LABORATORY NOTEBOOK

LABORATORY NOTEBOOK

NOTEBOOK NO.

CONTINUED FROM NOTEBOOK NO. CONTINUED TO NOTEBOOK NO.

ASSIGNED TO:

NAME Anna Buseman-Williams

SIGNATURE Anna Buseman-Williams DATE 6/14/06

DATE ISSUED BY

PHONE EMAIL abuseman@cnwra.swri.edu

COMPANY Southwest Research Institute

DEPARTMENT CNWRA

ADDRESS 6220 Culebra Rd.

CITY San Antonio, [TX] STATE ZIP 78238

DATE NOTEBOOK COMPLETED NUMBER OF PAGES FILLED IN

NOTES:

CNWRA
CONTROLLED
COPY 804

WWW.BOOKFACTORY.COM

Data and Results from Validation Test of SLIM
IM 20.06002.01.272.804
WordPerfect and ASCII formats

(rjl 6/4/2007)

804
BOOK NO.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

i ~~page 4~~ (rjl 6/4/2007)

Project Title: Validation of SLIM

PAGE 4	SUBJECT	DATE
1	Objectives	06/14/06
2	This notebook documents work performed	aMJ
3	for the validation ~~for~~ of SLIM. (aMJ 6.14.06) The objective	
4	of the study is to verify the accuracy of	
5	SLIM by developing simple test cases and	
6	comparing the analytical and numerical	
7	solutions of each contaminant transport.	
8	SLIM will be used for the purpose of simulating	
9	the transport of potentially highly	
10	contaminated groundwater through areas	
11	that surround the waste repository at	
12	Yucca Mountain. This notebook uses	
13	~~previous~~ aMJ 6.14.06 analytical solutions performed	
14	previously for the validation of MT3D found	
15	in Scientific Notebook 727E. The validation	
16	will be used to support project # 06002.01.282	
17	and is intended to address the criteria of	
18	CNWRA QAP-001.	
19	Computers, Computer Codes, & Data Files	
20	SLIM, the computer code used to simulate	
21	solute transport, was originally developed by	
22	Andrew F.B. Tompson at M.I.T (Massachusetts	
23	Institute of Technology) and was later	
24	developed at Lawrence Livermore National	
25	Laboratory.	
26	The analytical solutions were coded using	
27	MATLAB Version 7.0.1.	
28	The SLIM code was slightly modified by	
29	David Farrell for SwRI's applications. These	
30	modifications are detailed in Scientific	
31	Notebook 735.	
32		

	SUBJECT	DATE
33	Introduction	
34	SLIM is a general purpose three-dimensional	6.15.06
35	particle-grid transport model for saturated	aRW
36	or unsaturated flows with reactions. It	
37	solves the three-dimensional advective-	
38	dispersive-reactive equation describing	
39	solute transport using the random-walk	
40	particle algorithm. This method represents	
41	the solute mass as a large collection of	
42	particles, each of which is moved by random	
43	displacement over discrete increments	
44	of time. The magnitudes of each displace-	
45	ment depend directly on the velocity	
46	and dispersion tensor.	
47	SLIM was chosen for use in this project in	
48	an attempt to reduce run time.	
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58	aRW 6.15.06	
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		

	SUBJECT	DATE
65	Theoretical/Computer Analyses: Results	6.15.06
66	Numerical ~~and analytical models~~ models were aRW 6.15.06	aRW
67	completed for a one-dimensional flow field,	
68	as well as a three-dimensional, both w/ ~~a~~ aRW 6.15.06	
69	continuous sources. It was expected that ~~both~~ all aRW 6.15.06	
70	numerical solutions would agree with the	
71	analytical solutions generated for the	
72	validation of MT3D (Scientific Notebook	
73	727E).	
74		
75	- One-dimensional Transport in a Uniform Flow-	
76	Field: Procedure	
77		
78	In order to compare results w/ already	
79	completed analytical solutions, SLIM will be	
80	used to complete a simulation of a simple	
81	benchmark problem from MT3DMS User's	
82	Guide (Zheng & Wang 1999).	
83		
84	The parameters are as follows:	
85	v (groundwater seepage velocity) = 0.24 m/day	
86	n (porosity) = 0.25	
87	t (simulation time) = 2000 days	
88	L (length) = 1010 meters	
89		
90	Two cases of one-dimensional flow ~~will be~~ aRW 6.15	
91	were completed. In the first, Case 1a, advection	
92	and dispersion were present ($\alpha_x = 10$ m, $R=0, \lambda=0$),	
	while the second added in decay as	
	well ($\lambda = 0.002\ d^{-1}$).	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOOK NO.

