

**AN INTEGRATED USED FUEL DISPOSITION AND GENERIC REPOSITORY  
MODEL (v8.17.1)**

by

Kathryn D. Huff

A preliminary report submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Nuclear Engineering and Engineering Physics)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

2011

© Copyright by Kathryn D. Huff 2011

All Rights Reserved

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

---

I am grateful to a number of extraordinary professors and colleagues at the Universities of Wisconsin and Chicago who have inspired and encouraged me. Among them, I am especially indebted to my advisor, Paul P.H. Wilson, for his invaluable technical and practical guidance. I am also grateful to my laboratory advisor, Mark Nutt, who has been an outstanding resource for the work at hand and from whom I look forward to learning a great deal in the upcoming phase of my research.

## CONTENTS

---

Contents ii

List of Tables iv

List of Figures v

Acronyms vi

Abstract ix

### 1 Introduction 1

1.1 *Motivation* 1

1.2 *Methodology* 11

1.3 *Outline* 15

### 2 Literature Review 17

2.1 *Repository Capabilities within Systems Analysis Tools* 17

2.2 *Conceptual Discussion of Disposal Environments* 21

2.3 *Analytical Models of Radionuclide Transport* 33

2.4 *Analytical Models of Heat Transport* 55

2.5 *Detailed Computational Models of Radionuclide Transport* 65

2.6 *Detailed Computational Models of Heat Transport* 73

### 3 Modeling Paradigm 78

3.1 *Cyclus Simulator Paradigm* 78

3.2 *Repository Modeling Paradigm* 85

<b>4</b>	<b>Current Work</b>	<b>91</b>
4.1	<i>CYCLUS</i>	91
4.2	<i>GDSM Analysis</i>	92
4.3	<i>SINDA Model Analysis</i>	96
4.4	<i>LLNL Model Analysis</i>	99
4.5	<i>Demonstration</i>	100
<b>5</b>	<b>Summary and Future Work</b>	<b>103</b>
5.1	<i>Summary</i>	103
5.2	<i>Future Work</i>	104
	<b>References</b>	<b>113</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

---

2.1	Clay Repository Features . . . . .	24
2.2	Granite Repository Features . . . . .	26
2.3	Salt Repository Features . . . . .	29
2.4	Borehole Repository Features . . . . .	32
2.5	Models of Source Term for Various Geologies . . . . .	34
2.6	Waste Form Types . . . . .	36
2.7	Current WP Failure Models . . . . .	39
2.8	Yucca Mountain Footprint Expansion Calculations . . . . .	64
2.9	International Repository Concepts . . . . .	66
2.10	Particle Transport Codes Used in ANDRA Assessment . . . . .	72
2.11	Models for Heat Transport for Various Geologies . . . . .	77
5.1	Categorization of Phenomena . . . . .	110

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

2.1	Various conceptual models may be used for the same natural system [8]. . .	52
2.2	The geometry of the thermal model can be adjusted in two dimensions, altering the tunnel spacing and the vertical distance from the aquifer. . . .	75
3.1	The CYCLUS code repository allows for varied accessibility. . . . .	79
3.2	Module Interfaces and Encapsulation . . . . .	81

## ACRONYMS

---

**ANDRA** Agence Nationale pour la gestion des Déchets RADioactifs, the French National Agency for Radioactive Waste Management. 13, 59, 60, 65

**ANL** Argonne National Laboratory. 24, 91

**CAFCA** Code for Advanced Fuel Cycles Assessment. 20

**CEA** Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique et aux Energies Alternatives. 19

**COSI** Commelini-Sicard. 19

**CSNF** Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel. 36

**CUBIT** CUBIT Geometry and Mesh Generation Toolkit. 26

**DANESS** Dynamic Analysis of Nuclear Energy System Strategies. 19

**DOE** Department of Energy. vii, viii, 11

**DSNF** DOE Spent Nuclear Fuel. 36

**EBS** Engineered Barrier System. 24, 33

**EDZ** Excavation Disturbed Zone. 24

**EPA** Environmental Protection Agency. 8

**FEHM** Finite Element Heat and Mass Transfer. 25, 26

**FEPs** Features, Events, and Processes. 23

**GDSM** Generic Disposal System Model. 11–13, 23, 24, 91, 95



**GPAM** Generic Performance Assessment Model. 23

**HTGR** High Temperature Gas Reactor. 36

**INL** Idaho National Laboratory. 18

**LANL** Los Alamos National Laboratory. 25

**LLNL** Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. 67

**MA** Minor Actinide. 36

**MIT** the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 20

**NAGRA** National Cooperative for the Disposal of Radioactive Waste. 59

**NFCSim** Nuclear Fuel Cycle Simulator. 20

**NUWASTE** Nuclear Waste Assessment System for Technical Evaluation. 17, 18

**NWTRB** Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. 18

**OCRWM** Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. 21

**PEI** Peak Environmental Impact. 9

**RD&D** Research Development and Design. 10

**SA** Systems Analysis. vii, viii, 10, 102

**SKB** Svensk Karnbranslehantering AB. 66

**SNL** Sandia National Laboratory. 25

**SWF** Separations and Waste Forms. 10

**TSM** Total System Model. 21

**UFD** Used Fuel Disposition. vii, viii, 10, 11, 13, 23, 58, 60, 67, 80, 102

**US** United States. 11

**UW** University of Wisconsin. 72, 78

**VISION** the Verifiable Fuel Cycle Simulation Model. 17, 18

**WIPP** Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. 30

**YMR** Yucca Mountain Repository Site. 5, 9, 18, 38, 59

**AN INTEGRATED USED FUEL DISPOSITION AND GENERIC REPOSITORY  
MODEL (v8.17.1)**

Kathryn D. Huff

Under the supervision of Professor Paul P.H. Wilson

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison

As the United States Department of Energy (DOE) simultaneously considers alternative fuel cycles and waste disposal options, an integrated fuel cycle and generic disposal system analysis tool is increasingly necessary for informing domestic nuclear spent fuel policy. A generic repository model capable of illuminating the distinct dominant physics of candidate repository lithologies, designs, and engineering components will provide an interface between the Used Fuel Disposition (UFD) and Systems Analysis (SA) Campaign goals. Repository metrics such as necessary repository footprint and peak annual dose are affected by heat and nuclide release characteristics specific to variable spent fuel compositions associated with alternative fuel cycles. Computational tools capable of simulating the dynamic, heterogeneous spent fuel isotopics resulting from transition scenarios and alternative fuel cycles are, however, lacking in repository modeling options. This work proposes to construct such a generic repository model appropriate for systems analysis. By emphasizing modularity and speed, the work at hand seeks to provide a tool which captures the dominant physics of detailed repository analysis within the UFD Campaign and can be robustly and flexibly integrated within fuel cycle simulation tools such as the CYCLUS tool developed at the University of Wisconsin - Madison.

Paul P.H. Wilson

## ABSTRACT

---

As the United States Department of Energy (DOE) simultaneously considers alternative fuel cycles and waste disposal options, an integrated fuel cycle and generic disposal system analysis tool is increasingly necessary for informing domestic nuclear spent fuel policy. A generic repository model capable of illuminating the distinct dominant physics of candidate repository lithologies, designs, and engineering components will provide an interface between the Used Fuel Disposition (UFD) and Systems Analysis (SA) Campaign goals. Repository metrics such as necessary repository footprint and peak annual dose are affected by heat and nuclide release characteristics specific to variable spent fuel compositions associated with alternative fuel cycles. Computational tools capable of simulating the dynamic, heterogeneous spent fuel isotopics resulting from transition scenarios and alternative fuel cycles are, however, lacking in repository modeling options. This work proposes to construct such a generic repository model appropriate for systems analysis. By emphasizing modularity and speed, the work at hand seeks to provide a tool which captures the dominant physics of detailed repository analysis within the UFD Campaign and can be robustly and flexibly integrated within fuel cycle simulation tools such as the CYCLUS tool developed at the University of Wisconsin - Madison.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

---

The scope of this work includes implementation of a software library of medium fidelity models to comprehensively represent various long-term disposal system concepts for nuclear material. This software library will be integrated with a computational fuel cycle systems analysis platform in order to inform repository performance metrics with respect to candidate fuel cycle options. By abstraction of more detailed models, this work will capture the dominant physics of radionuclide and heat transport phenomena affecting repository performance in various geologic media and as a function of arbitrary spent fuel composition.

### 1.1 Motivation

The development of sustainable nuclear fuel cycles is a key challenge as the use of nuclear power expands internationally. While fuel cycle performance may be measured with respect to a variety of metrics, waste management metrics are of particular importance to the goal of sustainability. Since disposal options are heavily influenced by upstream fuel cycle decisions, a relevant analysis of potential geological disposal and engineered barrier solutions requires a system level approach that is both modular and efficient.

As the merits of numerous combinatoric fuel cycle possibilities are investigated, a top-level simulation tool capable of modular substitution of various fuel cycle facility, repository, and engineered barrier components is needed. The modular waste package and repository models resulting from this work will assist in informing current technology choices, identifying important parameters contributing to key waste disposal metrics, and highlighting the most promising waste disposal combinations with respect to metrics chosen by the user. Specifically, such models will support efforts underway

in focusing domestic research and development priorities as well as computational tools under development that quantify these metrics and demonstrate the merits of different fuel cycle alternatives.

System level fuel cycle simulation tools must facilitate efficient sensitivity and uncertainty analyses as well as simulation of a wide range of fuel cycle alternatives. Efficiency is achieved with models at a level of detail that successfully captures significant aspects of the underlying physics while achieving a calculation speed in accordance with use cases requiring repeated simulations. Often termed abstraction, the process of simplifying while maintaining the salient features of the underlying physics is the method by which used fuel disposal system models will be developed in this work.

Independent fuel cycle parameters of particular interest in fuel cycle systems analysis have been those related to the front end of the fuel cycle. Deployment decisions concerning reactor types, fast to thermal reactor ratios, and burnup rates can all be independently varied in fuel cycle simulation codes in such a way as to inform domestic policy decisions going forward. Some of these parameters are coupled, however, to aspects of the back end of the fuel cycle. For example, the appropriate fast reactor ratio is significantly altered by the chosen method and magnitude of domestic spent fuel reprocessing (or not).

However, independent variables representing decisions concerning the back end of the fuel cycle are of increasing interest as the United States further investigates repository alternatives to Yucca Mountain. Parameters such as the repository geology, tunnel design, and appropriate loading strategies and schedule are all independent variables up for debate. All of these parameters are coupled with decisions about the fuel cycle.

Thus, while independent parameters can be chosen and varied within a fuel cycle

simulation, some parameters are coupled in such a way as to require full synthesis with a systems analysis code that appropriately determines the isotopic mass flows into the repository, their appropriate conditioning, densities, and other physical properties.

## **Future Fuel Cycle Options**

Domestically, nuclear power expansion is motivated by the research, development, and demonstration roadmap being pursued by the United States Department of Energy Office of Nuclear Energy (DOE-NE), which seeks to ensure that nuclear energy remain a viable domestic energy option [21].

As the DOE-NE seeks to develop technologies and strategies to support a sustainable future for nuclear energy, various fuel cycle strategies and corresponding disposal system options are being considered. Specifically, the domestic fuel cycle option space under current consideration is described in terms of three distinct fuel cycle categories with the monikers Once Through, Full Recycle, and Modified Open. Each category presents unique disposal system siting and design challenges. Systems analyses for evaluating these options must be undertaken in order to inform a national decision to deploy a comprehensive fuel cycle system by 2050 [21].

The Once-Through Cycle category includes fuel cycles similar to the continuation of the business as usual case in the United States. Such fuel cycles neglect reprocessing and present challenges associated with high volumes of minimally treated spent fuel streams. In a business as usual scenario, conventional power reactors comprise the majority of nuclear energy production and fuel takes a single pass through a reactor before it is classified as waste and disposed of. In the open cycle, no reprocessing is pursued, but research and development of advanced fuels seek to reduce waste volumes. Calculations from the Electric Power Research Institute corroborated by the United

States (US) Department of Energy (DOE) in 2008 indicate that without an increase in the statutory footprint limit of the Yucca Mountain Repository Site (YMR), continuation of the current Once Through fuel cycle will generate a volume of spent fuel that will necessitate the siting of an additional federal geological repository to accomodate spent fuel [32, 20].

A Full Recycle option, on the other hand, requires the research, development, and deployment of partitioning, transmutation, and advanced reactor technology for the reprocessing of used nuclear fuel. In this scheme, conventional once-through reactors will be phased out in favor of fast reactor and so called Generation IV reactor technologies, which demonstrate transmutation capacity and greater fuel efficiency. All fuel in the Full Recycle strategy will be reprocessed. It may be reprocessed using an accelerator driven system or by cycling through an advanced fast reactor. Such fuel may undergo partitioning, the losses from which will require waste treatment and ultimate disposal in a repository. Thus, a repository under the Full Recycle scenario must support highly variable waste stream composition during transition periods, as well as myriad waste forms and packaging associated with isolation of differing waste streams.

Finally, the Modified Open Cycle category of options includes a variety of fuel cycle options that fall between once through and fully closed. Advanced fuel cycles such as deep burn and small modular reactors will be considered within the Modified Open set of fuel cycle options as will partial recycle options. Partitioning and reprocessing strategies, however, will be limited to simplified chemical separations and volatilization under this scheme. This scheme presents a dual challenge in which spent fuel volumes and composition will both vary dramatically among various possibilities within this scheme [21] .

Clearly, the myriad waste streams resulting from potential fuel cycles present an



array of corresponding waste disposition, packaging, and engineered barrier system options. A comprehensive analysis of the disposal system, dominant physics models must therefore be developed for these subcomponents. Differing spent fuel composition, partitioning, transmutation, and chemical processing decisions upstream in the fuel cycle demand differing performance and loading requirements of waste forms and packaging. The capability to model thermal and radionuclide transport phenomena through, for example, vitrified glass as well as ceramic waste forms with various loadings for arbitrary isotopic compositions is therefore required.

## **Future Waste Disposal System Options**

In addition to reconsideration of the domestic fuel cycle policy, the uncertain future of the YMR has driven the expansion of the option space of potential repository geologies to include, at the very least, granite, clay/shale, salt, and deep borehole concepts [40].

In accordance with various fuel cycle options, corresponding waste form, waste package, and other engineered barrier systems are being considered. Specifically, current considerations include ceramic (e.g. Uranium Oxide), glass (e.g. borosilicate glasses), and metallic (e.g. hydride fuels) waste forms. Waste packages may be copper, steel, or other alloys. Similarly, buffer and backfill materials vary from the crushed salt recommended for a salt repository to bentonite or concrete in other lithologies. paragraph needs explication

The physical, hydrogeologic, and geochemical mechanisms that dictate radionuclide and heat transport vary between the geological and engineered containment systems in the domestic option space. Therefore, in support of the system level simulation effort, models must be developed that capture the salient physics of these geological options and quantify associated disposal metrics and benefits. Furthermore, in the same way

that system level modularity facilitates analysis, so too will modular linkage between subcomponent process modules. These subcomponent models and the repository environmental model must achieve a cohesively integrated disposal system model.

### **Thermal Modeling Needs**

The decay heat from nuclear material presents a significant heat source within a repository. In order to arrive at loading strategies that comply with thermal limits in the engineered barrier system and the geological medium, a thermal modeling capability must be included in the repository model. Such a model is also necessary to inform material and hydrogeologic phenomena that effect radionuclide transport and are thermally coupled.

Since the partitioning and transmutation of heat generating radionuclides within some fuel cycles will alter the heat evolution of the repository [53]. To distinguish between the repository heat evolution associated with various fuel cycles, a systems analysis model must capture the decay heat behavior of dominant heat contributors. Plutonium, Americium, and their decay daughters dominate decay heat contribution within used nuclear fuels. Other contributing radionuclides include Cesium, Strontium, and Curium [44].

Thermal limits within a used nuclear fuel disposal system are waste form, package, and geology dependent. The heat evolution of the repository constrains waste form loadings and package loadings as heat generated in the waste form is transported through the package. It also places requirements on the size, design, and loading strategy in a potential geological repository as that heat is deposited in the engineered barrier system and host geology.

Thermal limits of various waste forms have their technical basis in the temperature

dependence of isolation integrity of the waste form. The waste form alteration, degradation, and dissolution behavior is a function of heat in addition to water contact and constrains loading density within the waste form.

Thermal limits of various engineered barrier systems similarly have a technical basis in the temperature dependent alteration, corrosion, degradation, and dissolution rates of the materials from whence they are constructed.

Thermal limits of the geologic environment on can be based on the mechanical integrity of the rock as well as mineralogic, hydrologic and geochemical phenomena. The isolating characteristics of a geological environment are most sensitive to hydrologic and geochemical effects of thermal loading. Thus, heat load constraints are typically chosen to control hydrologic and geochemical response to thermal loading. In the United States, current regulations stipulate thermal limits in order to passively steward the repository's hydrologic and geochemical integrity against radionuclide release for the upcoming 10,000 years.

The two heat load constraints that primarily determined the heat-based SNF capacity limit in the Yucca Mountain Repository design, for example, are specific to unsaturated tuff. These are given here as an example of the type of regulatory constraints that this model will seek to capture for various geologies.

The first Yucca Mountain heat load constraint intended to promote constant drainage, thereby preventing repository flooding and subsequent contaminated water flow through the repository. It requires that the minimum temperature in the tuff between drifts be no more than the boiling temperature of water, which is  $96^{\circ}\text{C}$  at the altitude in question. For a repository with homogenous waste composition in parallel drifts, this constraint limits the temperature exactly halfway between adjacent drifts, where the temperature is at a minimum.

The second constraint intended to prevent high rock temperatures that could induce fractures and alteration of the crystalline rock. It stated that no part of the rock reach a temperature above  $200^{\circ}\text{C}$ , and was effectively a limit on the temperature at the drift wall, where the rock temperature is a maximum.

Analogous constraints for a broader set of possible geological environments will depend on heat transport properties and geochemical behaviors of the rock matrix as well as its hydrogeologic state. Such constraints will affect the repository drift spacing, waste package spacing, and repository footprint among other parameters.

In addition to development of a concept of heat transport within the repository in order to meet heat load limitations, it is also necessary to model temperature gradients in the repository in order to support modeling of thermally dependent hydrologic and material phenomena. As mentioned above, waste form corrosion processes, waste form dissolution rates, diffusion coefficients, and the mechanical integrity of engineered barriers and geologic environment are coupled with temperature behavior. Only a coarse time resolution will likely be necessary to capture that coupling however, since time evolution of repository heat is such that thermal coupling can typically be treated as quasi static for long time scales. [9].

### **Radiotoxicity and Source Term Modeling Needs**

Domestically, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has defined a limit on human exposure due to the repository. This regulation places important limitations on capacity, design, and loading techniques for repository concepts under consideration. Repository concepts developed in this work must therefore quantify radionuclide transport through the geological environment in order to calculate repository capacity and other benefit metrics.

