
**Title 40 CFR Part 191
Subparts B and C
Compliance Recertification Application 2014
for the
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant**

**Appendix MON-2014
WIPP Monitoring Programs**



**United States Department of Energy
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant**

**Carlsbad Field Office
Carlsbad, New Mexico**

Compliance Recertification Application 2014
Appendix MON-2014

Table of Contents

MON-1.0 Introduction1
 MON-1.1 Compliance Monitoring Program.....1
 MON-1.2 Preclosure and Postclosure Monitoring.....2
 MON-1.3 Monitoring Assessment.....2
 MON-1.4 Appendix Summary.....3

MON-2.0 Compliance Monitoring Program Requirements4
 MON-2.1 Compliance Certification/Recertification4

MON-3.0 Preclosure Compliance Monitoring9
 MON-3.1 Geotechnical Engineering Program Plan9
 MON-3.1.1 Geomechanical Monitoring Program 9
 MON-3.1.1.1 Scope9
 MON-3.1.1.2 Schedule10
 MON-3.1.1.3 Program Output10
 MON-3.1.2 Geosciences Program 10
 MON-3.1.2.1 Scope11
 MON-3.1.2.2 Schedule11
 MON-3.1.2.3 Program Output11
 MON-3.2 Groundwater Monitoring Program.....11
 MON-3.2.1 Scope 12
 MON-3.2.1.1 Sampling and Reporting for Water Quality13
 MON-3.2.1.2 Sampling and Reporting for Water Level Fluctuations13
 MON-3.2.2 Schedule 13
 MON-3.2.3 Program Outputs..... 14
 MON-3.3 Delaware Basin Drilling Surveillance Program14
 MON-3.3.1 Scope 15
 MON-3.3.2 Schedule 16
 MON-3.3.3 Program Outputs..... 16
 MON-3.4 Subsidence Monitoring Program.....17
 MON-3.4.1 Scope 17
 MON-3.4.2 Schedule 17
 MON-3.4.3 Program Outputs..... 17
 MON-3.5 Waste Inventory Monitoring Based on WIPP Waste Data System18
 MON-3.5.1 Scope 18
 MON-3.5.2 Schedule 19
 MON-3.5.3 Program Outputs..... 19

MON-4.0 Postclosure (Long Term) Monitoring19

MON-5.0 Monitoring Programs Quality Assurance Requirements19

MON-6.0 Reporting and Assessment21
 MON-6.1 Monitoring Data Reporting21
 MON-6.1.1 CMP Assessment Report..... 21

MON-6.1.2 External Reporting..... 21

MON-7.0 References23

List of Tables

Table MON-1. Monitoring Parameters.....6
Table MON-2. WIPP GWMP Sample Collection and Water Level Reporting Frequency.....14
Table MON-3. DBDSP Data Collection Schedule16

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CARD	Compliance Application Review Document
CBFO	Carlsbad Field Office
CCA	Compliance Certification Application
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cm	centimeter
CMP	Compliance Monitoring Program
CRA	Compliance Recertification Application
DBDSP	Delaware Basin Drilling Surveillance Program
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DRZ	disturbed rock zone
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FEP	feature, event, or process
ft	feet
GMP	Geotechnical Monitoring Program
GDMPP	Groundwater Detection Monitoring Program Plan
GWMP	Groundwater Monitoring Program
GWMPPP	Groundwater Monitoring Program Plan
kg	kilogram
km	kilometer
m	meter
M&OC	Management and Operating Contractor
mi	mile
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
PA	performance assessment
QA	quality assurance
QAPD	Quality Assurance Program Document
SMP	Subsidence Monitoring Program
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WQSP	Water Quality Sampling Program
WDS	Waste Data System

The page intentionally left blank.

1 **MON-1.0 Introduction**

2 This appendix to the 2014 Compliance Recertification Application (CRA-2014) describes a
3 specific monitoring program that was developed to meet commitments contained in the U.S.
4 Department of Energy's (DOE's) application to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
5 (EPA), which demonstrated compliance with radioactive waste disposal regulations 40 CFR Part
6 191 Subparts B and C and the certification criteria in 40 CFR Part 194. This appendix does not
7 address monitoring activities intended to demonstrate compliance with 40 CFR Part 191 Subpart
8 A.

