result of delusions more than chemical reactions, just so you understand that. That is the river water coming into the aquifer and exiting back. DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever reason.
6 The complex chemistry you are talking 7 about, the contours near the river, that is a result 8 of delusions more than chemical reactions, just so you 9 understand that. That is the river water coming into 10 the aquifer and exiting back. 11 DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is 12 that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever 13 reason.
 about, the contours near the river, that is a result of delusions more than chemical reactions, just so you understand that. That is the river water coming into the aquifer and exiting back. DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever reason.
 of delusions more than chemical reactions, just so you understand that. That is the river water coming into the aquifer and exiting back. DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever reason.
 9 understand that. That is the river water coming into 10 the aquifer and exiting back. 11 DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is 12 that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever 13 reason.
10 the aquifer and exiting back. 11 DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows is 12 that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever 13 reason.
DR. PARIZEK: Right. What it shows in that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever reason.
12 that the chemistry is quite variable, for whatever 13 reason.
13 reason.
14 DR. DAVIS: Yes.
DR. PARIZEK: In the case of Forty Mile
16 Wash, there is also a plume variability to the
17 recharge along the wash versus the recharge from the
18 bedrock portion and the tufts portion. And so there
19 is that interface between the two along the western
20 edge of the alluvial valley fill, where it's again
21 sort of similar looking, kind of a complicated
22 chemistry.
23 Then, again, whether or not you have
24 channelites flow in the alluvium, how well-known is
25 that, the samples were rotary-grilled versus sonic
NEAL R. GROSS
(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	59
1	core.
2	Now, it may be a possibility. And, again,
3	how big a sample would you need in order to be able to
4	say I have enough sample to say something about
5	spatial variability, even at the core sample location?
6	DR. DAVIS: Well, there are two issues
7	here. One is you go back in
8	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim, in the interest
9	of time, perhaps we won't go back. Just try to
10	address the Yucca Mountain application.
11	DR. DAVIS: Okay. The K_d contour that I
12	showed that the government drew, that is the same kind
13	of contour you could draw with our model. The
14	difference is that they have used it to build up a
15	log-normal distribution that the performance
16	assessment code draws from randomly.
17	There is nothing wrong with their
18	approach. I would just argue that if it is possible,
19	you would not draw from it randomly. You would use
20	the alkalinity and pH data you have and couple it to
21	the flow, not to draw random K _d 's off the
22	distribution.
23	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Don, are you with us
24	in Las Vegas? Do you have a question?
25	DR. SHETTEL: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com
•	-

 \bigcirc

1 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Yes, we can 2 hear. 3 DR. SHETTEL: Ι have а couple of 4 questions. Phosphate is next to the complex with 5 uranium as well. Have you looked at the phosphate concentration in all of these waters? 6 7 DR. DAVIS: In the Naturita system, we 8 have looked at phosphate. It's very low affect 9 concentrations doesn't and the aqueous 10 speciation in Naturita. 11 DR. SHETTEL: My second question, I think Dr. Parizek touched on this to some extent, but 12 13 rainfall in the West, especially the continuous loop, 14 was rather episodic. In your case, it may have a 15 dilution effect more than anything else. Does that 16 factor into your model? 17 DR. DAVIS: The modeling that you're 18 referring to, the one percent of precipitation that we 19 assumed was recharge? 20 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Perhaps the question 21 is you assumed a steady flow. 22 DR. DAVIS: Yes, we assumed a steady flow. 23 DR. SHETTEL: Okay. So you're averaging 24 rainfall over the course of a year or some time 25 period? **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	61
1	DR. DAVIS: Yes.
2	DR. SHETTEL: How much effect would that
3	have if they weren't averaged but were episodic, if
4	they randomly input into your model?
5	DR. DAVIS: Well, obviously since we
6	haven't done that, I can't say for sure, but I don't
7	think it would have a big effect.
8	DR. SHETTEL: Okay. I want to thank you
9	for a very interesting talk. I think this raises one
10	more question about Yucca Mountain.
11	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thanks, Don.
12	Obviously this is a very interesting
13	presentation. We could easily go on and have another
14	hour of discussion, but we do have to move on in the
15	interest of time. Thank you very much, Jim.
16	What we are going to do now is go to our
17	next presentation by Keith Compton.
18	MR. COMPTON: Good morning. My name is
19	Keith Compton. I am with the Performance Assessment
20	Section in the Division of High-Level Waste Repository
21	Safety.
22	I am here to talk to you this morning just
23	to provide an introduction and some regulatory context
24	to the NRC approach to evaluating flow and transport
25	in the saturated zone. I will try to be brief. This
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

is only an introductory presentation. The technical details will be provided this afternoon and tomorrow morning.

Now, again, my objective is to provide the regulatory framework, the context for the activities that we will be talking about this afternoon. What I would like to do is to leave you with an understanding of the connection between the presentations that will be given by the center staff and by NRC staff and an understanding of how these are relevant to the regulatory requirements and to the regulatory tools that we use.

13 The first part of my talk will provide I will be talking about two of the 14 that context. 15 important regulatory tools that we have, which is the Yucca Mountain review plan and the risk insights 16 baseline report. And that will be the majority of the 17 18 talk, hopefully short talk. And the second half will 19 just be a brief summary of the talks that will be 20 given later so that you have an understanding of what 21 is going to be coming.

Jumping right in, the yucca mountain review plan for those of you who may not be familiar with it provides guidance for implementing the requirements of part 63, particularly the requirements

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

22

23

24

25

www.neairgross.com

	63
1	of part 63.21, which governs the content of a license
2	application, and 63.114, which deals with the
3	post-closure performance assessment that's required in
4	the safety analysis report of any potential license
5	application.
6	The review plan consists of a number of
7	topical area and model abstractions. Today and
8	tomorrow we will be focusing on two of the relevant
9	sections of the review plan.
10	The first deals with flow paths in the
11	saturated zone. It's mainly focused on hydrology.
12	The second is radionuclide transport in the saturated
13	zone and is more focused on chemistry retardation.
14	The Yucca Mountain review plan contains
15	detailed guidance in the form of review methods. And
16	it tells us how to review a number of topics. These
17	include descriptions of aspects of the abstraction and
18	their technical basis. It deals with adequate
19	justification of the models and the data that are used
20	in a performance assessment, evaluation of the
21	uncertainty in the models and data. And also it deals
22	with how to demonstrate that the models are supported
23	by independent evidence that's termed "model support."
24	Something that is important to bear in
25	mind on the review plan is that the review methods are
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

۱

given for a detailed review. It covers a lot of material. However, that level of detail is for if you needed to do a detailed review. However, in any review of a potential license application, we would tailor the depth of review to the extent to which the Department of Energy relied upon the particular abstraction to make their safety case to demonstrate compliance. So, in other words, if the DOE believes that this is an element that is important to their safety case, we would do a more detailed review.

There are two aspects to how we would relying these determine whether they are on abstractions to make their safety case. One is we would look for any explicit credit they take. And by going into the multiple barriers section of the safety analysis report and seeing what has been prevented, 16 what they have said about the credit that they plan to take for saturated zone. 18

But also we would look for any implicit credit that is taken by examining the TSPA model and determining whether they have, in fact, in the model taken credit for a feature, event, or process that would affect the repository performance. So there are two parts determining the extent of the reliance: the explicit and implicit credit.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	65
1	Now, turning to the details, this is a bit
2	of a summary. There are several pages on each of
3	these topics. I've tried to summarize them into one,
4	rather than just reading all of them.
5	The review plan identifies a variety of
6	factors that can affect flow paths. Several of the
7	factors in the first bullet, factors such as changes
8	in the water table or changes in potential and future
9	climate, will be discussed by Jim Winterle in his
10	presentation on flow paths.
11	I would also point out that the review
12	plan does require an examination of how features,
13	events, and processes have been included in the
14	assessment and evaluation of the approach used by DOE
15	in their abstraction, the saturated zone flow. The
16	focus of our talks is going to be on what we have
17	done. We are not going to be talking a lot on our
18	evaluation of the DOE models.
19	For saturated zone transport, it's
20	constructed in a fairly parallel fashion. Again,
21	there are a number of factors that have been
22	identified that can affect radionuclide transport.
23	We just heard about the importance of
24	water chemistry to transport. That is something that
25	is pulled out. And that is also something that Mr.
	NEAL R. GROSS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234.4433 WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701

Paul Bertetti will be talking about this afternoon covering the center's approach to abstracting the two: radionuclide transport and the impact of water chemistry. Again, the focus of our talk will be mainly on the first bullet. We won't be going into DOE or evaluating what DOE might have done.

Next slide, please. The next important regulatory tool that we have is a document known as the risk insights baseline report. This report is a set of analyses that were conducted by the NRC and by the center. They're intended to identify features of the engineered and natural environment that are important to repository performance. This is also used to assist in determining the level of detail. We determined how significant different abstractions, different components are to repository performance.

There are a number of risk insights. I'm only going to talk about the ones related to saturated zone flow and transport. We have one aspect which is considered to be of high significance to waste isolation; that is, retardation and the saturated alluvium.

As many of you know, there are two components to the saturated zone. There is a fractured tuff aquifer and then a saturated alluvial

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

67 aquifer. The absorption in the saturated alluvium we 1 believe is particularly important. 2 Now, because of that, it is also important 3 4 to consider the distance of the flow path in the 5 saturated alluvium. If the flow were to bypass this saturated alluvium for much of its length, that would 6 7 obviously impair its ability to function as a barrier. And so that issue of the distance of flow paths in the 8 9 saturated alluvium was rated as of medium significance to waste isolation. 1.0 11 Also, there is absorption, however, that does take place in the fractured tuff, particularly if 12 the nuclides diffuse out of the fractural water and 13 into the rock matrix. It's this term, "matrix 14 15 diffusion." The possibility of that, the impact that that could have on performance, is determined to be of 16 17 medium significance. I would also point out that in this, the 18 19 effect of colloids on transport in the saturated zone, is also rated to be of medium significance to waste 20 It is not something that we are going to 21 isolation. be talking about in our presentations in detail. 22 23 We have time constraints. And we wanted 24 to go over several things in sufficient detail. And 25 so for that reason, you are not going to see a lot on

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

evaluation of colloids.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the first talk this afternoon will be by Mr. Jim Winterle. He will present the groundwater flow model that has been developed by the center. And he will talk about the sensitivity of model flow paths to different factors, flow paths and travel times, to different factors, such as changes in recharge or changes in the water table level.

And, as I have pointed out, this talk will address several of the items that have been called out in the Yucca Mountain review plan and also in the risk insights baseline report.

The next presentation will be by Mr. Paul Bertetti on development of sorption parameters. He will focus on parameters affecting transport and, in particular, how they are abstracted for the purposes of performance assessment. This will, in large part, be focused on determination of retardation factors for actinides and particularly for neptunium. Again, this talk will cover or will mention several of the factors that are identified in the review plan and in the risk insights baseline report as well.

Finally, tomorrow morning Mr. Tim McCartin of the NRC will provide a discussion on performance assessment and risk perspective. In that talk, he

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

68

69 will discuss how a risk-informed approach can be 1 2 applied to evaluating the performance of the saturated 3 zone. He will be doing that by first describing 4 5 the principles of the risk-informed approach. And then he will step through an example that has been 6 7 developed to show how it can be used to evaluate the performance of the saturated zone as a barrier. 8 9 That presentation will illustrate the 10 relationship between the key items that have been 11 identified in the review plan and baseline report 12 showing retardation, the transport distance, matrix 13 these work together diffusion, how in working 14 combination to affect repository performance. 15 And that's it. As I said, this is a very 16 brief introductory presentation. What I had wanted to do is to just introduce you to two of the important 17 18 regulatory tools, the Yucca Mountain review plan and the risk insights. Again, the review plan identifies 19 items for review. 20 The risk insights assist in determining 21 22 the focus and the depth of the review. And I have 23 provided by use of the risk insights an introduction

particular importance to repository performance and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to some of the aspects that are considered to be of

(202) 234-4433

24

25

	70
1	then provided just a very brief introduction to the
2	talks that will be given later so that you have an
3	understanding of what is coming.
4	That's all that I have. If anyone has any
5	questions, I would be happy to take them.
6	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Great. Thanks, Keith.
7	Obviously we are going to suffer a great
8	temptation to ask Keith detailed questions about
9	presentations yet to come. I will empower Keith to
10	deflect all such questions. Let me start, Keith.
11	As you heard Ines ask Jim a question on
12	adequacy of an approach, in general terms, can you
13	give us some insight on the regulatory perspective as
14	to how or how the Yucca Mountain review plan might
15	determine what would and would not be adequate from
16	the NRC's point of view?
17	MR. COMPTON: I can talk a little bit
18	about I guess the standard to be applied, which would
19	be a reasonable expectation standard used to determine
20	whether something was adequate. I will mention that.
21	And hopefully that will get to the question.
22	When DOE develops their performance
23	assessment and develop their models, the standard that
24	we would apply to determining whether their overall
25	assessment was adequate would be reasonable
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com
expectation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And there is a number of things that are important to that. It includes the full record. It recognizes that you are not going to have absolute certainty and you're not going to be able to completely eliminate all uncertainties in your assessments. And it acknowledges that because this is our processes that operate over a very long time scale, that there are inherently greater uncertainties and that we will have to focus on the full range of distributions, not to pick out one particular tail of the distribution, one particular value of, for example, a retardation coefficient and focus in on that.

I don't know if that gets to your question. There are a number of items that are in the review plan. In determining whether it is adequate, we would look at the risk insights. We would look to see how important do we think this is in affecting it.

Performance is a very sensitive to changes. Then we need to know a lot more about it. We need to have a fair amount of confidence. If it's something that doesn't really affect the overall performance results, then we might not need as much information on that or as long as we understand how

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	72
1	important it is for performance.
2	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thanks.
3	Ruth?
4	MEMBER WEINER: This may strike you as a
5	simpleminded question, but to the public, Yucca
6	Mountain was always promoted as being in the
7	unsaturated zone. And that was why it was a good
8	site. What is the relative relevance and importance
9	of your focusing on the saturated zone?
10	MR. COMPTON: I'm not sure that I would be
11	able to talk about the relative importance of the
12	unsaturated zone and the saturated zone. I know that
13	our work has focused largely. Again, the goal of this
14	presentation is to present the work that we have done
15	and the approaches that we are taking. And a lot of
16	that work has been on the saturated zone. I don't
1.7	know if anyone wants to add anything.
18	MEMBER WEINER: Well, we can defer it to
19	later if somebody else wants
20	MR. COMPTON: Okay. But I will not try at
21	this point to speculate about the relative kind of
22	importance of the two. We are focusing in this
23	presentation on the saturated zone.
24	MR. CAMPBELL: I can just add this is
25	Andy Campbell, Chief of the Performance Assessment
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
·	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

73 Section -- that we will keep that in mind as we go 1 The relative importance of the saturated zone 2 alonq. -- keep in mind DOE and the federal government picked 3 4 the site. We're the regulator. So we're looking at and evaluating and will evaluate what DOE comes in 5 with. 6 Based upon our own analyses using TPA and 7 doing over many years work the saturated zone comes 8 out as an important barrier. And so it isn't so much 9 10 as what has gone on in the past but on the basis of all of this work, saturated zone comes out as fairly 1.1 12 important. And that is why we are focusing on that. That was documented in the risk insights 13 report, which was publicly available in April. 14 MEMBER WEINER: Thank you. That is very 15 helpful. 16 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Mike? 17 ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Just an 18 observation. I want to turn your attention to your 19 20 first backup slide. I thought those were kind of interesting and helpful rallying points for both your 21 consideration of the review plan and maybe the risk 22 23 insights. Let's just go through them. Maybe could 24 25 we get that slide up or talk about it? There are five NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

74 1 bullets there: system description and model integration and so forth. This seems to kind of maybe 2 3 help organize our thinking of how the other 4 presentations might come along. 5 MR. COMPTON: Sure. Particularly for the different model abstractions, these are 6 fairly 7 standard review areas. They're broken down in this format in the review plan. 8 The first review area, review method is a 9 10 description of the system and model integration. So in that bullet, we would look at how in a license 11 12 application and the safety analysis report the system was described and how it's integrated with other 13 14 sections. For example, saturated zone flow and 15 16 saturated zone transport need to be consistent with each other. And this would be a place where we would 17 look to see that, in fact, the approaches are 18 consistent. 19 20 The next section goes to the justification of the data and the models that would be used. So at 21 22 first we have presented. We described what is there. And now we look at how well the data and the models 23 24 are justified. 25 Next we go on to evaluating to what extent **NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS** 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

and how well has uncertainty in the data been evaluated. The next is going more towards model uncertainty. There may be different models that could be appropriate. And that section would provide guidance on how to determine whether they have appropriately accounted for the possibility of different conceptual models.

Then, finally, model supports are a topic which deals with how well the outputs of the model compare to some kind of objective comparison. It might be a comparison with field observations. It might be a comparison with the abstracted model with a more complex process-level model, but in general we want to see that the abstracted model is supported by some kind of objective evidence. This is the section in which it would be done.

Again, the depth to which you would go in any of these elements would depend on how important it is and how much credits the DOE was taking for it.

So, for example, if retardation in the saturated alluvium was determined to be a barrier that DOE is relying on to make their safety case to show that they will meet their performance objectives, then that is something that would be reviewed to a much greater amount of detail. If, on the other hand, they

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

www.nealrgross.com

	76
1	decided that was not important or they didn't want to
2	invest the energy in it or it just didn't have any
3	impact on performance, you wouldn't spend as much of
4	your time reviewing something that wouldn't really
5	have an impact or wasn't part of the argument.
6	So yes, these are the sections that are
7	called out, review methods that are called out in the
8	review plan.
9	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: It's kind of the
10	intersection of the two points you made earlier, that
11	the review plan is the items for review and the risk
12	insights. It's kind of the focus in depth of those.
13	To me, you can't get from one to the other.
14	MR. COMPTON: Right.
15	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thanks very much.
16	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Allen? Ines?
17	DR. TRIAY: I wanted to ask you from the
18	perspective of the approach that you are using to
19	review what comes in from DOE, to use the phrase that
20	was used here before. Do you model in parallel to
21	DOE? Do you use your own modeling capability and then
22	compare results at the end? Do you try to use their
23	same assumptions? Do you use your own assumptions?
24	Could you help me a little bit in terms of how do you
25	provide that independent validation of what comes in
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	77
1	from DOE in this very complicated area of radionuclide
2	migration?
3	MR. COMPTON: Okay. I'll try and take
4	that on. And then I will see whether my answer is
5	adequate.
6	MEMBER HORNBERGER: And how will that be
7	judged?
8	MR. COMPTON: But the first thing that is
9	important to bear in mind is that we review what the
10	Department of Energy submits. It is the department's
11	responsibility to make a safety case. So it is not
12	our job to kind of independently decide. I mean, they
13	have to make the safety case. So that is probably the
14	first thing to keep in mind.
1 <u>5</u>	The role of independent modeling, it
16	serves a number of roles. One of the things that it
17	does is it gives us an understanding of how to review
18	their model.
19	The fact that we have done these exercises
20	gives us our independent understanding of what is
21	important so that we can look for those if there may
22	be gaps. It is very hard to find what is not talked
23	about, but that is one of the roles of independent
24	modeling. As well, there may be some role for
25	independent modeling and confirming the calculation if
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	78
1	you want to check something to see whether there is
2	something that has been done.
3	Does that answer your question?
4	DR. TRIAY: Yes.
5	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim Clarke? Jim
6	Davis? Dick?
7	DR. PARIZEK: As I sort of watched the
8	process over the years, it seems like NRC has remained
9	constant. You have your rules, your regulations. I
10	think they are the same as they were when this process
11	started a long time ago.
12	Meanwhile the DOE appears to shift
13	emphasis as it has to decide what the work products
14	have to be and marshals its efforts and produces its
15	results. And so you could get the idea that group is
16	moving in different directions to create the final
17	product that you folks are going to review.
18	Have you evolved in this same time period?
19	To what extent have you evolved? I see like the
20	safety analysis or the risk-based discussions have
21	sort of elevated through time to make that very clear.
22	The KTI process has always been there and
23	the FEPs process has always been there. Are you
24	constant? Have you been constant? You have obviously
25	done models. You have learned a lot. You do some
	NEAL R. GROSS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

models in some cases in a limited way but enough to 1 draw attention to aspects of the problem that really 2 need attention, perhaps by DOE, reminding them, on the 3 4 one hand, or understanding the benefit you get 5 yourself, being able to make these analyses yourself. Where has NRC been heading in all of this 6 while? I mean, you obviously have learned a lot, and 7 they have learned a lot. We have all learned a lot. 8 Well, I will give two 9 MR. COMPTON: answers to that. And then I may pass the rest of it 10 The first is that yes, it has been evolving. 11 off. The second is that I have been with the NRC since last 12 September, not enough to discuss the evolution. Ι 13 don't know if Tim or Andy --14 MR. McCARTIN: Yes. Tim McCartin, NRC 15 staff. 16 We started doing performance assessments 17 around 20 years ago. And we clearly have tried to 18 incorporate the science as it has evolved. I guess I 19 20 will give a couple of examples. I mean, one I think will be a very good 21 one you will hear later by Paul Bertetti about the K_d 22 approach and the pH dependence, et cetera, that he 23 will be discussing. I think that is a very good 24 25 example of something that how we are evolving with NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	80
1	time, changing our look at the K _d approach.
2	Another example is matrix diffusion. I
3	will say matrix diffusion in the unsaturated zone. At
4	one time we had in our model, I will say 10 to 15
5	years ago. We no longer have it there. We have the
6	capability to do it. But we came to look on it as not
7	a very significant process.
8	And so there have been changes along the
9	way. I will talk a little bit about that in my talk
10	a very small amount with respect to matrix diffusion.
11	Colloids we look to DOE, who has actually
12	done a little more work than we have in the colloid
13	area. We continue to keep abstract of that. We are
14	continuing to do analyses with colloids. Another
15	version of the TPA code will have a more explicit
16	treatment of colloids.
17	So things continue to evolve with time.
18	I like to think we haven't stood still but continue to
19	make changes in the areas we believe are significant.
20	DR. PARIZEK: And clearly the role of
21	multiple barriers has not changed, the idea that the
22	natural system barriers have got to be there to do
23	something, but you can't take credit if you can't more
24	or less establish why it does something for you.
25	So they still take credit when they can
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

and are not taking full credit for other aspects of the natural barrier system. But they have to have multiple barriers, right? That hasn't changed.

MR. McCARTIN: Absolutely. And I will say maybe a prime motivation to my talk tomorrow is a process that I have been involved with the committee for the last couple of years in terms of explaining and communicating our understanding of the Yucca Mountain with respect to the multiple barriers and that that actually is something that I think has evolved very well over the last couple of years in doing а better job of communicating that understanding. So there is actually another example. It's not just the quantitative models but

the explanation and the understanding that they provide. I will say that is a very important part that I think has evolved over the last few years also.

DR. PARIZEK: Thank you.

MEMBER HORNBERGER: And I will point out that Tim McCartin did start out with NRC before last September. Mike Ryan suggested that he had red hair when he started here.

MR. McCARTIN: Sadly.

24 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Don Shettel in Las 25 Vegas, do you have a question?

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

www.nealrgross.com

DR. SHETTEL: Yes. I would like to follow-up on a previous comment. I think the saturated zone is an important barrier and may turn out to be the most important one, but regarding the vadous zone or unsaturated zone, residents' time for some radionuclides in the unsaturated zone is much longer than it is in the saturated zone.

As an example, neptunium, if there is a ratio of residents' time, the UZ to the SZ, is not one, that would suggest that the vadous zone is an important barrier, at least as far as DOE is concerned. I'm wondering if the NRC is going to have a similar meeting to decide if there is absorption in the vadous zone, the unsaturated zone.