SUBJECT | DATE

Because SLIM does not have the capability to input the decay rate constant, λ, the decay case output is found by multiplying the advection & dispersion case by $e^{-\lambda t}$. Therefore it was only necessary to simulate one one-dimensional case in SLIM. — 6.15.06 aaw

The approach in this analysis is summarized below: — 6.19.06 aaw

It was first necessary to change the parameters in the input files to the values indicated on the previous page. These input files are "rxn.1.dat", "rxn.2.dat", "poros," and "files.dat."

In "poros" the values were changed to 0.25. It was ensured that the number of data changed was sufficient enough to cover the size of the whole grid.

"Files.dat" is found below:

Software Validation_SLM\Code\1d run\files.dat

```
rxn.1.dat
rxn.2.dat
slim3.log
slim3.err
plotm.dat
plotM1.dat
plotc.dat
plotC1.dat
plotp.capture
plotb.dat
plotw.dat
poros

KD_FILE
365.0E+07 FLUXZ
```

note: all electronic files are contained on the Software Validation-SLM disc

BOOK NO. PROJECT

6.19.06 aaw

The majority of the input paraments are found in "rxn.1.dat". Below is the file used for the one-dimensional flow cases.

```
1                                   ! run number
102,2,2                             ! nx,ny,nz: discretization (128,128,64)
10.,1.,1.                           ! dx,dy,dz: discretization increment (feet)
1,0,0                               ! mx,my,mz: specify dimensions of the
problem (1,1,1) ⟶ indicates only 1-d flow (1,0,0)
10.,0.0,0.0                         ! al,ath,atv: dispersivities (1.0,0.1)
8000000                             ! npmax: max. num. particles per component
(19000)
0.,2000,10.,2000      ! t-init,t-max,dt,tcut: initial time, max time
lim., time step, cutoff time for inflow mass (0,50000,10.,100000)
0                                   ! itime (0): controls time step
1,0,1,0 ⟶ 1 Dirichlet boundary!     ! ibounc1(0),ibounc2(0),nbounc (0),initpar
(1): Dirichlet, Neuman, tot. bound. cond.s, initial part. distrib.
0,0                                 ! ixm,ixp (0,0): boundary reflection
indicators
0,0                                 ! iym,iyp (0,0): boundary reflection
indicators
0,0                                 ! izm,izp (0,0): boundary reflection
indicators
560,350                             ! iup,iud (210467,361223): particle
displacement seed, particle dispersion seed ⟶ random
10,10                               ! interv,intervp (10,201): printout interval for
end-of-time-step results, printout interval for end-of-time-step plot
data
1,1,1,1,0                           ! iplotm,iplotb,iplotc,iplotp,iplocp
(0,0,1,0,1): moment plot, breakthrough plot, contour plot, particle
point plot, conc. vs time plot
1.,0                                ! ver (0-1),isvel (1-2): dispersion scaling
factor, spatially variable velocities
1                                   ! intrp
1,0,1                               ! ncomp,ncomps,nr (125,1250,1000)
0,0                                 ! irxn,issorb
1                                   ! iplace (0 - account for particles
remaining in the source cell at the end of the time step)
```

Software Validation_SLM\Code\1d run\rxn.1.dat

Because the "isvel" value is set to 0, this indicates that the velocity will be explicitly defined in subroutine input3. So in the file "slim3z-por-disp-update.for" on line 1383 the value for vel(1,j) was set to 0.24.

INVENTOR SIGNATURE | PRINTED NAME | DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY | PRINTED NAME | DATE

~~page 6~~ (rjl 6/4/2007)

~~PAGE 6~~ (rjl 6/4/2007)

6.19.06 aBW

In the "rxn.2.dat" file data regarding phase ~~of~~ aBW 6.19.06 components and boundary conditions are inputted. Below is the "rxn.2.dat" input file for the one-dimensional flow test cases:

```
-----------------------------------------------
solid phase mineral data
-----------------------------------------------

MINERAL A
0    0    0                                (3)
0. .0    0                               (1.0)
0. .0    .0                              (1.5)

-----------------------------------------------
liquid phase component data
-----------------------------------------------

COMPONENT A
1.0 0.

-----------------------------------------------
initial liquid phase component mass distribution
-----------------------------------------------

0, 0.00
0, 0.00
-----------------------------------------------
specified dirichlet boundary conditions
-----------------------------------------------
cell #   mass into cell
1, 0, 100000.00, 0.00, 0.00
0, 0, 0., 0.00, 0.00
0, 0, 0., 0., 0.

-----------------------------------------------
specified neuman boundary conditions
-----------------------------------------------

0, 0, 0.00, 0.00, 0.00
```

Software validation-SLIM\Code\1d run\rxn.2.dat

The first line of information under "specified durichlet boundary conditions" indicates that 100,000 particles are inputted into cell 1.