The exposure limit set by the NRC is based on a 'reasonably maximally exposed individual.' That is to say, the limiting case is a person who lives, grows food, drinks water and breathes air 18 km downstream from the repository. The Yucca Mountain Repository EPA regulations limit total dose from the repository to 15 mrem/yr, and limit dose from drinking water to 4 mrem/yr. Predictions of that dose rate depend on an enormous variety of factors, most important of which is the primary pathway for release. In the YMR primary pathway of radionuclides from an accidental release will be from cracking aged canisters. Subsequently, transport of the radionuclides to the water table requires that the radionuclides come in contact with water and travel through the rock to the water table. This results in contamination of drinking water downstream.

Source term is a measure of the quantity of a radionuclide released into the environment whereas radiotoxicity is a measure of the hazardous effect of that particular radionuclide upon human ingestion or inhalation. In particular, radiotoxicity is measured in terms of the volume of water dilution required to make it safe to ingest. Studies of source term and radiotoxicity therefore make probabilistic assessments of radionuclide release, transport, and human exposure.

Importantly, due to the long time scale and intrinsic uncertainties required in such probabilistic assessments it is in general not advisable to base any maximum repository capacity estimates on source term. In order to give informative values for the risk associated with transport of particular radionuclides, for example, it is necessary to make highly uncertain predictions concerning waste form degradation, water flow, and other parameters during the long repository evolution time scale. However, source term remains a useful metric for the comparison of alternative separations and fuel cycle scenarios.

A generalized metric of probabilistic risk is fairly difficult to arrive at. For example, the Peak Environmental Impact (PEI) metric from Berkeley (ref. [15]) is a multifaceted function of spent fuel composition, waste conditioning, vitrification method, and radionuclide transport through the repository walls and rock. Also, it makes the assumption that the waste canisters have been breached at  $t = 0$ . Furthermore, reported in  $m^3$ , PEI is a measure of radiotoxicity in the environment in the event of total breach. While informative, this model on its own does not completely determine a source-term limited maximum repository capacity. Additional waste package failure and exposed individual radiotoxicity constraints must be incorporated into it.

## **Domestic Research and Development Program**

The DOE-NE Fuel Cycle Technology (FCT) program has three groups of relevance to this effort: these are the Used Fuel Disposition (UFD), the Separations and Waste Forms (SWF), and Systems Analysis (SA) campaigns. The UFD campaign is conducting the Research Development and Design (RD&D) related to the storage, transportation, and disposal of radioactive wastes generated under both the current and potential advanced fuel cycles. The SWF campaign is conducting RD&D on potential waste forms that could be used to effectively isolate the wastes that would be generated in advanced fuel cycles. The SWF and UFD campaigns are developing the fundamental tools and information base regarding the performance of waste forms and geologic disposal systems. The SA campaign is developing the overall fuel cycle simulation tools and interfaces with the other FCT campaigns, including UFD.

This effort will interface with those campaigns to develop the higher level dominant physics representations for use in fuel cycle system analysis tools. Specifically, this work will leverage conceptual framework development and primary data collection underway

within the Used Fuel Disposition Campaign as well as work by Radel, Wilson, Bauer et. al. to model repository behavior as a function of the contents of the waste. It will then incorporate dominant physics process models into the CYCLUS computational fuel cycle analysis tool.

## 1.2 Methodology

In this work, concise dominant physics models suitable for system level fuel cycle codes will be developed by comparison of analytical models with more detailed repository modeling efforts. The ultimate objective of this effort is to develop a software library capable of assessing a wide range of combinations of fuel cycle alternatives, potential waste forms, repository design concepts, and geological media.

Current candidate repository concepts have been investigated and reviewed in order to arrive at a fundamental set of components to model. A preliminary set of combinations of fuel cycles, repository concepts, and geologies has been chosen that fundamentally captures the fundamental domestic option space. Specifically, three candidate geologies and four corresponding repository concepts under consideration by the DOE UFD campaign have been chosen for modeling in this work. These will be expected to interface with CYCLUS simulations of a canonical set of potential fuel cycles within three broad candidate scenarios put forth by the US DOE.

A review and characterization of the physical mechanisms by which radionuclide and thermal transport take place within the materials and media under consideration was first undertaken. Potential analytical models to represent these phenomena were investigated and categorized within the literature review.

A review and characterization of current detailed computational tools for repository focused analysis was next conducted. Both international and domestic repository

modeling efforts were summarized within the literature review. Of these, candidate computational tools with which to perform abstraction and regression analyses were identified. Specifically, a suite of Generic Disposal System Model (GDSM) tools under development by the DOE UFD campaign will inform radionuclide transport models and a pair of corresponding thermal analysis codes will inform the thermal models.

Continuation of this work will consist of the development of a suite of subcomponent modules appropriate for use within the CYCLUS fuel cycle simulator. This process will include the development of a robust architecture within the repository module that will allow for interchangeable loading of system components. Within the system components, dominant physics will be modeled based on domain appropriate approximation of analytical models and supported by abstraction with the chosen GDSM tools and thermal tools.

In general, such concise models are a combination of two components: semi-analytic mathematical models that represent a simplified description of the most important physical phenomena, and semi-empirical models that reproduce the results of detailed models. By combining the complexity of the analytic models and regression against numerical experiments, variations can be limited between two models for the same system. Different approaches will be compared in this work, with final modeling choices balancing the accuracy and efficiency of the possible implementations.

Specifically, geological models will focus on the hydrogeology and thermal physics that dominate radionuclide transport and heat response in candidate geologies as a function of radionuclide release and heat generation over long time scales. Dominant transport mechanism (advection or diffusion) and disposal site water chemistry (redox state) will provide primary differentiation between the different geologic media under consideration. In addition, the concise models will be capable of roughly adjusting



release pathways according to the characteristics of the natural system (both the host geology and the site in general) and the engineered system (such as package loading arrangements, tunnel spacing, and engineered barriers).

The abstraction process in the development of a geological environment model will employ the comparison of semi-analytic thermal and hydrogeologic models and analytic regression of rich code results from more detailed models as well as existing empirical geologic data. Such results and data will be derived primarily from the UFD campaign GDSMs and data, as well as European efforts such as the RED-IMPACT assessment and Agence Nationale pour la gestion des Déchets RAdioactifs, the French National Agency for Radioactive Waste Management (ANDRA) Dossier efforts [33, 9, 18] .

For example, analytic models and semi-empirical models are available (i.e. specific temperature integrals (ref. [34]) and specific temperature change index (ref. [48])) that approximate thermal response from heat generation in waste packages as linear along repository drifts. These analyses arrive at a thermal evolution over time at any location in the rock by superpositioning and integration. Subsequently, their results can be converted easily into conventional line loading and areal power density metrics. Such analytic models will first be assessed to determine likely parameters upon which thermal response will rely (e.g. tunnel spacing, radionuclide inventories, etc.).

Thereafter, a regression analysis concerning those parameters will be undertaken with available detailed models (e.g. 2D and 3D finite differencing, finite element, and thermal performance assessment codes) to further characterize the parametric dependence of thermal loading in a specific geology.

Finally, the thermal behavior of a repository model so developed will depend on empirical data (e.g. heat transfer coefficients, hydraulic conductivity). Determination of representative values to make available within the dominant physics model will rely on

existing empirical data concerning the specific geologic environment being modeled (i.e. salt, clay/shale, and granite).

A similar process will be followed for radionuclide transport models. The abstraction process in the development of waste form, package, and engineered barrier system models will be analogous to the abstraction process of repository environment models. Concise models will result from employing the comparison of semi-analytic models of those systems with regression analysis of rich code in combination with existing empirical material data.

For instance, in the case of radionuclide release from waste packages, analytic models of radionuclide release (e.g. congruent or solubility limited) will first be assessed to determine likely parameters upon which radionuclide release will rely (e.g. radionuclide concentration, water flow rates, etc.) [31]. Again, regression analysis concerning those parameters will be undertaken with available detailed models to further characterize the parametric dependence of radionuclide release from specific waste packages. Finally, the radionuclide release model so developed will depend on empirical data (e.g. the waste form dissolution rate). Determination of representative values to make available within the dominant physics model will rely on existing empirical data concerning the specific waste form materials being modeled (i.e. long time scale extrapolations of known glass degradation rates).

Coupling effects between components will have to be considered carefully. In particular, given the important role of temperature in the system, thermal coupling between the models for the engineered system and the geologic system may be important. Thermal dependence of radionuclide release and transport as well as package degradation will necessarily be analyzed to determine the magnitude of coupling effects in the system.

The full abstraction process will be iterated to achieve a balance between calculation

speed and simulation detail. Model improvements during this stage will seek a level of detail appropriate for informative comparison of subcomponents, but with sufficient speed to enable systems analysis.

By varying input parameters and comparing with corresponding results from detailed tools, each model's behavior on its full parameter domain will be validated.

### 1.3 Outline

The following chapter will present a literature review that organizes and reports upon previous relevant work. First it summarizes the state of the art of repository modeling integration within current systems analysis tools. It then will focus upon current analytical and computational modeling of radionuclide and heat transport through various waste forms, engineered barrier systems, and geologies of interest. It will also address previous efforts in generic geology repository modeling in order to categorize and characterize detailed computational models of radionuclide and heat transport available for regression analysis.

Chapter 3 will detail the computational paradigm of the CYCLUS systems analysis platform as well as the components within the repository system. Models representing waste form, waste package, buffer, backfill, and engineered barrier systems will be defined by their interfaces and their relationships as interconnected modules, distinctly defined, but coupled. This modular paradigm allows exchange of technological options (i.e. borosilicate glass and concrete waste forms) for comparison but also exchange of equivalent models with varying levels of detail.

Chapter 4 will detail the analytical and regression analysis undertaken and forthcoming to achieve a generic repository model for the chosen base repository type. A concise, dominant physics geological repository model of the base case disposal environment will

be developed. Informed by semi-analytic mathematical models representing important physical phenomena, existing detailed computational efforts characterizing these repository environments will be appropriately simplified to create concise computational models. This abstraction will capture fundamental physics of thermal, hydrogeologic, and radionuclide transport phenomena while remaining sufficiently detailed to illuminate behavioral differences between each of the geologic systems under consideration. Verification and validation of abstracted models will be conducted through iterative benchmarking against more detailed repository models.

Chapter 5 will summarize the conclusions reached concerning the appropriate analytical and detailed models to utilize in the process of abstraction for radionuclide and heat transport through various components of the disposal system. Categorization of models and determination of the coverage within the option space domain will also be summarized. Finally, remaining future work and expected contributions to the field will be summarized.

## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

---

The following literature review addresses five areas of current research integral to the work at hand. The contribution of computational nuclear fuel cycle simulation tools to sensitivity analyses of repository performance metrics is first summarized. A review of analytical models of radionuclide transport follows, after which follows a review of analytical models of heat transport. An overview of current detailed computational models, available data and algorithms characterizing radionuclide transport follows, including both standalone and those incorporated into nuclear fuel cycle simulation tools. Finally, a review of current computational models of heat transport in the waste disposal system context is given. Special focus is paid to the availability of supporting data and algorithms informing geochemical and hydrogeological transport on long time scales and in various geologies.

### 2.1 Repository Capabilities within Systems Analysis Tools

Current top-level simulators largely disregard the waste disposal phase of fuel cycle analysis. Choosing instead to report metrics such as mass or volumes of accumulated spent nuclear fuel, these analyses fail to address the impact of those waste streams on the performance of the geologic disposal system [57]. To fully inform the decision making process, metrics that depend on the performance of the geologic disposal system will be necessary.

A model for repository capacity was developed for the the Verifiable Fuel Cycle Simulation Model (VISION) fuel cycle simulator and recent efforts on the Nuclear Waste

Assessment System for Technical Evaluation (NUWASTE) simulator have made some progress in addressing this deficiency, but despite a proliferation of sophisticated fuel cycle simulators, similar efforts are lacking in this regard [?] [47] [3].

## **NUWASTE**

NUWASTE is a Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board code under development that determines many metrics about the fuel cycle according to various parameters and for various fuel cycles [3]. Its use is limited to the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NWTRB) utilizes commercial Microsoft Access and Visual Basic database and functional capabilities.

NUWASTE tracks 65 isotopes within material objects, discretely models individual shipping casks and incorporates cooling time in both dry and wet intermediate storage facilities. Though it tracks the number of assemblies through a simulation and their isotopic composition, NUWASTE lacks radionuclide transport and heat based capacity calculations.

## **VISION**

VISION, a fuel cycle simulator created at Idaho National Laboratory (INL) is built on the commercial systems analysis platform, PowerSim. The code therefore has both commercial and governmental license restrictions and is sensitive to laboratory export control requiring explicit developer approval [58, 55]. VISION is capable of modeling an array of fuel cycle options. It tracks and conducts decay calculations for upwards of 80 isotopes of interest [?] [57].

While its repository model calculates YMR specific information about waste package heat production and heat based repository capacity, continuous masses are modeled

rather than discrete waste packages, and no radionuclide transport calculations are conducted [47] [14].

## DANESS

Dynamic Analysis of Nuclear Energy System Strategies (DANESS) is developed at Argonne National Laboratory and discretely models reactors within regional reactor parks for a flexible array of fuel cycles. Material movement is based on a fuel ordering paradigm and is written in a combination of FortranIV and C, but is limited to a 10 reactor simulation. Repository capabilities are also limited to mass accounting and perform no radionuclide or heat transport calculations.

Input and output are in Microsoft Excel format and DANESS relies on the proprietary IThink simulation platform. The code therefore has both commercial and governmental license restrictions and is sensitive to export control requiring explicit developer approval [58, 55].

## COSI

Commelini-Sicard (COSI) is a code from the Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique et aux Energies Alternatives (CEA) of France and is implemented in the Java programming language. It is capable of performing a large range of full fuel cycle scenarios in great detail. COSI6 is capable of making assessments of repository capacity as well as radiotoxicity and decay heat calculations of waste packages [14]. Radionuclide transport through the repository post-emplacement is, however, not calculated and the distribution licence is very restrictive.

## NFCSim

The Nuclear Fuel Cycle Simulator (NFCSim) code was implemented in the Java programming language by Erich Schneider and Los Alamos National Lab. Primarily a mass tracking code, the repository model was limited to a heat analysis. Uniquely, in NFCSim the transportation of each waste package was modeled discretely [50].

## CAFCA

Code for Advanced Fuel Cycles Assessment (CAFCA) is a fuel cycle code from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) based on the VENISIM system dynamics platform. While CAFCA is capable of tracking processed fuel assemblies and isotopics, it does not calculate capacity metrics or conduct detailed radionuclide or heat transport. Its licence, held by MIT, is of a less restrictive academic nature, but the source is not in wide distribution and the dependence on VENISIM necessitates that potential developers acquire a proprietary licence for that software.

## ORION

This code is a proprietary code developed at the United Kingdom's National Nuclear Laboratory. While there is no heat-limited capacity model or calculation of radionuclide transport, the material destined for the repository can be described with a number of mass indexed metrics such as activity  $[Bq]$ , radiotoxicity  $[Sv]$ , toxic potential  $[m^3]$ , spontaneous neutron emission  $[s^{-1}]$ , and heat production  $[W]$ . None of these metrics, however, incorporate a dose pathway or calculate radionuclide transport.



## **OCRWM Yucca Mountain Total System Model**

The Total System Model (TSM) code, developed at Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) is a very detailed model of the Yucca Mountain disposal system. It includes transportation issues and detailed emplacement timing and strategy models, but considers only the fuel cycle associated with the current U.S. reactor fleet. Casks are modeled discretely and radionuclide and heat transport are modeled in great detail. This level of detail results in a dramatically extended run time. The TSM model can only be run by its development team and runs a typical simulation, processing 70,000 MTHM in 12-15 hours [? ].

The TSM framework is based on the commercial SimCAD platform. The simulation steps through times in 8 hour time steps during the waste cask transportation, processing and emplacement. This event based simulator is primarily focused on the operation stage of the Yucca Mountain repository, but is equipped with a thermal management model that informs waste package emplacement.

## **2.2 Conceptual Discussion of Disposal Environments**

A suite of three geologic media and four disposal concepts of interest were chosen to capture the primary geologies and concepts found in the above review of international and domestic efforts. Granite, clay, and salt geologic environments will be modeled with flexible layouts and an array of available canonical engineered subcomponent models. The detailed Generic Performance Assessment Model (GPAM) effort and associated GDSM tools will be chosen to support the for this work will support abstraction for these concepts and further comparison with ANDRA and RED-IMPACT results will provide further benchmarks for validation.

The concepts that have been investigated internationally and will be investigated this work are dominated by saturated, closed concepts. Saturated concepts are those located below the water table such that, in contrast to YMR, the porosity within the rock matrix as well as fractures and other open spaces is suffused with water. A closed concept is one that neither relies on ventilation shafts nor an extended open period after waste emplacement.

Enclosed modes are appropriate for low permeability rock formations (clay/shale, granite, salt). Low permeability does not permit oxygen entry, so these are chemically reducing environments. Chemically reducing environments are reducing insofar as they induce redox reactions to proceed in the reduction direction. This attribute has the primary effect of slowing corrosion, dissolution, and alteration rates in materials that are subject to degradation. A reducing disposal environment also lowers solubility limits and increases sorption of the actinides. The dominant dose contributors in reducing environments are therefore the soluble, long lived fission and activation products such as  $^{129}\text{I}$  and  $^{79}\text{Se}$  [? 33]. Furthermore, rather than being kinetically limited, as in an oxidizing environment, sorption behavior is thermodynamically limited [39, 51]. The models created here will be designed such that these distinctions between reducing and oxidizing environments may be parsed.

Since heat is carried away less effectively once closure has occurred, heat limits are lower in closed repository concepts than in open ones such as YMR where drift tunnels are ventilated for a number of years after emplacement before closure.

A number of waste form options will be modeled as a part of this effort. To sufficiently model the fuel cycles of interest, it will be necessary to model a borosilicate glass high level waste form as well as an oxide ceramic waste form. These together will provide a sufficient but not comprehensive option space for modeling candidate domestic disposal

systems. Additional waste forms of interest are listed in Table ???. Waste forms will be distinguished by their alteration, corrosion, and other degradation behaviors.

Various engineered barrier system components will also be modeled as a part of this effort. Sufficient waste package, buffer, backfill, and other sealing components will be modeled in order to cover the option space demonstrated by both domestic and international repository concept research. Fundamentally, concrete, salt, and bentonite buffer and backfill options will be modeled and copper, carbon steel, and stainless steel waste package concepts will be modeled.

Distinctions between the four repository concepts that will be considered here include varying coefficients of hydraulic conductivity, thermal conductivity, sorption, solubility, etc.

## **Clay Disposal Environments**

Clays, including a range of claystones, shales, and argillites, have been investigated in France, Belgium, and Switzerland as well as the US [33, 18]. Attractive qualities of clay for repository investigations include its ease of excavation as well as the tendency, particularly for some very plastic clays under consideration, to coalesce over time around waste packages within the zone disturbed by excavation. A less attractive quality of clay is a low thermal limit around  $100^{\circ}\text{C}$  temperature limit to prevent alteration [24]. Some characteristics of clay disposal concepts are given in Table 2.1.