MR. McCARTIN: Yes. Tim McCartin, NRC.

Yes. As Keith explained, in getting ready for this working group, we made a choice to focus primarily on the saturated zone. And so our presentations are related to that.

However, the unsaturated zone has many attributes that need to be examined and looked at. I mean, first and foremost, just the fact that it is unsaturated and how dripping occurs into the drips, how many packages might be dripped on is an attribute. Also, the Calico Hills vitric unit is a primarily

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	83
1	matrix flow only unit, where you are right.
2	The transport time will be decidedly slow.
3	If there is some retardation, even slower, that is in
4	our risk baseline report. It is also something that
5	is accounted for in our simulations.
6	An important aspect is how much of the
7	footprint of the repository is underlain by the Calico
8	Hills vitric unit. There are other aspects with
9	respect to the potential for matrix diffusion.
10	In our modeling, we have seen it be fairly
11	limited in the unsaturated zone. DOE has shown it to
12	be a little more in their models. That will be an
13	aspect of our review.
14	So there are a lot of aspects to the
15	unsaturated zone. We did make a commitment to just do
16	the saturated zone. That was not to diminish
17	necessarily the contribution of the unsaturated zone.
18	It was one of time that we thought we just made a
19	decision.
20	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thanks very much.
21	Thank you, Keith. You got us pretty close to back on
22	time. Thanks to the presentation. We look forward to
23	hearing the other presentations that you have
24	presaged.
25	MR. COMPTON: Thank you.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	84
1	MEMBER HORNBERGER: We are now going to
2	take a one-hour break for lunch. We will reassemble
3	at 1:00 o'clock promptly to be on schedule.
4	(Whereupon, at 11:59 a.m., the foregoing
5	matter was recessed for lunch, to
6	reconvene at 1:06 p.m. the same day.)
7	MEMBER HORNBERGER: We're getting ready to
8	start here. It's precisely 1:00 Eastern
9	(Laughter.)
10	more or less.
11	(Laughter.)
12	We're going to return to our working group
13	session, and our next presenter is Bob Andrews, who is
14	joining us from Las Vegas. And I want to thank Bob,
15	because I know how tough it is for the people working
16	for DOE and the contractors to make time to do this.
17	And I want to tell Bob that even though he probably
18	has made similar presentations many times, we do
19	appreciate his willingness to do one more.
20	Bob, are you there?
21	MR. ANDREWS: Okay. Thank you very much.
22	Yes. Can you hear me?
23	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes.
24	MR. ANDREWS: You can hear me okay?
25	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes, you're on.
	NEAL R. GROSS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	85
1	That's fine, Bob.
2	MR. ANDREWS: Okay. Okay, thanks. Yes,
3	thanks. I have the pleasure of, you know, summarizing
4	and introducing, you know, Bill Arnold, who is going
5	to talk after I and I think after some centered
6	discussions that focus on the saturated zone.
7	My particular discussion will have a
8	summary overview of transport aspects in both the
9	unsaturated zone and the saturated zone. I didn't
10	want to lose sight of the fact that part of the
11	barrier below the repository to reduce radionuclide
12	transport is, in fact, in the unsaturated zone.
1 <u>3</u>	So I'll talk at least conceptually about
14	transport in the unsaturated zone, and then Bill will
15	discuss in greater detail transport in the saturated
16	zone later on this afternoon.
17	As a point of background, virtually all of
18	the information that's in these slides was presented
19	in earlier presentations to the NWTRB in March by
20	detailed individuals from Lawrence Berkeley Lab, Los
21	Alamos Lab, Sandia Labs, and the U.S. Geological
22	Survey. And it's very difficult for us to summarize,
23	but I've tried to do my best and pick the most salient
24	slides that make a discussion of the conceptual models
25	and the key tests that support those technical models
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

and the parameters that are being propagated in the performance assessments.

This work is also presented in 3 two 4 technical basis documents and the supporting KTI agreement responses that are presented in appendices 5 to those technical basis documents that have been sent 6 to NRC. Saturated zone was Technical Basis Document 7 Number 11. That was delivered to NRC last fall. And 9 the unsaturated zone transport is presented in Technical Basis Document Number 10, which I believe 10 11 was sent to NRC towards the end of May of this year, so just about a month ago. 12

So this is in some ways a summary of information that's in those technical basis documents, which, in turn, are summaries of information presented in the model reports and analysis reports and data descriptions that support those model and analysis reports, that support those technical basis documents, and supported the addressing of the KTI responses in appendices to that.

So what I want to do is on Slide 2 -- and I believe you're looking at me versus the slides, and at least we are here I think --

(Laughter.)

MEMBER HORNBERGER: But we all have copies

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

8

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	87
<u>,</u> 1	of the slides, Bob.
2	MR. ANDREWS: Okay. That's good, because
3	they're more colorful than I am.
4	(Laughter.)
5	So keep your head down.
6	Okay. We're going to walk through the
7	unsaturated zone flow and transport processes and some
8	key test results and data that support the
9	understanding of those processes and conceptual
10	models, and then do the same thing for saturated zone.
11	And as I said, Bill, who follows later on this
12	afternoon, will go into much greater detail on the
13	saturated zone part.
14	Slide 3 summarizes the key processes of
15	importance to performance, both of the barriers and to
16	the system, in the unsaturated zone. We have changes
17	in climate that have to be considered, the
18	infiltration at the service and ultimately the
19	percolation of that infiltration through the
20	unsaturated zone, contacting the repository, the
21	things that happen in the vicinity of the repository
22	and the couple processes that occur in the vicinity of
23	the repository.
24	In particular, the thermal, hydro,
25	chemical, and mechanical processes are beyond the
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

scope of this particular presentation, but there are separate technical basis documents on those particular aspects of the effects of the repository construction and heat on flow processes in the unsaturated zone.

We then are concerned with how that water through the mountain from transport moves a perspective, in particular not just the flux distribution but how that flux is distributed between the fractures and the matrix, at the faults, the effects of perched water zones, and ultimately effects of variability throughout the unsaturated zone, both in different rock types and the difference and uncertainty of particular properties within a rock type -- for example, the lower lith versus the middle non-lith, and the differences in the uncertainty of the flow characteristics in those two rock units.

When we get to transport, Slide 4 talks about the different concepts and conceptual models of importance to radionuclide transport. I think the keynote speaker hit on several of these in his introduction, which I thought was excellent. And those same processes are relevant to us with respect to the performance of the barriers below the repository horizon itself.

Those, including advection, matrix

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

diffusions, or the diffusion of radionuclides into the matrix, dispersion, sorption, the transport of colloids, which is a little bit different than the transport of dissolved species, they are characterized differently.

I believe Bill will talk a little bit about that, but I think we've kind of focused our presentations today on the dissolved constituents, notably things like neptunium, technetium, iodine, etcetera, rather than the colloidal leak transported radionuclides, which include things like plutonium, americium, etcetera.

Slide 5 just has some words that summarize 13 that we have models of unsaturated zone transport. 14 15 Those models are derived from in situ testing, 16 laboratory testing, some comparisons to analoq 17 information. There is indirect confirmatory information at the site itself, with respect to things 18 like carbon-14 and other radiotracers that have to be 19 20 also evaluated with respect to the understanding of both flow and transport. 21

Those tests are key to that understanding. Those tests are key to the models and the confidence in the models. And the tests are also key for developing parameter distributions that are used

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

22

23

24

25

within the models and the uncertainty in dose parameter distributions and then propagated through the performance of the unsaturated zone portion of the barriers below the repository horizon.

So on Slides 6 and 7, just to orient people to the tests that I'm going to be focusing on, because we have done explicit tests of transport within the unsaturated zone media at Yucca Mountain, the ones that I'm going to be focusing on -- one is Busted Butte, which is just to the south end of the repository block. A picture of Busted Butte is shown in the lower left-hand corner of Slide 7, looking to the east/southeast from the crest.

And then I'm going to talk about -- Busted Butte is on a scale of about 10 meters, roughly 10 meters. Then I'm going to talk about some crosstesting conducted in the repository block or just east of the repository block itself. One is Alcove 8, Niche 3, where the opportunity of the cross drift going across the ESF main allowed the possibility of putting in water and tracers in that water and evaluating the transport of those tracers through roughly about 20 meters of unsaturated rock.

And the other test was done in Alcove 1, between the surface and Alcove 1 at the east end of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

90

91 the northern ramp. And, again, that's tens of meters 1 scale of transport, where we put the water surface and 2 breakthrough different dissolved 3 observe of 4 constituents in the ESF alcove. So I'm going to talk a little bit about 5 each of those three test configurations, not the 6 details, but the general understanding, conceptual 7 understanding of transport processes that's derived 8 from those tests. 9 Starting with Slide 7, it simply shows the 10 cutaway and the actual test layout on the right-hand 11 12 side for -- more or less for background. Slide 8 talks about the different tracers. Sorry about the 13 typo on fluorescein. There's an S before the C. Ι 14 think that occurs a couple of times, to be honest with 15 16 you. So this shows the individual injection 17 holes, and we're actually looking at transport across 18 different rock units in the Busted Butte evaluation. 19 20 And then we're looking at varying ways of observing that transport through that rock mass at the scale of 21 that particular test. 22

Some of the actual data are shown on Slide 9. On the left-hand side, we show breakthroughs or distributions of two tracers -- lithium and

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

23

24

25

bromide. At the right, we show a diffusive halo if 1 you will of fluorescein as it is moving through, in 2 this particular case, the Busted Butte test. 3 In both cases on Slide 9 we show the 4 actual observed data. In the case of the left-hand 5 side, the observed data are with the data points 6 7 measured at different times for the different tracers. For example, lithium was measured at 337 days and 440 8 days, and you see the models in comparison to those 9 10 breakthroughs. So the models with matrix diffusion and 11 with a very limited amount of sorption were able to 12 reasonably reproduce the direct testing that was 13 performed there for both the lithium and the bromide. 14 And the right-hand side for the fluorescein, the 15 bottom part is the model, the top part is a halo if 16 you will observed of the fluorescein dye as it was 17 moving through the fractured rock mass. 18 So the Busted Butte test wasn't so much 19 20 used to develop parameters per se, but it was used to test the conceptual models of transport through 21 smaller sections of fractured rock mass -- a little 22 bit off of the repository block itself. 23 We then go to Slide 10, where we're 24 looking at Alcove 8, Niche 3, Alcove 8 above in the 25 NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

92

ECRB and Niche 3 down below. And you see in the upper right-hand side of Slide 10 that we've put a -essentially an infiltration plot in the drift, and then evaluated, after a period of reaching steadystate on the infiltration side, added some tracers and evaluated the tracer migration between Alcove 8 above and Niche 3 below.

As you can see, Alcove 8 itself is in the upper lith, and Niche 3 is in the middle non, so we're kind of crossing both of the primary rock units within the repository block. Some of the data and a comparison of the data to model results are shown on Slide 11.

Again, the differences in the transport characteristics of in this case lithium bromide and pentafluorobenzoic acid are driven primarily by the different sizes of those dissolved constituents, and you see that effect with respect to the diffusive characteristics, in particular the matrix diffusion characteristics, of the fractured rock mass.

And one aspect of uncertainty that has to be evaluated and propagated is: what is the actual interface area between the migrating dissolved constituents and the rock mass? That's not something that's usually directly measurable or observable --

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that fraction of the rock mass that actually is taking part in matrix diffusion.

in that particular uncertainty So parameter was first off evaluated in this test, but in the uncertainty, and that parameter has to be through the assessment of the propagated to performance of the unsaturated zone feature of the barrier below the repository.

Moving on to Slide 12, a third test in the unsaturated zone, where at the surface -- this is at the eastern end of the north ramp, just as you enter into the ESF. There was an infiltration zone put at the surface, that thing called blue cover. It's just a blue cover put on the -- above the infiltration that was artificially applied to try to minimize the amount of evaporation and control the actual amount of water that was being applied at the surface and allowing it to, if you will, recharge at the surface and then go through the unsaturated zone, such that it could be later on collected at the Alcove 1 with a series of sheets and other water collection devices.

So similar to Alcove 8, Niche 3, there's water applied. This was not an ambient system flux. It's an artificially perturbed flux, in order to get measurable concentration breakthroughs within a

> NEAL. R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

94

reasonable period of time, where that would be in the 1 2 order of years instead of tens of years or hundreds of 3 years, whatever it might have been. 4 So the schematic of the test shown in 5 Slide 12, some of the key results also indicated there as well, where, again, the process of dissolved 6 7 constituents -- in this particular case I'm not sure. I didn't write down the actual tracers that were 8 selected for that particular test. But the arrival of 9 10 the tracers at the -- in this case the Alcove 1, some 11 30 meters below the actual surface at that point, required the incorporation of matrix diffusion type 12 13 processes. So it wasn't just an advective transport 14 15 through the fractured rock mass, but it required the

through the fractured rock mass, but it required the interaction of that dissolved constituent with the rock matrix in which it was in contact with. So that matrix diffusion process, again, was evaluated and determined to be conceptually a strong basis and valid for that scale of rock mass -- again, on the scale of 30 meters.

You see some of the tests results and model prediction results in Slide 13, where in the red we actually look at the application of the tracer, and then in green are the actual observed breakthroughs at

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the point some, as I say, 30 meters below in the drift in this particular case.

So with respect to the unsaturated zone, which I know is not the focus of a number of the talks that will follow, a number of tests, in particular focused on the in situ tests here, but those have been supported by analog evaluations and laboratory tests, have kind of confirmed the conceptual basis, the conceptual models used in the unsaturated zone transport characterization and model.

Those tests are also used to provide data to constrain the parameter distributions, the reasonable parameter distributions of transportrelated parameters, and for the particular sorptionparameters, which haven't related transport Ι presented in here. Those are primarily derived from laboratory-based testing.

But in the cases where a laboratory 18 sorption measurement is comparable to a tracer that 19 20 used in an in situ test, the transport was characteristics, the sorption characteristics, are 21 If anything -- and we'll see 22 virtually analogous. some examples here when we get to the saturated zone 23 -- the laboratory sorption measurements predict a 24 slightly lower sorption, lower equivalent Kd, than 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

96

what would be derived in situ for the cases where there is a similar dissolved constituent that's being compared. Of course, we're not testing these things with radioactive tracers in the field for very obvious reasons.

And uncertainties, then, in parameters, whether those be sorption parameters or transport parameters in general, such as matrix diffusion, effective porosities, fluxes, etcetera, have been included and are being propagated through with respect to the performance assessment, where now performance assessment -- in the most general sense of the word, that includes the total system performance assessment and the evaluation of the capability of the barrier as required in Part 63, and as will be summarized in the safety analysis report later on this year.

17 Switching gears to the saturated zone, we have a conceptual picture. I think we've probably 18 used this conceptual picture several different times 19 20 to show the different transport behavior of the alluvium, fractured tuffs the and that 21 versus 22 difference in transport behavior, transport characteristics, is directly evaluated in a couple of 23 tests that I'm going to talk about in summary fashion 24 25 here today.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

I want to preface this by saying that, unfortunately, to date we haven't been able to form a full cross-fold tracer test in the alluvium for permitting reasons. I believe Nye County, who is going to talk tomorrow -- Dr. Hammermeister is going to talk tomorrow -- will talk a little bit about the current status of any plans for tracer testing, crustle tracer testing in the alluvium.

9 So to date the only test -- and I think I'll have one example of that -- in alluvium, a 10 11 relatively large scale of transport is what can be called huff-puff 12 varyingly а test or an 13 injection/withdrawal type test from a single pull, 14 where you inject a tracer, let the natural gradient 15 take over, and then withdraw the tracer and evaluate 16 what that tells about the transport you 17 characteristics of the alluvium. And we'll talk a 18 little bit about that in a second.

So we have very different, not processes, but different geologic characteristics that affect the transport behavior in both the volcanic aquifer, the tuff aquifers if you will, and the alluvial aquifers. I'm just trying to show those conceptually on Slide 15.

On Slide 16, again, an introduction. Just

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

1	99
1	as in the unsaturated zone, the Department has
2	utilized large-scale testing to characterize the
3	transport models, to validate those transport models,
4	and to develop parameter distributions and their
5	uncertainty that are used to propagate with respect to
6	the behavior and characteristics of the capability of
7	now the saturated zone component of the barrier to
8	radionuclide transport below the repository horizon.
9	Slide 17 shows and this may be a little
10	bit out of date with the most current Nye County work.
11	It's as of about six months no, nine months ago, at
12	the time we wrote the Technical Basis Document
13	Number 11 on the saturated zone.
14	But it shows the individual bore holes
1,5	used to in the saturated zone used to evaluate
16	geochemistry, used to evaluate hydrology, in
17	particular flow characteristics, potentials, etcetera,
18	and a blowup of the two multi-hole locations, one in
19	the tuff aquifer up above, the C-wells complex that's
20	been called, and one down below closer to Highway 95,
21	the alluvial testing complex in the some of the Nye
22	County early warning drilling program polls.
23	I think Bill will talk a little bit about
24	the geochemistry and the use of the geochemistry to in
25	part constrain and evaluate the likely paths of
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	100
1	groundwater flow once you enter the saturated zone.
2	I've left those out of my discussion, as well as the
3	potential evaluations, and have kind of focused on the
4	transport in situ testing information.
5	Now, these wells, as you can see, both at
6	the C-wells complex and the alluvial testing complex,
7	are on the order of tens of meters apart. We have
8	used some larger scale if you will tracers that I
9	believe Bill will talk about to help constrain general
10	transport paths and general transport rates, although
11	those general tracers, like carbon-14, like I don't
12	think we're going to talk about uranium-234, U-238,
13	although that is presented in the technical basis
14	document.
15	There are some limitations on how far you
16	can take those larger-scale, naturally-occurring radio
17	tracers with respect to evaluation of transport at
18	Yucca Mountain. So we have relied pretty heavily on
19	these tens of meters scale tests, especially at
20	C-wells.
21	Slide 18 just gives you the
22	hydrostrategigraphy, lithostrategigraphy, at C-wells.

triangles are from flow meter logs, the actual percentage of flux in the well when it's being pumped,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

A couple of important aspects here. Those little

(202) 234-4433

23

24

25

1	and where did that flux come from.
2	I think as the panel is well aware, the
3	actual distribution of transmissive features that can
4	yield water, and, therefore, are most likely to
5	transport any dissolved constituents is fairly limited
6	in a fractured rock mass. Not every fracture carries
7	water and is equally transmissive. In fact, you see,
8	you know, for most of those holes, for those three
9	wells, either three or four zones that are carrying
10	most of the water. And, in fact, it's one or two
11	zones that are carrying most of the water.
12	We factored that distribution. We've
13	called that the flowing interval spacing in the
14	technical basis document and in the model reports that
15	support the saturated zone flow and transport to say
16	that that's where, if there are dissolved
17	radionuclides or colloidal radionuclides that enter
18	the saturated zone, it would be in those features that
19	they are principally transported within.
20	Going on to Slide 19, there was a long-
21	term, year and a half-ish pumping test conducted in
22	C-wells. That pumping test was used to evaluate
23	larger scales, the scale now of kilometers, flow

transport at that scale of kilometers, but there was

They weren't

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

24

25

characteristics.

www.nealrgross.com

have

didn't

- -

at least an evaluation of the general flow characteristics in the saturated zone at the scale of kilometers that was evaluated as a result of this, you know, year and a half long pumping test in the fractured rock mass.

Slide 20, and also 21 -- but let's start 6 7 with 20 -- is a representative cross-hole tracer test conducted in the C-wells for a range of different 8 9 dissolved and an equivalent of a colloidal species. Those 360-nanometer spheres -- and we've looked at 10 different size of microspheres and their transport 11 characteristics, those different -- those spheres 12 represent an analog if you will for colloids as 13 colloids might be transported through the saturated 14 zone. And any radionuclides that may be sorbed onto 15 colloids could be transported with that colloidal 16 17 mass.

Again, different tracers being used in 18 part to evaluate different diffusive characteristics 19 confirm the different diffusive 20 and to 21 characteristics, in particular the matrix diffusion, 22 between the individual bore holes. So even though the water is predominantly moving through some of those 23 flowing features that I presented on Slide 18, during 24 25 injection/withdrawal test, the dissolved the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

constituents are interacting with the rock matrix.

So, again, the matrix diffusion model and the characteristics of the diffusion being related to the size of the dissolved constituent -- bromide in this case being a larger diameter than the PFBA, the pentafluorobenzoic acid -- and, therefore, being less likely to sorb or to -- sorry, to diffuse into the rock matrix.

Again, the third bullet, the sorption values -- even though I haven't shown them on here -or they're going to be shown in the next slide. For the in situ tracer tests confirm and, in fact, are a little higher than the laboratory sorption characteristics of these particular dissolved constituents.

So Slide 20 simply shows some of the data for a particular test. Slide 21 shows a little bit of laboratory data on top, essentially column breakthrough tests for the -- some of the different tracers used in the C-wells transport test -- in this particular case, bromide versus lithium, and then the bromide-lithium breakthrough and model results down below for the in situ test.

So, again, the laboratory sorption measurements, the column-type sorption

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 characteristics, indicating a Kd in this particular case of about .1 to .3 milliliters per gram, and the 2 field Kd, to get a reasonable reproduction of the 3 observed breakthrough of, in this case, lithium being 4 constrained between .6 and 4 milliliters per gram. 5 So, again, the in situ sorption values 6 7 being -- from this experiment anyway being slightly greater than the laboratory-derived sorption values. 8 So the use of the laboratory-derived sorption values 9 is conservative with respect to any application of 10 them for post-closure performance. 11 Given that the chemistry, as we talked 12 about earlier this morning, along those flow paths, 13 likely flow paths remains reasonably stable and 14

Moving to Slide 22, this is that -- the 16 results of that single whole injection/withdrawal. 17 They were injected for a period of time, let sit for 18 a period of time, and then withdrawn for a period of 19 And you can't really get -- well, you could, 20 time. had you used a sorbing-type tracer. You could have 21 determined something about sorption from these tests, 22 but we used non-sorbing tracers for this particular 23 24 test.

constant with time and space along that flow path.

So, essentially, what you're doing is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

15

25

trying to summarize and evaluate -- and you can't distinguish between flux and velocity using these. It's one kind of lumped parameter. But using reasonable ranges of effective porosity of the alluvium, you get a range of possible alluvial fluxes, as I show there, between roughly one and nine meters per year at that particular location.

The site-scale model that Bill will talk about later gives a median value for nominal set of conditions without uncertainty of roughly two meters per year. So it's right in the same bracket as the range of possible single-hole injection/withdrawal tests.

And, as I say, there have been plans over the years to do multi-hole tracer tests in the alluvial testing complex or similar multi-bore hole locations in the alluvium. And I think Dr. Hammermeister will talk about those -- the current status of those plans tomorrow.

There is one other type of information that I -- even though I kind of focused on the in situ observations up to this point, doing in situ sorption other than with simple tracers is prohibitive, both in time and in terms of protecting the environment. So the sorption characteristics of radionuclides of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

importance to performance are determined in the laboratory.

of those sorption examples Some measurements are shown in Slide 23. These are samples showing different qrain size different distributions at different locations. We've looked at different chemistries and their effects on sorption measurements, different mineralogies, although limited by where we have samples, and different radionuclides. it kind of focused on, at least for this But particular slide, on neptunium and uranium sorption.

And it's these data averaged over the reasonable range of grain sizes expected that are used develop reasonable range of sorption to a in the alluvium. And similar characteristics observations are available from laboratory experiments conducted over the last, you know, 10, 15 years, some of them conducted by Dr. Triay and her co-workers in the early and mid-'90s, argues for the sorption characteristics on the tuff aquifers and, for that matter, in the unsaturated zone as well.