~~page 7~~ (rjl 6/4/2007)

~~page 7~~ (rjl 6/4/2007)

6.19.06 aBW

According to Tompson et. al (1987), as the number of particles increases the noise is reduced. Therefore it is expected that if excess noise is present, increasing that value will mitigate this error.

After it was ensured that the initial parameters were inputted correctly, "slim3z-por-disp-update.for" was compiled by typing LF95 slim3z-por-disp-update.for at the DOS command prompt. This produces a new application, MAP & OBJ files. Now the file was run by typing "slim3z-por-disp-update.exe" at the command ~~plot~~ prompt. aBW 6.19.06 Upon completion of running the application, new plotp (CAPTURE file), plotm.dat, plotC1.dat, plotc.dat, and plotb.dat files ~~are~~ we aBW 6.19.06 produced. A text document entitled "slum3" was also produced. It contains parameters, time steps, errors, and other data associated with the run completed. plotc.dat ~~plotp.capture~~ aBW 6.19.06 is the output file of concern because it contains the concentration at each printout time. However because plotc is a binary file it must be ~~re-run~~ aBW 6.19.06 compiled using the slum2tec_3d_update.for file in order to have the ability to read it.

The output file resulting from this will contain the concentrations at a given distance and can then be compared with the analytical solutions in MATLAB.

~~page 8~~ (rjl 6/4/2007)

~~page 8~~ (rjl 6/4/2007)

6.19.06 aBW

In summary the procedure is as follows:

(1) input initial parameters in appropriate files.

(2) compile & execute slim3z-por-disp-update.

(3) compile & execute slim2tec-3d-update. to obtain the plotc OUT file at the necessary times.

(4) plot numerical solution in MATLAB (c/c_0 vs. distance) for comparison with the analytical solution from scientific notebook 727E.

7.10.06 aBW

One-Dimensional Transport in a Uniform Flow Field: Results

Figure 1 displays a relative concentration vs. time graph for the analytical & numerical solution for 1-d transport w/ advection & dispersion. Some "noise" is present for the first ~300 meters, but it is expected that further increasing the number of particles would reduce this, as stated earlier. aBW 7.10.06 The analytical and numerical solution are very similar, and the root mean square values were calculated to be less than 1%. aBW 7.10.06 Figure 2 displays the plot with the addition of decay. The numerical and analytical solutions are very close, as expected, and the root mean square values are below 1% as well. From these results it can be concluded that SLIM is an accurate model for one-dimensional transport w/ advection, dispersion, and decay.

~~page 9~~ (rjl 6/4/2007)

7.10.06 aBW

from: Software Validation - SLIM\Code\1d run\Final Results\no decay\oned_comparisons MATLAB



Figure 1: Comparisons of Analytical Solutions and Numerical Solution for 1-d Transport w/ Advection & Longitudinal Dispersion

(rjl 6/4/2007) → ~~page 10~~

~~page 10~~ ←

7.10.06
ABW

from: Software Validation-SLIM\Code\1d run\Final Results\decay\analytical solution_1d.MATLAB



Figure 2: Comparison of the analytical solution and numerical solution for 1-d transport w/ advection, longitudinal dispersion, & decay

~~page 11~~ ← (rjl 6/4/2007) → ~~page 11~~

7.10.06
ABW

Three-Dimensional Transport in a Uniform Flow Field: Procedure

The 3d procedure was very similar to that of the 1d test cases. SLIM will be used to simulate a 3-d transport w/ advection & dispersion. The transport will be a slightly modified version of Example 17.6 provided by Domenico & Schwartz (1990). No decay is present. ABW 7.10.06

The parameters are as follows:

$\alpha_x = 1.0$ m	$t = 5470$ days
$\alpha_y = 0.1$ m	$Y = 15$ m (source size y-direction)
$\alpha_z = 0.01$ m	$Z = 10$ m (source size z-direction)
$\theta = 0.300$	$V = 0.05$ m/days