9 The monitoring activities described are performed as assurance measures to detect substantial
10 and detrimental deviations from expected disposal system performance. This program consists
11 of a preclosure and postclosure monitoring program using monitoring techniques that do not
12 jeopardize the isolation of the waste. The program must be conducted until the DOE and the
13 EPA agree there are no significant concerns to be addressed by further monitoring. The long-
14 term performance expectations for the disposal system are derived from conceptual models,
15 scenarios, and assumptions developed for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) performance
16 assessment (PA).

17 The activities performed for the overall monitoring programs at the WIPP facility
18 comprehensively address the range of regulatory requirements at departmental, state, and federal
19 levels. This appendix addresses activities relevant to monitoring the disposal system. This
20 document provides an overview of the Compliance Monitoring Program (CMP) and specifically
21 describes how:

- 22 • The 10 compliance monitoring parameters are derived from the data.
- 23 • Information and data are extracted from the various WIPP monitoring and sampling
24 programs.
- 25 • The assessments are made against repository performance expectations.
- 26 • The results are reported to the EPA.

27 On January 3, 2002, the DOE Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO) submitted a letter to the EPA (Triay
28 2002). This letter requested Appendix MON be rewritten to incorporate the portions of
29 Appendices Environmental Monitoring Plan (EMP), Groundwater Surveillance Program Plan
30 (GWMP), Geotechnical Monitoring Plan (GTMP), Subsidence Monitoring Plan (SMP), and
31 Delaware Basin Drilling Monitoring Plan (DMP) required to demonstrate compliance with 40
32 CFR § 191.14(b) (U.S. EPA 1993) in accordance with the criteria established by 40 CFR §
33 194.42 (U.S. EPA 1996). The EPA approved the request in a letter to CBFO on March 15, 2002
34 (Marcinowski 2002).

35 **MON-1.1 Compliance Monitoring Program**

36 This appendix describes the CMP for the WIPP facility. Compliance monitoring concentrates on
37 the following areas:

- 1 • The Geotechnical Engineering Program
- 2 • The Groundwater Monitoring Program (GWMP)
- 3 • The Delaware Basin Drilling Surveillance Program (DBDSP)
- 4 • The Subsidence Monitoring Program (SMP)
- 5 • Waste Inventory Monitoring Based on Waste Data System (WDS)

6 The data and information collected since the 2009 Compliance Recertification Application
7 (CRA-2009) (U.S. DOE 2009a) for the above-listed programs are recorded or referenced in
8 Appendix DATA-2014. The descriptions provided in this appendix are specific to the CMP and,
9 thus, the requirements of section 191.14(b) and section 194.42.

10 **MON-1.2 Preclosure and Postclosure Monitoring**

11 The requirements of 40 CFR § 191.14, section 194.42, the initial EPA certification (U.S. EPA
12 1998a), the 2006 Recertification (U.S. EPA 2006), and the 2010 Recertification (U.S. EPA 2010)
13 serve as the regulatory basis for preclosure and postclosure monitoring. These requirements
14 specify that disposal systems must be monitored to detect substantial and detrimental deviation
15 from expected disposal system performance.

16 **MON-1.3 Monitoring Assessment**

17 The DOE was required by 40 CFR § 194.42(a) to perform an analysis that would determine the
18 effects of various parameters on the performance of the disposal system, and to use the results in
19 preclosure and postclosure monitoring plans. The disposal system performance analysis
20 identified 10 monitoring parameters, listed in Section MON-2.1, to be monitored and assessed
21 within the CMP. The discussion of preclosure monitoring activities for these 10 parameters
22 includes the following:

- 23 • Identifying activities required to comply with the monitoring requirements of the EPA's
24 certification and recertification of compliance with Part 191 Subparts B and C during the
25 preclosure phase of the project
- 26 • Identifying organizations that generate the monitoring data, organizations that convert the
27 data to monitoring parameters and assess the results against expected results, and the
28 organization that reports the results of the assessments to the EPA
- 29 • Identifying the compliance monitoring schedule
- 30 • Providing an overview of quality assurance (QA) requirements applicable to the CMP

1 **MON-1.4 Appendix Summary**

2 Section MON-2.0 identifies the monitoring requirements of Part 191 Subparts B and C in
3 keeping with the criteria of Part 194. Section MON-3.0 describes the preclosure monitoring
4 program associated with each monitoring parameter, the monitoring schedules, and program
5 outputs. Section MON 4-0 describes the planned postclosure monitoring. Section MON-5.0
6 describes the QA requirements applicable to the CMP. Section MON-6.0 describes the process
7 of communicating and reporting CMP results and evaluations.