So, in conclusion, just as we had in the unsaturated zone, the conceptual models we have for transport behavior in the saturated zone have been developed and are based largely on the in situ testing

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

106

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20
1 The in situ testing has not only been that we have. used to evaluate those models, but also to develop the 2 parameter distributions, reasonable ranges of those 3 4 parameter distributions that we apply with those models. 5 And I would be remiss to say that, you 6 7 know, these are just a one-shot, you know, transport evaluation. There is uncertainty in the model. There 8 9 is uncertainty in the parameters within the model. I talked about some of those parameters 10 11 today, things like flowing interval spacing, the 12 effective porosity within that flowing interval spacing, the degree of matrix diffusion, and the 13 sorption 14 characteristics of the individual radionuclides themselves along the likely travel 15 16 paths, both in the unsaturated zone and the saturated 17 zone. And that uncertainty is propagated through both barrier evaluation 18 the and the total system 19 performance assessment. 20 So with that, I will stop and entertain any questions. 21 Dr. Hornberger? 22 Thank you very much, 23 MEMBER HORNBERGER: 24 Bob. Obviously, Bob has summarized a tremendous 25 amount of information and work. It's going to be our **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.neairgross.com

	108
1	task to try to focus our questions on the issues that
2	we really want to grapple with most significantly in
3	this meeting.
4	But with that warning, I will proceed to
5	questions. Ruth?
6	MEMBER WEINER: I have a couple of
7	questions. Are you doing anything to the site by
8	introducing water? I mean, you're not introducing
9	that much water. But what's your sense of that?
10	MR. ANDREWS: Yes. When we before we
11	do any test at the site, especially any test that's
12	near the repository block itself, a detailed I
13	think they're called design evaluation design
14	impact evaluation is performed to evaluate, what's the
15	impact, if any, on performance or safety associated
16	with doing the test, whether we're putting water at
17	the surface, whether we're putting water underground.
18	We have an advantage that before this
19	site, assuming it's licensed, is closed, there is a
20	lot of time that transpires. And the natural system
21	is fairly forgiving with that amount of time. But a
22	particular evaluation is done for that water and any
23	other constituent that's introduced during the
24	physical test itself, just as we do with the actual
25	construction of the for example, the cross-drift or
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

the ESF where there are evaluations of the impact of 1 diesel emissions and other organic emissions during 2 the construction activities themselves. 3 MEMBER WEINER: My second question is: 4 5 how location-dependent are your tests for validation? In other words, if you -- the unsaturated zone clearly 6 is not homogeneous. It's clearly heterogeneous. If 7 you did the same test in a number of different sites, 8 how different would your results be? Do you get an 9 uncertainty band that way or --10 MR. ANDREWS: Yes. Generally, we're using 11 the individual tests -- you know, whether it be the 12 Alcove 1 stuff or the Alcove 8, Niche 3, or Busted 13 Butte -- we're using those with our models to evaluate 14 the confidence or robustness in the conceptual model 15 and conceptual understanding itself. 16 Clearly, the parameters, you know, at that 17 particular location where the test is performed are 18 contingent on where you give the test. So you then 19 are saying, "I have a model. I have a reasonable, you 20 know, approximation through the observations at that 21 of space with this set 22 particular point in You know, whether that be matrix 23 parameters." diffusion parameter or, you know, sorption parameter 24 or fracture characteristics, whatever. 25 NEAL R. GROSS

> COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

We then the extremelate it or
we then, when we extrapolate it of
interpolate it to the whole mountain, have to
consider, you know, uncertainty in that parameter and
variability in that parameter now at the scale of a
mountain and from location to location.
So in large part, uncertainty in matrix
diffusion, in fracture characteristics like fracture
porosity and fracture-matrix wetting area, and
sorption characteristics are derived not solely from
that similar test or singular test, but also from
other lines of evidence, including, in some cases,
literature information and other sources that we try
to characterize the global uncertainty in a particular
parameter that we then propagate through to the
evaluation of the barrier itself. So the test
MEMBER WEINER: So you find something
I'm sorry. Go on.
MR. ANDREWS: I'm sorry.
MEMBER WEINER: You find something drives
the uncertainty, and others don't?
MR. ANDREWS: Yes. I mean, there are some
parameters within the models as they are implemented
that drive, if you will, the behavior of that
particular barrier. Those are generally described,
the most if you will significant parameters and I'd
NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealroross.com

have to be careful about it -- what the measure of -of performance that you are looking at. You know, for example, is it a median breakthrough of a particular radionuclide, or what?

But generally, it's able -- you're able to post-process if you will the model results and determine, okay, this particular parameter or this suite of parameters drove the 95th percentile on the breakthrough of this particular radionuclide. So that's kind of a -- if you will a post-processing evaluation once you've implemented the model. But that's possible, yes.

MEMBER WEINER: Finally, I assume you heard Dr. Davis' presentation on the Naturita experiments. And I'd like to have you comment on the question of you have models and you validate them against real experimental data. And presumably you benchmark them, calibrate them against that -- those data. And then you do a random sampling of your models. Isn't that correct?

MR. ANDREWS: Yes.

MEMBER WEINER: Could you comment --

MR. ANDREWS: For parameters, yes.

MEMBER WEINER: Yes. Could you comment on Dr. Davis' statement that modeling -- doing a post-

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

experiment model, in other words going from the back 1 2 end, doing that rather than doing random sampling, how -- put another way, what is your sense of the validity 3 of the random sampling method? 4 5 MR. ANDREWS: Oh, I think that the -- in the random sampling -- well, it's not totally random, 6 because there's correlations, you know, of what's 7 being sampled to the different lithologic units that 8 you're dealing with. And if there was, you know, a 9 significant variation 10 variation in а in - geochemistry that significantly affected, you know, 11 12 transport behavior, there would be that correlation as well. 13

But I think the degree of complexity or the degree of sophistication you put in any particular representation, whether that be a fairly simplistic representation which the linear Kd-type model represents, or a more, you know, sophisticated complexation-type model, both of them have to be fundamentally compared to the observations. They are both models, and they have to be compared back to data, whether they're simple models or more complex models.

Propagating uncertainty is required in either model, either a simple model or a complex

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

1 model. You have to have the capability to evaluate the complexity and the -- not the complexity, excuse 2 me -- the uncertainty in that characterization and 3 propagate that uncertainty with -- generally speaking, 4 with a more complex model you have more individual 5 uncertainties, such as surface area or chemistry 6 7 reactions, that you have to consider and propagate, whereas with a simpler, you know, sorption-type model 8 there is generally one uncertainty, one parameter that 9 you kind of lumped a lot of the complexity in, and the 10 uncertainty in that also has to be propagated. 11 But I think in either case, whether you 12 the complex model or a simple model, 13 take а propagation of the uncertainty within that model as it 14 affects performance would be I think about the same. 15 MEMBER WEINER: Okay. Thank you. 16 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Mike? 17 ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thanks, Bob. Ι 18 agree with George. You covered a lot of ground in a 19 20 real short period of time. I've got another uncertainty question, but 21 hopefully it's a little simpler, at least it is in my 22 If you had to pick two or three things in the mind. 23 unsaturated zone, and two or three things in the 24 25 saturated zone, that are the drivers of uncertainty at NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

113

	114
1	this point, what would they be?
2	MR. ANDREWS: Probably the sorption
3	behavior of a couple of key radionuclides. Like
4	neptunium I think that's the focus of some of your
5	questions was on that. The actual flow
6	characterization, you know, within the fractures, both
7	in the saturated zone and in the unsaturated zone,
8	ends up being a fairly significant parameter, in
9	particular with respect to, you know, earlier
10	breakthroughs and later breakthroughs.
11	So those would probably be the two key
12	ones, but I think that probably that's for the
13	detailed modelers who follow me to
14	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: If it's not a fair
15	question to ask you, that's fine. But, you know, I
16	guess what I'm trying to do is get in my mind some
17	order of what things are really driving the bus in
18	terms of uncertainty. You know, and interesting one
19	is and, again, it's a question on breakthrough.
20	For neptunium, it's the time of arrival.
21	But does it affect the concentration? Because
22	concentration is what drives dose, not the time of
23	arrival, because there's relatively little decay. So
24	ultimately I'm thinking about these things and my
25	list, not so much in terms of the geohydrologic model,
·	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	115
1	but do they or do they not have an impact on an
2	ultimately calculated dose? Some of them might, and
3	some of them might not.
4	MR. ANDREWS: Yes.
5	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Any thoughts there?
6	Again, that may not be a fair question for you, but
7	MR. ANDREWS: Yes. And I think it's a
8	little unfair to say the time of arrival is not a
9	significant evaluator. I think the time of arrival is
10	in part the barrier capability that Part 63 asked for.
11	And the time of arrival, although I'll agree with you
12	the difference between 1,000 years and 2,000 years is
13	not significant, the difference between 1,000 years
14	and 20,000 years is significant to
15	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: That's a fair
16	amount, and I certainly accept that.
17	MR. ANDREWS: system performance. So
18	the time of arrival can make a significant difference
19	to Yucca Mountain performance and barrier performance.
20	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: And I guess that's
21	what I'm trying to get a feel of in your mind,
22	where are the ones where those differences are
23	potentially significant or important, and where are
24	they relatively minor in terms of, well, it's not
25	going to have a big impact? So I'm just trying to get
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

.

1	116
1	your top three. And I think you've given me two
2	you said neptunium and
3	MR. ANDREWS: Okay. I gave you two.
4	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Yes.
5	(Laughter.)
6	And that's fair enough. That's close
7	enough. I appreciate your insight.
8	MR. ANDREWS: Okay.
9	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Allen?
10	DR. CROFF: Can you comment on the extent
11	to which matrix diffusion to which you found it to
12	be reversible in your test?
13	MR. ANDREWS: I'm probably not the person
14	I'll have to find someone who was actually closer
15	to the test, to be honest with you.
16	DR. CROFF: Okay. Again, if it's not
17	fair, we'll
18	MR. ANDREWS: Yes. Let me try to find
19	someone to have an answer to that, okay? Because I'm
20	not close enough to that particular test, to be honest
21	with you.
2,2	DR. CROFF: Okay.
23	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Ines?
24	DR. TRIAY: What have you found in terms
25	of the effect of colloids on radionuclide migration?
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 Would you say that the colloids have a large impact? 2 And to what extent have you been able to bound the 3 effects of colloids on radionuclide migration? 4 MR. ANDREWS: I hate to use this answer, 5 Ines, but it depends. It sort of depends on -- in 6 large part on the chemistry. In particular, it 7 depends on, you know, the pH of the solution and 8 depends on the ionic strength of the solution. And the pH and ionic strength, as you move 9 10 away from the repository block itself, from the drifts 11 themselves, does return to more or less ambient, but right in the vicinity of the drifts and inside the 12 13 package and inside the engineered barrier system, the invert if you will. Those pH's and ionic strengths 14 15 can vary significantly depending on the amount of evaporation of water that occurs. 16 17 And they -- you know, those chemical controls on the colloid stability end up being fairly 18 19 significant with respect to the behavior of colloids 20 in the drift and in the package, if they happen to get into the package. And, of course, the degradation of 21 22 glass waste forms creates colloids, so, you know, 23 smectite-type colloids. So then the effect in the far field is 24 25 somewhat more constrained, because, you know, you're

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

118 1 generally dealing with a more well-defined and less 2 time-varying geochemistry. So it kind of depends on 3 where you are and what time you're talking about --4 the answer to that particular question. So sorry to 5 give you a PA kind of answer, but --6 DR. TRIAY: Everything is uncertain, 7 right? (Laughter.) 8 Yes, on that one. 9 MR. ANDREWS: 10 Let me ask you another DR. TRIAY: 11 question. Based on the previous talk on the -- on the 12 talk of Dr. Davis, can you tell me -- you were talking 13 about the differences in water chemistry that could be experienced at the site. 14 15 Could you give me an idea, from your 16 given all perspective, of these sensitivity 17 calculations, you know, that you have performed, whether those changes in water chemistry, because from 18 19 the perspective of, you know, what I understood from that first talk, that water chemistry is almost all-20 21 important when it comes to applying the surface complexation models. 22 23 To what extent do you feel that that water chemistry would have a big effect on the sorption data 24 25 that you're utilizing in your transport model? **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

MR. ANDREWS: Yes. Let me try to -- first off, the bulk of the sorption data that we're using in our transport model are derived using J-13 type water in the experiment. You know, J-13 is more or less along the flow path in the fractured tuffs between the zone underneath the repository and the 18 kilometer point of the reasonable maximally exposed individual. So that water -- and that water is

sampled, you know, periodically, and chemistry done periodically on J-13 water by the USGS. And it's been fairly stable, you know, during -- with time over the 20-plus years that J-13 and J-12 have been pumped.

Now, if you move away from J-13 -- and I think Bill won't talk so much bulk chemistry but types of chemistry in the saturated zone. Along the flow path, the likely flow paths, the chemistry and the saturated zone are, you know, fairly homogenous I'm going to say. And Bill will talk and show some plots I think of different chemical signatures, gross chemical signatures, in the saturated zone.

There are observations in the saturated zone where the chemistry is significantly different, and, in particular, where the redox state is significantly different, i.e. there are zones where it's reducing, and there are zones where it's more

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

119

oxidizing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our current evaluation and current model says that along the likely flow paths the geochemical system is fairly stable and likely to be oxidizing along the most likely flow paths. Those zones that are more reducing and more reducing in our system -just for those of you not aware, more reducing in our system has significant effect on several а radionuclides transport, most notably technetium, but also the other actonides are seemingly infected by the redox state of the groundwater.

So those more reducing conditions, which are observed in the saturated zone, we believe are not really along a likely flow path. So taking performance credit for that significant change in chemistry off of the flow path we didn't feel was appropriate. And so that particular, you know, model uncertainty of the -- where the chemistry is with respect to the flow paths has been excluded from the barrier evaluation and performance assessment.

But along the likely flow paths, the chemistries and the different chemical signatures are, in fact, very similar. So using a singular sorption mechanism, not affected by time or space, we felt was appropriate.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	121
1	So if you will, the complexities of
2	geochemistry in the saturated zone are not that great
3	along the likely flow paths.
4	DR. TRIAY: So that homogeneity in
5	chemistry, does that help you to bound, then, the
6	effect of colloids?
7	MR. ANDREWS: We use that chemistry in our
8	evaluation of colloid transport. I'd hate to use the
9	word "bound," but we use the chemistry in the
10	saturated zone to in our development of colloid
11	transport-related parameters in the saturated zone.
12	So I think "bound" is probably not the right word to
13	use, but that effect is factored in.
14	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim Clarke?
15	DR. CLARKE: Bob, the Alcove 1 test
16	revealed that matrix diffusion was important in the
17	areas of densely-welded tuffs. I can't tell from your
18	conceptual model on Slide 3, is that a large area? Is
19	this a significant retardation process overall in the
20	vados zone? In other words, what flow will be
21	intercepted by these densely-welded tuffs?
22	MR. ANDREWS: Well, I mean, the Alcove 1
23	is I mean, you're right, it's at the surface, which
24	is I believe it's probably Tiva Canyon, at that
25	particular test location. So it's probably, if you
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.neairgross.com

1	122
1	will, moré densely welded than the Topopah Springs
2	welded tuffs. But the welded tuff characteristics and
3	concept of in a welded tuff you can have matrix
4	diffusion processes operative, is more or less a
5	validation of the model, the actual parameters, than
6	that we used be
7	DR. CLARKE: I'm just asking how
8	significant that is overall to transport through the
9	vados zone. Will
10	MR. ANDREWS: It's fairly significant.
11	DR. CLARKE: So
12	MR. ANDREWS: It's not so significant when
13	you look at something like the 50 percent arrival of
14	mass. But it is I believe and there are
15	sensitivity analyses that I didn't bring. I think it
16	is fairly significant for the early breakthrough
17	arrival of mass. So it kind of depends on where you
18	are on the breakthrough curve, if you will.
19	DR. CLARKE: So I guess this is kind of a
20	question for the NRC. But does that mean that
21	translates to a risk insight? Would that have a high
22	significance similar to retardation in the alluvium?
23	I guess this is fairly new, these data, or is this
24	report just provided in
25	MEMBER HORNBERGER: No. I think the NRC
	(202) 224 4423
I	

	123
1	has seen this stuff.
2	MR. CAMPBELL: We've been following the
3	C-wells and other tests for quite a few years.
4	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Andy, he's talking
5	about the tuffs, the Tiva Canyon, the Alcove test
6	in the alcoves and the over
7	MR. CAMPBELL: I'm going to have to defer
8	to someone who can address those funds.
9	MR. ARLT: Yes. Hans Arlt, NRC. No, we
10	are aware of that. DOE does claim a lot of credit for
11	matrix diffusion in the unsaturated zone, and we have
12	a few agreements that do cover that.
13	DR. CLARKE: I just wondered on a risk
14	insight basis, does that mean that the unsaturated
15	zone has attributes of high significance as well? We
16	heard about the one this morning for the saturated
17	zone. Would matrix diffusion then have that level of
18	significance on a risk insight basis for the
19	unsaturated zone?
20	MR. ARLT: I think that was medium
21	significance.
22	DR. CLARKE: Okay.
23	MR. ARLT: But it's been rated.
24	MR. CAMPBELL: Our key slides with that
25	was with a group of three that we rated as medium as
	NEAL R. GROSS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com
-	-

7.

	124
1	opposed to the retardation in the alluvium. And
2	that's primarily based upon, like I said, many years
3	of analyses that we've done with the TPA code and
4	other things and looking at all of the information.
5	MR. ARLT: That is one of the most
6	important things that we'll be looking at from the NRC
7	side is the matrix diffusion in the unsaturated zone,
8	and also the Calico Hills, they are very aware of
9	that.
10	MR. CAMPBELL: Keep in mind that if in
11	DOE's model again, as to repeat what he said
12	earlier today, DOE's model takes a lot of credit for
13	that. But we're going to invest enough resources to
14	evaluate that, the importance that they attach to that
15	particular area. That's a very important part of
16	their model, but we're going to invest the resources
17	in evaluating that thoroughly.
18	DR. CLARKE: Okay. Thank you.
19	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim Davis?
20	DR. DAVIS: Yes. You mentioned that the
21	pH and ionic strength increase near the waste
22	repository, and that it attenuated away towards the
23	ambient values. I was wondering what over what
24	distance are you saying that it gets back to
25	ambient values? And how is that determined?
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.neairgross.com

MR. ANDREWS: It depends on the time. Initially, but, you know -- and I say it depends on time because of the thermal environment, and the thermal environment is changing significantly over time. And, in fact, a thermal environment, even within 10,000 years, is probably not back to, you know, ambient. It's still slightly elevated with respect to the ambient.

And it's that thermal environment that drives the chemistry evolution inside the drift. And if a package has been degraded inside the package, the degree that the thermal environment returns to, if you will, more or less ambient is in the first, you know, roughly 1,000 years if I go five, 10 meters away from the drift.

So if you just take round numbers, take 10 meters and 1,000 meters, you're close to the ambient thermal environment. The chemistry is still trying to catch up, if you will, to that to that change in temperature, and that takes another, you know -- I'm talking extemporaneously here.

I thought you'd look at the plots, to be honest with you. But another 1,000 or so years before the chemistry returns in that vicinity around the five, 10 meters around the drift -- I mean, therefore,

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

	126
1	in the drift to close to ambient chemistry.
2	So it's generally in that few thousand
3	year timeframe, driven mostly by the thermal
4	perturbations on the chemistry, that the pH, the
5	carbonate concentration, other dissolved constituents
6	are significantly changing. And it's not always
7	increasing. Sometimes it's decreasing. It depends on
8	which constituent you are talking about due to the
9	water-rock interactions during the dryout phase and
10	the rewetting phase, if you will, of the thermal
11	profile around the drift.
12	But to answer your question in a very, you
13	know, general way, it's usually in a few thousand
14	years we return close to ambient chemistry, which then
15	would correspond to ambient, you know, sorption type
16	and other characteristics from a geochemistry
17	perspective.
18	The rock itself, although it undergoes a
19	change, it is not a significant change in rock
20	mineralogy during that thermal pulse. So it's mostly
21	the aqueous chemistry that's changing.
22	DR. DAVIS: So after the thermal pulse has
23	subsided, is there do you think that there is going
24	to be any impact to the waste packaging or the total
25	waste environment on the chemistry of the water, aside
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.neairgross.com

	127
1	from the thermal impact which will last 1,000 years or
2	so? I mean
3	MR. ANDREWS: Inside the drift, yes.
4	DR. DAVIS: But how far out does that
5	MR. ANDREWS: Inside the drift.
6	DR. DAVIS: How far away from in the
7	unsaturated zone is that chemical perturbation going
8	to go?
9	MR. ANDREWS: That's probably on the order
10	I'd have to look at the actual model report to be
11	honest with you. But off the top of my head, I'd say
12	on the order of meters that it extends, because the
13	fluxes that the water volumes, even though the
14	concentrations are significantly different right next
15	to the waste, and in the invert, because of the
16	thermal behavior in that zone, the volumes of water
17	and the fluxes of water are significantly lower than
18	the volumes of water and fluxes of water that are in
19	the rock mass itself going around the drifts. So you
20	have kind of a dilution, if you will, effect based on
21	just volumes and masses of water that are in the rock.
22	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Dick?
23	MR. ANDREWS: There is a model that
24	addresses that. I'd just have to get that for you.
25	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Dick?
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

DR. PARIZEK: Yes, Bob. Could you give us sort of an update on what studies are still underway in the saturated zone/unsaturated zone? Unless others later today and tomorrow are going to speak in detail. But, you know, what's still going on in the program that's part of the present work, that may be different than the science and technology initiatives?

MR. ANDREWS: I'll let, you know, Nye County and Dr. Hammermeister talk about the saturated zone, because they probably are closer -- a lot closer to that on what the current testing that's going on there, additional drilling and testing in their early warning drilling program holes is.

With respect to the unsaturated zone, there's continuing monitoring of Alcove 8, Niche 3, continued monitoring of drift scale test, the heater test, occasional chemical samples taken, water samples taken for chemical analyses from the drift scale test.

Those are probably the two if you will active testing. There's a number of tests going on with respect to the thermal mechanical behavior in the cross-drift and in the lower lith, but that's not really germane to this discussion.

> That's kind of -- Drew, do you --MR. COLEMAN: That's a pretty good list.

> > www.nealrgross.com

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. PARIZEK: About a year ago, the program also gave a confirmation testing briefing to the ACNW, and it was quite extensive -- Debbie Barr's presentations. Is there an update on the status of the confirmation testing program that DOE is working with?

MR. ANDREWS: Yes. That plan is being revised slightly, and the actual revision will be reflected in the safety analysis report, you know, as required in the Yucca Mountain Review Plan. The actual plan I think will be available slightly before that, but maybe DOE should speak to the actual timing, you know, of that.

MR. COLEMAN: Yes, that's in preparation, and we're going to be reviewing it here in the next month or two and accepting it.

DR. PARIZEK: Then, you brought us back with this long-term test that was done in the tuffs. That's six years and seven months ago approximately when that test ended. But that year and a half pumping test delivered something on the order of about .44 million cubic meters of water, I think you indicated. And in that water that was returned back to the alluvium, somewhere down around I guess J-13. It had the tracers in it, it had microspheres in it.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	130
1	Is it possible to use that as a tracer experiment?
2	I mean, that slug of water is in the
3	system flowing along, and it has been there long
4	enough that you have six and a half almost more
5	than six and a half years, and you might find the
6	plume and use that as a long-term tracer test or get
7	value out of it if you could actually find the plume?
8	Is that possible? Has any thought been given to that?
9	MR. ANDREWS: It's very possible. There
10	has been thought given to it. I believe the USGS and
11	maybe it's Los Alamos I'm not sure who they
12	cooperated with have a I don't know if it's in
13	the form of a proposal to the Science and Technology
14	Group to do exactly what you just said. I don't know
15	what the status of that is, though, to be honest with
16	you.
17	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you.
18	MR. ANDREWS: So it has been proposed
19	and
20	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Okay. Thank you.
21	Don, do you have a question?
22	DR. SHETTEL: Yes, I have a couple of
23	questions. The first one involves injection rates in
24	the UZ experiments lead to the higher matrix
25	diffusion. First, I'm wondering if these are
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	I (202) 234-1433 YAABIINGTUN, U.C. 2000-3701 WWW.nealigross.com

•

accelerated in the sense that if more water is injected than might be flowing, natural episodic infiltration, and if you're injecting it into a deadend fracture versus a free-flowing fracture, it might tend to be saturated in the matrix in that area and thereby skew your results in terms of matrix diffusion.