7.18.06
ABW

The slightly modified version of the analytical solution performed for the validation of MT3D in MATLAB is found below.

```
% This program was written by Anna Buseman-Williams to solve a variation of example 17.6
in Domenico and Schwartz
% on pg. 653. It demonstrates three dimensional spreading of a plume in a one-dimensional
velocity
% field (y=0 and z=0) with no retardation.

%Define Constants

v=0.05; % groundwater velocity (m/day)
alfx=1.0; % dispersivity (m)
alfy=0.10; % dispersivity (m)
alfz=0.01; % dispersivity (m)
Y=15; %source size (m)
Z=10; %source size (m)
x=[0:10:600]; %distance intervals in x-distance (m)
t=5470; % time (days)
```

Software Validation-SLIM\Code\3d run\David\3d Results\threed.m

~~page 12~~ ← (rjl: 6/4/2007) → ~~page 12~~

7.18.06
abw

```
% The analytical solution was found in "Physical and Chemical Hydrogeology"
% by Domenico and Schwartz on pg. 647.

a=erfc((x-(v*t))/(2*sqrt(alfx*v*t)));
aa=double(a); %double precision
b=erf((Y)./(4*sqrt(x.*alfy)));
bb=double(b); %double precision
c=erf((Z)./(4*sqrt(x.*alfz)));
cc=double(c); %double precision
Co=(1/2).*aa.*bb.*cc; % where C is relative concentration
xo=[5:10:605;] %adjust the distance to account for SLIM calculating conc at midpt. of
cells
plot(xo,Co) %plots analytical solution
xlim([0 700]); %sets the x-axis scale to 0 to 700 meters
ylim([0 1]); %sets the y-axis scale to 0 to 1.0
xlabel('Distance (m)')
ylabel('C/Co')
hold on
```

It is important to note that when plotting the analytical solution the x-distances need to be at the midpoints in order to agree w/ the SLIM solution. If not, the graphs will be slightly off. This correction was needed when I found my numerical solution to be off.

• Three-dimensional Transport: Results.

Several runs of the numerical solution were completed. Run 1 consisted of nx, ny, nz values of 72, 10 and 8 respectively and dx, dy, dz values of 10, 15, and 10 in order to correspond to the source size values of 15 and 10 meters in the analytical solution. The cell in which initial particles were inputted was calculated to be located at i=10, j=5 and K=4 (x=90m, y=60m & z=30m)

~~page 13~~ ← (rjl 6/4/2007) → ~~page 13~~

7.18.06
abw

using the equation: source cell = (mx * my) * (iz-1) + mx(iy-1) + ix
where ix, iy & iz are the cell index and mx, my, mz are the number of cells in the respective direction (or nx-1, ny-1, nz-1)

This equation resulted in 20,000 particles being inputted into cell # 2211. It was also ensured that the "poros" file was adjusted to the number of lines needed to cover the whole grid, and the slim2tec file was corrected so the discretization corresponded to the parameters in the rxn.1.dat file. It is important to note that when entering these values in the slim2tec file mx, my & mz should be inputted, not nx, ny & nz. Figure 3 displays the result of a comparison of the first run w/ the analytical solution.



Figure 3: comparison of Run 1 (numerical solution) and the analytical solution for 3-d transport (from threed.m)

BOOK NO. PROJECT

~~page 14~~ (rjl 6/4/2007) ~~page 14~~

7.18.06 abw

As shown by Figure 3, the numerical and analytical are significantly off. Some possible solutions to this error are to decrease dy & dx to ensure enough particles are put in the source cell downstream and to continue to use a large amount of particles. Also to ensure that the data from the plotc OUT file is selected for the appropriate source cell.
The table below documents each run and notes on the results. The information in the table represents the significant changes made in each file.

file name	rxn.1.dat (nx,ny,nz dx,dy,dz)	rxn.2.dat (starting cell, # of part.)	starting source cell	slum2tec_...	poros file (# of lines)
Run 1	72,10,8 10,15,10	2211, 20,000	i=10 j=~~13~~ 6 k=~~7~~ 1 abw 7.18	71,9,7 10,15,10	448
plotc1	72,10,8 ~~10,15,10~~ 10,5,5 abw 7.18	abw 7.18 ~~2211, 20,000~~ 12364 12435 12506 14281 14352 14423 1,000	i=10 j=13 k=7 (6)	71,27,17 10,5,5	~~448~~ 2684 abw 7.18 *a lot of oscillating occur
plotc2	"	" 10,000	"	"	" *grid is smoother, but further refinement necessary
plotc3	72,46,36 10,3,2	49355... 62419 1,000	i=10 j=21 k=16 (25)	71,45,35 10,3,2	11,183 *a lot of oscillating/ noise occur for 1st 250 meters
plotc4	"	" 10,000	"	"	" *run not complete max # particles exceeded
plotc5	"	" 5,000	"	"	*matches better w/ analytical solution, noise still present