## **Disposal System Components**

The French ANDRA analysis modeled borosilicate glass as well as ceramic oxide waste-forms within carbon steel waste packages in combination with a bentonite buffer material and a crushed clay or shale backfill [9]. The Belgian reference concept focused on a highly

Clay Repository Features			
Hydrology	Geochemistry	Design Concepts	Thermal Behavior
Very low conductivity High porosity (up to 0.5) Low effective porosity Slow water velocity diffusion dominated	Reducing Saline pH? Saturated	no/bentonite/concrete backfill < ( $-100m$ ) closed horizontal, vertical, or room emplacement	limit due to EDZ enlargement $100^{\circ}C$ limit if bentonite

Table 2.1: Clay geological repository concept demonstrates certain dominant physical phenomena.

plastic Boom Clay, which eventually completely seals around stainless steel, nickel, or titanium waste packages [42]. The Swiss concept modeled glass wasteforms in stainless steel waste packages with a bentonite buffer and a bentonite and sand backfill [30]. Each of these analyses considered horizontal emplacement in multiple-package emplacement drifts.

### Hydrology

In the clay disposal environment, an exceptionally low porosity combined with low, diffusion dominated water movement and no fracturation, the overall hydraulic conductivity of clay is very low. Hydrology in the far field is typically assumed to be entirely diffusive.

### Geochemistry

This environment is very reducing in both the near and far field. The salinity of this environment increases with depth and it is expected that the pH will be near neutral in this environment. However, for some concepts incorporating cementitious backfill materials for protection of steel, the pH can become significantly alkaline, resulting in expedited alteration of the clay matrix as well as the bentonite buffer [9].

Highly mobile radionuclides which dominate dose from clay repository concepts for most fuel cycles include  $^{129}I$ ,  $^{79}Se$ , and  $^{36}Cl$  [53].

### Thermal Behavior

The thermal conductivity of clay is typically lower than  $2[W/m^{\circ}K]$ <sup>1</sup>.

Heat limits in clay are based on the domain of known behavior in clay and the tendency for bentonite fill material to lose its isolating properties with high temperatures [9, 46]. The alteration of high smectite bentonite to non-expandable clays is a primary limitation for heat tolerance in the clay concept. The isolation characteristics of bentonite buffer materials is reduced after this alteration. The time integral of this phenomenon determines total bentonite alteration. While short bursts of heat might be allowable, because the bentonite will not alter immediately, the kinetic alteration into smectite clays is hastened by temperatures above approximately  $100^{\circ}C$  [46]. The Belgian program has considered increasing the thermal limit of the clay in the buffer region by adding graphite. Conversely, well understood behavior for argillaceous clay and bentonite buffer backfill is conservatively assumed by the ANDRA assessment to occur only under  $90^{\circ}C$ , which is effectively a limit at the waste package interface with the bentonite buffer material.[9] The National Cooperative for the Disposal of Radioactive Waste (NAGRA) Opalinus Clay assessment less conservatively uses a maximum heat limit in the bentonite buffer of  $125^{\circ}C$ . [29]

---

<sup>1</sup>Belgium (ref. [42]) used values between 1.25 and 1.7  $[W/m^{\circ}K]$ .  
 France (ref. [9]) used values between 1.9 and 2.7  $[W/m^{\circ}K]$ .  
 Switzerland (ref. [? ]) used 1.8  $[W/m^{\circ}K]$ .

## Granite Disposal Environments

Granite disposal concepts have been considered in Finland, Japan, Sweden, China, Spain, the Czech Republic, South Korea and Switzerland as well as the US [24, 10, 33].

Attributes of granite that make it an attractive candidate geology for nuclear waste disposal include its very low porosity and permeability and high thermal conductivity. Fracturation in granite, however, has a negative effect on the isolation properties of the rock. Some characteristics of granite disposal concepts are given in Table 2.2.

Granite Repository Features			
Hydrology	Geochemistry	Design Concepts	Thermal Behavior
Low porosity ( $\sim 0.01$ ) High Fracturation Low permeability High Water Velocity	Reducing in Near Field Slightly Oxidizing in Far Field Increasing saline with depth [33] Cement causes alkalinity [10] Saturated or Unsaturated	Single WP tunnels Carbon-Steel [10]or Copper overpack Bentonite buffer Crushed granite backfill [33] < ( $-100m$ )	Closed Bentonite Limit $100^{\circ}C$

Table 2.2: Granite repository concepts demonstrate certain dominant physical phenomena.

## Disposal System Components

The Swedish KBS-3 concept includes ceramic oxide spent fuel waste forms within a steel shell and copper waste package buffered by bentonite clay and backfilled with clay and sand and emplaced vertically in horizontal drifts [2]. A similar Czech Republic repository concept consists of borosilicate glass waste forms within a stainless steel Universal Canister waste package, vertically emplaced in horizontal drifts and with a bentonite buffer and backfilled with a clay and sand mixture [33]. The Spanish concept is almost exactly similar to these, except emplacement is horizontal within the horizontal repository drifts.

This analysis will model borosilicate glass and ceramic oxide waste forms, carbon steel and copper waste packages, and bentonite and concrete buffer options.

A flexible repository layout model will support approximated modeling of each of these designs.

## **Hydrology**

In the granite disposal environment, a low porosity combined with higher expected water velocity (relative to other repository concepts in this work) and significant fracturation, the overall granite hydraulic conductivity is low, typically [51, 24]. Within this environment, the water behavior in the far field must be modeled as both diffusive and advective.

## **Geochemistry**

This environment is very reducing in the near field and less reducing in the far field. Far field fracturation in the granite near the surface of the site exposes the medium to the atmosphere, resulting in a slightly oxidizing condition in the far field, most importantly resulting in higher actinide solubilities in that region. Salinity in the granite environment increases monotonically with depth. The repository therefore, is in a location of high salinity, an indicator of low fluid flow and resulting in increased corrosion rates and for some radionuclides, changed solubilities [? ]. It is expected that the pH will be near neutral in this environment except with the introduction of concretes, due to which, the pH becomes significantly alkaline, resulting in more rapid alteration of bentonite buffers.

The relatively fast advective pathway provided by fracturation of granite has the effect of increasing the importance of  $^{234}\text{U}$  in the initial waste stream. While  $^{234}\text{U}$  and its

decay daughter  $^{230}\text{Th}$  are not very mobile in a reducing environment, their subsequent decay daughter  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  is highly mobile. In clay, the 1601 year half life of  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  is too short for a significant quantity to traverse the diffusive pathway. In granite, however,  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  is a dominant dose contributor [53].

### Thermal Behavior

Granite repository concepts are limited by the bentonite buffer in a manner similar to that of clay. However, in the absence of the bentonite limitation, a thermal limit within the granite itself is greater than  $200^{\text{circ}}\text{C}$ , limited by the increased risk of micro-cracking. least. This is due to the high thermal conductivity of granite, which is typically <sup>2</sup> found to be between 2.4 and 4 [ $\text{W}/\text{m} \cdot ^{\circ}\text{K}$ ].

The effective thermal limit for granite disposal concepts, however, is usually related to the bentonite limit, which is conservatively assumed by the ANDRA assessment to occur under  $90^{\circ}\text{C}$  at the waste package interface with the buffer material. Mechanical stresses and strains in the matrix due to heating at this level were analyzed by ANDRA and shown to have a negligible effect of flow behavior in granite. Similarly, thermo-hydraulic effects due to thermally induced fluid density changes are expected to be slight [? ]. Similarly, for reasons of buffer isolation integrity, the Czech and Spanish granite disposal concepts both maintained a thermal limit at the waste package interface with the buffer of  $100^{\circ}\text{C}$ . [33]

---

<sup>2</sup>Sweden (ref. [2]) used 3.4 - 4 [ $\text{W}/\text{m} \cdot ^{\circ}\text{K}$ ] and 2.45 - 2.9 [ $\text{W}/\text{m} \cdot ^{\circ}\text{K}$ ].  
 France (ref. [9]) used 2.4 - 3.8 [ $\text{W}/\text{m} \cdot ^{\circ}\text{K}$ ].  
 Finland (ref. [45]) used 2.3 - 3.2 [ $\text{W}/\text{m} \cdot ^{\circ}\text{K}$ ].



## Salt Disposal Environments

The salt disposal concept has been investigated in Germany and demonstrated for non-heat-generating waste at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility in the US. Salt demonstrates many attractive properties including ease of mining, creep behavior over time, which is expedited by heat, low permeability, and a high thermal conductivity, which affords a high temperature limit near  $200^{\circ}\text{C}$  [24]. Some characteristics of salt disposal concepts are given in Table 2.3.

Salt Repository Features			
Hydrology	Geochemistry	Design Concepts	Thermal Behavior
Dry Waste Package Dry Backfill Saturated Far Field Very low permeability Brine pockets in far field	Reducing in Near Field Slightly Oxidizing in Far Field Very saline brines pH?	Alcove Emplacement Crushed Salt Backfill < ( $-100\text{m}$ ) Multiple Packages Only Breached under Intrusion	$180^{\circ}\text{C}$ limit [33] Heat induced creep sealing Closed limited data

Table 2.3: Salt geological repository concept demonstrates certain dominant physical phenomena.

## Disposal System Components

The German reference concept in a salt dome has hundreds of drifts in which are placed thick steel waste packages and backfilled with crushed salt [33].

The consolidation properties of the backfill and salt are of great isolation importance. The infinitesimally small hydraulic conductivity of consolidated rock salt has the effect of nullifying the possibility of any releases without a disruption scenario. Thus, the accurate characterization of the site for both normal and high temperature will provide the fundamental confidence for repository behavior [17].

## **Hydrology**

In a rock salt or salt dome disposal environment, a very low porosity combined with negligible water velocity and effectively no fracturation, the overall salt hydraulic conductivity is exceptionally low. Within this environment, the diffusive speed out of the repository dominates the isolation behavior in a manner similar to the crystalline basement rock of the deep borehole concept. Candidate salt formations are remarkably uniform and their accessible porosity is fully saturated, but almost no water movement is expected to occur except that which is potentially induced by the thermal output of the repository..

## **Geochemistry**

This environment is very reducing in the near field and slightly less so in the far field [18]. The very high salinity in the salt environment expedites corrosive processes, but the engineered barrier system is of limited importance in this concept in which the diffusive rock barrier dominates isolation integrity. It is expected that the pH will be near neutral in this environment [33, 18].

## **Thermal Behavior**

Response of a salt repository to heat has a significant mechanical component. Bulk heating of a salt repository matrix causes coalescing of the salt surrounding the heat source. In the case of a nuclear waste repository, this phenomenon increases isolation capability of the salt. A heat limit, then, is difficult to characterize, but evolution of the heat in a salt environment is of great importance to nuclide transport modeling.

A model of temperature dependent salt coalescent behavior is in order. While coalescent phenomena has been observed within the WIPP facility, the emplaced material

in WIPP is not high heat generating. Thus, high heat salt coalescent behavior warrants further study [? ].

The UFD salt repository concept was based on some experience with construction and maintenance of the horizontal borings at WIPP. The current geometry involves emplacement of waste packages arranged at the corner of an alcove. This alcove is then backfilled with crushed salt. Notably, crushed salt has low conductivity, which increases the sensitivity of rock salt temperature on emplaced package temperature. However, as the crushed salt coalesces with heat over time, its thermal conductivity approaches that of intact salt. Further investigation toward a comprehensive model of the thermal behavior of dry salt has been recommended both domestically and internationally [? ].

The behavior of moisture in a salt repository under high heat is also not well characterized. Though it is clear that the salt will creep and coalesce with increased temperature, the potential generation of brines within the salt at high heat is a pertinent issue for salt disposal characterization.

The German salt repository concept maintains a  $180^{\circ}\text{C}$  temperature limit salt. At temperatures above  $220^{\circ}\text{C}$  the salt formation may release brines capable of facilitating nuclide transport [33][? ].

## **Deep Borehole Disposal Environments**

Deep Borehole disposal system concepts are being evaluated in Sweden and the United States. Attributes of this concept that are favorable for waste isolation include the stability of the crystalline basement rock in which the borehole emplacement would occur and the elongated diffusion path length for release. The potential technical difficulty of well controlled emplacement at great depth is an unfavorable attribute, however [24]. Some characteristics of deep borehole disposal concepts are given in Table 2.4.

**Borehole Repository Features**

Hydrology	Geochemistry	Design Concepts	Thermal Behavior
Crystalline rock Low porosity ( $\sim 0.01$ ) Limited fracturation at depth Rock Permeability ( $\sim 10^{-19}$ ) EBS Permeability ( $\sim 10^{-16}$ ) Very Limited Upward Flow	Reducing at depth Less Reducing at surface limited solubility enhanced sorption high salinity pH saturated	(i.e. -5km[18]) deep disposal (i.e. lower 2km [18]) 1km bentonite/concrete seal bentonite grout filling compressed bentonite plugs 400 packages per borehole closed	affects upward flow conductivity: $3.0 [W \cdot m^{-1} \cdot K^{-1}]$ specific heat $790 [J \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot K^{-1}]$ density $2750 [kg \cdot m^{-3}]$

Table 2.4: Borehole geological repository concept demonstrates certain dominant physical phenomena.

## Disposal System Components

In deep borehole concepts many types of waste form and waste package material are equivalently emplaced at great depths<sup>3</sup> in a crystalline rock such as granite basement rock. In this borehole, hundreds of canisters are stacked vertically in the deepest section. In some concepts, dense bentonite plugs are stacked between the packages. Above the packages, swelling bentonite clay, asphalt and concrete provide a seal for the upper few kilometers.

## Hydrology

In the deep borehole crystalline rock disposal environment, a low porosity combined with negligible upward water velocity and only minor fracturation, the overall crystalline basement hydraulic conductivity is very low. Within this environment the disposal pathway is the many kilometer diffusive path to the surface where fresh water aquifers may exist[18]. Without the introduction of a fast pathway such as an intersecting fracture or human intrusion, the length of the diffusive pathway has the effect of making the engineered barrier component choices irrelevant since no known engineered barrier choice can be expected to outlast the timescale of the diffusive pathway.

<sup>3</sup>4km in the Swedish concept and 5km in US concept [24, 18]

### **Geochemistry**

This environment is very reducing in the near field and less in the very far field near the earth's surface. The very high salinity of this environment is due to its depth. While this increases corrosion rates of engineered barriers, the isolation worth of this concept does not depend significantly on the engineered barrier components, relying instead on the diffusion path length.

### **Thermal Behavior**

The thermal behavior of the deep borehole environment is exactly similar to the granite case, except the bentonite buffer limitation is no longer applicable. Also, the 200°C limitation in order to avoid microfissures could be shown to be irrelevant in light of the great distance to the surface. That is, even if the damage zone in the vicinity of the emplaced waste packages is enlarged significantly by high heat load, the kilometers of diffusion length to the surface will still dominate the isolation behavior of the repository.

## **2.3 Analytical Models of Radionuclide Transport**

A comprehensive model of radiotoxic source term must address radionuclide transport through the full release pathway including waste packages, engineered barrier systems, and geologic media. A model of transport through the waste package must incorporate waste package failure rate, radionuclide release rate via waste form dissolution, and advective and diffusive transport through the engineered barrier system.

Waste package failure rate depends on near field environmental factors such as pH as well as decay heat and radiative damage anticipated from the contained waste. In turn, the radionuclide release rate from the waste package depends on the character of

**Models of Source Term for Various Geologies**

Source (Who)	Nation (Where)	Geology (What)	Methodology (How)
Enresa [33]	Spain	Granite	GoldSim $^{129}\text{I}$ primary contributor
SCK·CEN [33]	Belgium	Clay	FEP $^{129}\text{I}$ primary contributor
GRS [33]	Germany	Salt	Systematic Performance Assessment $^{135}\text{Cs}$ , $^{129}\text{I}$ , $^{226}\text{Ra}$ , $^{229}\text{Th}$
Ahn [5, 6]	USA	Yucca Tuff	Solubility Limited Release & Congruent Release
NCSU(Nicholson) [34]	USA	Yucca Tuff	TSPA codes EBSREL and EBSFAIL
WIPP	USA	Salt	?
NAGRA [29, 30]	Switzerland	Opalinus Clay	TAME code
ANDRA [9]	France	Argile Clay	Very detailed CEA code Mostly homogeneous medium $^{129}\text{I}$ primary contributor
ANDRA [10]	France	Granite	Very detailed CEA code Involves fracturation of medium $^{129}\text{I}$ primary contributor
SKB [2]	Sweden	Forsmark Laxemar	HYDRASTAR hydrologic transport code

Table 2.5: Methods by which to evaluate source term dependence of waste package failure, transport through the EBS and hydrogeologic transport. The latter two parts vary significantly among host formations.

the waste form matrix, water flow, radionuclide solubility and the elemental diffusion constant. Similarly, advective transfer through the engineered barrier system and into the geological medium also depends on water flow, radionuclide solubility, and radionuclide diffusion, but must be employed in the context of the hydrogeology of the rock.

Waste package failure rate varies between models. While some employ detailed computational tools such as GoldSim or EBSFAIL (a part of the EBSPAC module used in the TSPA code), which will be discussed in section ??, analytic models incorporate their own hydrogeologic approximations of canister degradation or make simpler assumptions of immediate waste canister failure in order to focus on dissolution and transfer.

Waste package release rate is the rate of mass transfer of a radionuclide from its waste form into the saturation water. The mode of water flowthrough heavily affects

radionuclide dissolution rate and is treated differently in various models. While some, inspired by the TSP assessment, assume water moves through the waste packages at a constant volumetric rate ('flowthrough model'), others adopt less conservative assumptions incorporating weather based predictions of hydrogeologic activity.

Radionuclide transport through the lithology is dependent upon diffusion as well as advection. Radionuclide transport is retarded by sorption, limited by solubility, and enhanced by colloidal mobility [16].

Dissolution is prerequisite to contribution of a radionuclide to source term [16]. That is, the initial dissolution of a radionuclide from its waste form is a breach of the primary barrier. Dissolution rates depend strongly on pH, Eh, speciation of radionuclides (chemical oxidative state), and radiolysis of the dissolving fluid, and primarily on material properties of the waste form.

Precipitation is the reverse of dissolution and occurs when a solubility limit is reached. Interestingly the chemical equilibrium of dissolution and precipitation is rate dependent and is highly dependent on thermodynamics. Predictions are not reliable in many cases.

Sorption, which includes both absorption and adsorption, is the interaction of a dissolved species with surfaces that removes that species from the dissolving medium models.

During sorption, contaminants are removed from the flowthrough water and taken up by the walls of pores or fractures in the rock matrix. Importantly, sorption is a reversible process, the counter process of which is desorption in which the contaminant is returned to the pore or fracture fluid from the matrix [4].

Sorption is typically expressed in terms of the distribution coefficient,  $K_d$ , the ratio at equilibrium between the mass of a radionuclide sorbed into the rock and the mass left in solution.  $K_d$  values are heavily radionuclide and geochemically dependent.