Well, MR. ANDREWS: they are at accelerated rates. That is true. So we are you know, orders of magnitude overinjecting, hundreds to thousands of times the background percolation flow rate, average percolation flow rate, and the uncertainty in that percolation flow rate.

So the system is being overstressed with respect to flux in every one of the tests that I have described here -- in the unsaturated zone and in the saturated zone. When you're then comparing and evaluating diffusive characteristics, matrix diffusion characteristics, the model upon which those diffusion characteristics is being evaluated has whatever the saturation is in that rock matrix within the model.

The ambient saturation within the fractured rock mass in the unsaturated zone is on the order of 90-plus percent. So the bulk of the pores within the matrix are already saturated. There's a

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

remaining 10 percent roughly that are not. The issue then becomes the fracture-matrix interconnection area, which I think, you know, the second or third part of your question was getting at.

That fracture-matrix interconnection area is evaluated in a test, but it's also an uncertain parameter that is propagated through to the effect on performance. So you are right in the sense that when you've done a test the goodness of the test is contingent on the properties during the test, which include the degree of saturation between the fractures and the matrix in the test, which is then evaluated and can only be evaluated within the model that's used to evaluate that test.

So it's consistent between the model and the test, and then the uncertainty of that particular aspect, the fracture-matrix interaction term, is an uncertain parameter that's applied when we evaluate the behavior of the barrier and the performance of the system.

DR. SHETTEL: That wouldn't seem to correspond very well. If that flow is really in the form of rivulets going down fractions, that can be very tough to compare with --

MR. ANDREWS: Well, we don't think there

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

132

1 is episodic flow through rivulets, except for the Tiva Canyon, and it may occur within the Tiva Canyon. But once you get below the Paintbrush, and the Paintbrush being some tens of meters of essentially porous medium, that -- any potential of episodic flow that may have occurred in the first upper 10 meters is damped out, and it becomes more or less a homogenous, although spatially distributed, flux within the fracture system below that point. So it's not like we have masses of water moving through discrete zones. Well, Alan Flint recently DR. SHETTEL: stated at the last NWTRB meeting, I believe, that there is really no reason that the boundary above the

repository would be damped out.

MR. ANDREWS: I think he was talking about lateral flow. He wasn't talking about temporal damping, so -- and the degree of lateral flow, spatially lateral flow that occurs at that interface between the PTn and Tiva Canyon is a function of the And because the flux -- surface flux changes flux. with time, the degree of effect of lateral diversion, not temporal damping but lateral diversion, changes with time.

So given that we have climate changes --I think it was on one of my slides -- we have climate

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

	134
1	changes that are being applied to the system, and 94
2	percent of the time we have a climate change that has
3	already occurred for this system. The first climate
4	change we apply is at 600 years.
5	That degree of lateral flow and the
6	fraction of flux below the PTn that's either diverted
7	or non-diverted becomes somewhat, you know, damped out
8	also in time. So not just the transient dumping but
9	the spatial damping gets evaluated. So
10	DR. SHETTEL: Okay. Last question.
11	Switching to the saturated zone, Slide 23, which shows
12	Kd's for alluvium from Nye County's drilling program,
13	there's really only two wells on that list that are in
14	the potential flow path from the repository.
15	Therefore, the other data is really irrelevant.
16	MR. ANDREWS: I'd have to get back with
17	you, because this is some of the data, and
18	DR. SHETTEL: Yes. 19D and 2D are the
19	only wells that are in the potential flow path.
20	MR. ANDREWS: Okay. I'll take your word
21	for that. I haven't looked at it in that I
22	mean,
23	DOE STAFF: Yes, that's correct.
24	MR. ANDREWS: Okay.
25	DOE STAFF: There are mineralogic and, you
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	135
1	know, grain size these are consistent. You know,
2	the alluvium was not radically different along the
3	flow path, and it is in other locations.
4	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Okay. I think we need
5	to move along. We are running a good bit behind.
6	Thank you very much, Bob.
7	What I'd like to do now is move to our
8	next presentation. Jim Winterle is here I think, I
9	hope. Hello, Jim. And Jim is going to give us a
10	presentation on the center modeling of saturated zone
11	flow.
12	For those of you who haven't done
13	groundwater modeling, I'll point out to you that in
14	advance something you can perhaps look for, it's not
15	uncommon to have groundwater heads match within, let's
16	say, 10 meters or so, and counted very good. And just
17	keep that in mind as you listen to what Jim has to
18	say.
19	(Laughter.)
20	MR. WINTERLE: Okay. I am Jim Winterle.
21	The title of my talk is "CNWRA Modeling of Site-Scale
22	Saturated Zone Flow at Yucca Mountain." This is a
23	nearly identical talk to one I gave a few months ago
24	at the NWTRB meeting. So some people in the audience
25	may have largely heard a lot of this before. I'll try
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	136
1	to put it this time in a different context as to, you
2	know, how the NRC is using this kind of information to
3	apply risk insights.
4	Next slide, please.
5	A few disclaimers first. One is that the
6	activities here were performed at the Center, and not
7	necessarily any of this reflects the opinion of the
8	NRC. And the second one is that I'm about to present
9	several model scenarios, but these are all exploratory
10	in nature, and they shouldn't be considered an
11	exhaustive list of scenarios, or none of them should
12	be considered preferred by CNWRA or NRC.
13	Next slide, please.
14	I'm going to talk about how our
15	groundwater flow model was constructed, based on a
16	hydrogeologic framework. And then I'm going to look
17	at three different types of analyses we've done with
18	the model one on the effects of different
19	hydrogeologic interpretations, and one on the effects
20	of what the local recharge is at Yucca Mountain,
21	and another on the effects of increased recharge and
22	water table rise, for instance, that might accompany
23	a potential future climate, and what the effects of
24	those are on groundwater flow paths.
25	To start, we've built this model based on
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

137

the Hydrogeologic Framework Model that was also independently developed at the Center and documented by Darrell Sims, et al. That used as input the GFM 3.1, which is a Department of Energy or USGS production, but it -- that model is just a small portion of the data that goes in this. And there were independent interpretations of geophysics and well bore interpretations.

We also lumped together the geologic units into hydrostratographic units in an independent manner differently than how DOE constructed their model. So we think that so much of the approach was done independently of the data and assumptions used by DOE that we're confident that it provides a fairly independent way of looking at things.

The hydrogeologic properties assigned to the flow model were based on correspondence to the structural features in here. And that framework model also includes several faults. I won't name them all, but here shown in black lines is fault features and a Caldera altered zone. In red, that shows where I had to extend the Caldera zone southward, and I had to extend the Highway 95 fault zone a little bit more to the east in order to get a good model calibration.

But other than that, one other change was

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the fault zones in the Fortymile Wash and Paintbrush Canyon area were so close together that I constructed those as one single wide zone of -- which we would consider an intensely fractured and faulted zone. Other than that, the features included in the model are the same as what was in the underlying framework model.

And this Slide 6 shows a comparison of cost sections from the underlying hydrogeologic framework model and how that gets put into a model grid. This is just a two-dimensional slice, but it's a fully 3-D model.

The major units are alluvium. It's the uppermost lavender colored unit. Then there's the upper volcanic aquifer. A unit I'll talk a lot more about in some of the analyses is the upper volcanic confining later, which is actually a poorly confining layer. It has a little bit lower permeability than the adjacent layers.

Below that is the lower volcanic aquifer, and below that a very thick confining sequence, which is a very good confining layer, and below that is a thick sequence of what we call paleozoic carbonates. They are very deep. The depth of the model goes down to about 1,500 meters below sea level.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

138

	139
1	Next slide?
2	The model domain in plan view is very
3	similar to the Department of Energy saturated zone
4	model. It extends well north through the Yucca
5	Mountain areas, where I'm pointing here. It extends
6	well north into the Calico Hills, to the west of
7	Crater Flat, and to the east of Jackass Flats, and
8	south in Canavera, which is a farms area.
9	The interpretation of the water table you
10	see in the contours here was used to assign lateral
11	boundary conditions, and those are what drives the
12	water what tells the model what the conditions are
1 <u>3</u>	outside of the model and forces the water to go
14	through the model.
15	And then, within the model, all of these
16	blue dots you see are calibration points. I believe
17	there were 70 in total that we used for calibrations.
18	And they are at various depths, so there's a three-
19	dimensional aspect to the calibration.
20	In the northern zone, I'll show later
21	there's an area of recharge, and then analyses of
22	recharge, with and without recharging the Yucca
23	Mountain area.
24	Let's go to the next slide.
25	(Slide change.)
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

With the basic set-up, one of the first analyses I wanted to look at is what are the effects of hydrogeologic interpretation? With the basic underlying framework model that I described, that our flow model is based on, it has so many hydrogeologic units and fault zones and, based only on that, I'm able to get a calibrated model that's reasonably consistent with the quality of calibration the Department of Energy gets.

Dr. Hornberger mentioned that calibrations, plus or minus 10 meters of water level at a particular well, is often considered good in our model. Those big errors are sometimes due to where you place hydrogeologic units uncertainties on whether or hydrogeologic units have certain properties or not.

16 So what I did was I tried to add particular features to the model or maybe adjust the 17 18 geometry of some features. So I don't really have 19 data to say things are a certain way in this model, 20 but there's nothing I've done to this that is refuted So I have conceptual basis to add 21 by the data. 22 particular features. Like this orange layer was an low permeability zone at the tuff galuma interface. 23 Another change was to change the Caldera zone just a 24 25 little bit further zone. And one change was to modify

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

140

the change to the Solitario Canyon fault. Little 1 things like that -- add a third feature, a fault zone 2 feature, to kind of limit the cross flow fault zone 3 4 and the Fortymile Wash area. (Slide change.) 5 And if we go to the next slide, you'll see 6 7 doing that, I was able to take the base case calibration or RMS error of 27 meters, meaning the 8 mean square of the error plus or minus zero line, 9 averaging about 27 meters in the base case scenario 10 and just by moving a few features around I was able to 11 reduce that RMS error to 1.1 meter. If you look at 12 the scales you see the error in this alternative model 13 is down within the measurement error of water levels 14 15 and wells in most cases. So the question was what effect does that 16 have on flow paths. Let's go to the next slide, I 17 think it shows that. 18 (Slide change.) 19 Our original model had flow paths that 20 start out going to the east, southeast and turn 21 abruptly south and largely continue going south into 22 the compliance point and then with the improved 23 calibration, they come a little bit farther east and 24 then again turn south and basically end up in almost 25 NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.neairgross.com

the same spot, slightly more spread to them. And so the two models you see here are basically constraints on what the effects of playing around with calibration or different ways of obtaining an improved calibration within the model and data uncertainties are on your flow paths.

(Slide change.)

And on the slide all the way to the right is the Department of Energy's base case flow model analysis. And you'll see that the flow paths coming out of their model are more or less in between the two cases that I've come up with here. So they're sort of within the range of uncertainty that we've developed with our model.

(Slide change.)

If we go to the next slide, the next 16 17 analysis I wanted to look at was what are the effects 18 of what you assume about recharge in the Yucca 19 Mountain area because the recharge, where the flow paths are first initiating, the question we have is 20 21 how important is that to how deep the flow paths go 22 and for what units they travel in. So I looked at one case with 10 millimeters a year in the northern area, 23 but no recharge over Yucca Mountain and then a case 24 25with the same recharge and then with five millimeters

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14
	143
1	a year at Yucca Mountain. And then we also show a
2	recharge area in Fortymile Wash. That doesn't come
3	into play until the third analysis I'm going to talk
4	about later.
5	So we'll go to the next slide.
6	(Slide change.)
7	You see in plan view, the two flow paths
8	with no recharge at Yucca Mountain and with 5
.9	millimeters a year at Yucca Mountain, they're almost
10	imperceptively different. I should mention these
11	little blue arcs here are the approximate geometry of
12	where the flow paths transition into alluvium and so
13	the risk insight question we're asking is do these
14	things affect what we've determined to be a risk-
15	significant item in flow distance in alluvium? So I
16	use that to evaluate. And you can see that there's
17	almost no difference in plan view in looking at these.
18	(Slide change.)
19	But if we go to the next slide you can see
20	in a side view that with a little bit of recharge, 5
21	millimeters per year at Yucca Mountain, the flow paths
22	go substantially deeper down to almost 400 meters
23	depth at some areas as opposed to only going about 50
24	to 100 meters deep in the case without recharge at
25	Yucca Mountain.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

.

And that, depending on what you assume about the porosity of volcanic units can have the significant effect on the travel time. And I'll tell you right here at this point that there's something I did to the porosity units. This dark blue layer is what we call the upper volcanic layer. It corresponds mainly to the Calico Hills unit and there's good evidence that that's a porous, nonwelded matrix and the flow in that unit may be largely matrix flow, but both NRC and DOE flow models conservatively assume that that's -- that all tuff is just fracture flow with relatively low effective porosity.

So one of the things I looked at in sensitivity of the travel time was what if, all tuff if it's welded, it's fractured, but these predominantly nonwelded units we assumed were matrix flow.

(Slide change.)

If we go to the next slide, you'll see that you can make a big difference between the Case 1 model with no recharge at Yucca Mountain stayed shallow and spent a lot of time flowing in that Calico Hills unit, the upper volcanic confining unit is what we call it in this model. And that some of the travel times or flow paths approached 100,000 years where the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

mean was down around 10,000 to 20,000. I forget the exact number, but by adding five millimeters of recharge, those flow paths go a lot deeper and that brings the mean flow path travel time to just over a thousand years in this case.

So depending on what you assume about the porosities of the different volcanic tuff units, it can have a substantial effect on whether or not recharge is important. All of our models, the DOE models, that our model do take into account the effect of recharge on the initiation of flow paths, so there's really no discrepancy there, but I think one of the things this points out is here we've identified a risk-significant area, the porosity of nonwelded tuff units for saturated flow, but because nobody is relying on having flow in high porosity units to make their safety case, at this point it's not an area where the Staff needs to focus its concerns. So there's an application of -- identified a potential risk-significant area, but we don't need to focus resources on it, unless the Department of Energy wants to change their approach and start getting delayed travel times as a result of porous flow and volcanic tuffs.

Next slide.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

	146
1	(Slide change.)
2	So basically, this slide is summarizing a
3	lot of what I just said. Those particle tracking
4	simulations assume that fractured tuffs had a 0.001
5	porosity and then that the nonwelded tuff had a .1
6	value of porosity. And that's an assumption that's
7	unique to this modeling analysis. I think there's
8	data to support that assumption, but nobody is taking
9	credit for that fact at this point. And if you make
10	that assumption for a given flux, because the flux is
11	inversely proportional to porosity or because of
12	velocity at a given flux of inversely proportional
13	porosity, the simulations with and without recharge
14	show a big difference in travel time at Yucca
15	Mountain.
16	I've done other analyses where I've set
17	all the volcanic units to the same effective porosity
18	and that big difference in flow path travel times
19	virtually disappears. And in fact, historically, the
20	performance assessments do not take credit for slow
21	flow and porous tuff.
22	Next slide.
23	(Slide change.)
24	The next analysis I did was to look at the
25	effects of potential water table rise on flow paths.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

The evidence shows that during past climate conditions, there have been spring flows at the location of well EWDP-9S. There's evaporate deposits there and in several areas. So one of the things I use to constrain the model was to raise the heads by a constant percentage instead of a constant amount. A constant percentage means more of an increase where the heads are higher, where presumably the recharge is occurring.

And the constraint was to keep raising them up until spring flow was just initiated at this location. And an interesting self-consistency of the model was that as I raise the water table up, the first place where the water table hit the land surface was right in this general vicinity where those evaporate deposits occur.

17 So in addition to raising the water table, I also doubled the recharge, so there's double the 18 recharge in the northern area and over Yucca Mountain. 19 I also added 200 millimeters a year recharge in the 20 And then the results of water table 21 Fortymile Wash. 22 rise are shown in the figure where most of the southern region it was 30 meters or less and in the 23 Yucca Mountain area the water table rise varied from 24 about 40 meters to about 120 meters. 25 And that's

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

	148
1	consistent with other analyses of how much the waters
2	have risen in the past.
3	(Slide change.)
4	And the next question, if we can go to the
5	next slide, is what was the effect of that on the flow
6	paths? And in plan view it has almost no effect on
7	the direction that things are traveling.
8	(Slide change.)
9	And then the next question shown on the
10	next slide is what is effect of that on travel time.
11	The increased water levels were increased more in the
12	north than they were to the south, so that did
13	increase the gradient and flow paths travel times were
14	somewhat shorter, averaging just under a thousand
15	years for the future climate scenario and averaging
16	about a little more than a thousand years for the
17	present day climate scenario, but they weren't what we
18	would consider substantially different.
19	So even though the gradients increased a
20	lot, most of that increased gradient is to the north
21	where flow paths are already going pretty quickly
22	through what we assume are low porosity tuffs and then
23	an off-setting fact is when the water table rises, we
24	get a couple hundred more liters of travel through
25	alluvium. So that slows down the travel times a
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

little bit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

21

24

25

(Slide change.)

So if we go into the next slide, I think we're into the conclusions. A summary of everything we've just covered is that the model calibrations can significantly approved by relatively minor be different adjustments to the geometry of the hydrostaticgraphic and structural features, but the variability in model flow paths for those different scenarios was relatively model and we don't really consider that that affects the more significant aspect of alluvium transport distance.

Small amounts of recharge can have a big effect on the units that the flow paths travel 15 through, but one of the other conclusions from the future climate scenario is that further increases to 16 recharge don't add to that effect. So as long as 17 you're considering a little bit of recharge in Yucca 18 Mountain, you're capturing the effect that you need to 19 20 capture and so it's not so important that you get the exact amount of recharge in the Yucca Mountain area as long as you got enough recharge to initially set the 22 23 slow paths going in the proper direction.

> Another point is that what you assume about the porosity of units like the upper volcanic

> > NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	150
1	unit, the Calico Hills nonwelded tuff formation can
2	have a big effect on your modeled particle travel
3	times to the compliance boundary and that if one were
4	to choose in the future probably relatively modest
5	data collection efforts could be used to justify that
6	assumption and improve performance predictions. Right
7	now, nobody is taking advantage of that.
8	Next slide.
9	(Slide change.)
10	In the future climate scenario, it assumes
11	five percent in the rise in the water table boundary
12	was able to match the model match the observation
13	of spring flow that had occurred in the past at weld
14	9S location and that the five percent increase
15	resulted in a water table rise that varied between
16	about 50 and 150 meters below the repository,
17	increasing from south to north and that those
18	potential effects of water table rise might be
19	something to consider if that repository footprint was
20	to be extended farther north because the slope of that
21	water table rise seems to be pretty steep to the
22	north.
23	And then the scenario of combined water
24	table rise and increase recharge did not significantly

change the flow paths for particle travel times to the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

150

(202) 234-4433

25

	151
1	compliant boundary.
2	That's the end.
3	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thanks very much, Jim.
4	Ruth?
5	MEMBER WEINER: You mentioned that your
6	model was different from the DOE model. Was it
7	different because it was independent or was it
8	independent because it was different?
9	(Laughter.)
10	MR. WINTERLE: I'd say it was because it
11	was independent. The results in the end aren't that
12	different so is the model different if the results are
13	similar? I think the ways it's different is we lumped
14	the hydrogeologic units together differently. We
15	defined fault zone geometries differently. Tuff
16	alluvium interface was defined based on completely
17	independent interpretations without any use of DOE's
18	model for that.
19	MEMBER WEINER: So I think you've almost
20	answered the rest of the question which is what impact
21	do you think the differences between your model and
22	DOE's model would have? How would you interpret that?
23	Are they minor because you reached almost the same
24	conclusion? Are they major?
25	MR. WINTERLE: I would say there are some
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

.

major conceptual differences in the geometry of fault zones and Caldera zones and the depths the fault zones go to, but in the end, it turns out that those don't seem to affect the flow paths. What affects the flow paths is that in the end you've got to have a model that's calibrated to reasonably match the water level observations. Once you get to that point there's only so many directions the water can go. It has to flow generally down radiant, so things like anisotropy can divert flow askew of the gradient. It's constrained how far that effect can be.

MEMBER WEINER: My other question is how much does the importance of the recharge rate depend on the results of sorption and desorption experiments? By itself, you can't really say.

Yes, these analyses were MR. WINTERLE: just particle tracking and they don't really say qeochemistry sorbing anything about the or characteristics of anything. It's just you could assume whatever those particle travel times are the radionuclide travel times are going to be equal to or Whether -- independent of the less than that. sorption rates or retardation coefficients though eventually those radionuclides that aren't sorbed are going to have to where the water went, so the effects

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	153
1	on the flow paths should be applicable to the
2	transport path.
<u>,</u> 3	MEMBER WEINER: Oh yes. Now I just
4	wondered, all right, ultimately these things are
5	coupled in performance assessment, of course?
6	MR. WINTERLE: Right.
7	MEMBER WEINER: One is your assessment of
8	that.
9	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Mike?
10	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Jim, I appreciate
11	the fact that you really focused her eon the water and
12	getting that right and matching heads and so on.
13	Given Dr. Hornberger's charge at the beginning and if
14	we're within 30 feet, we're okay. Are we okay or much
15	better than okay or great? What do you feel is the
16	real representation of the modeling now in terms of
17	reality, whatever that is, I don't know?
18	MR. WINTERLE: I think the first analysis
19	we did suggests that being within 30 feet is okay with
20	some caveats. You want that 30 feet not to be all
21	biased depositive errors or negative errors. You want
22	them evenly distributed. In most cases, the largest
23	errors are right next to where fault zones or some
24	kind of feature gives you a steep gradient, so your
25	model grid kind of limits what you can define as a
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

fault zone, so if you were just off by 100 meters, your calibration error is off, but basically you've captured the effect that there's some barrier there that's slowing down your water, causing a gradient or directing your flow in some direction or another. You may be just off as to the exact location of that.

ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: To nonhydrologists, it sounds like if you do have those discontinuities and you have some physical explanation or other phenomenological explanation that says this is why that discontinuity is occurring, you're kind of bringing closure to the exercise. Is that a fair assessment of where you think you are?

MR. WINTERLE: Well, yes. As long as you can demonstrate you've captured the salient features, the major effects of the structural features, you can accept a little calibration error.

> ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Sure. Thank you. MEMBER HORNBERGER: Allen? Ines?

DR. TRIAY: Yes. Along those lines, if you had design your working of the world and you could design the best way to validate the model that you have proposed what do you think remains to be done? MR. WINTERLE: Well, if we all live to be 200, I wouldn't mind dumping a lot of some inert

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

tracer inside Yucca Mountain and waiting for it. I don't know how long the performance confirmation period is going to extend it to, but a large scale tracer test, I think, would really be the best way to figure out where flow paths that originate near Yucca Mountain actually do transition into the alluvium because there's a lot of uncertainty into the geometry of that interface. There's older debris flows and things down there that could complicate things. But we're limited to points of data here and there where we can put in well bores.