INVENTOR SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

BOOK NO. PROJECT

~~page 15~~ (rjl 6/4/2007) ~~page 15~~

7.18.06 abw

After increasing the max number of particles in rxn.1.dat file to 15,000,000 and increasing the htest value in the source code, two additional runs were completed to reduce noise in the numerical solution.

filename	rxn.1.dat	rxn.2.dat	starting source cell	slum2tec_...	poros file
plotc6	"	" 10,000	"	"	" *noise still present
plotc7	"	" 15,000	"	"	" *only slightly off from 100-300 m

Figure 4 displays a comparison of plotc7 and the analytical solution. It is slightly off @ the beginning distances, but it is expected that if the number of particles was increased, this noise would be reduced. The root mean square error value was calculated using Excel to be approximately 2 percent. It is important to note that while running plotc7, as well as the other runs w/ large amounts of sources &/or particles, a warning was given after compiling the source code. This warning stated that the total image size exceeds the maximum and that the image may not run, however this warning does not appear to affect the result. From the results, it can be concluded that SLIM is an accurate model for three-dimensional

INVENTOR SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

BOOK NO.

PROJECT

~~page 16~~ ← (rjl 6/4/2007) → ~~page 16~~

7.18.06
aBW



from: threed.m

Figure 4: Comparison of the analytical solution and numerical solution for 3-d transport w/ advection & dispersion

INVENTOR SIGNATURE | PRINTED NAME | DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY | PRINTED NAME | DATE

BOOK NO.

PROJECT

page 17 ← (rjl 6/4/2007) → page 17

7.18.06
aBW

transport with advection and dispersion.

8/10/06

D.A.T.

INVENTOR SIGNATURE | PRINTED NAME | DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY | PRINTED NAME | DATE

BOOK NO. PROJECT

NOTE THAT THE INFORMATION ON THIS PROJECT WAS TRANSCRIBED FROM THE AUTHOR'S NON-CNWRA NOTEBOOK AS THIS CNWRA SCIENTIFIC NOTEBOOK WAS NOT AVAILABLE. DOCUMENTS WORK PERFORMED BEFORE JULY 15, 2006.

DAT 8/10/06

The following summarized work contained deliverable "Development and Application of Models to Simulate Saturated Zone Transport Under Future Climates at Yucca Mountain". To support the report the following analyses were performed:

- 10,000 year simulations under a future climate scenario defined by J. Winterle in Winterle (2003)
- SLIM3 simulations to simulate solute (conservative) ~~under~~ DAT 8/10/06 over a 1,000,000 year period
- analytical simulations for decaying plumes with decaying sources over a 1,000,000 year period.

The results of the 10,000 year simulations performed under future climate conditions are useful for comparison with the results contained in Farrell et al (2005) that were performed under current climatic conditions. Note that both sets of simulations were performed using the computer code MT3DMS 4.5 contained in the GMS 5.0 package which is under control at CNWRA (i.e., TOP018).

* note: all electronic files are contained on supporting disks 2 & 3 (RSH 6/4/2007)

10,000 Year Simulations Under Future Climate

The 10,000 year simulations under future climate expanded on the previous model described in Farrell et al. (2005). As described in Farrell et al. (2005) the domain was 28.5 × 41.4 × 2.7 km and consisted of 95 columns, 138 rows, and 30 horizontal layers... $\Delta X = \Delta Y = 300$ m and ΔZ varied from 50 m near the water table to 200 m at depth. From a hydrogeologic perspective, the domain was divided into 19 hydrostratigraphic and structural units; these units were based on the hydrostratigraphic model constructed for the YM region by Sims et al. (1999) ... see Table 1... this is consistent with the description provided in Farrell et al. (2005)... see also Winterle (2003, Table 2-1). Figure 5 shows the distribution of hydrostratigraphic units at YM based on the model of Sims et al. (1999).