1 **MON-2.0 Compliance Monitoring Program Requirements**

2 The DOE's preclosure and postclosure CMP defines programs to assess the performance of
3 specific aspects of the disposal system. The relevant monitoring requirements are identified in:

- 4 • Section 191.14(b)
- 5 • Section 194.42
- 6 • The May 18, 1998, 40 CFR Part 194 Criteria for the Certification and Recertification of the
7 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's Compliance with the Disposal Regulations: Certification
8 Decision, Section VIII.D.4, Monitoring (U.S. EPA 1998a)
- 9 • The CRA-2004, Chapter 7.0, Section 7.2
- 10 • The CRA-2009, Section 42.0, Monitoring (40 CFR § 194.42)

11 **MON-2.1 Compliance Certification/Recertification**

12 The original approach used to develop the CMP was based on the results of the parameter
13 analysis documented in the Compliance Certification Application (CCA), Chapter 7.0, and
14 Appendix MON, Attachment MONPAR (U.S. DOE 1996). The EPA documented its approval
15 of the DOE monitoring approach in the compliance certification decision (U.S. EPA 1998a) and
16 Compliance Application Review Document (CARD) 42 (U.S. EPA 1998b). In the CRA-2004,
17 Appendix MON-2004 was rewritten to incorporate portions of Appendices EMP, GWMP,
18 GTMP, SMP, and DMP that were not revised for the CRA-2004. The DOE reassessed the CCA,
19 Appendix MON, Attachment MONPAR, for the CRA-2004 and determined the original
20 conclusions and monitoring parameters identified in MONPAR remain valid and unchanged
21 (Kirkes and Wagner 2003). For the CRA-2009, the DOE once again assessed the original
22 MONPAR analysis used to determine which monitoring parameters should be included in the
23 CMP. Based on the review of operational activities, conditions, monitoring data, PA, and
24 experimental programs that occurred since the CRA-2004, the reassessment states, "the
25 conclusions of the MONPAR analysis remain valid and its conclusions continue to be adequate
26 for inclusion in the CRA-2009" (Wagner 2008). An assessment of the program was made again
27 in 2013 to determine if changes should be made to the CMP. This assessment determined that
28 the conclusions of the original MONPAR assessment remain valid; therefore no changes are
29 needed to the program (Wagner 2013). The annual compliance monitoring reports also
30 concluded that no changes to the monitoring program are recommended (Wagner and Hillesheim
31 2008 and Wagner and Hillesheim 2009; Wagner and Kuhlman 2010; Wagner, Kuhlman and
32 Johnson 2011 and Wagner, Kuhlman and Johnson 2012).

33 The EPA-approved monitoring approach recognizes that the DOE will monitor 10 parameters.
34 These parameters are:

- 35 1. Creep closure and stresses
- 36 2. Extent of brittle deformation

- 1 3. Initiation of brittle deformation
- 2 4. Displacement of deformation features
- 3 5. Change in Culebra Dolomite Member of the Rustler Formation (hereafter referred to as
- 4 Culebra) groundwater composition
- 5 6. Change in Culebra groundwater flow
- 6 7. Drilling rate
- 7 8. Probability of encountering a Castile Formation (hereafter referred to as the Castile) brine
- 8 reservoir
- 9 9. Subsidence
- 10 10. Waste activity

11 All of the above parameters are being monitored during the preclosure period.

12 The CRA-2004, Appendix MON-2004, Attachment A, describes the DOE's plans for postclosure
13 monitoring. The DOE will revisit this plan for postclosure monitoring before the end of WIPP
14 facility operations.