Colloids present in the near field dissolving solution have an effect on the mobility of radionuclides. Studies addressing the subtle differences between resultant behavior of various isotopes exist.

## Waste Form Release Models

Radionuclide release from various possible waste form types will be dominated by an array of degradation, alteration, and dissolution phenomena. These phenomena begin when surrounding waste packages are breached, exposing the waste form to water. Some phenomena dominating the release from canonical waste forms such as Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel (CSNF), DOE Spent Nuclear Fuel (DSNF), and High Temperature Gas Reactor (HTGR) are discussed in Table 2.6.

Waste Form Types			
WF Type	SubTypes	Contents	Release Drivers
Once Through	CSNF Ceramic Oxide CSNF Ceramic Oxide HTGR TRISO Graphite DSNF Metal DSNF Carbides DSNF Ceramic Oxides	Nominal Burnup UOx & MOX High Burnup High Burnup High Burnup N Reactor Fuel Fast Reactor Fuels Research Reactor Fuels	redox reactions redox reactions, heat graphite reactions metal reactions, heat carbide reactions, heat redox reactions, heat
Borosilicate Glass	Current Future	Minor Actinides (MAs) Cs/Sr Mo, no MA no Cs/Sr	heat, glass alteration glass alteration
Glass Ceramic	Glass Bonded Sodalite	Echem processed oxide fuels	ceramic, redox, glass reactions
Metal Alloy	From Echem From Aqueous	Cladding, noble metals undissolved solids, transition metals	metal reactions, heat metal reactions, heat
Advance Ceramic		volatized iodine	ceramic reactions, redox
Salt	Cementitious Sodium	separated streams	alkaline reactions, dissolution

Table 2.6: An array of waste forms developed for nuclear wastes will have a corresponding array of dominant release mechanisms [13]



### **Hedin Model ([25])**

In a saturated fractured rock matrix representative of the KBS-3 granitic Swedish repository concept, copper canister waste packages contain a waste matrix, and a bentonite buffer surrounds the canisters within repository drift tunnels. Waste form dissolution within the Hedin model is a rate based model that takes place within the waste package void. Radionuclides are released congruently until the waste form is completely degraded. [25]

### **Ahn Models ([5, 6])**

In an oxidizing, unsaturated environment, waste canisters are modelled as compartments of waste form surrounded by a buffer layer that is in turn surrounded by layers of near field rock and far field rock. Water is introduced to the system at a constant rate, and encounters an array of failed waste packages (at  $t = 0$  in the 2004 model, and at  $T_f = 75,000$  years in the 2007 model). The water immediately begins dissolving the waste matrix. Radionuclides with higher solubilities are preferentially dissolved and treated with a 'congruent release' model discussed below. Radionuclides with lower solubilities are transported through the buffer with the alternative 'solubility limited' release model. The water flow begins at one waste package and travels through the matrix and buffer space to the next waste package, contacting each waste package consecutively and then flowing on into the near field. In this way, the water is increasingly contaminated as its path through the waste packages proceeds.

### **Ahn Congruent Release Model**

In the Ahn models, radionuclides with a high solubility coefficient are modeled with the congruent release model. Radionuclides of this type include most of the fission products,

but not the actinides. This model states that the release from the waste packages is congruent with the dissolution of the waste matrix and is transported through the rock by advective transfer with the water that flows through the waste packages.

### **Ahn Solubility Limited Release Model**

In the Ahn models, radionuclides with lower solubility coefficients are modeled with the solubility limited release model. Solubility values are assumed from TSPA for this model, and elements with a solubility of less than  $5 \times 10^{-2} [mol/m^3]$  are taken to be 'low.' Elements in this 'low' category include Zr, Nb, Sn and some toxic actinides such as Th and Ra for an oxidizing, unsaturated environment similar to YMR. It should be noted that in a reducing environment, the actinides are not as mobile, and the high and low solubility radionuclides will differ from this model. This model suggests that dissolution of radionuclides into the flowthrough water is dominated by diffusion, which is largely dependent upon the concentration gradient between the waste matrix and the water. The mass balance driving radionuclide release takes the form:

$$\dot{m}_i = 8\epsilon D_e S_i L \sqrt{\frac{U r_0}{\pi D_e}} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\epsilon$ ,  $U$ ,  $r_0$ , and  $L$  are the geometric and hydrogeologic factors porosity, water velocity, waste package radius, and waste package length, respectively.  $D_e$  is the diffusion coefficient ( $m^2/yr$ ) of the element  $e$  and  $S_i$  is the element's solubility ( $kg/m^3$ ).

In the Hedin model of the waste matrix, the amount of solute available within the waste package is solved for, and for radionuclides with low solubility, the mass fraction released from the waste matrix is limited by a simplified description of their solubility. That is,

$$m_{1i}(t) \leq v_{1i}(t)C_{sol} \quad (2.2)$$

where the mass  $m_{1i}$  in  $[kg]$  of a radionuclide  $i$  released into the waste package void volume  $v_1$  in  $[m^3]$ , at a time  $t$ , is limited by the solubility limit, the maximum concentration,  $C_{sol}$  in  $[kg/m^3]$  at which that radionuclide is soluble [25].

## Waste Package Failure Models

Current Waste Package Failure Models			
Model	WP Failure Mode	Waste Form	Details
TSPA	EBSFAIL		300,000 years
Ahn 2003	Instantaneous Failure	Borosilicate Glass	$t = 0$
Ahn 2007		CSNF $UO_2$ matrix	$T_f = 75,000$ years
		Borosilicate Glass	$T_f = 75,000$ years
		Naval $UO_2$ matrix	$T_f = 75,000$ years
Li	EBSFAIL		300,000 years
Hedin 2003	Instantaneous	Copper KBS-3 Concept	$t_{delay} = 300$ years

Table 2.7: The above represent current methods by which waste package failure rates are modeled.

### Instantaneous

The Hedin model of waste package failure is effectively instantaneous, but limited by a release resistance coefficient. The release is assumed to occur through a hole in the waste canister that exists throughout the simulation, and the resistance coefficient limiting flow through the hole represents the magnitude of the canister flaw in combination with the buffer-geosphere interface[25].

Other models also use an instantaneous waste package failure mode for all waste packages simultaneously, in which failure occurs either at the onset of the simulation or

at some distinct time during the simulation. The mathematical representation of this probability density function is clearly just the delta function, with  $n_F$  being the number of failed waste packages,  $N$  being the total number of waste packages, and  $t_F$  being the time to failure,

$$n_F(t) = N\delta(t - t_F). \quad (2.3)$$

### Rate Based

When enough data exists, waste package failure can be represented more realistically by fractional destruction according to experimentally observed corrosion and dissolution rate functions.

However, this can be complicated to model even if the data exists. In particular, the corrosion rate will depend dramatically on the chosen material as well as hydrologic and thermal conditions. Specifically, corrosion rates for the same material are very different under dry oxidizing conditions and wet reducing conditions.

An expression of the number of failed waste packages,  $n_F$  per time step is a simple product between the initial number of waste packages,  $N$  and the rate  $f$  of package failure as a function of time  $t$ , temperature  $T$ , and other parameters.

$$n_F = Nf(t, T, \dots). \quad (2.4)$$

### Probabilistic

When a probability distribution of waste package failure is available, the discrete waste packages can be modeled to fail according to that distribution. For example, if the expected lifetime of a waste package is some known  $t_F$ , a Gaussian distribution around  $t_F$  would provide probability density function for waste package failures per time step,  $f(t)$

$$n_F = Nf(t). \quad (2.5)$$

Expressed with a cumulative distribution function  $F(t)$  rather than the probability distribution function,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{t=t} n_F = NF(t). \quad (2.6)$$

The instantaneous case is a special case of the probabilistic situation. Specifically, it is the Dirac delta function mentioned in equation (2.3).

A particularly attractive probability distribution for use in the case of failed engineered barriers is the Weibull distribution,

$$f(t, \lambda, k) = \begin{cases} \frac{k}{\lambda} \left(\frac{t}{\lambda}\right)^{k-1} e^{-(t/\lambda)^k} & t \geq 0, \\ 0 & t < 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

In this expression,  $k$  is a shape parameter and  $\lambda$  is a scale parameter. The time to

failure,  $t$  in the Weibull distribution gives a distribution for which the failure rate is proportional to a power of time [43]. Its complementary cumulative distribution function is

$$f(t, \lambda, k) = 1 - e^{-(t/\lambda)^k}. \quad (2.8)$$

## **Radionuclide Transport Through Secondary Engineered Barriers**

When the waste package is breached, radionuclides are transported through secondary engineered barrier, which includes the buffer, backfill, and tunnel wall. After transport through the secondary EBS, radionuclides reach the geosphere.

### **Barrier Dissolution and Failure**

The same models of waste package failure (instantaneous, rate based, and probabilistic) can be applied to buffers. While concretes are expected to degrade, bentonite buffers are quite stable in a reducing environment and help to keep the environment reducing. Furthermore, if preserved by a low heat environment, the plastic deformation characteristics of bentonite clays, they tend to swell over time and exhibit increased isolating behavior.

### **Transport Through Degraded Barrier Matrix**

Diffusive and advective transport occur in the barrier matrix both before and after degradation. Before degradation, transport is primarily diffusive. Thereafter, transport can become advective due to cracking. Cracking can be modeled explicitly or as a continuum model.

## Hydrogeologic Transport Models

Clay, shale, granite, and salt can largely be characterized as permeable porous media. While clay shale and salt do not exhibit significant fracturation and can often be modeled as homogeneous, granite is characterized as a fractured permeable porous media. Solute transport in both fracture and homogeneous permeable porous media involves advection, hydraulic dispersion, and diffusion.

Advection is transport congruent with the water velocity, diffusion is the result of brownian motion accross concentration gradients, and hydraulic dispersion is transport resulting from anisotropies in the water velocity field.

Fundamentally, the effect of these flows on mass transport is captured by the conceptual expression

$$\text{In} - \text{Out} = \text{Change in Storage} \quad (2.9)$$

Rearranging 2.9 and defining incoming and outflowing fluxes in a control volume, solute transport in a permeable medium of homogenous porosity can be written (as in Schwartz and Zhang [51])

$$\frac{\partial nC}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (F_c + F_{dc} + F_d) + m \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$n = \text{solute accessible porosity } [\%]$$

$$C = \text{concentration } [kg \cdot m^{-3}]$$

$$t = \text{time } [s]$$

$$F_c = \text{advective flow } [kg \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}]$$

$$= nvC$$

$$F_{dc} = \text{dispersive flow } [kg \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}]$$

$$= \alpha nv \nabla C$$

$$F_d = \text{diffusive flow } [kg \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}]$$

$$= D_e \nabla C$$

$$m = \text{solute source } [kg \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}].$$

In the expressions above,

$$v = \text{pore velocity } [m \cdot s^{-1}]$$

$$nv = \text{Darcy velocity } [m \cdot s^{-1}]$$

$$\alpha = \text{dispersivity } [m]$$

and

$$D_e = \text{effective diffusion coefficient } [m^2 \cdot s^{-1}].$$

The method by which the dominant solute transport mode (diffusive or advective) is determined for a particular porous medium is by use of the dimensionless Peclet number,



$$\begin{aligned}
 Pe &= \frac{nvL}{\alpha nv + D_e}, \\
 &= \frac{\text{advective rate}}{\text{diffusive rate}}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.11}$$

where

$$L = \text{transport distance } [m].$$

For a high  $Pe$  number, advection is the dominant transport mode, while diffusive transport dominates for a low  $Pe$  number. If one of these terms can be neglected, the solution is simplified.

Otherwise, the analytical expression in equation (2.10) will be the foundation of simplification by regression analyses for the radionuclide transport interface between components of the repository system model representing permeable porous media.

It is customary to define the combination of molecular diffusion and mechanical mixing as dispersion,

$$D = \alpha v + D_e \tag{2.12}$$

such that the mass conservation equation becomes:

$$\nabla (nD\nabla C) - \nabla (nv) = \frac{\partial(nC)}{\partial t} \tag{2.13}$$

Adding sorption, by accounting for a change in mass storage

$$\nabla (nD\nabla C) - \nabla (nv) = \frac{\partial(nC)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(s\rho_b)}{\partial t} \quad (2.14)$$

If it is assumed that sorption can be approximated as a linear equilibrium, reversible reaction,

$$\frac{\partial(s\rho_b)}{\partial t} = (R_f - 1) \frac{\partial(nC)}{\partial t}$$

equation (2.14) becomes

$$\nabla (nD\nabla C) - \nabla (nv) = R_f \frac{\partial(nC)}{\partial t} \quad (2.15)$$

where

$$R_f = \text{retardation factor} \quad (2.16)$$

$$= 1 + \frac{\rho_b K_d}{n} \quad (2.17)$$

$$\rho_b = \text{bulk density of the rock matrix} \quad (2.18)$$

and

$$K_d = \text{species distribution coefficient.} \quad (2.19)$$

For uniform flow, the dispersion tensor,  $D$ , becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
D_x &= D_L \\
&= \alpha_L v_x + \tau D_m
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
D_y &= D_{TH} \\
&= \alpha_{TH} v_x + \tau D_m
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
D_z &= D_{TV} \\
&= \alpha_{TV} v_x + \tau D_m
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where

$D_e$  = effectivediffusion coefficient [ $m^2/s$ ]

$\alpha_L$  = longitudinal dispersivity [ $m$ ]

$\alpha_{TH}$  = horizontal dispersivity [ $m$ ]

$\alpha_{TV}$  = vertical dispersivity [ $m$ ]

and

$$\tau = \text{tortuosity}. \tag{2.23}$$

The unidirectional dispersion tensor gives

$$D_x \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + D_y \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} + D_z \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} + v_x \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} = R_f \frac{\partial(nC)}{\partial t} \tag{2.24}$$

A special case of uniform flow, no flow, simplifies to the diffusion equation,

$$D_x \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial x^2} + D_y \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial y^2} + D_z \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial z^2} + C = R_f \frac{\partial(nC)}{\partial t} \quad (2.25)$$

Solutions to these equations can be categorized by their boundary conditions. The first, or Dirichlet type boundary conditions define a specified species concentration on some section of the boundary of the representative volume,

$$C(\vec{r}, t) = C_0(\vec{r}, t) \text{ for } \vec{r} \in \Gamma. \quad (2.26)$$

The second type or Neumann type boundary conditions describe a full set of fluxes at the boundary of the domain

$$\frac{\partial C(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial x} = nD\vec{J} \text{ for } \vec{r} \in \Gamma. \quad (2.27)$$

The third, Cauchy, type describes a combination of the Dirichlet and Neumann type conditions, defining both a concentration at a boundary and a flux at that boundary,

$$C(\vec{r}, t) = C_0(\vec{r}, t) \text{ for } \vec{r} \in \Gamma \quad (2.28)$$

$$\frac{\partial C(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial x} = nD\vec{J} \text{ for } \vec{r} \in \Gamma. \quad (2.29)$$

### One Dimensional Solution with Constant Concentration

An analytical solution for the one dimensional case with a continuous source of constant concentration is known. For the boundary conditions

$$C(0, t) = C_0 \quad (2.30)$$

and

$$\left. \frac{\partial C}{\partial x} \right|_{x=\infty} = 0 \quad (2.31)$$

as well as the initial condition

$$C(x, 0) = 0 \text{ for } x \in (0, \infty), \quad (2.32)$$

the so called Ogata and Banks solution gives

$$C(x, t) = \frac{C_0}{2} \left[ \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{x - \frac{v_x t}{R_f}}{2\sqrt{\frac{D_x t}{R_f}}} \right) + e^{\frac{v_x x}{D_x}} \operatorname{erfc} \left( \frac{x + \frac{v_x t}{R_f}}{2\sqrt{\frac{D_x t}{R_f}}} \right) \right]. \quad (2.33)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{erf}(x) &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt \\ \operatorname{erfc}(x) &= 1 - \operatorname{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-t^2} dt \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

Equation (2.33) is an appropriate one dimensional solution to the situation in this

work where a constant concentration at the internal boundary of each control volume is available at each time step. Abstraction-based abstractions based on this solution will be used to advance the concentration values at each time step within each control volume.

### **Temperature Dependent Diffusion : Arrhenius**

The Arrhenius relationship,

$$D = D_0 e^{-\frac{E_A}{RT}} \quad (2.35)$$

where

$$D = \text{the diffusion coefficient} \quad (2.36)$$

$$D_0 = \text{the maximum diffusion coefficient} \quad (2.37)$$

$$E_A = \text{the ctivation energy of diffusion}[J/kg] \quad (2.38)$$

$$T = \text{is the temperature}[^\circ K] \quad (2.39)$$

$$R = \text{the ideal gas constant}[J/\text{mol} \cdot ^\circ K], \quad (2.40)$$

$$(2.41)$$

gives the diffusion coefficient of solids as a function of temperature.

Gives D as a function of temperature and apparent activation energy of the medium.

### **Temperature Dependent Diffusion : Stokes Einstein**

The Stokes-Einstein relationship,

$$D(T) = \frac{k_B T}{6\pi\eta r} \quad (2.42)$$

gives an equation for the diffusion coefficient in a fluid, as a function of  $T$ , the temperature of the surrounding medium,  $k_B$ , the Boltzmann constant, and  $\eta$ , the viscosity of the medium. This relationship is appropriate for media that have a low Reynolds number,

$$Re = \frac{\rho v L}{\mu} \quad (2.43)$$

where

$$\rho = \text{fluid density}[kg/m^3] \quad (2.44)$$

$$v = \text{mean relative velocity of fluid}[m/s] \quad (2.45)$$

$$L = \text{characteristic length of system}[m] \quad (2.46)$$


$$\mu = \text{dynamic fluid viscosity}[kg/m \cdot s] \quad (2.47)$$

where viscous forces dominate.

### **Continuum Models of Fractured Media**

There exist various conceptual models for incorporating fractures into a porous medium model. Some examples are given in Figure 2.1.

The models arrived at via a continuum approximation are appropriate for very fractured or very unfractured situations. This approximation is not suitable for situations



**Fig. 12.6** Conceptual models of a fractured rock system (modified from Gale, 1982).  
 (a) A simplified fracture network of aperture  $2b$  with groundwater flow from left to right.  
 (b) Equivalent porous medium model of (a).  
 (c) Discrete fracture model of (a).  
 (d) Dual porosity medium model of (a).



in which the fracture width or frequency varies greatly.

Equivalent Porous Medium (EPM) models assert that a uniformly fractured medium can be approximated as a fractureless matrix with an effective porosity high enough to account for real fracturation [12][8].

Dual continuum models are the most widely employed models of fracture flow [19]. Dual Porosity Models make up one type of dual continuum model. This model incorporates advective transport in simplistic, uniform fractures and diffusive sorption and desorption into the stagnant (no advective transfer) water contained in the pores of the rock matrix [54] [26].

Dual Permeability Models are another type. These are similar to dual porosity models, but incorporate advective transfer within the rock matrix and between the rock matrix and the fracture volume[54] [26].