Material properties used in the model were based on Winterle (2003). These material properties were also used in Farrell et al. (2005). See Table 1 for a summary

INVENTOR SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

DAT 8/10/06

Table 1: Hydrostratigraphy & Material Properties Used in Numerical Model

Material Type	Description	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/day)†	Porosity
PZ	Deep Paleozoic aquifer system	0.05	0.01
UVA	Uppermost volcanic aquifer	0.5	0.001
UVC	Upper volcanic confining unit	0.15	0.1
LVA	Lower volcanic aquifer	0.15	0.001
LVC	Lower volcanic confining unit	0.0002	0.1
Alluv	Valley-Fill alluvium	3	0.1
FMW	Fortymile Wash fault zone	5	0.001
BR–PBC	Bow Ridge–Paintbrush Canyon fault zone	4	0.001
Cald-pz	Caldera zone: altered Paleozoic rocks	0.001	0.01
Cald-vr	Caldera zone: altered volcanic rocks	0.0003	0.01
SC–IR	Solitario Canyon–Iron Ridge fault zone	0.0005	0.01
SC–West	Western splay of Solitario Canyon fault zone	0.0005	0.01
CF	Crater Flat fault zone	5.0×10^{-5}	0.01
VH1	VH–1 fault zone	5.0×10^{-5}	0.01
BM	Bare Mountain fault zone	0.05	0.01
H95	Highway 95 fault zone	0.005	0.01
Grav1	Gravity fault zone #1	0.001	0.01
Grav2	Gravity fault zone #2	0.05	0.01
CA	Central Amargosa fault zone	0.5	0.01

of the material properties used. Calibration of the groundwater model (DAT 8/10/06) used to support the transport simulations was performed by Winterle (2003) ... the reader should refer to the reference for a detailed discussion. Note that the groundwater model was constructed for execution under MODFLOW-2000 using the Groundwater Modeling System (GMS) version 5.1 environment. GMS (DAT 8/10/06) was developed by Environmental Modeling Research Laboratory. (DAT 8/10/06).

Key aspects of Winterle (2003) wrt future climate simulation:

- future recharge is assumed to be 10 mm/yr (double present-day value)
- recharge was assumed to occur in the lower reaches of Fortymile Wash ... ≈ 200 mm/yr.
- Lateral boundaries were determined using an iterative process in which

INVENTOR SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

Figure 5: Hydrostratigraphic Model ~~ab~~ (DAT 8/10/06) at Yucca Mountain



the elevation of the water table along the lateral boundaries was systematically increased until discharge occurred at the paleo-spring deposits near Nye County Early Warning Drilling Program well NC-EWDP-9S. Boundary condition was 5% higher than present-day.

Figure 6 shows the hydrostratigraphic units at the water table. In addition the figure shows the repository footprint at the watertable. This footprint shows the potential source locations for the transport simulation. Note that for transport it is assumed that $C(x,y,z,t=0)=0$ and ~~C(x,y,z,t>0) ≠ 0~~ (DAT 8/10/06) $C(x,y,z,t>0) \geq 0$

As noted before, solute transport was simulated using MT3DMS Version 4.5 (MT3DMS ≡ Modular Three-Dimensional Multispecies Transport Model).

The following assumptions were made to maintain consistency with Farrell et al. (2005) and to facilitate comparison with results of that report:

- advection & hydrodynamic dispersion were the primary physical processes controlling plume evolution
- longitudinal dispersivity values used in the analysis were ~~assumed to~~ chosen to be consistent with Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC (2004) ["Saturated Zone Flow and Transport Model Abstraction"] and Mohanty et al. (2004) ["System-Level Performance Assessment of the Proposed Repository Footprint at Yucca Mountain Using the TPA Version 4.1 code"].
- Molecular diffusion is current assumed to be negligible relative to hydrodynamic dispersion ... this assumption will be verified at a later time.
- Dual domain formulation is not currently used but will be considered in future work due to potential importance of matrix diffusion (NRC, 2005 ... "NUREG-1762 – Integrated Issue Resolution Status Report").

Figure 6: Hydrostratigraphic Units at the Watertable & the Potential Repository footprint at the Water table



D.A.T 8/10/06

- Porosities used in the model those identical to those in Winterle (2003) were within the distribution ranges for the alluvium valley-fill and volcanic units in Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC (2004 – Table 6-8).
- For some simulations tuff and alluvium can have identical longitudinal dispersivities as in Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC (2004).
- Two dispersivity ratios are once again considered — those based on the DOE model (0.5% and 0.005% for α_{TH}/α_L and α_{TV}/α_L respectively) and more traditional ratios (10% and 1% for α_{TH}/α_L and α_{TV}/α_L respectively).