15 The monitoring parameters that have related PA parameters include:

- 16 • Drilling rate
- 17 • Probability of encountering a Castile brine reservoir
- 18 • Change in Culebra groundwater flow
- 19 • Change in Culebra groundwater composition
- 20 • Waste activity

21 The other monitoring parameters are related to either the EPA's list of potential monitoring
22 parameters in 40 CFR 194.42 or screening decisions for repository features, events, or processes
23 (FEPs). Table MON-1 describes the related PA parameters and the related FEPs.

24 The data used to determine the 10 monitoring parameters of the CMP are generated by 5 separate
25 monitoring programs (described in Sections MON-3.1, MON-3.2, MON-3.3, MON-3.4, and
26 MON-3.5). Each monitoring program focuses on the collection of field data. The programs that
27 generate or evaluate the data are described in Section MON-6.0. Results from each monitoring
28 program are documented individually in annual reports (see Appendix DATA-2014), while the
29 assessment results of the 10 parameters are documented and reported in a compliance monitoring
30 parameter assessment reports (Wagner and Hillesheim 2008 and Wagner and Hillesheim 2009;

1 Wagner and Kuhlman 2010; Wagner, Kuhlman and Johnson 2011 and Wagner, Kuhlman and
 2 Johnson 2012).

3 As stated earlier, if any of the data, parameters, or observations are not consistent with
 4 expectations as defined in Section MON-6.1.1, the CMP process requires addressing concerns
 5 and developing recommendations. Results from monitoring programs will be generated on an
 6 ongoing basis throughout the operational period of the repository. Compliance monitoring data
 7 are provided to the cognizant individuals and organizations within the project and evaluated for
 8 their significance, and the evaluation results and data summaries are reported to the EPA.
 9 Section MON-6.0 describes the process of communicating and reporting CMP results and
 10 evaluations.

11

12

Table MON-1. Monitoring Parameters

Monitoring Parameter	Monitoring Program	Frequency of Data Collection and Reporting	Related PA Parameter	Related FEPs	Evaluation Cycle
Creep Closure and Stresses	Geotechnical Monitoring Program (GMP)	Various data calls from weekly to monthly based on repository conditions, instrumentation, and data collection system. Data are reported annually.	Not directly related to a PA parameter. May provide a short-term (operational) observation of the geomechanical response of repository excavation. Can provide confidence in the creep closure model.	Salt creep, excavation-induced stress changes, changes in stress field, pressurization.	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification
Extent of Brittle Deformation	GMP	Various data calls from weekly to monthly based on repository conditions, instrumentation, and data collection system. Data are reported annually.	Not directly related to a PA parameter. Can provide confidence in the long-term behavior of the disturbed rock zone (DRZ), as modeled. Intrinsic shaft DRZ permeability and effective shaft seal permeability is calculated from this parameter.	DRZ, roof falls, consolidation of seals.	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification.

Monitoring Parameter	Monitoring Program	Frequency of Data Collection and Reporting	Related PA Parameter	Related FEPs	Evaluation Cycle
Initiation of Brittle Deformation	GMP	Various data calls from weekly to monthly based on repository conditions, instrumentation, and data collection system. Data are reported annually.	Not directly related to a PA parameter. Can provide confidence in the anhydrite fracture model implemented in the BRAGFLO code. May provide related repository observation data on initiation or displacement of major brittle deformation features in the roof or surrounding rock.	Disruption due to gas effects.	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification.
Displacement of Deformation Features	GMP	Various data calls from weekly to monthly based on repository conditions, instrumentation, and data collection system. Data are reported annually.	Not directly related to a PA parameter. Provides related repository operational data on initiation or displacement of major brittle deformation features in the roof or surrounding rock.	Stability of open panel.	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification.
Culebra Groundwater Composition	Groundwater Monitoring Program (GWMP)	Data are collected annually and reported annually.	Average Culebra brines composition and matrix distribution coefficient for uranium (IV, VI), plutonium (III, IV), thorium (IV), americium (III). Matrix distribution coefficient is not a sensitive PA parameter.	Groundwater geochemistry, actinide sorption.	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification.