### **Discrete Fracture Network Models**

Discrete fracture network models approximate that water and contaminants move only through the fracture network [8, 51]. Such an approximation is appropriate when flow through fractures is fast relative to porous flow. This modeling formulation is complex and requires detailed knowledge of the candidate lithology.

The flow in each fracture can be approximated, as in Schwartz and Zhang, with the flow between two parallel plates having an aperture  $b$ , the mean fracture height [51]. For a fracture perpendicular to gravitational acceleration,  $g$ , the hydraulic conductivity,  $K$ , is described according to the cubic law as

$$K = \frac{\rho_w g b^2}{12\mu} \quad (2.48)$$

where

$\rho_w$  = water density,

$\mu$  = viscosity.

Accordingly, the volumetric flow rate in the single fracture of width,  $w$ , can be described in terms of the hydraulic head gradient,  $\frac{\partial h}{\partial L}$ , as

$$Q = -Kbw \frac{\partial h}{\partial L}. \quad (2.49)$$

Calculation of the volumetric flow rate and corresponding solute transport in a discrete fracture network model for many non-parallel fractures is an intensive numerical computation. However, for uniformly fractured media, a fracture network can be approximated by a set of parallel plates fractures.

If flow is expect in the  $\theta_f$  direction, and the fractures of the set are spaced a distance,  $s$ , apart,

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \text{fracture frequency} \\ &= \frac{\cos(\theta_f)}{s}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

The fracture network permeability is then defined as,

$$k_f = \frac{b^3}{12N}. \quad (2.51)$$

The permeability,  $k$ , in an equivalent permeability model is thereby obtained by the permeabilities of the fracture network,  $k_f$ , and the permeability of the host matrix,  $k_m$ . Following the derivation in Schwartz and Zhang, in terms of the cross-sectional contact areas of the matrix and fractures  $A_m$  and  $A_f$ , the equivalent permeability,  $k$ , can be expressed

$$k = \frac{k_m + \frac{A_f}{A_m} k_f}{1 + \frac{A_f}{A_m}}. \quad (2.52)$$

This permeability is then used as the effective permeability of the rock in expressions that utilize it to determine the darcy velocity, such as Equation (2.10).

### **Sudicky and Frind**

Sudicky and Frind give a model for fractured porous media that analytically captures nuclide mobility due to advection through fractures as well as competing retardation factors including sorption on the fracture walls, diffusion into stagnant fluid in the rock matrix, and sorption into rock matrix walls.

## **2.4 Analytical Models of Heat Transport**

A comprehensive model of a repository must arrive at an appropriate notion of heat-based repository capacity. This requires a model which addresses heat transport through the repository as a function of spatial repository layout, waste stream decay heat, and heat transfer properties of the engineered barrier system and lithology. This model must sufficiently solve for peak temperatures at heat limited locations, which are in most cases

at the waste package interface with the buffer material and the buffer material interface with the lithology. These heat limits were discussed in sections 2.2, 2.2 , 2.2, 2.2.

Heat transfer in these concepts will be dominated by diffusive and convective heat transfer. In a closed system, very few air gaps will exist. For this reason, heat transfer by radiation is likely to be negligible. Similarly, since water velocities are comparatively low, heat transfer by mass transfer will be small relative to diffusion and convection.

A discussion of analytical models of heat transport follows that quantifies these modes of heat transfer and addresses their applicability to the model at hand.

## Conduction

Conductive heat transfer occurs as a result of a temperature gradient. Heat flows diffusively from the hotter material to the cooler material over time and steadily approaches thermal equilibrium. The general form of the conduction equation can be expressed

$$\nabla^2 T + \frac{q'''}{k} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}, \quad (2.53)$$

which with no heat source becomes the transient Fourier equation,

$$\nabla^2 T = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}, \quad (2.54)$$

or to the Laplace equation in steady state,

$$\nabla^2 T = 0. \quad (2.55)$$

Replacing the source gives the steady state Poisson equation,

$$\nabla^2 T + \frac{q'''}{k} = 0. \quad (2.56)$$

An areal heat flux,  $q''[W/m^2]$  can be derived from an integration of Poisson's equation (2.56) and expressed in terms of the thermal conductivity of the material,  $k[W/m \cdot ^\circ K]$ , and the temperature gradient  $\nabla T[K/m]$  by the expression

$$q'' = -k\nabla T. \quad (2.57)$$

For the one dimensional case, equation 2.57 can be reduced using a finite difference approximation. For a body at  $x_1$  with temperature  $T_1$  and a body with temperature  $T_2$  at position  $x_2$ ,

$$q''_x = -k_x \frac{dT}{dx} \quad (2.58)$$

$$= -k_x \frac{(T_1 - T_2)}{x_1 - x_2}. \quad (2.59)$$

A one dimensional heat flux rate can be found by integration over the surface area of the representative volume,

$$\dot{q} = -kA \frac{\Delta T}{\Delta x}. \quad (2.60)$$

## Convection

Convective heat transfer occurs advectively in accordance with fluid movement. The form of Fourier's Law that describes convection is very similar to equation 2.57 for conduction, though the convective heat transfer coefficient  $h[Wm^{-2}K^{-1}]$  and the surface area of heat transfer  $A[m^2]$  replace the conductivity coefficient. Convection is typically expressed as

$$q'' = -hA\nabla T \quad (2.61)$$

such that

$$q''_x = hA \frac{dT}{dx} \quad (2.62)$$

$$= -h_x A \frac{(T_1 - T_2)}{x_1 - x_2}. \quad (2.63)$$

## Radiation

Heat transfer by radiation is the result of the emission of electromagnetic waves. Plack black body radiation is analytically described, using  $\sigma$ , the Stefan-Boltzmann constant as

$$q'' = \sigma A_1 F_{1 \rightarrow 2} (T_1^4 - T_2^4) \quad (2.64)$$

where

$$\sigma = 5.670373 \times 10^8 [W/m^2 \cdot ^\circ K^4]. \quad (2.65)$$

## Mass Transfer

Heat transfer by mass transfer is straightforward, resulting in the change in temperature in adjacent volumes as a result of matter movement. If the specific heat capacity of the transferred mass can be expressed as  $c_p$ , then the heat conductance is simply,

$$\dot{q} = \dot{m}c_p (T_j - T_i). \quad (2.66)$$

$$(2.67)$$

## Lumped Parameter Model

The lumped heat capacitance model makes an analogy to electrical circuit by reducing a thermal system into discrete lumps. Such an approximation is appropriate when it can be assumed that the temperature gradient within each lump is approximately uniform. the appropriateness of this approximation can quantitatively expressed by comparison of the internal thermal resistance to the external thermal resistance. The Biot number,

$$Bi = \frac{hA}{k} \quad (2.68)$$

indicates the relative speeds with which heat conducts within an object and across

the boundary of that object. If the Biot number is low ( $< 0.1$ ), and therefore conduction is faster within the object than at the boundary, the assumption of a uniform internal temperature is appropriate and the lumped parameter model may be expected to give a result within 5% error[27]. This assists in choosing the size of distinct lumps within a conceptual model.

The lumped capacitance model can address multiple media and multiple heat transfer modes. The rate of heat transfer  $[W \cdot m^{-2} \cdot ^\circ K \cdot s]$  through a circuit is simply given as the quotient of the temperature difference and the thermal resistance of the multiple lumps,

$$\dot{q} = \frac{\Delta T}{\sum_{i=0}^N R_i}. \quad (2.69)$$

By representing the various modes of heat transport (i.e. conduction, convection, radiation, and mass transfer) with various expressions for resistance, the lumped capacitance model provides a solution to the transient problem described by the energy balance,

(Energy added to body  $j$  in  $dt$ ) = (Heat out of adjacent bodies into body  $j$ )

$$c_j \rho_j V_j dT_j(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{i=N} [q_{i,j}] dt, \quad (2.70)$$

where  $c_j \rho_j V_j$  is the total lumped thermal capacitance of the body.

For example, in the case of a simple conductive circuit between two bodies,  $i$  and  $j$ ,



the resistance of  $j$  can be described as

$$R_{cond} = 1/hA \quad (2.71)$$

such that

$$c_j \rho_j V_j dT_j(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{i=N} [hA_j [T_i - T_j(t)]] dt. \quad (2.72)$$

$$(2.73)$$

A time constant appears under integration that describes the speed with which the body  $i$  changes temperature with respect to the maximum temperature change,

$$\int_{T_j=T_0}^{T_j(t)} \frac{dT_j(t)}{T_i - T_j} = \frac{hA_j}{c_j \rho_j V_j} \int_0^t dt \quad (2.74)$$

$$-\ln \frac{T_i - T_j(t)}{T_i - T_0} = \frac{hA_j}{c_j \rho_j V_j} t \quad (2.75)$$

$$\frac{T_i - T_j(t)}{T_i - T_0} = e^{-(hA_j/c_j \rho_j V_j)t} \quad (2.76)$$

such that

$$\frac{T_j(t) - T_i}{T_i - T_0} = 1 - e^{-t/\tau} \quad (2.77)$$

where

$$\tau = (c_j \rho_j V_j / hA_j).$$

The time constant,  $\tau$  is the time it takes for the body to change  $(1 - (1/e))\% \Delta T$  and is equal to the product of the thermal capacitance and thermal resistance of the body,  $CR$ , analogous to an electrical circuit. [23] This is the case for all resistances,  $R_i$  representing modes of heat transfer. Thus, one can say, in general

$$\tau_j = c_j \rho_j V_j R_j. \quad (2.78)$$

## Impact of Repository Designs

The repository layout has a significant influence on its heat limited capacity. Waste package spacing in drifts, boreholes, or alcoves, tunnel spacing, and multiple gallery level designs can increase or decrease available heat loading. For example, in the YMR, a variety of parameters have been shown to potentially increase the repository waste density.

The YMR statutory limit of once-through, thermal PWR waste is 70,000 tonnes SNF. That is to say, the statutory line load limit is approximately 1.04 tonnes/m for 67km of planned emplacement tunnels (with 81 meters between drifts). The Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Science and Engineering Report gives this basic “statutory limit”, but suggests an inherent design flexibility that could allow for expansion.

This inherent flexibility can come from an increase in the areal extent of the repository footprint, the density of drifts, or vertical expansion. The “full inventory” Yucca Mountain design alternative gives a maximum repository capacity of 97,000 tonnes. In addition, the current design for the repository has flexibility for “additional repository capacity” which would give a 119,000 tonne capacity at 1.04 tonnes/m.[22]

In addition to variable drift spacing, other modifications to repository layout have had promising results in terms of heat-limited repository capacity. The Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) in their Room at the Mountain study found that with redesign of the repository an increased capacity of at least 400% (295 tonnes once-through SNF) and up to 900% (663 tonnes) could be expected to be achieved. Proposed design changes include decreased spacing between drifts, a larger areal footprint, vertical expansion into second and third levels of repository space, and hybrid solutions involving combinations of these ideas. In particular, EPRI suggests either an expansion of the footprint with redesign of the current Upper Block line load design plan or a multi-level plan that repeats the footprint and line load design of the current plan[32].

Specific Temperature Change analysis by Radcliff, Wilson, et al. find a maximum thermal capacity of 1.09 tonnes/m for commercial SNF (at an ELF of  $49GWd_{th}/m$ )[48].

Layout options such as age based fuel mixing also allows for decreases in drift spacing. In aged based fuel mixing, aged (long cool time) SNF is loaded in a mixture with young SNF. This age based fuel mixing has been shown to achieve a 48% increase in the repository capacity as constrained by heat load[38]. This factor uses a fiducial default footprint of  $4.6km^2$  used in the NRC TSPA. The reported 48% increase in capacity results in total repository capacity of 103,600 tonnes[? ].

## Heat Limits in Engineered Components

Various waste form constraints exist that limit fuel loading. These are in general less restrictive than heat limits resulting from geological medium constraints, however in some cases they are more restrictive.

For example, the current constraining heat limit in borosillicated glass reported by the UFD campaign is  $500^{\circ}C$ , corresponding to the temperature at which the glass can

**Yucca Mounting Footprint Expansion Calculations**

Author	Max. Capacity <i>tonnes</i>	Footprint <i>km<sup>2</sup></i>	Details
OCRWM	70,000 97,000 119,000	4.65 6 7	"statutory case" "full inventory case" "additional case"
Yim, M.S.	75,187 76,493 95,970 82,110	4.6 4.6 4.6 4.6	SRTA code STI method 63m drift spacing 75 yrs. cooling
Nicholson, M.	103,600	4.6	drift spacing
EPRI	63,000	6.5	Base Case CSNF
option 1	126,000	13	expanded footprint
option 2	189,000	6.5	multi-level design
option 3	189,000	6.5	grouped drifts
options 2+3	252,000	6.5	hybrid
options 1+(2or3)	378,000	13	hybrid
options 1+2+3	567,000	13	hybrid

Table 2.8: Various analyses based on heat load limited repository designs have resulted in footprint expansion calculations of the YMR.

be expected to begin devitrifying [? 24, 52]. For ceramic oxide fuel pellet waste forms, zirconium cladding has a heat limit of  $350^{\circ}\text{C}$  to prevent rupture.

## Specific Temperature Integral

Line loading ( $t/m$ ) and areal power density ( $W/km^2$ ) are two common metrics for describing the loading of the repository. While these metrics are informative for mass capacity and power capacity respectively, they fail to reflect differences in thermal behavior due to varying SNF compositions. A closer look at the isotopics of the situation has proven much more applicable to thermal performance studies of the repository, and the preferred method in the current literature relies on specific temperature integrals.

Specific Temperature Integrals model the thermal source as linear along the emplace-

ment paths, similar to the line loading and areal power density metrics. However, a temperate integral takes account of heat transfer behavior in the rock, includes the effects of myriad SNF compositions, and gives the thermal integration over time for any specific location within the rock. Man-Sung Yim calls this the Specific Temperature Increase method[36] though other researchers have other names for this method. Tracy Radel calls her temperature metric at a point in the rock the Specific Temperature Change[47].

In a repository with linear drifts, the Heat flux from the drifts can be expressed as the superposition of the linear heat flux contributions of all the radionuclides in the waste. Each radionuclide contributes in proportion to its decay heat generation and its weight fraction of the SNF. With information about isotopic composition of the SNF, the Specific Temperature Increase can determine the maximum thermal capacity of the repository in terms of tonnes/m. The length based accounting in  $\frac{t}{m}$  is converted to  $\frac{t}{\text{Repository}}$  by multiplication with the total emplacement tunnel length of the repository. In the case of Yucca Mountain, this was 67 km.

## 2.5 Detailed Computational Models of Radionuclide Transport

Detailed computational models of radionuclide transport seek to quantify the spatial movement of radionuclides within a repository environment due to heat generating waste forms. Such models are detailed with respect to their fine spatial and temporal resolution or with respect to the incorporation and coupling of numerous physical phenomena. Current detailed computational models addressing various repository geologies and geometries will be reviewed here that utilize finite differencing and finite element methods in many dimensions, sophisticated numerical solvers, and other high

fidelity approaches.

Focused fuel cycle sensitivity analyses emphasizing used fuel disposition and waste management in the Yucca Mountain Repository (YMR) have been conducted by Li, Piet, Wilson, and Ahn. With a focus on YMR capacity benefit, repository performance metrics of interest for these analyses were heat, source term, and more global environmental impact metrics. Sensitivity analyses for other geologies were conducted concerning repository concepts relevant to other nations as well. See Table 2.9.

## European RED-IMPACT

The RED-IMPACT assessment compared results from European fuel cycle codes for various specific waste package forms, radioactive and radiotoxic inventories, reprocessing discharges, waste package thermal power, corrosion of matrices, transport of radioisotopes and resulting doses. Granite, clay and salt were analyzed by various countries and codes as listed in table 2.9.

International Repository Concepts				
Geology	Nation	Waste Stream	Metric	Institution
Granite	Spain	HLW	Heat Load	Enresa
Granite	Czech Rep.	HLW	Heat Load	NRI
Clay	Belgium	HLW	Heat Load	SCK·CEN
Salt	Germany	HLW	Heat Load	GRS
Granite	Spain	HLW	Dose	Enresa
Clay	Belgium	HLW	Dose	SCK·CEN
Clay	France	HLW	Dose	CEA
Salt	Germany	HLW	Dose	GRS
Granite	Czech Rep.	ILW	LT Dose	NRI
Granite	Spain	ILW	LT Dose	Enresa
Clay	Belgium	ILW	LT Dose	SCK·CEN
Granite	Spain	HLW/ILW/Iodine	LT Dose	Enresa
Clay	Belgium	HLW/ILW/Iodine	LT Dose	SCK·CEN

Table 2.9: International repository concepts evaluated in the RED Impact Assessment.[33]

## **UFD Generic Performance Assessment Model**

The UFD campaign is currently conducting an effort to produce a Generic Performance Assessment Model for analysis of GDSMs for various geological environments. Teams from Argonne National Laboratory, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratory are developing models of generic clay, granite, and salt disposal environments. Sandia is simultaneously constructing a deep borehole disposal system model in crystalline rock. Each generic disposal system model will perform detailed calculations of radionuclide transport within its respective lithology. A 2012 goal of the project includes an overarching generic model that incorporates the various geologically distinct submodels in order to provide a fully generic repository model. This overarching GPAM work will be incorporated into this effort.

The radionuclide transport calculations for the geologically distinct models are performed within the GoldSim simulation platform. GoldSim is a commercial Probabilistic elements of the GoldSim modelling framework enable the models to incorporate Features, Events, and Processes (FEPs) expected to take place probabilistically during the evolution of the repository.

Cells within GoldSim represent components of the waste disposal system and are linked by diffusive, advective, precipitated, direct, or otherwise filtered mass transfer links.

Thermal modeling for the GDSMs are conducted independently with associated codes capable of modeling thermal evolution for all geologies. For example, one thermal model is being created using the SINDA\G heat transport solver and another is under development that utilizes a combination of MathCAD and Excel.

### **Clay/Shale GDSM**

The Clay GDSM is being pursued by the team at Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) and will be the primary model with which this work will conduct parametric regression analyses.

The Clay GDSM models a single waste form, waste package, EBS, Excavation Disturbed Zone (EDZ), and far field zone. This waste unit cell is modeled with boundary conditions such that it may be repeated throughout the extent of a repository configuration.

The waste form and engineered barrier system are modeled as well-mixed volumes and radial transport away from the cylindrical base case unit cell is modeled as one dimensional.

Two radionuclide release pathways are considered. One is the nominal, undisturbed case, while the other is a fast pathway simulating a disturbed case [18].

### **Granite GDSM**

Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and Sandia National Laboratory (SNL) have created a model of the granite repository concept in a saturated, reducing environment.

Waste form degradation is modeled as a constant, fractional rate to represent dissolution for both canonical borosilicate glass and commercial used fuel waste forms.

Though waste package failure is conservatively assumed to be instantaneous, waste package release into the near field is solubility limited as is the near field to far field interface.

Transport through the buffer is modeled as entirely diffusive coupled with sorption. Advection is neglected.