DR. TRIAY: So short of living to be 200, what is the next best way to validate the model? What remains to be done? I'm not suggesting that what you have done is not very good. I'm just saying if you had the ability to delineate, what are we going to do next?

18 MR. WINTERLE: I think maybe a couple more 19 strategically placed bore holes would be in order. I 20 think actually that is being done. I'm not sure where 21 the Nye County drilling program is at now, but I know 22 that's on-going. And they've done an enormous amount 23 of data collection in the past few years at а 24 reasonable budget. So that seems to be money well spent in reducing these uncertainties. 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

	156
1	The other thing we can do is just try to
2	keep attempting to look at different conceptual models
3	so we understand what are the consequences of being
4	wrong and so far haven't come up with any consequence
5	that would be so wrong as that we really need to start
6	over and look at things in more dept.
7	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim Clark? Jim Davis?
8	DR. DAVIS: Is someone at the Center
9	looking at the effects of water chemistry from the
10	climate change?
11	MR. WINTERLE: I think Paul Bertetti's
12	talk right after me, well, I don't think we're going
13	to look at climate change effects on water chemistry
14	yet.
15	DR. DAVIS: Your conclusion is that a
16	small amount of recharge captures all of the
17	information that you need to know about the increased
18	recharge, but that might not be true if you're also
19	taking into account chemical effects that happen with
20	increased recharge. So I think it needs to be
21	remembered that that's a conclusion relevant to where
22	the water flows.
23	MR. WINTERLE: That's a good point.
24	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Dick?
25	DR. PARIZEK: What's a five percent
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

l	157
1	increase in boundary head values related to in terms
2	of recharge? What sort of recharge would it take to
3	give you that increase?
4	MR. WINTERLE: There was no coupling of
5	those in the model, so
6	DR. PARIZEK: In other words, does that
7	get us into a pluvial or a monsoonal? I can't quite
.8	see what amount increased recharge it would take to do
9	that.
10	MR. WINTERLE: I think it's I'm trying
11	to remember. I haven't really gone through and looked
12	at the effect on specific discharge through the model
13	boundaries and compared that to what's been analyzed
14	or estimated for previous climates.
15	DR. PARIZEK: It was good enough to give
16	you the paleo springs reoccurring where spring
17	deposits occur, right? So that's at least
1.8	MR. WINTERLE: I guess what happened was
19	I got to that point, I was happy, so I haven't had the
20	time to really dig and to compare that to other
21	analyses and what regional groundwater fluxes had been
22	estimated. But it's definitely something we should
23	look at.
24	DR. PARIZEK: Right. It seems like
25	changing say the water level elevation from 50 to 150
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

•

meters isn't exactly a minor shift, although it doesn't change the flow path or travel times significantly than maybe that doesn't matter too much. It's just hard to imagine you steeping the gradient that much and not have that affect travel times other than the chemistry changes that might occur, but that's what your analyses is showing us, right?

MR. WINTERLE: I guess a follow-on analysis that I should consider is to look at different segments of the flow paths and the effect on travel time so I can understand it a little better, but it looks like the flow path right near the repository where most of that water level rise is occurring, if that goes from 50 years to 5 years, it doesn't have a big impact on the full transport time.

DR. PARIZEK: The role of major faults, okay, looking for some data on fault permeability and particularly the block boundary faults and again, you seem like you've captured a lot of the details enough that it seems like what would it take to cause your conceptual model to blow up? It can't blow up because it sort of agrees with all the data you matched, right? So what could change conceptually in the model that would show that maybe the present understanding is in error?

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	159
1	MR. WINTERLE: I could speculate.
2	DR. PARIZEK: Maybe that's what we need to
3	do now, but before everybody buys the model,
4	everybody's flow goes south, southeast and then south,
5	if that's a fact of reality, then we have reason to
6	feel better about it. If it's possible that it could
7	be straight south, say under the footprint or split
8	where the straight south and also southeast, you may
9	have a consequence on performance.
10	I want to make sure that the conceptual
11	model that goes into everybody's simulations is
12	correct or as correct as it can be.
13	MR. WINTERLE: One potential question is
14	what if there's some structural feature that we've
15	missed that can grab that water before it has a chance
16	to get over into the permeable zone, beneath Fortymile
17	Wash which that seems to be controlling things.
18	Higher permeability out Fortymile Wash and that draws
19	all the water toward it and then straight south from
20	there. So what if there's some zone we've missed? If
21	there is, I don't think I mean there's pretty good
22	density of bore holes on Yucca Mountain proper so it
23	seems like we would have at least saw the effects of
24	that on the water table map if something existed.
25	Maybe something could exist farther south.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	160
1	DR. PARIZEK: Yes, on the footprint where
2	the need to control this a little bit stands.
3	MR. WINTERLE: So those are things that I
4	guess we could explore through modeling to look at the
5	effect, how drastic of a feature would you need to
6	really capture the water.
7	DR. PARIZEK: See, if I was in DOE, I
8	would hear this and I would say I don't think I'm
9	going to have much in the confirmation testing program
10	dealing with regional flow. And I would say well,
11	what does NRC think about that statement in terms of
12	this counter plight between what more should be done
13	or should the program know to get the level of
14	confidence it's looking for or is it needed? That's
15	essentially the question.
16	MR. WINTERLE: Another thing is the level
17	of importance that's being relied on for the saturated
1,8	zone. A lot of people are the model doesn't seem
19	to be overly dependent on just the saturated zone flow
20	paths or just the unsaturated zone flow paths. But we
21	assign a high significance to the transport
22	properties, but only a medium significance to the flow
23	paths, but those two things go hand in hand. So I
24	think overall we're going to have do a lot of
25	thinking during our detailed review and what
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

.

	161
1	constitutes adequate.
2	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Of course, if they had
3	a radio tracer to the backfill in Yucca Mountain, as
4	Jim has suggested
5	(Laughter.)
6	DR. CLARKE: Two hundred years, I don't
7	think is long enough.
8	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Performance
9	confirmation is a long-term project.
10	(Laughter.)
11	Don, do you have questions?
12	DR. SHETTEL: My question has been
13	answered already.
14	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you. Thanks a
15	lot, Jim. We're going to move on and Paul Bertetti is
16	going to talk to us about sorption parameters.
17	MR. BERETTI: Well, thank you very much
18	for the opportunity to talk a little bit about how
19	we've developed sorption parameters for saturated
20	alluvium, essentially the part of the saturated zone
21	in Fortymile Wash.
22	I'm going to focus on this topic today,
23	just in order to restrict the content area.
24	Obviously, we've discussed and it has been brought up
25	earlier in the day. We have some risk significance
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

associated with colloid-based, colloid-facilitated transport as well as matrix diffusion in the saturated There's all these unsaturated zone processes zone. that we haven't really discussed. So I'll try to focus on this to provide some detail about what we've gone and the process through which we've gone through to develop the parameters that we have.

So first what I'm going to talk about is some of our experience with experiments and modeling of those experiments, took place several years back. And our interpretation of that modeling to develop an abstraction, an initial abstraction and a range of And then the extension of that modeling 13 parameters. to further develop those parameters in the abstraction that we can use in the performance assessment code. Then I'll kind of stop a little bit, show some 16 examples of the range of parameters that we get now and talk about some of our work currently to help understand the uncertainties that we have remaining in 20 our abstraction.

I think if we go to the next slide, if you back up a little bit, I just want to -- this is I just want to acknowledge that similar to Jim's. these are analysis presented by the Center and doesn't necessarily reflect the position of the NRC. Also,

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

the results here are exploratory in nature. Also, I will provide some results for under development portion, the TPA Version 5 and so those results should be considered developmental until NRC fully approves that.

Next slide, please.

(Slide change.)

of background. Just а little bit Obviously, we've kind of talked a little bit about the of specifically significance retardation, of radionuclides of neptunium in the saturated alluvium. We know that the transport times of neptunium in the saturated alluvium are particularly sensitive to the range of retardation factors and K_ds that have been used for this point. And so it has been identified as an area of potentially highly risk significant to waste isolation.

Primary retardation mechanism, as Jim Davis explained earlier is the chemical sorption of radionuclides on mineral surfaces. And so today, I'm going to talk about, we know that there's a number of things that affect the magnitude of that sorption, but today, I'm going to talk about how we determine those particular values that we assign to that.

Next slide, please.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

164

(Slide change.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

So just to kind of review some of the definitions that I'll talk about today, as Jim mentioned, the K_d, or distribution coefficient is essentially a ratio of concentration of mass of radionuclide on solid and concentration of mass of radionuclide in solution.

I'll also mention a term of Ka and you'll also see it annotated as Kal and that is just a normalization of the K_d to the surface area of the minerals that we've studied. Also, you'll see a term R_d or the retardation factor. That's just a function of the amount of K_d and the specific conditions porosity and bulk density that you have for the zone in which radionuclides are traveling.

Next slide, please.

(Slide change.)

18 So the objective from NRC and Center point 19 of view are to develop an independent data and 20 modeling capability which to not only assess DOE 21 activities, but also to provide input to our own 22 performance assessment model. We'd like to develop an 23 independent methodology that's based on parameters 24 that we can measure. So it would be to our advantage 25 to be able to measure parameters in the field and I'll

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	165
1	apply that to our model, rather than have a set of
2	parameters that we have to essentially go by our
3	expert judgment on. But would also like to be able to
4	reduce overall uncertainty by being able to measure
5	parameters directly and that ideally would help us
<u>,</u> 6	improve realism in our model.
7	Then finally, we'd like to develop a set
8	of abstracted models that are formed by what we know
9	impact sorption and that is the chemistry and
10	mineralogy of the system.
11	Next slide, please.
12	(Slide change.)
13	So our general overall approach was to
14	conduct a set of laboratory experiments using relevant
15	minerals, water chemical and radionuclides for the
16	program. And I'll just sort of mention now that in
17	our earlier set of experiments which were started in
18	the late 1980s and early 1990s, there was a limited
19	amount of sort of field-based samples, so our initial
20	approach was to try to pick minerals not only that we
21	could understand to develop a modeling approach and
22	interpret our modeling approach, but also to pick them
23	in a way that we supposed were appropriate minerals
24	for the system.
25	We'd also like to apply them to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

166

appropriate mechanistic models over that broad range of conditions to see what the effects of those conditions are on sorption. We also collected and analyzed some limited field samples to inform our approach and provide a bound for our sorption parameter range.

We then applied some detailed models and experiments to build on or confirm results and that helped us develop our initial performance assessment abstraction. We'd also like to make sure that our performance assessment model has the important relevant information built in.

Next slide, please.

(Slide change.)

Okay, so here I'll talk about some of our experimental results and some of the insights that we've developed from that.

Down on the bottom here I have a couple of graphs. One is for neptunium sorption of smectite or Montmorillonite, that's a clay phase. We also have neptunium sorption on quartz. The smectite sorption also shows data for conditions in which we have equilibrium with atmospheric CO_2 and also conditions under which there is no CO_2 present.

All of the data here on the quartz plot

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 are with atmospheric CO₂ present. I also wanted -these are plotted in terms of K_d . We have a log scale 2 and then plotted versus a range of pH that's fairly 3 broad from about 3 to 10, depending on the type of 4 experiments and the range of pH that was applicable. 5 The first thing you should notice is that 6 7 mineral like the magnitude sorption for а 8 montmorillonite is significantly different than the 9 magnitude sorption for quartz and we'll try to talk about this a little bit further. 10 We studied various minerals and chemical 11 conditions. We looked at a number of different 12 13 minerals from clays, quartz, even basic minerals like alpha-alumina which helped us understand the sorption 14 parameters required to model alumina silicates. 15 We looked at a variety of chemical conditions. As you 16 17 see here, we can vary pH and vary the amount of carbon dioxide that's present in the system as well. 18 We used minerals similar to what we 19 20 expected at Yucca Mountain based on the known tuffs and the studies, 21 mineralogy of the characterization studies that had gone in the 1980s 22 23 and early 1990s from Yucca Mountain and vicinity. The sorption behavior we see is similar 24 with pH, is similar for a given actinide, even on 25 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

(202) 234-4433

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

different mineral surfaces. For instance, we see that when CO_2 is present, neptunium has a sorption maximum around 8; for montmorillonite we also see the same sorption maximum around 8 for quartz. So very different mineral surface, very similar behavior and we see that for all the actinides that we have studied.

We sorption behaviors 8 also see the 9 effectively represented by a surface complexation 10 modeling approach, similar to what Jim alluded to 11 earlier today. This is a surface complexation of fit 12 of the data with no carbon dioxide present and this is a prediction of behavior with CO₂ present that's independent of the experimental data. So we can reproduce the behavior appropriately with the surface 16 complexation modeling approach.

Next slide, please.

(Slide change.)

19 Here are another two graphs. One of the 20 main features of the work that we have done is to look at the effects of surface area. When we normalize 21 22 data for the effects of surface area, we see that even for different minerals in which we had different 23 magnitudes of sorption, we get an overlap of sorption 24 25 behavior both for uranium and neptunium in this case.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

13

14

15

17

18

169 Here's the two plots, one in terms of K_a1 1 which is our effective surface area for all the 2 minerals listed both for neptunium on the left and 3 4 uranium on the right with CO_2 and without CO_2 . When we normalize and consider these effects of surface 5 area, we get a very similar behavior over the range of 6 7 pH conditions present. Next slide, please. 8 (Slide change.) 9 So how do we utilize this information and 10 take the information from the field, sort of develop 11 an initial abstraction. What I have shown here are 12 two plots of frequency and distribution of pH and 13 partial pressure of CO_2 in saturated zone waters from 14 15 the Yucca Mountain region. We know from just the slice that I showed you previously that pH and 16 inorganic carbon or the CO₂ in solution are primary 17 controlling factors in the magnitude sorption for any 18 mineral surface, especially for the actinides. 19 20 We can use the range of chemistry then to quide our modeling approach. The variability in pH in 21

guide our modeling approach. The variability in pH in
inorganic carbon is also linked through the aqueous
chemistry through the chemical equilibria that we get
through carbon reactions and the amount of hydrogen
solutions. So those are linked together.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

170 1 We use the database of Perfect, et al. which is a USGS database, considered a large number of 2 saturated zone chemistries in the southern Nevada 3 4 region. 5 We paired that database down to a smaller number of data points based on chemical balancing 6 7 inherent -- included in the system, a region that was 8 more appropriate for the Yucca Mountain 9 region to come up with the series of about 460 values 10 that are used to develop these distributions that you 11 see here. 12 Notice that we can represent a range of pH 13 from about 6.3 to about 9.6 that's fairly normally 14 distributed on this scale with an average value of 15 around 7.8. Likewise, we can look at the distribution of carbon dioxide and explore its link between a pH 16 17 and CO_2 . 18 note here, there's a detailed As а description of the approach, not only for application 19 20 of these data, but also the abstraction of this 21 approach in the RTPA code in those two references which I have on the last slide in presentation. 22 23 Next slide, please. 24 (Slide change.) 25 So in detail what we did was take the data **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1 from the Perfect, et al. database and the understanding of the pH and CO, distribution that we 2 3 have from there, apply a service complexation modeling 4 approach that we know is effect at reproducing the 5 sorption behavior. Use a particular type of surface complexation model that includes an electrical double 6 7 layer that Jim mentioned earlier. We do arrive at 8 some parameters for sets of minerals to provide us 9 with coefficients or these sorption exchange 10 coefficients. But we could use to model the data over a range of CO, and pH for the entire system for all 11 12 the actinides. And we use geochemical modeling software 13 to generate a range of these surface complexation 14 15 predictions and we use data on uranium and the other 16

actinides that was available, the most recently available data from the NEA thermodynamic database.

And we combine those results to come up with some distributions for actinides.

Next slide, please.

(Slide change.)

22 So down here at the bottom I have an 23 example of the range of sorption parameter 24 distributions that we generated and used and we call 25 the TPA version 4.0 or 4.1.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

17

18

19

20

21

	172
1	Notice that we have americium, neptunium
2	and uranium and all plotted on the log of this sort of
3	Kal
4	factor. So we can use this distribution and the range
5	of values here to formulate the distribution an the
6	range of values for retardation factors that we use in
7	the TPA 4.1 code.
8	So we develop the sorption distributions
9	in terms of Kal. We use values from chemistry to
10	constrain those distributions and then recast those in
11	terms of K _d 4D for use in TPA.
12	So these distributions are independently
13	sampled in TPA 4.1 its independently sampled
14	distributions, but we know that for a particular
15	simulation it should be simulating the same water
16	chemistry, those are correlated so that the same
17	chemistry is applied to each one. And that's how the
18	distribution are generated in TPA4.1.
19	Next slide, please.
20	(Slide change.)
21	So maybe the next step would be to develop
22	a set of responses over a larger range of pH and CO_2
23	and that's what I've shown here. Here are just some
24	three dimensional plots of pH versus PCO_2 for all of
25	the actinides. Notice that we can mimic the behavior.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

These are just modeled produced curves, based on the same set of distributions that I showed you earlier and the same sorption modeling constants that I talked about earlier.

We can use the surface complexation modeling approach to generate these curves over the range of pH and CO_2 and we can use some curve fitting methods to mimic each one of these curves to a similar equation and then define a set of coefficients. And then we can use those coefficients to define and calculate a K_a value for sampled ranges of pH and CO_2 .

So now instead of inputting into TPA a range of R_ds that we sample and then gave to correlate after the fact, now we can input directly a range of pH and CO₂ that we've measured in the field and we know what the distribution is and then use the modeling to calculate the sorption factor on the fly.

And then we can use our measured values of porosity and bulk density to then calculate a retardation factor that's appropriate. So even though for each simulation run in TPA, we still use one value of that sorption coefficient. It would be based on real sample values of simple chemistry.

Go to the next slide, please.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	174
1	(Slide change.)
2	So TPA co-development, this co-development
3	for what would be TPA 5.0, they've incorporated these
4	response services in terms of the Kal valleys. They
5	used a field measure range of pH and CO_2 . Those are
6	stochasticlly sampled and so those are correlated
7	together. Because they're chemically correlated as
8	well, so we can use a correlation factor to ensure
9	that we sample those appropriately. We can use that
10	both for the unsaturated and the saturated zone, based
11	on measured chemistry and the distribution of
12	chemistry for those waters and we calculated a surface
13	area for individual geologic layers based on measure
14	samples and then we can calculate K_d and R_d within the
15	TPA code. And since we sample chemistry directly,
16	then we don't have to do the after-the-fact
17	correlation. In fact, the distribution and the shapes
18	of the distributions for the retardation factors that
19	we produce, are relevant to the chemistry. There's no
20	guessing as to what type of shape we should get.
21	Next slide, plese.
22	(Slide change.)
23	So in the next couple of slides, I'll show
24	you some comparisons of retardation and factor output
25	from the two versions of the TPA code. Here I show
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

some density plots of neptunium and uranium retardation coefficients. These are in terms of R_d . And that compares the output from the range of distributions that were used in TPA Version 4 versus this proposed approach. And here we're only talking about saturated alluvium, data for the saturated alluvium and these represent 400 realizations from the code or 400 realizations from a sampled set of parameters.

For neptunium, what we see is the median 10 11 value is slightly higher, the median value here is 12 slightly higher in the version 5 code which utilizes the sampled range of pH, relative to the median value 13 for Version 4. And the range is narrowed. 14 So the 15 mean value is a little bit higher and the range of 16 sampled values is a little bit narrow. In fact, 17 there's a range of values that go all the way out to 18 about 3,000 in the older distributions. So it's 19 narrowed in this approach.

20 ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Paul, just a really 21 quick question. Four hundred realizations. Is that 22 enough?

MR. BERETTI: Well, what I'm trying to do is have enough realizations to sort of sample and represent the distribution. This is enough -- that's

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

23

24

25

	176
1	kind of a typical range that you sample to to ensure
2	that in the code because of the number of parameters.
3	I guess you could do more, but I haven't done that.
4	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Well, I guess the
5	question is if you did 10,000 would you really change
6	the shape?
7	MR. BERETTI: I think you could get closer
8	to more representative shape, but so my answer is I
9	think this is okay for what I want to present here.
10	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: You wouldn't change
11	between 4.1 and 5 say, these two?
12	MR. BERETTI: No, I think you would see
13	the same trends.
14	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: That's all.
15	Thanks.
16	MR. BERETTI: Yes. For uranium, the
17	median value is lower in here. We have a more
18	predominant range of values that are in the lower
19	values, but the total range is about the same. So we
20	have a range up here and notice that it's slightly
21	tilted. We have a range of up to about 8,000.
22	There's about the same number of points. So we have
23	a very broad range and we have more values at the low
24	end.
25	Next slide, please.
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

(S1	.i	de	change.)
•					

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

This is a similar data set, except now I'm going to plot them in terms of the density function plots and this -- now I'm going to also plot them in terms of K_d and one thing I have to say is the specific values of K_d depending on the values of bulk density and porosity that you use, so I just use mean values in the TPA code to produce these plots. You would get slightly different numbers depending on the values that you use. And if you sample those values over the range, then you would get a different sampling. And I have not done that here.

And also note that the distribution shapes are functions of this sample pH and CO_2 . So part of this is the fact that we have very discrete CO_2 values instead of the continuous range of CO_2 values that are noticed.

18 Again, here's a difference. We have mean 19 and constrained values for neptunium Kas that are 20 slight higher than the median values produced by TPA 21 4.1, but the range is significantly narrowed. We 22 don't have a large number of these very large values. 23 Notice all those for americium which could 24 important nuclide, the values of K_d are be an 25 extremely large. The minimum values are on the order

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1	178
1	of 10,000 for K_d . Uranium on the other hand, we have
2	this sort of 5.0 range. It's a little bit lower. But
3	the total range is about the same for both samples.
4	Okay, next slide, plese.
5	(Slide change.)
6	Okay, so how are we approaching some of
7	the uncertainties that we know are included in this
8	sort of modeling approach? One of the things we like
9	to do is update water chemistry distribution to
10	reflect the recent sampling in the early well and
11	drilling program. And how might those changes in
12	sample not only water, but mineralogy affect the
13	influence and affect these results?
14	We also have additional work on-going to
15	confirm the mineral content. Recall, I said that the
16	basis for a lot of this modeling approach was on the
17	experiments with mineral phases that we thought were
18	appropriate and that we'd like to make sure that they
19	are indeed appropriate. We also want to look at
20	specific surface areas for the alluvium. Is that
21	range of surface area appropriate? Is it consistent
22	with our measured values? Especially, does it reflect
23	the recent analysis of cuttings and sonic core samples
24	that have been collected. One of the problems with
25	collection of cuttings is that you have a grain size

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433
	179
1	distribution that's influenced by the drilling fluid
2	and the method of collection. Nye County's extensive
3	work and efforts to try to collect more representative
4	samples of alluvium resulted in the sonic core and I'm
5	sure Dale will talk more about that tomorrow.
6	And we'd also like to be able to test our
7	model outputs against experimentally measured values
8	based on these more representative samples.
9	I'll show you some examples in the next
10	couple of slides.
11	Next, plese.
12	(Slide change.)
13	This is just a reset. This is just
14	another view of the saturated flow pathing system.
15	These arrows are not calculated flow paths. They're
16	just meant to bound the type of flow paths that Jim
17	showed you and I think you'll see in Bill Arnold's
18	presentation later. Give you an idea of how those are
19	constrained in the models. The approximate compliance
20	boundary is shown on there. And it also shows the
21	location of a couple of wells that I'll talk about,
22	Well 2D and we'll see some examples of data from that
23	and also Washburn-1X. I'll also show the well
24	location of the 19PB which is a location of the sonic
2 ⁵	coring that has taken place. Also is the location of
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

the alluvial testing complex that Bob spoke to earlier.

the thing to is 3 Some of note flow 4 direction is predominantly toward the south. You're going to have a portion in fracture volcanic rock and 5 alluvium. We're going to talk about alluvium here in 6 7 We know that there's some a couple of moments. uncertainty in the length of that flow path. As Jim 8 9 alluded to, we recognize that there's a relationship uncertainties in the flow model 10 between and 11 uncertainties in the transport parameters that influence that. 12 13

So I'm going to show you some examples from a couple of selected wells, specifically 2D and Washburn-1X.