Monitoring Parameter	Monitoring Program	Frequency of Data Collection and Reporting	Related PA Parameter	Related FEPs	Evaluation Cycle
Change in Culebra Groundwater Flow	GWMP	Data are collected monthly and reported annually.	Culebra transmissivity, fracture and matrix porosity, fracture spacing, dispersivity, and climate index. Changes in Culebra groundwater flow are important to performance and incorporated into the PA.	Groundwater flow and recharge.	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification.
Drilling Rate	DBDSP	As well records are received (weekly and monthly basis). Data are reported annually.	Required PA parameter per 40 CFR § 194.33. The Drilling Rate is important to performance and incorporated into the PA.	Drilling Fluid Flow	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification
Probability of Encountering a Castile Brine Reservoir	DBDSP	As drilling records are received. . Data are reported annually.	Probability of Encountering a Castile Brine Reservoir	Drilling Fluid Flow	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification
Subsidence	SMP	Data are reported annually or as determined necessary by the DOE.	Not directly related to a PA parameter. Can provide spatial information on surface subsidence (if any) over the influence area of the underground openings during operations.	Changes to groundwater flow due to mining effects; subsidence baseline.	Data are evaluated annually or as determined necessary by the DOE.
Waste Activity	Waste Inventory Monitoring Based on WDS	Continually updated as waste is approved for shipment to the WIPP and emplaced. . Data are reported annually.	Waste Activity	Waste Inventory Monitoring Based on WDS	Data are evaluated annually and during recertification

1

2 The 10 parameters above are called *compliance monitoring parameters*. As discussed
 3 previously, the EPA determined during the original WIPP certification and the 2004 and 2009
 4 recertifications that these parameters met the regulatory monitoring requirements.

1 **MON-3.0 Preclosure Compliance Monitoring**

2 This section describes the preclosure CMP and the resulting data. The 10 parameters, associated
3 monitoring program for each, frequency of data collection and reporting, related PA parameters,
4 and related FEPs decisions used to support the PA are listed in Table MON-1.

5 **MON-3.1 Geotechnical Engineering Program Plan**

6 The WIPP Geotechnical Engineering Program Plan (Nuclear Waste Partnership LLC 2012a)
7 defines the field programs and investigations carried out by the Geotechnical Engineering
8 Section within the Management and Operating Contractor (M&OC). The Geotechnical
9 Engineering Program provides geologic information related to geotechnical characteristics and
10 assesses the stability and performance of the underground facility. The geotechnical monitoring
11 activities identified in Table MON-1 are included as part of the WIPP Geotechnical Engineering
12 Program Plan. This plan provides for the collection of data as described in the Geomechanical
13 Monitoring Program and the Geosciences Program.

14 **MON-3.1.1 Geomechanical Monitoring Program**

15 The data collected as part of the Geomechanical Monitoring Program is used to validate the
16 WIPP design, track short-term and long-term geotechnical performance behavior of underground
17 openings, and support routine safety and stability evaluations of the excavations. From an
18 operational point of view, geomechanical data are used to identify areas of potential instability
19 allow corrective action to be taken in a timely manner. For underground opening behavior, in
20 situ data were used to model long-term disposal system performance. Geomechanical
21 monitoring instrumentation generates data related to the following four parameters:

- 22 1. Creep closure and stresses
- 23 2. Extent of brittle deformation
- 24 3. Initiation of brittle deformation
- 25 4. Displacement of deformation feature

26 **MON-3.1.1.1 Scope**

27 The activities associated with the Geomechanical Monitoring Program are designed to:

- 28 • Maintain and augment the geotechnical instrumentation system in the WIPP underground
29 and upgrade the automatic data acquisition system as necessary.
- 30 • Monitor geotechnical instrumentation on a regular basis and maintain a current database of
31 instrument readings.
- 32 • Evaluate the geotechnical instrumentation data and prepare regular reports that document the
33 data and analyses describing the stability and performance of underground openings.

- 1 • Recommend corrective or preventive measures to ensure excavation stability and safe
2 operation of the facility.