The far field was represented using a model that includes advection, diffusion and sorption. Specifically, the Finite Element Heat and Mass Transfer (FEHM) code was coupled into GoldSim to represent the far field.

### **Salt GDSM**

The salt repository concept has an alcove gallery geometry and is located in a bedded salt formation. The formation is located in a reducing, saturated environment. Once waste packages are horizontally placed in a corner of the alcove, the space is backfilled with crushed salt.

Decay heat induced salt consolidation and brine flow are primary focuses of this analysis and inform radionuclide transport calculations.

A constant, temperature independent annual degradation rate model is used to represent waste form dissolution for both canonical borosilicate glass and commercial used fuel waste forms. Waste package failure is conservatively assumed to be instantaneous, and all near field components are modeled as a single mixed cell, the water volume of which is determined by the bulk volumes and degraded porosities of contained materials (e.g. bentonite buffer). A block of rock below the salt provides the pathway interface to an aquifer below. Radionuclide transport into that interface is modeled as diffusive, advective, and solubility limited.

The far field is modeled using an equilibrium sorption model in addition to solubility limited diffusion and advection. In such an equilibrium sorption model, the sorption to precipitation balance is assumed to be at a reaction equilibrium. In this way, the partitioning coefficient  $K_d$  is used to quantify the ratio between dissolved and undissolved reactant. Radionuclide transport in the far field takes place for 5km, and ends in a biosphere model.

Two radionuclide release pathways are considered. One is the nominal, undisturbed case, which the other is a fast pathway simulating a disturbed case [18].

### **Deep Borehole GDSM**

The deep borehole model concept consists of some 400 waste canisters in a 5km deep hole within a low permeability, high salinity region characteristic of crystalline rock formations at depth. The lower 2km of the hole are filled by waste packages as well as spacing and sealing plugs. A 1km sealing zone extends above the waste disposal region.

As with the salt model, a constant, temperature independent annual degradation rate model is used to represent waste form dissolution for both canonical borosilicate glass and commercial used fuel waste forms. Waste package failure is conservatively assumed to be instantaneous.

Flow in the vicinity of the borehole was modeled using tabulated groundwater flow velocities obtained from simulations run using the FEHM code meshed in three full dimensions with the CUBIT Geometry and Mesh Generation Toolkit (CUBIT) meshing tool [18].

### **Li Model[34]**

As a function of time, water enters the Engineered Barrier System and corrodes the waste packages. These fail and from the failed waste packages radionuclides are released according to advective transfer. Further transport through the near and far field rock medium is modeled in two modes, one representing the Unsaturated Zone, and one representing the Saturated Zone.

**Waste package failure and radionuclide release** are modeled with two TSPA code modules called EBSFAIL and EBSREL. The waste package failure rate is determined from EBSFAIL, which incorporates waste form chemistry, humidity, oxidation, etc and upon contact from water begins the degradation process. The results of EBSFAIL become the input to EBSREL, which models corresponding radionuclide release from those failed waste packages. Mass balance governing the radionuclide release rate in this model allows advective transfer to dominate and takes the form:

$$\dot{m}_i = w_{li}(t) - w_{ci}t - m_i\lambda_i + m_{i-1}\lambda_{i-1}.$$

In this expression,  $w_{li}(t)$  is the rate  $[mol/yr]$  of isotope  $i$  leached into the water. It is a function of water flow rate, chemistry, and isotope solubility.  $m_i$  describes the mass of isotope  $i$ , and  $\lambda_i [s^{-1}]$  describes its decay constant. Finally,  $w_{ci}(t)$  describes the advective transfer rate  $[mol/yr]$  of the isotope  $i$ . This model defines  $w_{ci}$  as:

$$w_{ci}(t) = C_i(t)q_{out}(t). \quad (2.79)$$

where  $q_{out}$  is the volumetric flow rate of the water  $[m^3/yr]$ , and  $C_i$  is the concentration on isotope  $i$  in the waste package volume  $m_i/V_{wp}$  in  $[mol/m^3]$ . These assumptions fail to take into account any differences in the varying solubilities of the isotopes, but are quite sensitive to the concentration of an isotope  $i$  in the waste package volume. characteristics and is independent of or weakly dependent on concentration [34].

## ANDRA Dossier 2005

The ANDRA Dossier 2005 studies provided detailed radionuclide transport calculations for both argillaceous clay and granite formations.

## ANDRA Clay Model

In the ANDRA clay model, complicated saturation and resaturation phenomena are neglected and it is assumed that the initial repository condition is fully resaturated. This is a conservative simplification. Another conservative assumption is one in which the evacuation disturbed zone does not heal. Rather, it is modeled in its damaged state immediately after excavation.

This model only tracks 15 radionuclides of importance. These are chosen to be those with halflives over 1000 years and most toxicity or mobility. [9] The behavior of radionuclides in glassvitrification forms can be summarized by categorizing them into mobile, intermediate, and well retained elements.

Some specific codes and the method with which they were used in the ANDRA clay assessment are listed in Table 2.10.

<b>Detailed Nuclide Transport Models Used in the ANDRA analysis.</b>	
<b>Models</b>	<b>Codes</b>
Hydrogeology and particle tracking in continuous porous media	Connectflow (3D finite element) Geoan (3D finite differences). Porflow (3D finite differences).
Hydrogeology and particle tracking in discrete fracture networks.	Connectflow (3D finite elements). FracMan (discrete fracture networks) and MAFIC (3D finite elements).
Transport in continuous porous media.	PROPER (finite differences), Goldsim (control volumes), and Porflow (control volumes?).
Transport in discrete fracture networks.	PROPER (1D stream tube concept). PathPipe (networks of tubes) and Goldsim (networks of 1D pipes).

Table 2.10: Similar to the Total System Performance Assessment, ANDRA's analyses are a coupled mass of many codes. Table reproduced from Argile Dossier 2005 [9]

Waste form dissolution and package release was assumed to be immediate for some waste forms and corrosion rate based for those where appropriate data was available. Vitrified waste package releases were either modeled with a simple model or a two

phase phenomenological model.

Transportation through the backfill is modeled as diffusive, with high permeability after degradation.

The evacuation disturbed zone has both a fracture zone and a microfissure zone.

In the host formation, movement is dominated by diffusion, and advection is modeled, but is negligible.

Tools used in the ALLIANCES software platform include Castem, PorFlow and Trace for hydraulic calculations and radionuclide transport and Prediver and Colonbo for waste package failure.

### **ANDRA Granite Model**

j++¿

## **2.6 Detailed Computational Models of Heat Transport**

Detailed heat transport models seek to quantify the heat evolution within a repository environment due to heat generating waste forms. Such models are detailed with respect to their detailed spatial and temporal resolution or with respect to the incorporation and coupling of numerous physical phenomena. Such codes typically utilize finite differencing or finite element methods in many dimensions or sophisticated numerical solvers, respectively.

### **LLNL MathCAD Model**

This model, created at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) for the UFD campaign, is written in a combination of MathCAD and Excel. The model consists of

two parts. The first is a MathCAD solution of the transient homogeneous conduction equation

$$\nabla^2 T = \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}. \quad (2.80)$$

The solution of this equation at the boundary of the EBS and the waste package is then treated as a boundary condition for the heterogeneous steady state equation,

$$\nabla^2 T + \frac{q'''}{k} = 0, \quad (2.81)$$

which in turn calculates a resulting gradient through the geometry. The process is then iterated with a one year resolution in order to arrive at a heat evolution over the lifetime of the repository. This model seeks to inform heat limited waste capacity calculations for each geology, for many waste package loading densities, and for many fuel cycle options.

### **Bauer SINDA\G Model**

This model, created at Argonne National Lab by Ted Bauer uses a lumped capacitance solver, called SINDA\G.

The Bauer model is geometrically adjustable.

The SINDA lumped capacitance solver solves a thermal circuit, for which conducting nodes may be of four types corresponding to the four modes of heat transfer.

For heat flux rate through each conducting node, the SINDA lumped parameter model solves the Fourier equation,




Figure 2.2: The geometry of the thermal model can be adjusted in two dimensions, altering the tunnel spacing and the vertical distance from the aquifer.

$$\dot{q} = \frac{1}{R}(T_i - T_j) \quad (2.82)$$

$$(2.83)$$

where

$R$  = resistance

$T$  = temperature

and

$\dot{q}$  = heat rate.

Lumps are connected by conduction, convection, radiation, and mass flow heat transfer links. Briefly, these are represented by

$$R_{cond} = \frac{L}{kA} \quad (2.84)$$

$$R_{conv} = \frac{1}{h \cdot A} \quad (2.85)$$

$$R_{mf} = \frac{1}{\dot{m}c_p} \quad (2.86)$$

$$R_{rad} = \frac{1}{\sigma F_{ij} A [T_i + T_A + T_j + T_A] [(T_i + T_A)^2 + (T_j + T_A)^2]} \quad (2.87)$$

where

$k$  = conductivity[]

$A$  = area[m<sup>2</sup>]

$c_p$  = specific heat capacity[]

$h$  = heat transfer coefficient[]

$\dot{m}$  = mass transfer rate[kg · s<sup>-1</sup>]

$T_i$  = lump temperature[°C]

$T_A$  = absolute temperature[°C]

$F_{ij}$  = radiation interchange factor[-].



With these representations of thermal resistance, a lumped parameter model will require an analysis that determines the appropriate length scale for the lumped parameter approximation.

The Bauer model utilizes the SINDA\G lumped capacitance solver to determine the two dimensional heat evolution of the repository and to optimize spatial waste loading in order to meet a constraint at the edge of the waste package.

## Other Numerical Methods

Codes used by repository modeling efforts investigated in this review include finite difference codes, finite element codes, and specific temperature integrals. They are listed in Table 2.11.

**Models of Heat Load for Various Geologies**

Source (Who)	Nation (Where)	Geology (What)	Methodology (How)
Enresa [33]	Spain	Granite	CODE.BRIGHT 3D Finite Element
NRI [33]	Czech Rep.	Granite	Specific Temperature Integral
ANDRA [10]	France	Granite	3D Finite Element CGM code
SKB [2]	Sweden	metagranite	1D-3D Site Descriptive Models
SCK-CEN [33]	Belgium	Clay	Specific Temperature Integral
ANDRA [9]	France	Argile Clay	3D Finite Element CGM code
NAGRA [29, 30]	Switzerland	Opalinus Clay	3D Finite Element CGM code
GRS [33]	Germany	Salt	HEATING (3D finite difference)
NCSU(Li) [35]	USA	Yucca Tuff	Specific Temperature Integral
NCSU(Nicholson) [38]	USA	Yucca Tuff	COSMOL 3D Finite Element
Radel & Wilson [47]	USA	Yucca Tuff	Specific Temperature Change

Table 2.11: Methods by which to calculate heat load are independent of geology. Maximum heat load constraints, however, vary among host formations.

### 3 MODELING PARADIGM

---

The modeling paradigm with which this repository model and simulation platform are implemented are here described. Implications of the simulation platform architecture on the design of the repository model are discussed and the interfaces defining components of the repository model follow.

#### 3.1 Cyclus Simulator Paradigm

The CYCLUS project at the University of Wisconsin (UW) at Madison is the simulation framework in which this repository model is designed to operate. Modular features within this software architecture provide a great deal of flexibility, both in terms of modifying the underlying modeling algorithms and exchanging components of a fuel cycle system.

The CYCLUS fuel cycle simulator is the result of lessons learned from experience with previous nuclear fuel cycle simulation platforms. The modeling paradigm follows the transaction of discrete quanta of material among discrete facilities, arranged in a geographic and institutional framework, and trading in flexible markets. Key concepts in the design of CYCLUS include open access to the simulation engine, modularity with regard to functionality, and relevance to both scientific and policy analyses. The combination of modular encapsulation within the software architecture and dynamic module loading allows for robust but flexible reconfiguration of the basic building blocks of a simulation without alteration of the simulation framework.

The modeling paradigm adopted by CYCLUS includes a number of fundamental concepts that comprise the bedrock on that other, more flexible, design choices have been made.

## Dynamic Module Loading

The ability to dynamically load independently constructed modules is a heavy focus of CYCLUS development. Dynamically-loadable modules are the primary mechanism for extending CYCLUS ' capability. The primary benefit of this approach is encapsulation: the trunk of the code is completely independent of the individual models. Thus, any customization or extension is implemented only in the loadable module. A secondary benefit of this encapsulation is the ability for contributors to choose different distribution and licensing strategies for their contributions. By allowing models to have varied availability, the security concerns of developers can be assuaged (See Figure 3.1).




Figure 3.1: The CYCLUS code repository allows for varied accessibility.

Finally, this strategy allows individual developers to explore different levels of complexity within their modules, including wrapping other simulation tools as loadable modules within the CYCLUS framework. This last benefit of dynamically-loadable mod-

ules addresses another goal of CYCLUS : ubiquity amongst its potential user base. By engineering CYCLUS to easily handle varying levels of complexity, a single simulation engine can be used by both users keen on big-picture policy questions as well as users interested in more detailed, technical analyses.

### **Encapsulation**

CYCLUS implements an encapsulated structure that takes advantage of object-oriented software design techniques in order to create an extensible and modular user and developer interface. A primary workhorse for this implementation is the notion of dynamic module loading in combination with well defined module interfaces within a region, institution, and facility hierarchy. In this paradigm, the shared interface of polymorphic objects is abstracted from the logic of their instantiation by the model definition they inherit.

In this way, CYCLUS allows a level of abstraction to exist between the simulation and model instantiation as well as between model instantiation and behavior. An interface defines the set of shared functions of a set of subclasses in an abstract superclass. In CYCLUS main superclasses are Regions, Institutions, Facilities, and Markets while their subclasses are the concrete available model types (e.g. a `RecipeReactorFacility`). See Figure 3.2.

The interface for the `FacilityModel` class is the set of virtual functions declared in the `Facility` class such as `getName`, `getID`, `executeOrder()`, `sendMaterial()`, `receiveMaterial()` etc. Through such an interface, the members of a subclass can be treated as interchangeable (polymorphic) instantiations of their shared superclass.




Figure 3.2: Modules are defined solely by their interfaces in a modular paradigm and can be arbitrarily interchanged with modules possessing equivalent interfaces.

### Modularity and Extensibility

A modular code must have the traits of encapsulation and abstraction appropriate for a user or developer to flexibly make alterations to the simulation performance with minimal modification to the code. An extensible code should be both robustly suited to the addition of classes and subclasses as well as suited to communication with other codes. In CYCLUS, addition of new models by dynamic loading is possible without any alteration of the software trunk. The modular design of CYCLUS stresses avoidance of rigidity, in which changes to the code are potentially difficult, and fragility, in which changes to the code are potentially damaging.

## **Market-based Material Transactions**

The foundation of a simulation is a commodity market that collects offers and requests and matches them according to some algorithm. The user is able to select which type of algorithm is used for each market by selecting a `MarketModel` and configure it with a particular set of parameters defined by that `MarketModel`. Changing the parameters of a market changes its performance and selecting a different `MarketModel` completely changes its behavior.

The transaction of nuclear materials takes place in markets that act as brokers matching a set of requests for material with a set of offers for that material. A variety of market models will be available to perform this brokerage role. It is important to note that each market is defined for a single commodity and acts independently of other markets. Once the requests and offers have been matched by each market in a simulation, the facilities exchange material objects.

## **Region-Institution-Facility Hierarchy**

Many times in a fuel-cycle simulation, parameters describing relationships between facilities are required. For instance, one may wish to account for the presence of a contract between two facilities, or one may wish to model two facilities operated by the same entity. Accordingly, `CYCLUS` implements this ability via a Region-Institution-Facility hierarchy. Every discrete facility in `CYCLUS` is considered to be owned by an institution that operates in a geographic region. An institution can be used to represent any entity that may own and operate a facility such as a private corporation, a government agency, or a non-governmental organization, among others. A region can be used to represent any geographic area, typically a politically relevant area such a sub-national region (e.g. a U.S. State), a nation-state, or a supranational region (e.g. the E.U.). While some

performance parameters of the facility may depend on its institutional ownership or geographical location, this capability is more useful in modeling the way in which a facility engages in a market for trade of nuclear material based on its ownership entity and/or region.

For each of the global regions, the user defines available facility configurations that can operate in those markets. Multiple facility configurations will typically be created in each region, including one or more reactor configurations (AP1000 vs ESBWR vs EPR or PWR vs. HTGR vs CANDU) and one or more configurations for other facility types. The user is free to choose the level of detail used in distinguishing one facility configuration from another. Each facility configuration will either be a supplier in one or more global markets, a consumer in one or more global markets, or both a supplier and consumer in non-intersecting sets of global markets. The set of facility configurations defines which facilities are available for deployment in a given scenario, but multiple instances of each facility configuration may exist.

A facility configuration is created by selecting a FacilityModel and defining the parameters for that facility configuration. Each FacilityModel will define its own set of parameters that govern its performance. The same FacilityModel may be used for multiple facility configurations in the same region, each with parameters values appropriate for that facility configuration.

The repository model that is the subject of this work is a facility model within the CYCLUS simulation paradigm.

Facilities are deployed to issue offers and requests in these markets. Like markets, the user may select which type of algorithm is used for each facility by selecting a FacilityModel and configure it with a particular set of parameters defined by that FacilityModel. Changing the parameters of a facility changes its performance and selecting a different

FacilityModel completely changes its behavior. Unlike markets, multiple independent instances of each facility configuration can be deployed to represent individual facilities.

Each instance of a facility is associated with a defined Institution and each institution operates in a geographically defined Region.

## **Discrete Materials and Facilities**

The CYCLUS modeling infrastructure is designed such that every facility in a global nuclear fuel cycle is treated and acts individually. While modeling options exist to allow collective action, this will be as a special case of the individual facility basis. Each facility has two fundamental tasks: the transaction of goods or products with other facilities and the transformation of those goods or products from an input form to an output form. For example, a reactor will receive fresh fuel assemblies from a fuel fabrication facility, transform them to used used fuel assemblies using some approximation of the reactor physics, and supply those used fuel assemblies to a storage facility.

## **Materials**

Material movement is the primary unit of information in CYCLUS . Materials passed, traded, and modified between and within facilities in the simulation are recorded at every timestep. This material history is stored in the output dataset of CYCLUS . In addition to holding the map of isotopes and their masses, a material object holds a comprehensive history of its own path as it moves through models within the simulation.

## **Implications for Repository Model**

The above sections outline the fuel cycle simulation platform currently under development at UW in which the repository model at hand is to be implemented. Implemented



as a facility within this framework, the repository model interface is defined by the Facility Model interface defined within the CYCLUS paradigm.

That interface requires that a capacity be defined by the repository at every CYCLUS timestep so that the repository may make appropriate requests of disposable material.

Furthermore, the capability for dynamic module loading possible within the CYCLUS paradigm allows the repository system subcomponents to be interchangeably loaded at runtime, enabling comparison of various repository subcomponents, physical models of varying levels of detail.