Next slide.

(Slide change.)

This is a little complicated, but it has 18 a lot of information. These are x-ray diffraction 19 20 results of well cuttings collected from Well Washburn-1X and Well 2D. So we received cuttings as sample 21 splits from the Department of Energy. We collected 22 semi-quantitative, x-ray diffraction analysis at every 23 5 foot interval for the entire depth of those two 24 25 holes. So the difference in depth here is that this

NEAL R. GROSS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

1

2

14

15

16

17

	181
1	is the complete depth of Well Washburn-1X which is
2	about 650 feet and Well 2D goes down to about 1600
3	feet. Don't confuse this with Well 2DB which is a
4	newer well that penetrates all the way down to
5	something on the order of 2000 feet, I believe.
6	And here we have a comparison of bulk
7	mineralogy between the two wells and then the clay
8	component which is shown in this green layer on the
9	edge, then is expanded to show the types of clays that
10	might be present in that clay fraction.
11	Water table is shown in blue here. I also
12	have a couple of SEM photo micrographs at about 640
13	feet and 820 feet that I'll show you later. One thing
14	that I would like you to note from this diagram is
15	that while Washburn and 2D which are separated in
16	space across that 40 mile wash, at least across the
17	kind of range of expected arrivals of the flow paths
18	have a very similar bulk and clay mineralogy at least
19	through the saturated zone or at least through the
20	depth of Washburn.
21	Also, there's not a significant change in
22	mineralogy as you go from saturated to unsaturated
23	conditions at the water table that exists now. The
24	other thing is notice that we have a significant

silica fraction. This is quartz and prostobilite

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

25

here. There's a lot of feldspar as you would expect from the tuffs. And we have a consistent amount of clay fraction that's dominated by smectite or that montmorillonite that I showed you previous. We also have a significant amount of zeolite that occurs throughout the depth of the hole. In fact, some have a lot of zeolite as we go deeper, so depending on the zone.

9 One big difference between these results for these two holes is that about 1150 feet we see a 10 11 large occurrence of dolomite and calcite. We 12 interpret this and I think it's consistent with the lithologic interpretations from DOE and also Nye 13 County that this is the kind of a start of an older 14 15 package of alluvium or maybe pre-basinal sediments that are dominated by not only calcites, but also 16 dolomitization of tuff particles and that's where you 17 get a lot of that dolomite. 18

One thing to consider though is this depth kind of encompasses the range of the depth of flow paths that Jim Winterle showed you earlier. So even though we've considered a lot of the minerals that --I think we considered enough mineralogy to describe this zone. We might want to look at calcite and the influence of calcite as well and in fact, we have done

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that and I can talk to that later, if you'd like. 1 2 Next slide, please. Well, here is an example of scanning electron micrograph of the well 3 4 cuttings taken from Well 2D at about the 640 foot level. This is again below the water table in a zone 5 where you have that small amount of zeolite and 6 7 smectite. Here's a larger scale version. We see kind 8 of the alluvial grains. Notice that they're coated 9 with some material and there's maybe a sparse coating. These are well cuttings so they've kind of been washed 10 11 off, a lot of the fine grain material has actually removed And 12 been here. they're somewhat 13 unconsolidated, but notice that they're sort of 14 loosely cemented by this material. If we take a close up of this, what we see is it's composed of almost 15 16 entirely of zeolites, clinoptilolite, one of the 17 minerals that we studied in our sorption experiments and infiltrated or maybe even ingrown clay particles. 18 So the surfaces of these grains might be well 19 20 represented by clays and zeolites. 21 Go to the next slide, please. (Slide change.) 22 Now if we go a little bit deeper we saw a 23 little more percentage of zeolite in the horizon. 24 Notice we have a similar sort of coating of material. 25 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

If we look at that closely again, we'll see again it's dominated by zeolite. This is primarily that zeolite clinoptilolite and also clay. Both clays that not only are ingrown and formed in place, but also clays that probably were filtered in and kind of were filling in those pore spaces. Note again, those clays are dominated by smectites.

So I think this sort of demonstrates that our approach to not only modeling using an alumina silicate phase, but also the range of materials, quartz, montmorillinite, zeolites that predominated in our surface experiments are appropriate for the surfaces.

One of the things that Jim mentioned in 14 15 his talk was the presence of iron oxides and kind of the appearance of those iron oxides. We see iron 16 17 oxides here, but there's some evidence that they're contained within these amorphous silica phases on the 18 19 surfaces in Jim's materials for Naturita kind of show 20 There are other investigations that show that that. 21 and Naturita's measurements on the tuff samples and batch studies of that also showed that, that there was 22 23 sort of minimization of the iron oxide sorption capacity in those experiments. 24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Next slide.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1	185
1	(Slide change.)
2	So to conclude or just provide a summary
3	of what I've shown, we have geochemical sorption
4	models that are based on our experimental results.
5	They've been applied to produce the sorption
6	parameters for actinides that we use in TPA.
7	The sorption parameters are constrained by
8	measured water chemistries. We use recently collected
9	analyzed water samples that are consistent with our
10	experimental approach and consistent with the range of
11	chemistries that we have and consistent with the range
12	of mineralogist that we considered.
13	Our TPA output suggests that the saturated
14	alluvium may be an important barrier and that has a
15	retardation capability that could be assessed on the
16	order of the time frame which the regulations address.
17	And the methodology incorporated in the TPA right now
18	are flexible, so they're not limited to a particular
19	type of surface complexation modeling approach. We
20	have a more generic approach that we can develop using
21	sampled and information kind of on the order of what
22	Jim had described earlier and we can incorporate the
23	same sort of changes and coefficients applied directly
24	into TPA without modifying the code substantially.
25	That's all I have.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	186
1	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you, Paul.
2	MR. BERETTI: You're welcome.
3	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Questions. Ruth?
4	MEMBER WEINER: I have a number of
5	questions, Paul, I'm afraid and I'll try to condense
6	them as much as possible. You showed us, there's a
7	slide earlier where you showed the oxidation states of
8	the actinides that you were looking at.
9	MR. BERETTI: That's correct.
10	MEMBER WEINER: Americium 3, neptunium 5
11	and so on.
12	MR. BERETTI: Correct.
13	MEMBER WEINER: Do you have spectroscopic
14	verification of those oxidation states?
15	MR. BERETTI: Well, I think the oxidation
16	states for americium and thorium, neptunium, in
17	particular, and uranium in an oxidizing system are
18	fairly well defined for the states that we use in the
19	model. And I think the system and the saturated
20	alluvium is primarily oxidizing and I would expect
21	that the oxidation states for those four to be
22	consistent with that.
23	For plutonium we used the oxidation state
24	plus 5, sort of as a default. We don't have any
25	evidence or a lot of other information to constrain
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 the oxidation state or the range of states for plutonium. We felt that at the time of the modeling 2 that that kind of was a conservative approach, based 3 on our understanding of how neptunium 5 complexes and 4 sorbs and compared to thorium in the plus 4 state 5 which sorbs much more strongly. 6 7 So the answer to that is I think there's evidence for the other four. We have direct evidence 8 9 for neptunium in terms not only in our experiments, also for uranium as well that 10 but those are 11 appropriate. MEMBER WEINER: What direct evidence do 12 13 you have? MR. BERETTI: Well, the direct evidence is 14 we measured -- I don't have field evidence because I 15 don't field waters for neptunium in those. We have 16 done XF studies with uranium to look at the uranium 17 complexation on montmorillonite at different 18 Hq values. We've also done XF studies with neptunium on 19 clays to try to assess the complexation and the 20 21 complexes that might occur. I have spectroscopic with neptunium, kind of infrared IR 22 studies spectroscopy that shows neptunium plus 5 under the 23 conditions in which we've studied. 24 25 For americium and thorium, I think those

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.neairgross.com

are fairly well established, but I don't have any direct evidence for those.

3 MEMBER WEINER: Are you familiar with the work that has been done by Don Rye and Andy Fellmy at 5 PNL by David Clark's laboratory at LANL, Cynthia Palmer at Livermore. I mean all of these people have done extensive work on the oxidation states of the actinides under various conditions. And I question a little bit your assumption of plutonium 5. I question somewhat your assumption of uranium 6 which is very 11 dependent on pH.

And my suggestion is that you either get direct spectroscopic evidence and visible spectroscopy of your oxidation states or do some literature consultation, consult some of the literature in this area. This is very extensive.

MR. BERETTI: Yes, and I'm familiar with We had to make a conscious decision much of that. about plutonium because at the time we did not have a lot of information. I would agree that that's very I still would say that I would -- my uncertain. feeling is that uranium in the plus 6 state in the conditions as measured in the alluvium is appropriate. Beyond that I don't have much else. But I agree that that's something that needs to be strongly considered.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

	189
1	MEMBER WEINER: Because plutonium 4 forms
2	a colloid and that may be a problem.
3	MR. BERETTI: Right, we were trying to
4	model the aqueous component of plutonium sorption. I
5	would agree that plutonium 4 on the colloid is much
6	more important in terms of plutonium transport, but we
7	just did not include it in this component.
8	MEMBER WEINER: I want to move briefly to
9	your modeling. Does your modeling include when you
1.0	formulate, build your model, do you minimize do you
11	have some way to minimize the Gibbs-free energy for
12	all of your solution components?
13	MR. BERETTI: Well, the model is built
14	within the code the same way as all solution all
15	the solution components are contained within the code
16	the same way. So the fitting uses a code like FITEQL
17	to sort of get the best fit estimate for the
18	complexation constant, for the sorption parameter and
19	then one represents the behavior, but I would say
20	somewhat semi-empirically because we don't have direct
21	evidence for the complexation that we are modeling to
22	mimic sorption behavior over the range that we have
23	used. That is incorporated then in the overall
24	geochemical model to predict sorption over range of pH
25	and CHH.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.neairgross.com

.....

	190
1	MEMBER WEINER: I'm asking because when we
2	modeled the actinides for the Waste Isolation Pilot
3	Plant, we used EQ36 and basically fed in our solution
4	components constantly minimizing the Gibbs free energy
5	so that we could see what remained in solution and
6	what did not. I think Ines is very familiar with this
7	work.
8	And that's the sense in which I ask. And
9	that leads me to another question which is pH and
10	carbonate are not independent of each other.
11	MR. BERETTI: That's correct.
12	MEMBER WEINER: And you, in your model,
13	you recognize the buffering activity of carbonate and
14	the fact that it's going to change as you add
15	carbonate or CO_2 , you're going to change the pH.
16	MR. BERETTI: That's correct.
17	MEMBER WEINER: And that is done in the
18	model?
19	MR. BERETTI: That's incorporated in the
20	model.
21	In the model representation for sorption
22	over pH and CO_2 , that's incorporated within the
23	modeling approach because all those phases are
24	included.
25	For the sampling then of those
	NEAL R. GROSS
	COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(202) 234-4433

And then we correlate that, based on our understanding of the correlation between pH, CO_2 and those produced distributions.

For the proposed version 5, we sample pH directly. Then that is correlated to CO_2 , based on a correlation that we have measured, based on our sample parameter. So yes, they're directly related and yes, those are correlated. They're kind of limited by the quality of the data in the data set. And those are correlated with the factor of something on the order of minus .8. So they're very closely correlated, as you would expect chemically and that's how we choose a value of CO_2 that's related to --

MEMBER WEINER: I'll let you go now.

MEMBER HORNBERGER: We're getting pretty detailed into the modeling, so let's try to stay at a higher level.

MEMBER WEINER: I'm done.

MEMBER HORNBERGER: Mike?

ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: No, I'm all set.

Thanks for a nice presentation.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 191

	192
1	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Allen?
2	DR. CROFF: I've got a question on one of
3	your early slides. It was page 7 where you had some
4	experimental results. If I read the left most graph
5	correctly it shows that the reaction is, the sorption
6	reaction is indeed reversible?
7	MR. BERETTI: That's correct.
8	DR. CROFF: Have you found that to be
9	generally the case across various radionuclides and
10	across various minerals and this kind of thing?
11	MR. BERETTI: For the ones that we've
12	studied in the most detailed, yes. I would say those
13	are primarily our particular experience is mostly
14	limited to uranium and neptunium in those particular
15	studies.
16	DR. CROFF: Thanks.
17	MR. BERETTI: But yes, that is correct.
18	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Ines?
19	DR. TRIAY: Let me ask you, I thought that
20	this was a very good presentation as well. Let me ask
21	you from your perspective, what is driving the
22	sorption aspect of radionuclide migration more, the
23	mineralogy or the water chemistry?
24	MR. BERETTI: Well, I think the water
25	chemistry has the largest effect. The effect of
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

2 the effect of surface area that you see. So I would couch it in terms of if I knew an effective surface 3 area independent of the mineral phase, then if I knew 4 the chemistry parameters, then we should be able to 5 model the sorption behavior. 6 7 Now what that doesn't account for are 8 other types of reactions that occur because of the 9 mineral phases, so it completely ignores redux sort of reactions that might occur and I acknowledge that. 10 11 DR. TRIAY: So you think that the best way model sorption would 12 to be via the surface complexation models almost ignoring, if you will, the 13 14 -- and I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, I'm 15 trying to understand. 16 MR. BERETTI: Right. 17 DR. TRIAY: When I made a statement and 18 say no, that's not it, it's something else. Ignoring 19 the mineralogy and just having surface complexation 20 parameters, bear radionuclide as a function of water 21 chemistry? 22 MR. BERETTI: Well, what I would say is that -- the answer partly would depend on the 23 chemistry of the system. For instance, if we had a 24 25 chemistry and a mineralogy type where ion exchange and NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

1 a nuclide where ion exchange processes were important, 2 then obviously that would need to be included and 3 incorporated as well. So your model would have to 4 encompass the range of reactions and sorption 5 mechanisms that you propose. 6 I think for the alluvium the surface 7 complexation modeling approach is appropriate or the range of chemical and mineralogical conditions for 8 9 I think it's an appropriate approach. actinides. DR. TRIAY: How do you take into account 10 11 in the surface complexation modeling for sorption the difference in oxidation states for plutonium? 12 13 MR. BERETTI: We had not done that in this 14 case, but if you had enough information to inform your 15 water chemistry with respect to oxidation and you had previously done enough modeling to do that, 16 the 17 problem here is we're trying to include as much 18 chemistry information as we can to develop a sorption 19 parameter without explicitly incorporating all of that 20 chemical modeling within the TPA code. And so it's 21 very -- you would have to have a reactor transport 22 model to appropriately do that and that's not the point where we are. I don't know if that answers your 23 24 question or not.

MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim Clark.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

25

www.nealrgross.com

DR. CLARKE: Slide 14 where you show the neptunium and uranium and the differences between 4.1 and Version 5, I guess the big difference is neptunium. Would there be increased medium value for retardation factor?

MR. BERETTI: Yes, I would say that seems to be different.

DR. CLARKE: For uranium, I can't tell. MR. BERETTI: The mean values are similar. The reason I don't mention those too much, it's kind of depending on the set of data, the realization set that you create and I mean if you happen, you have a small percentage of values that are very large and if you happen to hit one that's extremely large, then it's going to change your mean significantly. So the mean values are about the same between the two sets. The median values are different, however.

DR. CLARKE: That's what I was trying to get at. Did you really think there's a significant here and if so, do you think you know why?

MR. BERETTI: I know why is that even though that range of chemistry that we use to develop the initial distribution, we had to suppose what the shape of the distribution was, so we came up with our best estimate. The law of normal distribution is

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	196
1	purposely biased toward the lower end value. So we
2	kind of have a predominance of lower end values and
3	that has that low median.
4	DR. CLARKE: That's for Version 4?
5	MR. BERETTI: That's for Version 4. So
6	for Version 5, we don't have to judge what the
7	distribution shape is. We can measure a distribution
8	of pH and CO_2 and then apply that and so what you see
9	is kind of what the model produces based on that. And
10	so as that distribution would change and as our
11	understanding of CO_2 and pH would change, then that
12	might change as well. It might also be impacted by
13	the range of surface areas that we would measure and
14	then also incorporate into the code.
15	DR. CLARKE: Thank you.
16	MR. BERETTI: Yes sir.
17	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim Davis.
18	DR. DAVIS: Very nice presentation. I
19	really admire the work that David and you and Bobby
20	Padwell have done.
21	Given that though, I do want to say
22	something. You've compared in talking about what
23	you do in 4.1 and extending to 5, you've made the
24	statement that you might be able to work with real
25	materials and develop a semi-empirical model and use
·	NEAL R. GROSS
	1323 RHOE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

a similar approach. And I want to point out that 1 there, the abstraction you're making here is somewhat 2 -- it has other limitations than you're mentioning 3 than just surface area. For example, I believe that 4 these measurements that you've done as a function of 5 pH and carbon dioxide are done in simple electrolyte 6 7 solutions and so your knowledge of the effect of calcium, for example, or uranium sorption is 8 incomplete. 9 That's correct. 10 MR. BERETTI: DR. DAVIS: And calcium is, in fact, going 11 12 to be in all ground waters. MR. BERETTI: That's correct. 13 DR. DAVIS: So this is another aspect of 14 this semi-empirical approach where you begin to 15 incorporate all of the components of ground water that 16 17 you include. MR. BERETTI: That's correct. 18 DR. DAVIS: So it's important to look at 19 20 the composition of an artificial ground water solution. And the other thing that's being abstracted 21 is the electrical double layer. You have included in 22 your model a pH, the pH and CT dependence that you 23 have in the model is, in part, includes within it 24 25 electrical double layer components and so you're NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

saying that that pH and CT in the ground water, I will 1 have the same electrical double layer on smectites in 2 that ground water and that's not confirmed yet either. 3 4 MR. BERETTI: No, it is not. DR. DAVIS: So there's some uncertainties 5 there and then the final thing I would say is that for 6 7 the neptunium, for example, you haven't worked at a partial pressure or at least the data you showed here, 8 you haven't worked at a partial pressure of carbon 9 dioxide about air and the values in the system are all 10 above air. So you're extrapolating from air values up 11 12 to these higher partial pressures of carbon dioxide. MR. BERETTI: Right, it seems like I have 13 data at higher partial pressures. 14 15 DR. DAVIS: Oh, you do. 16 MR. BERETTI: Of CO_2 that are consistent we predict. Also from the modeling 17 with what 18 approach. DR. DAVIS: I thought the graph you showed 19 20 was --I only showed is from the 21 MR. BERETTI: montmorillonite study that is in Davener's paper from 22 a few years back. So yes, we do have data for a 23 larger range of CO,. And that's more recent. So it's 24 25 not incorporated here. NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 www.neairgross.com WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. DAVIS: One of the reasons I mention 2 the calcium is in the last couple of years there's been this new aqueous species that's been determined 3 by excess spectroscopy to be possibly predominant in 4 these kinds of waters that involves a calcium uranium 5 carbonate ternary aqueous species. And if you take a 6 7 model like this and you have to make an assumption then about what -- if that's predominant in aqueous 8 9 species, it's going to affect your calculated 10 sorption. 11 MR. BERETTI: Yes, I understand. DR. DAVIS: Eventually, you're going to 12 13 have to face that calcium problem. Yes, I would agree. 14 MR. BERETTI: Data 15 that we can collect in terms of confirmation work 16 would be, would consider that appropriate. 1.7 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Dick? 18 DR. PARIZEK: I was curious on page 18, 19 these are not sonic log samples? 20 MR. BERETTI: No sir, those are well 21 cutting samples. 22 DR. PARIZEK: From earlier sampling. MR. BERETTI: Yes sir. 23 24 DR. PARIZEK: Do you expect that would 25 differ, the sonic log? **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. BERETTI: The sonic coring data that 2 we have on a smaller number of samples to date that we 3 collected last December show very similar bulk The primary difference in the 4 mineralogy values. 5 sonic core sample results that we have now, we have about 10 to 15 percent more by weight of the clay 6 7 fraction which sort of represents the kind of fine grain material that probably is washed out of a well 8 9 cutting and that's kind of consistent with what the Nye County folks expected too. 10 11 So what we see is in a sonic core sample, 12 very simple distribution of mineralogy with a larger 13 percentage occupied by the clay fraction. DR. PARIZEK: And the clay abundance is --14 15 MR. BERETTI: The clay abundance is almost 16 exactly the same, correct. 17 DR. PARIZEK: So it's representative. 18 MR. BERETTI: It's representative just in 19 a very similar fashion. DR. PARIZEK: Now for performance, when I 20 21 look at the smectites, they go from roughly 40 percent to 70 percent of the sample, depending upon where you 22 are in the 2D log or for that matter --23 MR. BERETTI: Forty to 70 percent of the 24 25 clay fractions. **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

ļ	201
1	DR. PARIZEK: Of the clay fractions.
2	MR. BERETTI: Right.
3	DR. PARIZEK: So shouldn't there be some
4	difference in just the retardation characteristics
5	when you have that much difference in those kind of
6	clays?
7	MR. BERETTI: It's likely that there
8	could. We have a couple of factors that we've seen.
9	When I do the we've done our experimental analysis
10	and looked at that effective surface area, it seems
11	that the clay, only about 10 percent of the measured
12	surface area of clays is actually sorbing. Kind of
13	consistent with the percentage of edge sites. So
14	that's sort of modified by that factor.
15	And we do see a measured differences in
16	measured surface areas on the sonic core and well
17	cuttings that are consistent with the additional
18	amount of clay. So if we scale the surface area
19	appropriate to what we've measured in the experiments,
20	then the effects of the fine grained materials are
21	kind of all normalized against each other, so it's
22	really a difference in surface area, not mineral type.
23	DR. PARIZEK: There seems to be some sort
24	of a consistent pattern to the smectite abundance with
25	depth. It's not just erratic, but rather, you have a
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	202
1	kind of increasing trend that values down, there's an
2	increasing trend. That has to do something with the
3	history of the valley fill accumulation.
4	MR. BERETTI: I would expect so, yes.
5	DR. PARIZEK: You could probably expect
6	similar results at other holes?
7	MR. BERETTI: Yes, I think if you notice
8	the sort of trend for the water table between the two
9	holes, you find that they're very similar. I don't
10	think that's coincidental.
11	DR. PARIZEK: There seems to be a whole
12	different story when you go down below a thousand say
13	feet.
14	MR. BERETTI: The interpretation of that
15	would be sort of complex, but yes, I would agree with
16	you that there's those trends don't seem to be random.
17	DR. PARIZEK: Thank you.
1,8	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Don, do you have
19	questions?
20	DR. SHETTEL: That should be on now, I
21	think. Is that better?
22	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes.
23	DR. SHETTEL: I believe as Jim Davis
24	pointed out, these solutions are fairly simple and
25	there are some other complexing ligands out there such
	NEAL R. GROSS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON D.C. 2005-3701 www.nealronse.com
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

as fluoride which at the one ppm level in the ground significant if you're in water is more acidic solutions, especially for neptunium. As far as uranium and phosphate is also an important ligand for uranium and neptunium, but again on the more acidic side of the sorptions, so this may not have that much effect on most of the ground waters which are more alkaline, but it could add a contribution to the complexing.

And with regard to colloids, have you -any of these experiments have colloids in them or have you looked or found any?

MR. BERETTI: No, we have not. These experiments and this sort of approach is not meant to represent colloids and in fact, it excludes colloidal sized materials as best that we could.

What we have tried to do, another sort of process level modeling approaching to look at the important factors of colloid facilitating transport. We've used DOE data and some field-derived data from a Nevada test site to try to develop that approach, but it's not incorporated in these experiments or in the modeling that I discussed.