Scenario: Plume Size at Compliance Boundary

This simulation is similar to that performed in Farrell et al. (2005). It assumes that all potential sources (i.e., source cells) within the repository footprint are active ... this scenario correlates to the case where there are significant waste package failures across the repository footprint. All failures are assumed to occur almost simultaneously. Simulations performed under this Scenario are listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Simulations Performed

Objective

Determine the size of plumes that may cross the regulatory compliance boundary for selected values of longitudinal dispersivity sampled from the Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC (2004)* and the distributions in Mohanty, et al. (2004)†

Source model

All potential source grid cells within the repository footprint are active

Model considerations

- 10 mg/L constant concentration applied to all source cells
- Longitudinal dispersivity, α_L = 100, 10, and 1 m [330, 33, and 3.3 ft], respectively
  - Commonly used transverse dispersivity ratios
    - horizontal transverse dispersivity (α_{TH}) ratio: (α_L/α_{TH}) = 10
    - vertical transverse dispersivity (α_{TV}) ratio: (α_L/α_{TV}) = 100
  - Transverse dispersivity ratios in Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC (2004)*
    - horizontal transverse dispersivity (α_{TH}) ratio: (α_L/α_{TH}) = 200
    - vertical transverse dispersivity (α_{TV}) ratio: (α_L/α_{TV}) = 20,000

Dirichlet source strength in each source cell was 10 mg/L (D.A.T 8/10/06)

BOOK NO.

DAJ 8/10/06
PROJECT

Simulation models : (see accompanying DVD)

- All-Sources-Disp-1 : • Sources placed in all water table cells in repository footprint
  • longitudinal dispersivity $1\ m = \alpha_L$
  • common dispersivity ratios used

- All-Sources-Disp-10 : • Sources placed in all water table cells in repository footprint
  • longitudinal dispersivity $\alpha_L = 10\ m$
  • common dispersivity ratios used ~~to 5%~~ DAJ 8/10/06

- All-Sources-Disp-100 : • sources placed in all water table cells in repository footprint
  • longitudinal dispersivity $\alpha_L = 100\ m$
  • common dispersivity ratios used

- All-Sources-Disp-DOE-1 : • sources placed in all watertable cells in repository footprint
  • longitudinal dispersivity $\alpha_L = 1\ m$
  • DOE dispersivity ratios used (see p. 19)

- All-Sources-Disp-DOE-10 : • sources placed in all watertable cells in repository footprint
  • longitudinal dispersivity $\alpha_L = 10\ m$
  • DOE dispersivity ratios used (see p. 19)

- All-sources-Disp-DOE-100 : • sources placed in all watertable cells in repository footprint
  • longitudinal dispersivity $\alpha_L = 100\ m$
  • DOE dispersivity ratios used. (see p. 19)

SEE SAMPLE OUTPUT PLOTS ON PAGE 21

DAJ 8/10/06 DAJ 8/10/06

red line represents approximate location of compliance boundary

INVENTOR SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE INV

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

BOOK NO.

D.AJ 8/10/06
PROJECT

Figure 7: Plots Associated with Scenario All sources turned on (see p. 20)



DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

Relative Concentration Cutoff for plots = 10^{-3}

red line represents approximate location of regulatory compliance boundary



(e) (f)

Table 3: Summary of Plume Dimensions for Simulations

Longitudinal Dispersivity (m)†	Horizontal Transverse Dispersivity (m)†	Vertical Transverse Dispersivity (m)†	Maximum Plume Width (m)†	Maximum Plume Thickness (m)†
100	10	1	3300	1200
100	0.5	0.005	2100	900
10	1	0.1	1900	950
10	0.05	0.0005	1800	900
1	0.1	0.01	1800	800
1	0.005	0.00005	1500	900

*Shaded rows represent data based on simulations conducted using the U.S. Department of Energy dispersivity ratios.

Scenarios described on p. 20

Table 4: Annual Groundwater Flow Through Plumes At the Regulatory Compliance Boundary (10^{-3} relative Concentration Cutoff)

Dispersivity (m)		approximate plume width (m)	approximate vert. thickness (m)	approximate Flow through plume m^3/year	acre-ft/year
1	(DOE)	1300	900	965425	783
1	(common)	1800	800	1,079,017 ~~1,079,016~~ (DAJ 8/10/06)	875
10	(DOE)	1800	900	1,214,975.*	985.
10	(common)	1900	950	1,323,490	1073
100	(DOE)	2100	900	1,531,540	1242
100	(common)	3300	1200	2,223,945	1803.6

* Scenarios described on p. 20

DAJ 8/15/06

BOOK NO.

D.AT 8/12/06

PROJECT

All sources Turned on

Figure 8: Vertical Cross-sections Through Plumes at the Regulatory Compliance Boundary



(Slice at row 107 of GWS model)

Geology summarized in Figure 10

Dotted box shows the region occupied by the plume (Slice at 107 row of grid)

Geology summarized in Figure 10 (Slice at row 107 of GWS model)

INVENTOR SIGNATURE

DISCLOSED TO AND U

BOOK NO.