The repository is both a subclass and a superclass. It is a subclass of the FacilityModel class, and a superclass of its own subcomponents. That is, dynamically loaded subcomponents of the repository inherit data, parameters and behaviors from the repository itself.

## 3.2 Repository Modeling Paradigm

The repository model architecture is intended to modularly permit exchange of disposal system subcomponents, accept arbitrary spent fuel streams, and enable extending modules representing new or different component models.

### Simulation Interface

The interface of the repository model with the CYCLUS fuel cycle simulation interface is intended to be minimally restrictive, requiring only that the simulation supply waste stream information and provide a bookkeeping framework with which to record repository performance metrics. The repository model, in order to participate in the simulation as a facility model, must make requests for spent material up to its capacity. Therefore,

determination of the repository capacity for various types of spent fuel commodities will be the primary interfacing functionality of the repository model. Calculation of metrics including expected dose rates and component failures will be a secondary internal functionality.

### **Waste Stream Input**

The repository model must accept arbitrary spent fuel and high level waste streams. Material objects resulting from the simulated fuel cycle arrive at the repository and are emplaced if all repository capacity limits allow it.

Since disposable material in most simulations of interest will be of variable composition and therefore heterogeneous heat production capability, the repository model will repeatedly need to recalculate its own capacity as new materials are offered. These capacity calculations will be discussed in section ??j++ç .

### **Repository Performance Metrics Calculated**

Repository performance metrics that may be calculated from the source term and heat data calculated by the model will cover many metrics of interest to sustainability goals. Some metrics support analyses that seek to maximize safe repository capacity under heat and source term limitations. Those include spatial dimensions, spatial dimensions per kWh or equivalent, repository footprint, and number of waste packages generated.

Still other metrics that may be calculated include those being considered by the UFD campaign in a Fuel Cycle Data Package task underway [39]. Additional metrics that will be considered in this context will likely include environmental metrics such as peak dose to the public, radiotoxic fluxes released to the biosphere integrated over time, and the minimum managed lifetime. These metrics are recorded in a database flexibly defined

by the repository model.

### **Facility Functionality**

The repository will behave as a facility within the CYCLUS simulation paradigm. The fundamental facility behavior within CYCLUS involves participating in commodity markets. The repository will participate as a requester of waste commodities. During reactor operation, the repository will make requests to markets dealing in spent fuel streams according to its available capacity. Possible optional intermediate storage facility model is available for cooling periods.

### **Nested Component Concept**

The fundamental unit of information in the repository model is the nuclide release at each stage of containment, and the repository model in this work mimics reality treating them as nested elements in a release chain.

### **Control Volumes**

Each component of the repository system (i.e. waste form, waste package, buffer, and geologic medium) is modeled as a discrete control volume. Each control volume performs its own mass balance at each time step and assesses its own internal heat transfer and degradation phenomena separately from the other nested components.

Each control volume will initially be modeled as a mixed cell. That is, for permeable porous media, all contaminants released into the pore and fracture water are assumed to be uniformly distributed.

## **Information Passing Between Volumes**

Each component passes some information radially outward to the nested component immediately containing it and some information radially inward to the nested component it contains.

Most component models require external information concerning the water volume that has breached containment, so information concerning incoming water volumes is passed radially inward.

Each component model similarly requires information about the nuclides released from the component it immediately contains. Thus, nuclide release information is passed radially outward from the waste stream sequentially through each containment layer to the geosphere.

## **Concept Generality**

The capability to allow each model to define the models within it gives this repository model concept the ability to model many types of repository concept while maintaining a simple interface with the simulation.

## **Components of the Nested System**

### **Waste Stream**

The waste stream data object contains spent fuel isotopics over the course of the simulation. As nuclides are gained, lost, and transmuted within the spent fuel object, a history of its isotopic composition is recorded.

For waste streams that vary from each other in composition, the thermal capacity of the repository must be recalculated. One way to model this will be to recalculate the

appropriate lengthwise spacing of waste packages when the heat generation rate of a new package is significantly different than other waste packages in the repository.

### **Waste Form**

The waste form model will calculate nuclide release due to dissolution of the waste form. Various heuristics by which nuclide release is modeled in accordance with waste form dissolution as well as the method by which the dissolution is modeled.

Dissolution can be instantaneous, rate based, water dependent, heat dependent, or coupled.

Dissolution related release can be modeled as congruent, solubility limited, or both. Some nuclides are immediately accessible, and some tend to remain in the fuel matrix.

### **Waste Package**

The waste package model calculates nuclide release due to waste package failure. Waste package failure is typically modeled as instantaneous and complete or partial and constant. That is, a delay before full release, or a constantly present hole in the package.

Waste package time to failure is dependent on water contact and heat, but can be modeled as an average, probabilistic, or a rate.

In the case of highly deforming geologic media, such as salt, mechanical failure can be the primary mechanism for release from the waste package.

### **Buffer**

Diffusion is the primary mechanism for nuclide transport through the buffer component of the repository system.

Salt, clay, and borehole repository concepts may not have a buffer material.

**Backfill**

Similarly, diffusion is the primary mechanism for nuclide transport through the buffer component of the repository system.

Clay concepts and borehole concepts may not have a backfill material.

**Geological Environment**

The literature review introduced various hydrogeological models that represent fluid and contaminant travel through permeable porous media and fractured porous media. These assume saturated flow and incorporate diffusive flow, advective flow, hydrodynamic dispersion, and equilibrium sorption. The geological environment control volume component will implement these models appropriately for each geology to provide a mass balance and to communicate concentrations to adjacent components.

Dirichlet boundary conditions at the surfaces of the control volume will allow the simulation to step through transport in the rock.

Heat transfer through the geological environment i

Sudicky and Frind give a model for fractured porous media that analytically captures nuclide mobility due to advection through fractures as well as competing retardation factors including sorption on the fracture walls, diffusion into stagnant fluid in the rock matrix, and sorption into rock matrix walls.

## 4 CURRENT WORK

---

### 4.1 CYCLUS

The CYCLUS framework discussed in chapter 3 provides a fuel cycle simulation platform on which to initially develop and deploy the repository model that is the subject of this effort. As a part of this effort also under development, CYCLUS has been developed with an architecture that supports the goals of this effort and will continue to mature in parallel with the development of this model.

#### **Framework**

The CYCLUS framework is available, and the product of some quantity of work.

This will be essential for implementing and testing the repository model.

#### **Available Models**

CYCLUS has a base set of models that are currently available and will support open and some closed fuel cycle simulations. These include a source and a sink facility model as well as recipe based reactor models, an enrichment facility, an intermediate storage facility, and a fleet of markets that direct material movement in the simulation.

Further fuel cycle facility models are being developed within CYCLUS that will be essential for providing interesting scenarios for comparison via repository metrics. For a modified open cycle, a separations facility is necessary that will be capable of conducting arbitrarily complex chemical separations of used fuel. Similarly, an associated reprocessing facility will be necessary that is equipped to handle the so called ‘winery’

problem of constructing critical fresh fuel assemblies appropriate for specific reactors from separated streams.

## **4.2 GDSM Analysis**

Much of my future work is based on the parametric and regression analysis that has begun with the base case Clay GDSM at ANL.

### **Sensitivity Analyses**

The Used Fuel Cycle Division has reported sensitivity results for various parameters as they affect Mean Annual Dose. I've looked at a few parameters too. I'll repeat those calculations for source term rather than dose in order to provide some graphs for the parameters below and more. I will be interested in coefficients defining the relationships between these parameters and source term over time for each isotope.

#### **Cooling Time**

Extending the cooling time between discharge and emplacement results in an altered waste stream. The resulting source term releases of this waste stream were expected to differ from base case results. Nonetheless it was found that for the clay GDSM there was approximately no Mean Annual Dose sensitivity to the cooling period length [18].

#### **Burnup**

The burnup of a used fuel assembly results in an altered waste stream at the time of emplacement. It was found that for the clay GDSM, the mean annual dose sensitivity to waste form dissolution rate became more important linearly with increased burnup [18].



It is expected that the burnup will alter heat based capacity.

j+sindaAnalysis+ç

j+burnupVScapacityGRAPH+ç

### **Drift Spacing**

The mean annual dose is not very sensitive to the horizontal spacing between drifts.

### **Vertical Distance to Aquifer**

The vertical distance to the aquifer above the disposal configuration defines the distance separating source term nuclide contaminants from the biosphere. The clay model indicates that the mean annual dose is very sensitive to this distance [18].

### **Vertical Darcy Velocity**

Sensitivity to vertical Darcy velocity is similar to the sensitivity to vertical distance to aquifer in the sense that it directly determines the nuclide travel time to the biosphere. The clay model indicates that the mean annual dose is very sensitive to this parameter [18].

It is assumed that the thermal model will not demonstrate any sensitivity to the vertical Darcy velocity. Since heat dissipation in the far field is taken to be completely diffusive in clay, the Darcy velocity and the thermal model are entirely independent.

### **Hypothetical Intersecting Fast Advective Pathway**

A fast pathway model intended to demonstrate a disrupted scenario is modeled as a single intersecting fracture in the clay matrix. The importance of the various ways in which this fast pathway intersects the model is very nuclide specific [18]. In the clay

model the fast pathway intersects the engineered barrier system either directly in the emplaced waste or just outside the secondary engineered barrier system.

It is assumed that the thermal model will not demonstrate any sensitivity to the presence of a fast pathway. Since advective heat dissipation in such a crack would be minimal at the water speeds being considered. The thermal model takes the far field to be completely advective, also, and does not currently have the capability to model a fast pathway.

### **Dimensions of Hypothetical Fast Pathway**

That is, how important is the crack width?

J Ahn's PhD thesis had some analytical answers to this question.

### **Clay Porosity**

This should have a very slight linear effect. A coefficient needs to be derived from the relationship.

### **Buffer Porosity**

This should have a very slight linear effect. A coefficient needs to be derived from the relationship.

### **Waste Form Porosity**

That is, the porosity within the waste form initially.

### **Waste Form Degradation Rate**

This will be irrelevant for cases with low burnup or no fast pathway.

**Waste Form Release Mode**

Solubility limited? Continuous?

**Waste Package Degradation Rate**

This will be irrelevant for cases with low burnup or no fast pathway.

**Waste Package Release Mode**

Solubility limited? Continuous?

**Nuclide Solubilities**

For each nuclide.

**Etc.**

There are many parameters I haven't thought of.

**Comparison with other geologies**

A short comparison with each of the other models representing specific geologies will be begun in order to determine the differences in results for similar parameters.

## 4.3 SINDA Model Analysis

### Sensitivity Analysis

#### Cooling Time

Extending the cooling time between discharge and emplacement results in an altered waste stream. The emplacement capacity of this waste stream may be expected to differ from base case results.

Since the cooling period will be modeled outside of the repository model within the CYCLUS analysis, this sensitivity will not be incorporated into the repository modeling effort at the heart of this work, but gives an intuition for appropriate sensitivity to altered waste streams.

It is expected that the cooling time alters heat based capacity.

j+sindaAnalysis+ç

j+coolingVScapacityGRAPH+ç

#### Burnup

The burnup of a used fuel assembly results in an altered waste stream at the time of emplacement. It was found that for the clay GDSM, the mean annual dose sensitivity to waste form dissolution rate became more important linearly with increased burnup [18].

It is expected that the burnup will significantly alter heat based capacity.

j+sindaAnalysis+ç

j+burnupVScapacityGRAPH+ç

## Heat Generating Isotopes

Plutonium and minor actinides are dominant contributors to heat. Focusing on the sensitivity of the heat based capacity to the waste stream content of these nuclides could significantly simplify the heat analysis.

For each of these, a sensitivity analysis of capacity to the nuclide will be developed by analyzing the thermal repository capacity for a waste stream of that nuclide alone.

;  
+sindaAnalysis+;

;  
+contributorMassVScapacityGRAPH+;

## Drift Spacing

It is expected that the heat based capacity will be highly sensitive to the spacing between drifts. A higher drift density produces larger amounts of heat generation per repository footprint area. Constrained by heat limits typically at the drift tunnel boundaries, the repository capacity is reduced by increased areal loading density.

;  
+sindaAnalysis+;

;  
+spacingVScapacityGRAPH+;

## Waste Package Separation

It is expected that the heat based capacity will be highly sensitive to the spacing between packages linearly within the drifts. A higher line loading density produces larger amounts of heat generation per repository footprint area. Again, the repository capacity is reduced by increased areal loading density.

;  
+sindaAnalysis+;

;  
+lineloadingVScapacityGRAPH+;

### **Waste Package Loading Density**

It is expected that the heat based capacity will be highly sensitive to the mass loading per waste package. A higher package loading density produces larger amounts of heat generation per repository footprint area. Constrained by heat limits typically at the drift tunnel boundaries, the repository capacity is reduced by increased areal loading density.

;  
+sindaAnalysis+;

;  
+pkgloadingVScapacityGRAPH+;

### **Clay Porosity**

It is expected that the heat based capacity will be fairly sensitive to the clay matrix porosity. A higher porosity allows greater diffusive flowthrough and heat removal. Constrained by heat limits typically at the drift tunnel boundaries, the repository capacity is increased by increased clay porosity.

;  
+sindaAnalysis+;

;  
+porosityVScapacityGRAPH+;

### **Buffer Porosity**

It is expected that the heat based capacity will be fairly sensitive to the buffer matrix porosity. A higher porosity allows greater diffusive flowthrough and heat removal. Constrained by heat limits typically at the drift tunnel boundaries, the repository capacity is increased by increased clay porosity.

;  
+sindaAnalysis+;

;  
+porosityVScapacityGRAPH+;

**Vertical Distance to Aquifer**

It is expected that the thermal model will not demonstrate significant sensitivity to the distance to the overlying aquifer. Heat dissipation over the length scales at hand, in the hundreds of meters, renders the distance of the boundary at the far field irrelevant.

**Review of Radel Analysis**

Maybe earlier in lit review instead.

**Changing Geometry**

The tunnel geometry can be altered in two dimensions.

**Thermal Conductivities, etc.**

Sensitivity to various physical parameters of the model will be found.

**4.4 LLNL Model Analysis**

An analysis similar to that conducted with the SINDA model will be conducted for the LLNL thermal model.

## 4.5 Demonstration

### Conceptual Model

#### Volumes

Volumes are defined by their dimensions, surfaces, temperature, contained matter, and contained contaminants.

Dimensions fully define the shape and magnitude of the volume. **Volume shape?**

**Can be more than just cylindrical?**

Interfaces are defined by a shared surface area, a flux type, and a flux direction. Any single volume may only interface with one inner and one outer volume.

Contained matter must sum to the full volume of the volume.

#### Matter

This model treats matter in solid and liquid phases. Gaseous matter is not supported.

Liquids are defined by their dynamic viscosities ( $\mu$ , [Pascal seconds]) and by characteristic diffusivity ( $d_i$ , [ $m^2/s$ ]) and solubility ( $K$ , [ $kg/m^3$ ]) coefficients for each nuclide.

Solids are assumed to be porous media and are defined by their porosity ( $n$ , %), tortuosity ( $\tau$ , [-]), and dry (bulk) density ( $\rho$ ). Fracturation is dealt with separately, a flux type, and a flux direction.

#### Connections

Heat transfer connections include at least conductive and convective connections. Radiative and mass transfer heat connections will be a secondary extension to the modeling paradigm.



Nuclide transport connections will include at least diffusive and advective connections. These will incorporate available porosity of the surface interface. Solubility limitations will be a characteristic of the mixing volume cell rather than the release pathway.

## **Mathematical Model**

### **Mass Balances Within Cells**

This will describe the preliminary mixing model.

### **Mass Transfer Boundaries**

#### **Heat Diffusion**

Equation, assumptions, B.C.s, I.C.s, solutions.

#### **Fluid/Contaminant Diffusion**

Equation, assumptions, B.C.s, I.C.s, solutions.

#### **Heat Advection**

Equation, assumptions, B.C.s, I.C.s, solutions.

#### **Fluid/Contaminant Advection**

Equation, assumptions, B.C.s, I.C.s, solutions.

## **Computational Model**

### **Simplified Models**

For a proof of principle, each repository subcomponent has been implemented with a first order model. The information passing system is thereby tested for completeness.

### **Information Exchange**

The information exchange paradigm must provide a comprehensive set of module boundary information as described in the mathematical model.

## 5 SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

---

### 5.1 Summary

#### **Motivation**

The need for this work has been shown by a summary of the current state of the art of fuel cycle simulator repository capabilities. The literature review concluded that most fuel cycle simulators lack repository analysis beyond basic mass tracking. The integrated radionuclide transport and thermal analysis to be pursued in this work will provide a currently unavailable tool for disposal system analysis. An immediate need for such a tool has been expressed in the UFD campaign roadmap for this year in which an interface with the SA campaign was noted as a primary goal.

#### **Current Work**

Development of the CYCLUS fuel cycle simulator has generated a tool with which the systems analysis aspects of this work will be conducted. Development of the fundamental repository module concept appropriate for modular integration with CYCLUS has laid the foundation for a software effort which will deliver a library of disposal system component models capable of analyzing current disposal concepts of interest both domestically and internationally.

## 5.2 Future Work

### Demonstration Case Development

A first milestone in the development of this software will be a proof of principle demonstration of the data structure and information passing schemes. That is, no physics will be implemented in the demonstration milestone. Rather, the component models will be developed in such a way that they are capable of passing their information passing schemes and placeholder functions will be generated in place of physics.

### Demonstration Case Concept

The demonstration will produce a complete but ‘empty’ repository model. That is, on the repository scale the appropriate facility interface will be implemented, which allows the repository modeled to be loaded into a CYCLUS simulation. A structure of subcomponent control volumes will also be implemented which can be dynamically loaded at runtime.

At the subcomponent level, information passing, bookkeeping, and mass and energy balances within and between the subcomponent control volumes. Information passing between subcomponents concerning heat and radionuclide concentration boundary conditions will be implemented. A complementary output database structure will be defined and bookkeeping for writing relevant radionuclide and heat transport information.

### Demonstration Code Development

Initial code development on the base case model has begun with creation of the Facility-Model subclass, `GenericRepository`.

A first phase in the demonstration milestone will be for the repository model to successfully load its subcomponent models from user input (i.e. the lithology, waste form, waste package, buffer, etc.) with their corresponding defining parameters.

A second phase will involve implementing an information exchange paradigm between the subcomponents which communicates sufficient temperature and contaminant concentrations at the boundaries of the control volumes for solution of their internal transport calculations.

When these aspects are implemented, a structure for the output database will be defined and appropriate bookkeeping will be implemented sufficient to communicate the heat and solute evolution within the repository.

### **Demonstration Testing**

This work will be developed with a test driven development strategy. That is, before any new functionality is implemented, a suite of tests is written which as closely define its necessary behavior as possible. The software is then written with the goal of passing the test suite. In this way, the software developed in this work is expected to be comprehensively tested in parallel with its development.