DR. SHETTEL: And lastly, I guess, humic and fulvic acids are not incorporated as well?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BERETTI: No. There's not really been a lot of work. I don't think there's been a lot of work by anyone to look at the organic acid content of the ground waters and the saturated zone. I think the total amount of organic carbon is fairly low. There has been some work by DOE to use the organic carbon to help date ground waters.

I will add that our most recent sampling of Well-19PB in which I think that was done last month, we collected a significant amount of samples specifically to characterize the organic acid composition. So hopefully, in the next couple of months we'll have an idea of what those compositions are and what the concentrations are for humic and fulvic acids for those waters. But right now, we don't have any of that. I can't really speak to the others.

DR. SHETTEL: Thank you.

MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you, Paul. We are now going to take a 15-minute break. We are going to start promptly at -- the clock on the far wall there, when the clock on the far wall says 5 past 4, we will start.

(Laughter.)

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	205
1	entitled matter went off the record at 3:51:38 p.m.
2	and went back on the record at 4:08:20 p.m.)
3	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Okay. Let me mention
4	a couple of things. Well, I'll mention the second
5	thing first then, and that will be the first thing.
6	We have a change in schedule for Thursday morning.
7	Currently on the schedule we have the DOE response to
8	NRC independent evaluation of documents, and that has
9	now been postponed from 8:35 until a start time of 11
10	a.m. It's 11 a.m. our time so that you might note on
11	your schedules that that's a change.
12	LAS VEGAS PARTICIPANT: We can't hear you.
13	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Hang on, we're
14	checking.
15	MR. LARSON: It's because the presentation
16	is going to be from Las Vegas.
17	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes, the presentation
1.8	is going to be can you hear me now?
19	MR. BROWN: Vegas?
20	LAS VEGAS PARTICIPANT: Yes, we're here
21	but we can't see you and we can barely hear you.
22	MR. BROWN: Okay. Hold on for a second.
23	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Okay. Can you see us
24	now?
25	LAS VEGAS PARTICIPANT: Yes, we see you.
	NEAL R. GROSS
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	206
1	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Okay. And can you
2	hear us now? You can hear us?
3	LAS VEGAS PARTICIPANT: Much better.
4	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Okay. At any rate, I
5	was saying what you missed was that I said the
6	presentation originally scheduled for 8:35 on Thursday
7	morning has been postponed and will now be at 11:00
8	Thursday morning.
9	The other thing that I wanted to mention
10	to our panel members, you'll notice on our schedule
11	tomorrow afternoon from 2 to 3, during that time the
12	panel members will be invited to make summary comments
13	on the basis of what they have heard, so please, you
14	can give some thought to that both overnight and as
15	the day progresses tomorrow.
16	All right. So I think that our next
17	presentation since we are now hooked up is Bill Arnold
18	in Las Vegas. Bill, you are there and you can hear
19	us, and I think we can hear you.
20	MR. ARNOLD: Okay. Hello, and I'm pleased
21	to have the opportunity to speak to you. I'm going to
22	talk about the saturated zone flow and transport
23	modeling and results. This builds on the presentation
24	given by Bob Andrews earlier in which he described the
25	conceptual models in the unsaturated zone and the
	NEAL R. GROSS
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 2000-3701 www.nealrgross.com

207 1 saturated zone, and the experimental basis for those conceptual models. 2 3 I'm going to describe how those conceptual models are implemented in the numerical models for 4 5 performance assessment calculations. Some of the 6 additional lines of information that qive us 7 confidence that those models are realistic and 8 describe some of the modeling results. If we go to 9 the second page --10 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Bill, can I ask if 11 there are several microphones on at your end if they 12 could be turned off. We can, I think, hear some background noise. Okay. Never mind. Go ahead, Bill. 13 14 MR. ARNOLD: Okay. Well, I think it's 15 being fixed here. 16 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes, that's much 17 better. MR. ARNOLD: Okay. So saturated zone flow 18 19 really defines the flow paths and the flow rates of 20 ground water through the system. And this is, of 21 course, important to determining the releases to the 22 maximally exposed individual. Saturated zone 23 transport defines the advective and dispersive 24 transport velocities of radionuclides. These can 25 either be dissolved or attached to colloids that are NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

potentially released. In their transport times, we include the effects of matrix diffusion and retardation along paths of likely ground water flow. And the metric of interest here is the mass or the activity flux of radionuclides at the point of compliance, which is about 18 kilometers south of Yucca Mountain. And the basis for quantifying the above processes relies on site-specific data, hydro geology, the geo-chemistry, and the transport testing that's been conducted by many scientists over the last 20 plus years.

Now if you go to slide 3, this illustrates these two components that are important to us, namely the ground water flow pathways and the transport times. The figure on the left you've seen before shows our expected ground water flow paths from Yucca Mountain as simulated by the flow and transport modeling.

The figure on the right shows the results of some transport simulations. These are simulated breakthrough curves for Neptunium in this case at the 18 kilometer boundary. The solid black line is with no sorption, but with matrix diffusion. The dashed red line is for Neptunium with sorption, with matrix diffusion and sorption in the rock matrix of the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

volcanic units, and you can see the line with transport times associated with that.

The dashed blue line shows a simulation result for Neptunium transport with sorption only in the Alluvium, and then the dashed magenta line shows simulation results with both sorption in the volcanic matrix and in the Alluvium. And this is for our expected behavior of the system without consideration of all of the uncertainties in the system, but this result is consistent with what you saw earlier in terms of NRC's conclusions about risk significance for different processes in the The system. more significant process here is sorption in the Alluvium, as opposed to matrix diffusion and sorption in the rock and the volcanic matrix.

Slide 4, we're going to discuss the regional and site-scale flow models. The regional model allows us to understand the general flow directions in the regional flow system and provides constraints on the volumetric flow rates through the aquifers, which then can be applied at the boundaries of the site-scale model. The site-scale model provides us much greater detail on the flow directions higher and the flow rates, much resolution representation of the hydrogeologic units of relevance

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

to repository performance at the site-scale.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

site-scale model builds And the on wells, observations of hydraulic head at the permeability measures and DOE and Nye County bore holes, and some large scale aquifer tests conducted at the C-wells, and somewhat smaller scale test at the Alluvial Testing Complex.

Slide 5, this figures shows a portion of the regional scale flow system and a lot of the physiographic features in that area are labeled here. As well, it shows the rectangular boundaries of the site-scale model within the regional flow system. And the several features that are key controls on flow at these are hydrogeologic regional system, the formations, their spatial location, the individual In addition, major faults play an properties. important role in the regional scale flow system.

Death Valley Regional 18 Also. the Groundwater Flow system is largely controlled, the 19 water though that system is controlled by recharge and 20 discharge. And a feature of importance at the site-21 scale is a local recharge along Fotymile Wash, and 22 considerable pumping from the system along the 23 southern boundary of the site-scale model in the 24 25 Amargosa Desert region.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Let's go to slide 6. This figure shows the boundaries of the Death Valley Regional Flow Model, and within those boundaries the recharge, and recharge is primarily at higher topographic elevations of greater than 1,500 meters above sea level. You can see the darker purple colors correspond to higher values of recharge in the system. Also in this figure, you can see the outline of the Nevada test site and the approximate location of Yucca Mountain.

The highest values of recharge occur in the highest mountain ranges, such as the Spring Mountains to the south and east of Yucca Mountain, the Panamint Range on the other side of Death Valley. Recharge is a complex function of precipitation, the slope in the geology and the vegetation, and there is a considerable degree of uncertainty in the recharge estimates depending on the method that's used.

Another thing that I'd like to point out that this color scale is really not a linear scale, and there are relatively large areas that fall in this white or very light purple range in which recharge is a very small value, less than 1 millimeter per year in the white zone, so there is recharge occurring but at a very low rate in these areas.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

I also wanted to point out that there are large areas where there's thick valley fill deposits in the system where there's essentially no recharge occurring in the system.

Slide 7 shows the locations of discharge regions in the Death Valley Regional Flow System, and these natural groundwater discharge locations occur in the topographic lows, in general, and significant discharge occurs from springs in the carbonate aquifer flow system, and by evapotranspiration from shallow groundwater at the playas. Taken together, these recharge and discharge estimates provide us with a basis for an overall groundwater budget through the regional scale flow system.

Okay. Slide 8, let's focus in on the site-scale flow system. The figure on the left shows an interpretation of a potentiometric surface at the site-scale. It also shows the wells that were used in this interpretation and the values, the water level values that we used in the interpretation.

I'm sure most of you are familiar with the general configuration of the ground water flow system here and the water table. Just to point out, there's a relatively high gradient to the north of Yucca Mountain. There is a moderate gradient just to the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

west of Yucca Mountain that apparently corresponds to the Solitario Canyon fault. There's a relatively low gradient area to the south and east of the repository location.

Another feature I think that's significant here is there is apparent convergent groundwater flow system that corresponds and seems to be center on Fotymile Wash. This figure also shows the location of tertiary faults, and in some cases the correspondence between those fault locations and interpretations of the potentiometric surface, especially where those faults are apparent barriers to groundwater flow, such as Solitario Canyon fault.

I should also point out that this interpretation of potentiometric surface assumes isotropic permeability, and it does indicate generally a southeasterly flow from Yucca Mountain, and a southerly flow in the area of Fotymile Wash.

Slide 9 shows the hydrogeologic framework model that's incorporated into the site-scale flow model. The figure on the left shows the geology at the water table as interpreted from this model. This is a 3-D model domain. It's 30 kilometers by 35 kilometers by 2,750 meters below the water table. And the grid that's used in the flow modeling is a 500

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

213

meter horizontal spacing and variable resolution in the vertical direction, but the highest resolution to the grid is near the water table. The interpretation of the geology or the hydrogeology at the water table has a high degree of

complexity and resolution near the repository, and then as you move away from the repository and the high density of geologic information, the interpretation of the hydrogeology becomes more interpretive and somewhat coarser in resolution.

Slide 10 gives some information on the calibration of the site-scale flow model, and what's plotted in this figure are the simulated heads in the upper layer of the model close to the water table shown with the contours, and then the residuals in head are plotted with the various symbols and colors at individual wells.

The first thing that I should point out is 18 that the general configuration of the potentiometric 19 20 surface in the model matches the observations. We 21 compare this configuration of the simulated water 22 levels with the observed and interpreted 23 potentiometric surface. They are very similar. And most of the water levels along the flow path southeast 24 25 of the repository are accurately simulated. Those

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17
cross symbols indicate a residual or a simulated head within one meter of the observed head, so that area with mostly -- that crosses there to the south and the east of the repository indicate that the calibration is quite close to the observed values in that area.

Values of head to the north and the west of Yucca Mountain are generally under-predicted by the model. This is probably due to simplifications in the conceptual model that exist within the model domain. And also, variations in the interpretation of the meaning of the heads, particularly directly to the north of Yucca Mountain as to whether or not those are perched, that represents perched water or is actually the water table.

Simulated head along Fotymile Wash and Amargosa Desert are generally within 5 meters of measured head, but I guess the lesson -- the point I kind of want to make here is that along the flow path, the calibrated flow model does reproduce the gradients that are observed rather accurately.

Slide 11 shows the comparison between measurements of permeability and the model calibration -- the values of permeability used in the calibrated site-scale flow model, so this is another piece of information that helps gives us confidence that we're

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	216
1	realistically modeling the flow system here.
2	The Calico Hills formation, which is a
3	significant aquitard in the system. You can see the
4	red dot represents the model calibrated value. The
5	range of values for single-hole tests and for cross-
6	hole tests there are shown for comparison. For the
7	Prow Pass Tuff, the calibrated value of permeability
8	which I should point out here is given in units of
9	meters squared, is somewhat higher than the cross-hole
10	testing would indicate, and significantly higher than
11	the single-hole testing would indicate.
12	For the Bullfrog Tuff, the calibrated
13	value is very close to the cross-hole testing results,
14	and much higher than the single-hole test. We have
15	reasons to think that the single-hole testing may have
16	under-estimated permeability in this area.
17	At Tram Tuff, we do have some significant
18	difference between the calibrated permeability in the
19	model and the cross-hole testing results here, but I
20	should point out that this cross-hole testing value
21	that's given here is also in the single-test of the C-
22	wells in which the Tram Tuff is intercepted by a fault
23	in the borehole which may have biased the results
24	there.
25	With regard to the larger scale flow

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

system, the carbonate aquifer, which is rather deep in the site-scale flow model domain, there is a good match between the calibrated value of permeability and the results of single-hole testing in the carbonate aquifer. And in particular, the Bullfrog Tuff, and to a lesser extent the Prow Pass Tuff probably most important with regard to flow paths from the repository.

The next slide, Slide 12, is an Okay. confidence, provides additional data set that confirmation of the flow paths that are simulated in the site-scale flow model. This is hydrochemical data and an interpretation of hydrochemical data in which the hydrochemical data in numerous wells within the site-scale model domain have been interpreted to fall within these different hydrochemical facies, Western Yucca Mountain facies, Eastern Yucca Mountain facies, Fotymile Wash, some of the most important ones here. But the pattern that comes out of this interpretation, as indicated by the green dots here, which is the Eastern Yucca Mountain facies, is that we do have similarities in ground water chemistry from underneath the repository to the south and east, and to the south, and further to the south qivinq some the simulated flow paths confirmation to that

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

correspond to this distribution of the Eastern Yucca Mountain hydrochemical facies that's indicated here.

There is significantly different groundwater chemistry along Fotymile Wash as indicated by the yellow dots here, probably influenced by recharge along the Fotymile Wash channel. And also some significant differences in hydrochemistry just to the west of Yucca Mountain, just to the west of Solitario Canyon fault, and a couple of wells to the east of Solitario Canyon fault too. They seem to be influenced by some underflow across Solitario Canyon fault. And then the red dots here indicating part of the flow system from Crater Flat.

I should also point out that the individual chemical species that were used in this interpretation and isotopic ratios are listed under each one of these hydrochemical facies.

18 Slide 13 presents a similar hydrochemical 19 data, sort of an expanded scale here, where the 20 dissolved constituents of importance are Chloride, 21 Sulfate, Delta-Deuterium, et cetera. And these 22 indicate the same trends that I pointed out before, flow system from beneath Yucca Mountain to the south 23 and east, and then to the south, the flow system from 24 25 Crater Flat generally to the south, flow system from

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

beneath Fotymile Wash to the south, and then to the southwest, and then a flow system from Jackass Flats that sort of downs this system on the eastern side of Amargosa Desert.

So let's go on to Slide 14, and this is the Carbon-14 data set which also provides us with some confidence in the simulated transport times to the system. Now Carbon-14 is a naturally occurring radioisotope with a half-life of 5,700 years, and there are some rather severe assumptions that need to be used in the interpretation. Direct interpretation of this Carbon-14 data is that the water acquires its initial Carbon-14 content as it percolates through the soil zone, and that in the absence of any water-rock interactions, Carbon-14 content will change only as a function of radioactive decay, thus allowing a direct measurement of groundwater age or changes in groundwater age along the flow path.

However, there are some significant uncertainties associated with these assumptions. Groundwater can acquire dead carbon; that is carbon that has essentially lost its Carbon-14 content from water-rock interactions, primarily through the dissolution of Calcite during evolution of the groundwater in the aquifer. And this would lead to

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Carbon-14 ages that are anomalously old.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's also the possibility of mixing the groundwater from different sources along the flow path. In particular, in the influx of groundwater from recharge along Fotymile Wash that has a higher Carbon-14 content, and this would also complicate our interpretation of groundwater ages through the system.

So Slide 15 shows the -- this figure shows the percent modern carbon in multiple wells through the system, and what you'll see is a pattern beneath Yucca Mountain. Most of the groundwaters have between 15 and 30 percent modern carbon in them beneath Yucca Mountain, and to the south and east of Yucca Mountain. There are a few samples, in particular, the one that's anomalous here of 5 percent, this is from the Carbonate Aquifer deeper in the system where we would expect a very low Carbon-14 concentration. The two yellow dots next to Fotymile Wash there are a significantly higher percent modern carbon, probably associated with recharge in Fotymile Wash. And there has been some modeling of the Carbon-14 evolution through the system that does take into account interaction of the groundwater with dead carbon in the system, particularly with regard to percolation beneath Fotymile Wash. And putting that information

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

together with these measurements of Carbon-14, the conclusion is that groundwater velocity estimates range from about 5 to 40 meters per year corresponding to advective transport times over the 18 kilometers from beneath the repository out to the accessible environment of several hundred years to several thousand years for an unretarded species.

This is not a very definitive estimate of groundwater transport times through the system, but it does -- it is consistent with our range of modeling, and does provide some confidence that there is a connection with reality there.

Slide 16 shows some more detail about the hydrogeologic interpretation in the site-scale model domain with regard to the Alluvium given its potential significance to radionuclide transport through the system, so the figures that's shown on the left there is the interpreted thickness of the Alluvium. Generally, the Alluvium is thickest under Fotymile Wash and southward towards the Amargosa Valley. And these interpretations are based on wells and on geophysical interpretation.

I should point out that this is not saturated thickness of the Alluvium, but thickness of the Alluvium from the ground surface. And this

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

information is used to constrain the location of the tough Alluvium contact which may be important to transport simulation.

Slide 17 shows the saturated zone sitescale flow model and transport model. And I wanted to use this to explain some of the numerical methods used here. Particle tracking method is used, and this includes radionuclide transport processes of advection, dispersion, and matrix diffusion in the fractured volcanic units, insorption in the volcanic matrix, and in the Alluvium.

12 The simulated flow paths from the repository occur in the upper few hundred meters of 13 14 the saturated zone so they're relatively close to the 15 water table, and the flow rates in terms of the Darcy flux or the specific discharge vary along the flow 16 17 path from the repository, from about .7 meters per year under Yucca Mountain, increasing to about 2.4 18 19 meters per year at the 18 kilometer boundary of 20 accessible environment. So as I pointed out before, 21 this is a convergent flow system in which the specific 22 discharge increases significantly along the flow path 23 underneath the repository.

Slide 18 gives some information on our model of colloid-facilitated transport as it's

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

.9

10

11

24

25

implemented in the model. There are two modes of colloid-facilitated transport. The first one is an equilibrium model in which radionuclides can be reversibly sorbed onto colloids. The second model is which the radionuclides are either permanently sorbed or attached to the colloids through the system, and these radionuclides then just ride on the colloids through the system with no possibility of leaving the colloids.

So for the transport of radionuclides that 10 11 are reversibly attached to colloids, we assume local equilibrium, and then the colloids, the aqueous phase, 12 and the aquifer material for the sorption of these 13 14 colloids. For the radionuclides that are irreversibly 15 attached to the colloids, there's no desorption of the colloids that The colloids with the 16 occurs. irreversibly attached radionuclides are subject to 17 attachment and detachment from the mineral grains, so 18 19 the colloids themselves are subject to retardation 20 through the system, but there is no permanent 21 filtration of the colloids in the system. This is, of 22 course, a conservative assumption with regard to radionuclide transport. 23

And a small fraction of the colloids with irreversibly attached radionuclides is transported

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

through the system with no retardation. And this is as a result of the filtration kinetics in the system. Our estimates of the rate constance for kinetic attachment and detachment of colloids, and the sort of minimum transport time through the unsaturated zone and saturated zone indicates that there will be this small fraction that would not be retarded as the colloids move through the system.

Slide 19 lists all of the parameters that are considered in the uncertainty analysis for groundwater flow and radionuclide transport. I won't go through all of these in detail but there was a question earlier about which of these parameters are probably -- are most significant to our uncertainty in radionuclide transport through the system. And I would point out that probably the most important one is still our uncertainty in groundwater-specific discharge. How fast ground water is moving through the system has a significant impact on the transport simulations.

And with regard to transport, one of the parameters that's relevant to matrix diffusion is the flowing interval spacing. This is also a parameter to which there is significant sensitivity in the modeling results. And then for Neptunium transport, the

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

sorption coefficient for Neptunium onto the Alluvium is a significant parameter. So that's kind of a very quick and dirty prioritization of these parameters with regard to sensitivity.

Slide 20 shows some transport simulation What's shown in these figures here are 200 results. realizations of the system in which uncertainty in all of the -- uncertain parameters is included. The upper figure shows the simulated breakthrough curves for in this case a non-sorbing species from the water table beneath the repository to the boundary of the accessible environment.

The histogram below shows a histogram of the median transport time shown in those breakthrough curves above, so the midpoint of each one of those 16 breakthrough curves is then represented in the The red dashed line in this case histogram below. 18 shows the median of the median transport times which is between six and seven hundred years through the 20 So this suite of realization shows the system. variability in the transport times among realizations for species such as Technetium-99 and Iodine-129 extends from less than 100 years to greater than Many of these breakthrough curves 10,000 years. exhibit a long tail that's characteristic of mass

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

21

22

23

24

25

226

transfer in the rock matrix in the volcanic units, so you can discern the impact of matrix diffusion in the simulation results. And these results like the others, I want to point out that these do not include radioactive decay.

So Slide 21 shows a similar set of results 6 7 in this case for Neptunium. You can see that the simulated breakthrough curves are shifted to the right 8 9 reflecting the sorption of Neptunium in the system, and the variability here indicates, among these 10 11 realizations, that Neptunium-237 has an uncertainty 12 that extends for less than 1,000 years to greater than 13 100,000 years. And sorption and retardation for Neptunium is generally moderate in Alluvium and minor in the matrix of the fractured volcanic units. And 16 approximately half of these realizations exhibit 17 median transport times of greater than 20,000 years in the saturated zone. And I should point out, this is under present climatic conditions, and that holds true for all of these transport simulation results that I'm showing here.

Slide 22 shows similar transport simulation results for Plutonium that is reversibly attached to colloids. Here the variability in the transport times among the realizations extends from

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

> > 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

less than 10,000 years to greater than 100,000 years, which is the limit that the simulations was done here. And sorption for Plutonium is strong in the Alluvium and in the matrix of the fractured volcanic units.

The reversible colloid-facilitated transport model results here, the model that's used here result in minor enhancement of Plutonium mobility. These simulation results do show the effect of colloid-facilitated transport, but it's not a dramatic effect. That's a function of the sorption coefficients onto the colloids for Plutonium, and the colloid concentrations in the groundwater. More than half of the realizations exhibit median transport times of greater than 100,000 years under present climatic conditions.

16 So on to Slide 23, just to summarize a few 17 of the important points here. The saturated zone flow 18 model developed to evaluate what the flow directions 19 and the float rates through the system. These flow models are constrained by the regional groundwater budget, hydrochemistry, water level observations, and site-specific permeability measurements. 22 The flow model projects flow paths in generally southeasterly direction and then southwesterly direction. The flow model predicts fluxes along the flow path from beneath

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

23

24

25

227

228 1 the repository in the range of .7 to 2.4 meters per 2 year. The fraction of the flow path in the 3 Alluvium is a function of the flow path which is 4 itself sensitive to the anisotropy and permeability 5 which is an uncertain parameter, and the flow path 6 7 length in the Alluvium ranges between 1 and 10 kilometers. 8 Slide 24, the rest of the summary and 9 conclusions - matrix diffusion in the tuff and 10 been poracity in the Alluvium have 11 effective determined from tracer tests, so there is a basis for 12 this process in experimental and field results. 13 Effective transport velocities developed from the flow 14 and transport model yield transport times mostly 15 between several hundred and several thousand years for 16 unretarded species. And these transport times are 17 consistent with the Carbon-14 ages within that 18 relatively broad band of uncertainty. 19 Processes of matrix diffusion and sorption 20 have been confirmed in field tests, and uncertainty in 21

groundwater flow and radionuclide transport parameters are evaluated with the model for incorporation in the performance assessment analyses. So that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

22

23

24

25

	229
1	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very much,
2	Bill. Let's go through the questions as we've been
3	doing. Ruth.
.4	MEMBER WEINER:: Thank you for a very good
5	presentation.
6	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Mike.
7	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Bill, just a quick
8	question, and it caught my eye on the case of
9	Plutonium. Why wouldn't you account for decay?
10	Because if you look at a period around 100,000 years,
11	that's four half-lives or 80 percent decay.
12	MR. ARNOLD: I missed part of the
13	question. Can you repeat it?
14	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: I'm sorry. Yes, in
15	the case of Plutonium on Slide 22, you said, as you
16	did with all the slides, that you did not account for
17	radioactive decay. In the time period of up to
18	100,000 years, that's four half-lives or so, and
19	that's not a trivial amount of decay in your period of
20	observation or interest, so could you help me
21	understand why you didn't account for decay?
22	MR. ARNOLD: Yes. That's absolutely true.
23	Yes, thank you for pointing that out. Just for the
24	purposes of presentation of these results, these do
25	not show the effects of radioactive decay. In the
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

performance assessment calculations, radioactive decay is included as a process. We use a numerical method for coupling these results with the performance assessment calculations, and it's a convolution integral method. And radioactive decay is incorporated in that step of the analysis, in the convolution integral.

ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: I guess you did that for everything even though it might not be a big effect for some longer-lived species.

> MR. ARNOLD: Yes, that's correct. ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Okay. Thanks. MEMBER HORNBERGER: Allen. Ines.

DR. TRIAY: Yes. I would like you to expand a little bit on this third bullet on your summary and conclusions when you say that this transport - excuse me, the fourth bullet - where you say that "processes of matrix diffusion and sorption have been confirmed in field tests." Could you tell me what exactly does that mean, to what extent have they been confirmed? What does that mean from the point of view of the database for diffusion, as well as sorption? Could you fill out that sentence for me a little bit?

MR. ARNOLD: Right. Let me just make sure

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

www.nealrgross.com

	231
1	we're talking about the bullet that says, "Matrix
2	diffusion in the tuff, and effective porosity in
3	Alluvium"
4	DR. TRIAY: No, no. I'm talking about in
5	the summary and conclusions radionuclide transport,
6	page 24. I'm talking about the fourth bullet, the one
7	that starts with "processes of matrix diffusion and
8	sorption have been confirmed in field tests."
9	MR. ARNOLD: This is referring back to the
10	C-wells testing that Bob Andrews described, and the
11	ability to match the cross-hole tracer testing that
12	was done at the C-wells is taken as confirmation of
13	the process of matrix diffusion. Also, the
14	differences in the breakthrough curves for tracers
15	with different diffusion coefficients. Also, the
16	sorption process with regard to the lithium transport
17	in the tracer tests provides confirmation that the
18	process of sorption is occurring in the system. And
19	in addition, it provides some evidence that the
20	laboratory-based measurements of sorption coefficients
21	are at least applicable at this field scale, and
22	possibly even conservative relative to the field
23	scale.
24	DR. TRIAY: Can we make a statement like
25	this for colloid transport? Do you have the same type
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	232
1	of confirmatory test?
2	MR. ARNOLD: I don't believe that we can
3	make a similar statement for colloid transport at the
4	field scale. There are aspects of our colloid-
5	facilitated transport that have been confirmed at the
6	field scale with the cross-hole testing at the C-
7	wells. And the aspect I'm referring to here is the
8	retardation of colloids in the system, or the
9	reversible chemical filtration of colloids in the
10	system. However, not all aspects of the conceptual
11	model for colloid-facilitated transport have been
12	confirmed at the field scale.
13	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Jim Clarke.
14	DR. CLARKE: Bill, very nice presentation.
15	Just one question, and this may not be something you
16	have readily available, but in your first page of
17	conclusions, page 23, the last bullet, "The fraction
18	of the flow path in the Alluvium ranges between 1 and
19	10 kilometers." And I just wondered for a sorbing
20	radionuclide, what's the impact on the travel time for
21	that distance range? Is that a pretty big difference?
22	Is that something that's being characterized a little
23	better? Are you going to go with that, or what's the
24	impact of that?
25	MR. ARNOLD: There's probably a
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

significant impact to that uncertainty with regard to 1 Neptunium transport, and that's because of the 2 contrast in the sorption in the Alluvium versus the 3 volcanics, for Neptunium in particular. That 4 statement is a little bit incomplete. That range of 5 1 to 10 kilometers is not all due to our uncertainty 6 7 in flow paths, and uncertainty in the geology of the That's partly a function of variability in system. 8 flow paths depending on the site of origination 9 beneath the repository, so this 1 to 10 kilometers is 10 a combination of uncertainty in the system and 11 variability along flow paths depending on the starting 12 13 point of the flow path. Jim Davis. MEMBER HORNBERGER: 14 DR. DAVIS: Yes. This information in the 15 analysis of the hydrochemical facies, is that 16 available in one of your technical documents? 17 Yes, it is. MR. ARNOLD: There's an 18 analysis model report that's devoted entirely to this 19 subject. I can provide you with the current draft, or 20 current version of that report if you'd like. 21 DR. DAVIS: Yes, I'd like that. And one 22 other question - in looking at the Carbon-14, you have 23 the velocity estimates range from 5 to 40 meters per 24 year, and then in the particle tracking model you have 25 **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com (202) 234-4433

	234
1	flow rates ranging from .7 to 2.4 meters per year. Is
2	that the agreement in flow velocities that you're
3	referring to in the conclusions?
4	MR. ARNOLD: No, these are two different
5	quantities that are being referred to here. The .7 to
6	2.4 meters per year is specific discharge, and the 5
7	to 40 meters per year is the core velocity. What we
8	are comparing though is the conclusion of several
9	hundred years to several thousand years for unretarded
10	species, that conclusion from the Carbon-14 analysis,
11	and that result from the transport simulations.
12	DR. DAVIS: Thank you.
13	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Dick.
14	DR. PARIZEK: Several questions. One, in
15	terms of the site-scale model, as you know, I guess
16	your regional flow model was used to constrain the
17	input to the site-scale model, and it was the old
18	three layer Valley Regional Flow Model of the survey
19	that was used. If you look at the updated model, the
20	flux boundaries aren't necessarily the same any more,
21	and the quantities you are entering in the site-scale
22	model differ, and also in some cases even direction of
23	flow differs. What difference might that make in the
24	site-scale model forecast that you've summarized
25	today, if you updated it with a multilayer model

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	that	's	now
--	------	----	-----

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

MR. ARNOLD: Well, that is being analyzed. There are some preliminary results with regard to that, and there is an update to the flow model AMR in which the impacts of those -- the new Regional Scale Flow Model are assessed. It may be premature for me to state what those conclusions are at this point, because that's still in draft.

available?

DR. PARIZEK: Okay. So it's something that's being worked on, in any event.

> MR. ARNOLD: Yes.

DR. PARIZEK: Is there any permeability contrast for the bedrock that would give you flow directions that would be more southerly than what you show on -- well, the page that gives us the red flow lines, I guess it's page 3. And once again, unlike what Jim Winterle showed us earlier, but is there any way to get the flow to go south that's credible based on permeability contrast within the tuff units?

20 Well, one thing I should MR. ARNOLD: 21 point out is we do consider anisotropy, horizontal anisotropy and permeability in the volcanic units. And the results that are shown here on page 3 are for isotropic conditions. And the full assessment of uncertainty as shown in those breakthrough curves

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

actually at the end of this report, these flow paths do vary from realization to realization. And when the horizontal anisotropy is high, as it is in some realizations, as high as a factor of 20 in the northsouth direction versus the east-west direction, the flow paths are simulated to be in a more north-south direction.

And that horizontal anisotropy is kind of a lumped parameter. It sort of implicitly considers the kind of permeability contrast I think you might be referring to here, higher permeability in north-south oriented faults, or lower permeability across barriers that are oriented in the north-south direction that would lead to that anisotropy in a more north-south direction.

DR. PARIZEK: That's the one that gives you that 1 kilometer distance of travel in Alluvium, the shortest of the range from 1 to 10 kilometers, if you take that --

MR. ARNOLD: That's right. The travel, that distance of only 1 kilometer corresponds to a case in which you have a high anisotropy, and the flow path is more north-south, and the source originates from the southern end of the repository.

DR. PARIZEK: And would you expect the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

effective poracity and matrix diffusion numbers that you use to vary if you went through a long-term tracer experiment? I guess most of what's happened to the Alluvium has so far been short-term push-pull-type testing. But again, if the long-term experiments are run as originally planned, do you think that would change the effective poracity and/or diffusion

MR. ARNOLD: Well, my impression is that the uncertainty distribution we're using for effective poracity in Alluvium now is really a bias towards a high or a low value. I think it's probably a good estimate. It's got a fair amount of uncertainty in it. We would certainly reassess that uncertainty distribution with the results from a large scale cross-hole tracer test in the Alluvium, and I think it would reduce our uncertainty in that parameter, and give us greater confidence in what we're using in the model.

20 DR. PARIZEK: All right. And is there any input to the science testing, the confirmation testing 21 flow 22 dealing with saturated zone and program 23 transport? Are there any studies included in there, or is that maybe a premature comment on a report 24 that's due out later in the year. 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

properties?

	238
1	MR. ARNOLD: I'm not personally very
2	familiar with what's in that report, the confirmation
3	plan anyway. There is some work in the science and
4	technology area.
5	DR. PARIZEK: You have some proposals for
6	the science and technology program. Could you kind of
7	give us some details of what those might include, or
.8	hints at what's involved in the science and technology
9	area?
10	MR. ARNOLD: I'll let Drew Coleman make
11	some comments on that.
12	MR. COLEMAN: Yes. This is Drew Coleman,
13	DOE's Saturated Zone Lead. Yes, we have in the
14	confirmation plan to finish the Alluvial Tracer
15	Complex testing, be kind of contingent on the ability
16	to get permit from the state to finish that testing,
17	but that's in the performance confirmation plan. And
18	then they have in the science and technology program,
19	they have a long-term pump test that we're working on
20	the details of right now, sort of planning it with a
21	view towards maybe doing the testing in `05. And then
22	there's also a natural gradient test where you would
23	put tracers in and let them travel under the natural
24	gradient, and try to collect them in some reasonable
25	amount of time at a downstream point. Those are some
	NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

Π

	239
1	of the saturated zone plans in the next one or two
2	year time frame.
3	DR. PARIZEK: Drew, that `05 long-term
4	test would be for Alluvium, an Alluvial Complex Test,
5	or is that another bedrock test?
6	MR. COLEMAN: I believe that would be up
7	in the volcanics this time. There's also the Nye
8	County Tracer tests that we're going to have going in
9	the Alluvium. It's a little north of the original
10	tracer test and that ought to even be going a little
11	sooner than `05, maybe late `04 here.
12	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Don, do you have
13	questions?
14	DR. SHETTEL: Yes, I have one comment.
15	The biggest problem I see in the saturated zone is the
16	question of colloids. And I don't know how this is
17	going to get resolved, but one thing from the past is
18	the migration of Plutonium from the Benham underground
19	test. Is any of that work being incorporated into
20	saturated zone?
21	MR. ARNOLD: In a conceptual level it is,
22	because we do have this fast fraction of colloids
23	which move through the system that radionuclides
24	irreversibly attach to them. And that fraction is not
25	subject to filtration or retardation of any kind. And
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

1	240
1	that is consistent with the observation of Bob.
2	DR. SHETTEL: What proportion is the fast
3	fraction of
4	MR. ARNOLD: For our analysis in the
5	saturated zone, it's a small fraction. It's less than
6	1 percent, but I don't have the number right here.
7	DR. SHETTEL: Okay. Thank you.
8	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thanks very much,
9	Bill. Abe Van Luik had an item that he wanted to
10	present. Abe.
11	MR. VAN LUIK: Yes. What I did was I
12	faxed a couple of sheets of paper. I noted listening
13	to Dr. Davis this morning that he's a familiar figure
14	at the Nuclear Energy Agency. He has contributed to
15	several meetings on these types of topics, and I just
16	wanted the group I know that most of you are aware
17	of this, some of you may not be, to be aware that
18	there are actually documents that have been created
19	through the Nuclear Energy Agency looking at these
20	topics that we're discussing today. And I noticed in
21	the two examples that I give the front page and the
22	table of contents for in my fax, that actually DOE,
23	Sandia mostly, and in one case MTS, NRC through the
24	Center, and USGS through Davis has participated in
25	producing both of these products. And I think it's
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

interesting to look at the first page of my fax, which was taken directly from that website that you can access, anyone can access. And it shows that this first document on using thermodynamic sorption models for guiding KD investigations was published in 2001. They completed Phase 1 of the NEA sorption project, and Phase 2 is going into a lot of the stuff that was mentioned in the Q&A on the Davis talk; which is, what about Neptunium, what about some of these other questions?

I think Phase 2 is going on without U.S. participation, which is unfortunate but that's just kind of the way it happened, but it will be completed pretty soon, and a document will be available to us. So I just wanted people to be aware that there are resources internationally, especially when it comes to saturated zone transport. Every repository program in the world is looking at saturated zone transport.

And in the other document, "Radionuclide Retention in Geologic Media", it has a section on matrix diffusion. To the question does it exist, it says yes. And then it's kind of like Bob Andrews, there's a but after that. And it speaks of colloids. There's been a lot of work done by Dick Eldra, especially, in the European Union on colloids, and so

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

241

1 we're aware of these things. We try to participat 2 those, so does the NRC, so does the USGS. Ar 3 thought that those of you not familiar with till 4 documents ought to become aware of them. Thank 5 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very m 6 Abe. So we're finally at the point on our provident of that says it's 4:15, and we now have time schedd 8 for public comments. And I think what we'll do 9 we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are 10 public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas? 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of comm 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introd 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is J 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd like 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for		242
2 those, so does the NRC, so does the USGS. Ar 3 thought that those of you not familiar with the 4 documents ought to become aware of them. Thank for 5 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very me 6 Abe. So we're finally at the point on our proof 7 that says it's 4:15, and we now have time schedd 8 for public comments. And I think what we'll do 9 we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are 10 public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas? 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of community of thick to make. I'll introduce myself first. 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce myself first. 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is and the second review behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have a couple of things to say to that extent, and the second review behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have a couple of things to say to that extent, and the second review of the to the committee and to keep it for record. 24 I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas Payute Extend to the chair of o	1	we're aware of these things. We try to participate in
3 thought that those of you not familiar with the 4 documents ought to become aware of them. Thank in 5 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very me 6 Abe. So we're finally at the point on our provident that says it's 4:15, and we now have time schedder 8 for public comments. And I think what we'll do 9 we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are 10 public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas? 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of comments 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introd 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is J 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our	2	those, so does the NRC, so does the USGS. And I
4 documents ought to become aware of them. Thank in MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very mm 5 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very mm 6 Abe. So we're finally at the point on our proportion of that says it's 4:15, and we now have time schedd for public comments. And I think what we'll do we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 10 we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas. Okay. 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of community of like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce myself first. 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is a second review behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have a couple of things to say to that extent, and the have my own personal comment in general. I'd like pass it to the committee and to keep it for record. 24 I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	3	thought that those of you not familiar with these
5 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very m 6 Abe. So we're finally at the point on our proview that says it's 4:15, and we now have time schedd 7 that says it's 4:15, and we now have time schedd 8 for public comments. And I think what we'll do 9 we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are 10 public comments. And then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas? 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of community. 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce yourself first. 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is and couple of things to say to that extent, and the product of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have couple of things to say to that extent, and the pass it to the committee and to keep it for record. 24 I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	4	documents ought to become aware of them. Thank you.
6 Abe. So we're finally at the point on our provident that says it's 4:15, and we now have time schedd for public comments. And I think what we'll do we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 10 we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas. Okay. 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of community of the to make. I'll introduce myself first. 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce myself first. 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is a second review behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have complete of things to say to that extent, and the have my own personal comment in general. I'd like pass it to the committee and to keep it for record. 24 I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	5	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very much.
7 that says it's 4:15, and we now have time schede for public comments. And I think what we'll de we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. we have comments from people in Las Vegas? MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of comments I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. you hear me? MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please intrody yourself first. MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is a Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have couple of things to say to that extent, and the have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik pass it to the committee and to keep it for record. I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	6	Abe. So we're finally at the point on our program
8 for public comments. And I think what we'll do 9 we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are 10 public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas? 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of community of the to make. I'll introduce myself first. 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce yourself first. 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is domain of the tas Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have my own personal comment in general. I'd like pass it to the committee and to keep it for record. 24 I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	7	that says it's 4:15, and we now have time scheduled
9 we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are 10 public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas? 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of community 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is and the second review 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the have my own personal comment in general. I'd like 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd like 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for record. 24 I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	8	for public comments. And I think what we'll do is
10 public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. 11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas? 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of commentation 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is and the second review 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the have my own personal comment in general. I'd like 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd like 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	9	we'll start here in Rockville to see if there are any
11 we have comments from people in Las Vegas? 12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of comm 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is J 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd like 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas	10	public comments, and then go to Las Vegas. Okay. Do
12 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of comm 13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is descendents 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd like 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	11	we have comments from people in Las Vegas?
13 I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. 14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce myself first. 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is descendent in the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have comple of things to say to that extent, and the have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik 20 couple of the committee and to keep it for record. 24 I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	12	MR. ELZEFTAWY: I have a couple of comments
14 you hear me? 15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please intro- 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is J 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS	13	I'd like to make. I'll introduce myself first. Can
15 MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please intro 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is a 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas	14	you hear me?
 16 yourself first. 17 MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is . 18 Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review 19 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have 20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas 	15	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Yes. Please introduce
17MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is18Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review19behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have20couple of things to say to that extent, and the21have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik22pass it to the committee and to keep it for23record.24I presented these two questions to25chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las VegasNEAL R. GROSS	16	yourself first.
18Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review19behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have20couple of things to say to that extent, and the21have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik22pass it to the committee and to keep it for23record.24I presented these two questions to25chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las VegasNEAL R. GROSS	17	MR. ELZEFTAWY: I will. My name is Atef
 behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have couple of things to say to that extent, and the have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik pass it to the committee and to keep it for record. I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas NEAL R. GROSS 	18	Elzeftawy, and I'm here for the second review on
20 couple of things to say to that extent, and the 21 have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik 22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Veg NEAL R. GROSS	19	behalf of the Las Vegas Payute Tribe. And I have a
 have my own personal comment in general. I'd lik pass it to the committee and to keep it for record. I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Veg 	20	couple of things to say to that extent, and then I
22 pass it to the committee and to keep it for 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Veg NEAL R. GROSS	21	have my own personal comment in general. I'd like to
 23 record. 24 I presented these two questions to 25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Veg NEAL R. GROSS 	22	pass it to the committee and to keep it for the
I presented these two questions to chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Veg NEAL R. GROSS	23	record.
25 chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Ven NEAL R. GROSS	24	I presented these two questions to the
NEAL R. GROSS	25	chair of our Las Vegas Payute Tribe here in Las Vegas,
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON. D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrord		NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON. D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealroross.com

1 my answer to that, based on what I know so far and 2 about the Yucca Mountain program in general, is that 3 after all those years, we have not really nailed down 4 the so-called expected behavior of radionuclides in the tuff and the valley. In other words, we have not 5 really got enough data for us to say is this the 6 distribution of this behavior, is log-normal or normal 7 8 distribution, or a gamma function, or whatever that 9 is. We know that we have some data. We know the DOE 10 has provided some information, but what does it mean 11 to the normal person might not be really there. 12 The second question I think that was very 13 good with regard to the conceptual models and the mathematicals, implementation of the site data, and 14 15 the confidence of the site data with regard to the 16 recordation of the radionuclides. 17 We all have our own - that's exactly what 18 I said - we all have our own conception models, now ideas as scientists, and as people. We also have our 19 20 mathematical implementations. But I think it's going 21 to come down to the site data that would provide 22 enough confidence beyond 50 percent range to say that 23 the geosphere can retard, not may - remember, there's 24 a big difference between can and may - can retard the 25 transport of the radioactive materials in the system.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

> > WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

So far, my personal comment now as a public citizen is that in 1983 when I looked at the data of the saturated zone hydrogeology back with the NRC, we made the comment that it looks like surface groundwater moving toward the south, maybe a little bit southwest. After all these models, and after 21 years of work, the Department of Energy have not really made any different interpretation, or maybe to bind the groundwater system of the Amargosa Desert area.

I have a problem with all the beautiful models we have and all the money we spent. I haven't seen somebody to sort of push the envelope a little bit with regard to the models. The fellow who talks about the recharge, how about trying 5, and 10, and 15, 20 millimeters per year recharge and find out how the system is going to react using what you have done.

I have one comment to Ruth. 18 I'm not really sure what's her last name, but if you go back 19 20 to the University of California at Berkeley, there was 21 a paper under Hilgardia published in, I think, 1973-74 related to the so-called soil water or porous media 22 23 parameters that we really deal with with regard to the The soil moisture, retention 24 unsaturated zone. curves, the hydraulic conductivities, the retardation 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.neairgross.com

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

factors and all that. I think you need to get it and read it, and find out what Don Nielson has published in 1973-74.

I published a paper when I was working for my second Ph.D. degree in 1973 in the University of Florida, way back then, and it was dealing about the absorption of the Tritium in just the porous media. You'll find that. I think I have a copy at home, but go and find it and find out what was said about the absorption and desorption of the Tritium. And I'm not talking about radionuclide with big veins.

The gentleman by name, Jim Davis, who has 12 a presentation that I didn't see, I think I told Al 13 Freas and John Cherry in 1979 that that figure that you quoted from him is really misleading. Actually, 16 it's scientifically wrong. I'm not sure if Al Freas and John Cherry has corrected that or not, but it's misleading to have this figure. It talks about "Sorbing Solutes and Non-Reactive Tracer". I think you need to switch that back and forth because if we 21 talk about the sorbing solutes breakthrough curve, that tells me that this is only the aero function distribution, and that is not the aero function distribution.

There is a non-reactive tracer flat in the

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

curve, and that is not true. Usually, the nonreactive tracer acts as a "piston flow" in the porous media analysis, so I think you need to correct that draft. You quoted it wrong.

5 And one of the things I wanted to mention, way back then when we were working under the 10 CFR 6 7 60, we were talking about the 1,000 year groundwater travel time. During the public meeting of the Nuclear 8 9 Transportation Research Board, if they changed the 10 name, whatever the case may be - the Department of 11 Energy made the comment - Russell himself made the 12 comments about the transport of the radionuclide in system, in porous system unsaturated or saturated. 13 And he said they have nothing to do with the existing 14 15 regulation, 10 CFR 63. So my question to you as a 16 public citizen, why are we sitting here in a sense 17 wasting all that time trying to find out the nittygritty of the absorption, desorbtion, reversible 18 19 groundwater travel time and all that, and the 20 Department of Energy and the NRC already made the 21 decision that they are not going to consider that, 22 except in the performance analysis. So how can you relate all the things you do today with regard to the 23 licensing? That's really what the bottom line is. 24 25 And that probably concludes my comments.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

www.neairgross.com

	247
1	MEMBER HORNBERGER: Thank you very much.
2	Do we have any other comments? All right. Well,
3	we've actually made it to our 5:15 ending point. I
4	turn it back to you, Mr. Chairman.
5	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: If there are no
6	further comments or observations, we will adjourn for
7	the day.
8	DR. CLARKE: And you're going to reconvene
9	at 9 tomorrow morning.
1.0	ACTING CHAIRMAN RYAN: Yes, I'm sorry. We
11	will reconvene and start at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.
12	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above-
13	entitled matter went off the record at 5:16:59 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. (202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Name of Proceeding: Advisory Committee on

Nuclear Waste

151st Meeting

Docket Number: n/a

Location: Rockville, MD

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

Rebecca Davis Official Reporter Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433