3 **MON-3.1.1.2 Schedule**

4 The process by which geomechanical monitoring of an area is initiated may vary as part of
5 operational excavation monitoring or research testing. Installation and monitoring of the
6 instruments is governed by approved WIPP procedures. Instrumentation is monitored remotely
7 using data loggers, or is read manually. Routine tasks are carried out according to approved
8 WIPP procedures. Activities which are in development, or which are not expected to be
9 performed routinely, are performed in accordance with industry standards and individual activity
10 plans that supplement the Geotechnical Engineering Program Plan.

11 Remotely polled instruments are connected to a surface computer through a system of cables,
12 termination boxes, and data loggers. Manually read instruments are monitored using electronic
13 read-out boxes and mechanical measuring devices. Instrumentation is located in the shafts and
14 drifts, including tape extensometer stations, convergence meters, borehole extensometers,
15 piezometers, embedment strain gauges, stress gauges, inclinometers, load cells, and crack
16 meters. Monitoring data are collected on a quarterly basis at a minimum, but more frequent
17 readings may be collected as determined by the cognizant engineer or cognizant manager.
18 Instruments are read as designated in Table MON-1.

19 **MON-3.1.1.3 Program Output**

20 Data analysis is performed on an annual basis and is published annually in the Geotechnical
21 Analysis Report (U.S. DOE 2009b, U.S. DOE 2010a, U.S. DOE 2011a, and U.S. DOE 2012a).

22 An assessment of convergence measurements and geotechnical observations is made after each
23 round of data collection. The results of each assessment are distributed to affected underground
24 repository operations, engineering, and safety managers.

25 **MON-3.1.2 Geosciences Program**

26 Geosciences activities document existing geologic conditions and characteristics and monitor for
27 changes resulting from the excavations. These activities generate data related to the following
28 four parameters:

- 29 1. Creep closure and stresses
30 2. Extent of brittle deformation
31 3. Initiation of brittle deformation
32 4. Displacement of deformation features

1 **MON-3.1.2.1 Scope**

2 The Geosciences Program implements field activities such as geologic mapping of the facility
3 and near-surface stratigraphic horizons, core logging, and geophysical surveys. These activities
4 generate data used in monitoring the repository and in rock mechanics studies. Information
5 from the Geosciences Program is used to document the existing geologic conditions and
6 characteristics and to monitor for changes resulting from excavations. Activities associated with
7 this program include geologic and fracture mapping, maintenance of a facility for the storage of
8 geologic samples (the Core Library), seismic monitoring and evaluation, and other activities
9 performed as needed. These activities characterize, demonstrate the continuity of, and document
10 the geology at the site.

11 **MON-3.1.2.2 Schedule**

12 The following activities are performed on the indicated schedule:

- 13 • Seismic Monitoring. Regional seismic monitoring and evaluation are conducted by the New
14 Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. The network is operated continuously and
15 monitoring results are reported quarterly.
- 16 • Geologic Mapping. Geologic mapping is conducted in newly excavated areas and in other
17 areas when deemed necessary by the cognizant engineer or Geotechnical Engineering
18 Manager.
- 19 • At a minimum, a complete analysis of geotechnical data is performed annually. The
20 geotechnical activities will continue throughout the operational period.

21 **MON-3.1.2.3 Program Output**

22 Data analysis is performed on an annual basis and is published annually in the Geotechnical
23 Analysis Report (U.S. DOE 2009b, U.S. DOE 2010a, U.S. DOE 2011a, and U.S. DOE 2012a).

24 **MON-3.2 Groundwater Monitoring Program**

25 Groundwater monitoring at the WIPP facility is carried out under the WIPP Groundwater
26 Monitoring Program Plan (GWMP) (Nuclear Waste Partnership LLC 2012b). The purpose of
27 the GWMP is to collect groundwater data from numerous wells located at and near the facility.

28 The Culebra is the focus of the GWMP. It has been extensively studied during past hydrologic
29 characterization programs, and was found to be the most likely hydrologic pathway to the
30 accessible environment or compliance point for any potential human-intrusion-caused release
31 scenario.