D.AT 8/12/06

PROJECT

All sources turned on

Figure 9: Vertical Cross-sections Through Plumes at the Regulatory Compliance Boundary



(Slice at 107 row of grid)

dotted Lines show region occupied by the plume

INVENTOR SIGNA

DISCLOSED TO AN

BOOK NO. DAJ 8/12/06 PROJECT

Figure 10: Geology Present in Figures 8 & 9 and Subsequent Figures where Referenced

Abbreviations are explained in Table 1 of page 15.

CF_flt ← same as CF in Table 1
FMW_flt ← same as FMW in Table 1
BR-PBC_zone ← same as BR-PBC in Table 1
SC-IR_flt ← same as SC-IR in Table 1
SC-west_flt ← same as SC-west in Table 1
VH1_flt ← same as VH1 in Table 1
BM_flt ← same as BM in Table 1
CA_flt ← same as CA in Table 1
Grav1_flt ← same as Grav1 in Table 1 (DAJ 8/12/06)
Grav2_flt ← same as Grav1 in Table 1
Caldera_PZ ← same as Cald_pz in Table 1
Caldera_VR ← same as Cald_vr in Table 1
ab_Land_surface ← represents cells that are above ground level.

See figures 8 & 9 for concentration legends.

INVENTOR SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE INV

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

BOOK NO. DAJ 8/12/06 PROJECT

All sources turned on

Figure 11: Vertical Cross-sections Through Plumes at the Regulatory Compliance Boundary



DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

BOOK NO. DAJ 8/12/06 PROJECT

Formation of Multiple Independent Plumes

Farrell et al. (2005) showed small plumes migrating from opposite ends of the repository would eventually ~~coalesce~~ converge prior to reaching the regulatory compliance boundary. The following simulations were performed to see if this is still the case under the flow field that results from a future wetter ~~flow~~ climate at Yucca Mountain. The scenario is described in Table 5.

Table 5: Description of Scenario for Multiple Independent Plumes Analysis

Objective
Determine whether small, widely spaced plumes can cross the regulatory compliance boundary

Source model
Two source cells, one located in the northern portion of the repository and the other located in the southern portion of the repository

Model considerations
- 10 mg/L constant concentration applied to all source cells
- Longitudinal dispersivity, α_L = 100, 10, and 1 m [330, 33, and 3.3 ft]
  - Commonly used transverse dispersivity ratios
    - horizontal transverse dispersivity (α_{TH}) ratio: (α_L/α_{TH}) = 10
    - vertical transverse dispersivity (α_{TV}) ratio: (α_L/α_{TV}) = 100
  - U.S. Department of Energy transverse dispersivity ratios
    - horizontal transverse dispersivity (α_{TH}) ratio: (α_L/α_{TH}) = 200
    - vertical transverse dispersivity (α_{TV}) ratio: (α_L/α_{TV}) = 20,000

Sources were placed at the northern and southern ends of the repository footprint. In addition sources were placed at the eastern and western edges of the repository. The various simulations are summarized in simulation models:

On accompanying CD

- East-West Sources - Disp - 1 (longitudinal dispersivity α_L = 1m ; common dispersivity ratios)
- East-West Sources - Disp - 10 (α_L = 10m ; common dispersivity ratios)
- East-West Sources - Disp - 100 (α_L = 100m ; common dispersivity ratios)
- East-West Sources - Disp - DOE-1 (α_L = 1m ; DOE dispersivity ratios)
- East-West Sources - Disp - DOE-10 (α_L = 10m ; DOE dispersivity ratios)
- East-West Sources - Disp - DOE-100 (α_L = 100m ; DOE dispersivity ratios)
- North-South Sources - Disp - 1 (α_L = 1m ; common dispersivity ratios)

INVENTOR SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE

BOOK NO. DAJ 8/12/06 PROJECT

See simulation models on p. 28

Figure 12: North-South Simulation for α_L = 1m and Common Dispersivity ratios.



red line represents the compliance boundary

The simulation for North-South sources with α_L = 1m and DOE dispersivity ratios needs to be run for completeness but based on the results above and those in Farrell et al. (2005) it is very unlikely that ~~this~~ DAJ 8/12/06 such a simulation would result in results that are significantly different from those above.

Results show that plumes always converge prior to reaching the regulatory compliance boundary in Southern 40-mile Wash. This is mostly due to the convergent flow field in that part of the flow domain.

DAJ 8/13/06

INVENTOR SIGNATURE PRINTED NAME DATE

DISCLOSED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY PRINTED NAME DATE