Test problems which will help comprehensively define and confirm each unit of the demonstration functionality will include very basic information passing tests as well as more complex multiple subcomponent integration tests. A null test, for example, will release a single contaminant radionuclide through each subcomponent sequentially. This test will pass if the bookkeeper properly writes to the database its (aphysically unhindered) path through each control volume.

## Base Case Development

### Base Case Concept

The base case concept will model a generic, isotropic, permeable porous geological medium with reducing geochemistry. This model will be appropriate for clay and salt geologies. The fracturation in the geologies of the granite and deep borehole concepts will not be appropriately modeled in the base case unless an equivalent porous medium calculation is conducted external to the code. The incorporation of fracture models will follow in subsequent extensions to the base case.

A waste form component module capable of modeling two canonical waste form concepts will be developed. It will be modeled with a rate based dissolution model and will be equipped with a heat limit which may constrict the waste form loading. Such a waste form component module will be appropriate for borosilicate glass, the dissolution of which is dominated by a surface alteration rate. It will be appropriate also for a ceramic oxide waste form, the dissolution of which is dominated by a corrosive degradation rate.

An explicit time dependent probability distribution waste package failure model will be employed that can accommodate instantaneous, constant, and more complex time dependent failure probability density functions, such as Weibull distribution. From a user-defined time dependent probability distribution (of which the Weibull distribution is one), a waste package failure vector will be populated, which assigns a failure time to each waste package object. As the simulation progresses, these waste packages will fail discretely, triggering the initial degradation attack for the waste forms within them.

The buffer component will be modeled as an isotropic permeable porous medium which is chemically reducing and in which transport is diffusion dominated and solubility limited. For the base case, this model will involve only diffusive transport. Extensions

to this model will include a model for sorption as well as fracturation and advective transport.

Heat limits in the base case will be calculated at the boundary between the waste package and buffer as well as the boundary between the buffer or backfill and the rock matrix.

### **Base Case Abstraction**

Abstraction will be conducted for each of the models listed above to identify potential simplifying assumptions. For example, diffusive contaminant transport in permeable porous media will likely utilize the sensitivity analysis results in section ?? to assume that the mean annual dose is not sensitive to the horizontal spacing between drifts. Appropriate conceptual models will employ these simplifications to streamline calculations.

### **Base Case Code Development**

Building upon the empty demonstration code structure, the development of the base case model will primarily consist of populating the subcomponent control volume models with appropriate physics, mass balances, rate equations, and data. This step will implement the calculations in each subcomponent which will provide sufficient information to determine the heat based capacity of the repository for each request of material.

### **Base Case Testing, Verification, and Validation**

For verification and validation during development, some comparisons to current detailed models such as the UFD GPAM and GDSEs will be incorporated into the testing

framework. Additional verification and validation can be expected to be conducted with respect to known benchmarks such as ANDRA and RED-IMPACT results once the model is fully functional.

## **Extensions**

When the base case is established, a series of extensions to these models will be pursued.

### **Extension Concepts**

First, additional phenomena in radionuclide transport will be added to the modeling capability. Sorption, for example, will be added by incorporating sorption effects to the basic diffusive solute transport model, approaching a full solute transport solution such as equation (2.33). Additionally, solubility limited transport will be added with a simple restriction on the mixing calculations during mass balancing in the control volumes.

Next, additional geologies (i.e. granite and deep borehole) will be added to the modeling capability by adding a dual continuum fracture model.

Another anticipated extension will adapt the radionuclide transport model to incorporate the effects of heat and time driven coalescent behavior in clay and salt behavior. This extension will focus on the porosity decrease in those media as time and heat drive collapse around the waste packages. Time dependent coalescence will be addressed first, followed by temperature dependent coalescence.

Another potential extension will address the issue of modeling a disruption scenario with a fast advective pathway that intersects the repository.



## **Extension Abstraction**

## **Extension Code Development**

## **Extension Testing, Verification, and Validation**

## **Sensitivity Analysis**

A sensitivity analysis underway to arrive at simplified dominant physics relationships between the various input parameters of the simulation.

## **Nuclide Transport**

These are the independent parameters I'm interested in.

A TABLE, perhaps. Including parametric domain.

This is how I'll vary them.

Show that these provide a largely complete set of input variables to define nuclide transport. Discuss variables that are being neglected for simplicity, perhaps to be added later.

## **Heat Evolution**

These are the independent parameters I'm interested in.

A TABLE, perhaps. Including parametric domain.

This is how I'll vary them.

Show that these provide a largely complete set of input variables to define heat evolution. Discuss variables that are being neglected for simplicity, perhaps to be added later.

Categorization of Phenomena

Phenomenon	Simplest						Hardest
WF dissolution	instant	fractional	f(t)	f(H2O)	f(T)	f(T,H2O)	f(T,H2O,etc.)
WP dissolution	instant	fractional	f(t)	f(H2O)	f(T)	f(T,H2O)	
WF release	instant	fractional	diffusive	advective	diff+adv	congruent	solubility limited
WP release	instant	fractional	diffusive	advective	diff+adv	congruent	solubility limited
Buffer failure	instant	fractional	f(t)	f(H2O)	f(T)	f(T,H2O)	f(T,H2O,etc.)
Buffer release	instant	fractional	diffusive	advective	diff+adv	congruent	solubility limited
FF transport	diffusive	+fractures	+advective	congruent	+sorption	+colloids	solubility limited
WF Heat	indexed	decay					
WP Heat	conductive	+conv	+rad	+mass	2d	finite diff	finite element
Buffer Heat	conductive	+conv	+rad	+mass	2d	finite diff	finite element
FF Heat	conductive	+conv	+rad	+mass	2d	finite diff	finite element

Table 5.1: This table is a preliminary sketch of the various categories of phenomena which will occur in the components of the repository model.

## Mathematical Model Abstraction

Using the results of these sensitivity analyses, regression analysis will be performed to develop simplified parametric dependencies for all independent variables for each model.

## Computational Model Development

The development of the computational model will begin with simplistic models of the fundamental components of the detailing the physical phenomena at work vs. the conceptual and mathematical models available, listed in order of complexity.

### Base Case

Clay, bentonite backfill, no evacuation disturbed zone, some handfull of waste packages and waste forms.

**TAD Canisters** The canisters proposed for transportation, aging and disposal are called TAD canisters. They are two concentric cylinders of steel and alloy22 inside and

out respectively.

**Borosilicate Glass** Current borosilicate glass: Includes processing chemicals from original separations, with U/Pu removed, but minor actinides and Cs/Sr remaining  
Potential borosilicate glass: No minor actinides and/or no Cs/Sr; Mo may be removed to increase glass loading of radionuclides; it has a lower volumetric heat rate

**Glass Ceramic** Glass Ceramic: This is glass-bonded sodalite from Echem processing of EBR-II, and from potential future Echem processing of oxide fuels  
Metal Alloy: This includes subcategories

**Metal Alloy** Metal alloy from Echem: Includes cladding as well as noble metals that did not dissolve in the Echem dissolution  
Metal alloy from aqueous reprocessing: Includes undissolved solids and transition metal fission products

**Advanced Ceramic** Advanced Ceramic: An advanced waste form that includes iodine volatilized during chopping, which is then gettered during head-end processing of used fuels

**Separated Streams** Other: Examples include radionuclides removed from other waste forms (e.g., Cs/Sr, I, C), as well as new waste forms such as a salt waste form

**Classes A, B, and C waste** Lower Than High Level Waste (LTHLW): Includes Classes A, B, and C

**GTCC LTHLW** Greater Than Class C (GTCC)

**Demonstration**

Show that the complete model behaves in agreement with the more detailed model on which it was based. Else, iterate through sensitivity analyses, model abstraction, and computational development until the model is validated.

**Extension**

This disposal system will at this point be extended to include a fleet of predefined model implementations to represent some canonical waste forms, packages, buffers, and clay types.

**Fuel Cycle Analysis**

Show some various fuel cycles have different repository needs and metrics. Specifically, compare a closed fuel cycle, an open one, and at least one modified fuel cycle.

## REFERENCES

---

- [1] The report to the president and the congress by the secretary of energy on the need for a second repository | department of energy. <http://www.doe.gov/downloads/report-president-and-congress-secretary-energy-need-second-repository>.
- [2] AB, Svensk karnbranslehantering. 2006. *Long-term safety for KBS-3 repositories at forsmark and laxemar-a first evaluation: Main report of the SR-Can project*. SKB.
- [3] Abkowitz, Mark. 2010. Nuclear waste assessment system for technical evaluation - NUWASTE.
- [4] Ahn, J. 1988. Mass transfer and transport of radionuclides in fractured porous rock. Tech. Rep., California Univ., Berkeley, CA.
- [5] Ahn, J. 2004. An environmental impact measure for nuclear fuel cycle evaluation. *Journal of Nuclear Science and Technology* 41(3):296 – 306.
- [6] Ahn, J. 2007. Environmental impact of yucca mountain repository in the case of canister failure. *Nuclear technology* 157(1):87 – 105.
- [7] Ahn, J., D. Kawasaki, and P. L. Chambre. 2002. Relationship among performance of geologic repositories, canister-array configuration, and radionuclide mass in waste. *Nuclear Technology* 140(1).
- [8] Anderson, M. P, and W. W. Woessner. 1992. *Applied groundwater modeling: simulation of flow and advective transport*.
- [9] ANDRA. 2005. Argile: Evaluation de la faisabilite du stockage geologique en formation argileuse. Tech. Rep., ANDRA, Paris.

- [10] ———. 2005. Granite: Evaluation de la faisabilite du stockage geologique en formation granite. Tech. Rep., ANDRA, Paris.
- [11] Bateman, H. 1908. 1910. the solution of a system of differential equations occurring in the theory of radio-active transformations. In *Proc. cambridge philosophical soc*, vol. 15, 423.
- [12] Berkowitz, Brian, Jacob Bear, and Carol Braester. 1988. Continuum models for contaminant transport in fractured porous formations. *Water Resources Research* 24(8):PP. 1225 – 1236.
- [13] Blink, J. A., T. A. Buscheck, W. G. Halsey, and T. Wolery. 2010. Disposal systems evaluations and tool Development-Engineered barrier system evaluation (Work package LL1015080425). Tech. Rep., Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), Livermore, CA.
- [14] Boucher, Lionel. 2010. International comparison for transition scenario codes involving COSI, DESAE, EVOLCODE, FAMILY and VISION. CEA France.
- [15] Bouvier, E., J. Ahn, and T. Ikegami. 2007. *Comparison of environmental impacts for PWR-UOsub 2, PWR-MOX and FBR*. LaGrange Park, IL: American Nuclear Society.
- [16] Bracke, G., T. Beuth, K. Fischer-Appelt, J. Larue, and M. Navarro. 2008. Safety functions derived from geochemistry for safety analysis of final disposal of high-level radioactive waste. *Uranium, Mining and Hydrogeology* 771—778.
- [17] Brewitz, Wernt, and Ulrich Noseck. 2002. Long-term performance of spent fuel in geological repositories. *Comptes Rendus Physique* 3(7-8):879–889.

- [18] Clayton, D, G Freeze, E Hardin, W.M. Nutt, J Birkholzer, H.H. Liu, and S Chu. 2011. Generic disposal system modeling - fiscal year 2011 progress report. Tech. Rep. FCRD-USED-2011-000184, U.S. Department of Energy, Sandia, NM.
- [19] Diodato, D. M., and T. Center. 1994. A compendium of fracture flow models—1994. *Work sponsored by US Department of Defense, United States Army, Europe, Combat Maneuver Training Center, Hohenfels, Germany.*
- [20] DOE. 2008. The report to the president and the congress by the secretary of energy on the need for a second repository | department of energy. Tech. Rep. DOE/RW-0595.
- [21] ———. 2010. Nuclear energy research & development roadmap: Report to congress.
- [22] DOE, US. 2002. Yucca mountain science and engineering report. *US Department of Energy, Las Vegas, NV DOE/RW-0539-1, Rev 1.*
- [23] El-Wakil, Mohamed Mohamed. 1981. *Nuclear heat transport.* American Nuclear Society.
- [24] Hardin, E, J Blink, Harris Greenberg, Mark Sutton, Massimo Fratoni, Joe Carter, Mark Dupont, and Rob Howard. 2011. Generic repository design concepts and thermal analysis - 8.8.2011 draft. Tech. Rep. FCRD-USED-2011-000143, Department of Energy Office of Used Fuel Disposition, Sandia.
- [25] Hedin, A. 2002. Integrated analytic radionuclide transport model for a spent nuclear fuel repository in saturated fractured rock. *Nuclear Technology* 138(2).
- [26] Ho, C. K. 2000. Dual porosity vs. dual permeability models of matrix diffusion in fractured rock. Tech. Rep., Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM (US); Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, CA (US).

- [27] Incropera, Frank. 2006. *Fundamentals of heat and mass transfer*. 6th ed. Hoboken N.J.: Wiley.
- [28] Johnson, L., C. Ferry, C. Poinssot, and P. Lovera. 2005. Spent fuel radionuclide source-term model for assessing spent fuel performance in geological disposal. part i: Assessment of the instant release fraction. *Journal of Nuclear Materials* 346(1): 56–65.
- [29] Johnson, L., B. Kunz, C. Frei, Nagra, and Projekt Opalinuston. 2002. *Project opalinus clay: Safety report: Demonstration of disposal feasibility for spent fuel, vitrified high-level waste and long-lived intermediate-level waste (Entsorgungsnachweis)*. Nagra, National cooperative for the Disposal of Radioactive Waste.
- [30] Johnson, L. H., and Nagra. 2002. *Calculations of the temperature evolution of a repository for spent fuel, vitrified high-level waste and intermediate level waste in opalinus clay*. Nagra.
- [31] Kawasaki, D., J. Ahn, P. L. Chambre, and W. G. Halsey. 2004. Congruent release of long-lived radionuclides from multiple canister arrays. *Nuclear technology* 148(2): 181 – 193.
- [32] Kessler, J. H., J. Kemeny, F. King, A. M. Ross, and B. Ross. 2006. Room at the mountain: Estimated maximum amounts of commercial spent nuclear fuel capable of disposal in a yucca mountain repository. Tech. Rep., The ASME Foundation, Inc., New York.
- [33] von Lensa, W., R. Nabbi, and M. Rossbach. 2008. *RED-IMPACT impact of partitioning, transmutation and waste reduction technologies on the final nuclear waste disposal*. Forschungszentrum Jülich.
- [34] Li, J. 2006. A methodology to evaluate nuclear waste transmutation/fuel cycle systems.



- [35] Li, J., M. Nicholson, W. C Proctor, M. S Yim, and D. McNelis. 2007. Examining repository loading options to expand yucca mountain repository capacity. In *Proceedings of GLOBAL*, 519 — 525.
- [36] Li, Jun, M. S Yim, and D. McNelis. 2008. The specific temperature increase method for repository thermal analysis. *Transactions of the American Nuclear Society* 99:216 — 218.
- [37] Miron, A., J. Valentine, J. Christenson, M. Hawwari, S. Bhatt, M. L Dunzik-Gougar, and M. Lineberry. 2009. Identification and analysis of critical gaps in nuclear fuel cycle codes required by the SINEMA program. Tech. Rep., University of Cincinnati.
- [38] Nicholson, M. A. 2007. *Thermal loading and uncertainty analysis of high level waste in yucca mountain*. North Carolina State University.
- [39] Nutt, Mark. 2011. Personal communication.
- [40] Nutt, W. M. 2010. Used fuel disposition research and development roadmap-FY10 status. Tech. Rep., Argonne National Laboratory (ANL).
- [41] OECD-NEA. 2006. *Advanced nuclear fuel cycles and radioactive waste management*. OECD Publishing.
- [42] ONDRAF-NIRAS. 2001. Technical overview of the SAFIR 2 report. Tech. Rep. Niron 2001-05 E, Belgium.
- [43] Papoulis, A., and S. U. Pillai. 2002. *Probability, random variables, and stochastic processes*. 4th ed. Series in Electrical and Computer Engineering, McGraw-Hill.
- [44] Piet, S., T. Bjornard, B. Dixon, D. Gombert, C. Laws, and G. Matthern. 2007. Which elements should be recycled for a comprehensive fuel cycle? *Proc. Global 2007* 1595.

- [45] Posiva. 2010. *Interim summary report of the safety case 2009*. POSIVA.
- [46] Pusch, R., L. Borgesson, and M. Erlstrom. 1987. *Alteration of isolating properties of dense smectite clay in repository environment as exemplified by seven pre-quaternary clays*. Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Co.
- [47] Radel, T. E. 2007. *Repository modeling for fuel cycle scenario analysis*. University of Wisconsin – Madison.
- [48] Radel, T. E, P. P.H Wilson, R. M. Grady, and T. H. Bauer. 2007. *Effect of separation efficiency on repository loading values in fuel cycle scenario analysis codes*. LaGrange Park, IL: American Nuclear Society.
- [49] Savoye, S., F. Goutelard, C. Beaucaire, Y. Charles, A. Fayette, M. Herbette, Y. Larabi, and D. Coelho. 2011. Effect of temperature on the containment properties of argillaceous rocks: The case study of Callovo-Oxfordian claystones. *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology*.
- [50] Schneider, E., M. Knebel, and W. Schwenk-Ferrero. 2004. NFCSim scenario studies of german and european reactor fleets. Tech. Rep., LA-UR-04-4911, Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- [51] Schwartz, F. W., and H. Zhang. 2004. Fundamentals of ground water. *Environmental Geology* 45:1037–1038.
- [52] Soelberg, N., S. Priebe, D. Gombert, and T. Bauer. 2009. Heat management strategy trade study. *Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative, AFCI-SYSA-PMO-MI-DV-2009-000169, INL/EXT-09-16708*.
- [53] Swift, Peter, and Mark Nutt. 2010. *Applying insights from repository safety assessments*. San Francisco, CA.

- [54] Uleberg, K., and J. Kleppe. 1996. Dual porosity, dual permeability formulation for fractured reservoir simulation. In *Norwegian university of science and technology, trondheim RUTH seminar, stavanger*.
- [55] Van Den Durpel, L., D. C Wade, and A. Yacout. 2006. DANESS: a system dynamics code for the holistic assessment of nuclear energy system strategies. *Proceedings of the 2006 System Dynamics Conference*.
- [56] Williams, N. H. 2001. Total system performance Assessment—Analyses for disposal of commercial and DOE waste inventories at yucca Mountain—Input to final environmental impact statement and site suitability evaluation REV 00 ICN 02. Tech. Rep.
- [57] Wilson, P. P.H. 2011. Comparing nuclear fuel cycle options. *A report for the Reactor & Fuel Cycle Technology Subcommittee of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future*.
- [58] Yacout, A. 2011. DANESS. [http://www.anl.gov/techtransfer/Software\\_Shop/Daness/DANESS.htm](http://www.anl.gov/techtransfer/Software_Shop/Daness/DANESS.htm)
- [59] Yacout, A. M., J. J. Jacobson, G. E. Matthern, S. J. Piet, D. E. Shropshire, and C. Laws. 2006. VISION – verifiable fuel cycle simulation of nuclear fuel cycle dynamics. In *Waste management symposium*.