1 Data obtained through the GWMP are also used to support the following two monitoring
2 parameters:

- 3 1. Culebra groundwater composition
- 4 2. Culebra groundwater flow parameters

5 Details on how the program is implemented are provided in the GWMP (Nuclear Waste
6 Partnership LLC 2012b).

7 On January 31, 2012, the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) submitted a letter
8 from Dave Martin, Cabinet Secretary, to Edward Ziemianski, Interim Manager of the Carlsbad
9 Field Office, and Farok Sharif, Washington TRU Solutions, transmitting a Class 2 Permit
10 Modification Request, EPA I.D. Number NM4890139088-TSDF (NMED 2012a). As a result of
11 this modification, changes were made to the Culebra Water Quality Sampling Program. The
12 groundwater composition sampling frequency and the method for reporting the change in the
13 groundwater flow parameter was changed. Prior to 2012, sampling was conducted semi-
14 annually. The sampling frequency was changed to annual sampling, based on 15 years of data
15 that indicated little or no change in constituent concentrations. The change also aligned the 40
16 CFR § 194.42 Compliance Monitoring Program requirements with the WIPP Groundwater
17 Detection Monitoring Program Plan (GDMPP) as defined in the WIPP Hazardous Waste Facility
18 Permit (NMED 2012b).

19 **MON-3.2.1 Scope**

20 The GWMP addresses requirements for sample collection, groundwater surface elevation
21 monitoring, groundwater flow direction monitoring, data management, and reporting of
22 groundwater monitoring data. It also identifies analytical parameters selected to assess
23 groundwater quality.

24 Six Culebra wells were drilled as part of the WIPP GWMP: Water Quality Sampling Program
25 (WQSP) wells WQSP-1 through WQSP-6. Water samples are collected from these wells and
26 analyzed for certain chemical and physical parameters. This activity generates data in support of
27 the Culebra Groundwater Composition parameter, which calls for analysis of the following ions:

28 Cations: Ca^{2+} , K^+ , Na^+ , Mg^{2+}

29 Anions: Cl^- , HCO_3^- , SO_4^{2-}

30 Water level data are collected to assess changes in Culebra groundwater flow. Water level
31 measurements are tracked over time using WQSP wells and other wells that are widely
32 distributed across the WIPP area to monitor potentiometric surface and groundwater flow
33 directions. If changes in water level(s) occur, the cause is investigated, and any potential impact
34 on the long-term performance of the repository is assessed.

1 **MON-3.2.1.1 Sampling and Reporting for Water Quality**

2 Sampling for water quality is performed at six groundwater monitoring wells. The Culebra is
3 monitored using wells WQSP-1 through WQSP-6. It should be noted that the program
4 previously monitored well WQSP-6a in the Dewey Lake Red Beds Formation. However, the
5 change in the WIPP GDMPP introduced through a NMED Class 2 Permit Modification Request
6 removed this well from the sampling and reporting program.

7 Field parameter measurements are used by the sampling team to determine when purged
8 groundwater is representative of the undisturbed native groundwater of the Culebra. After well
9 stabilization, final samples are collected for submittal to analytical laboratories. The field
10 indicator parameters are pH, temperature, specific conductance, and specific gravity. Each well
11 is purged no more than three well bore volumes, or until field parameters stabilize, whichever
12 occurs first. Well stabilization occurs when field-analyzed parameters are within $\pm 5\%$ of three
13 consecutive measurements. Should field parameters not stabilize after 3 well bore volumes have
14 been purged, a notation is made in the field data sheets, where appropriate, and final samples are
15 obtained.

16 When the field indicator parameters have stabilized, indicating that the sample is representative
17 of the Culebra, final samples are collected in the appropriate type of container for the specific
18 analysis to meet state and federal groundwater requirements. The final samples are submitted to
19 a laboratory for analysis. Section MON-3.2.1 lists the analytes needed to support the PA
20 parameter.

21 Samples are tracked and managed in accordance with WIPP facility standard operating
22 procedures to assure samples are analyzed within prescribed time periods.

23 **MON-3.2.1.2 Sampling and Reporting for Water Level Fluctuations**

24 Water level measurements are taken in the six groundwater monitoring wells (WQSP-1 through
25 WQSP-6) and other available WIPP wells in the monitoring network (Appendix HYDRO-2014,
26 Figure HYDRO-1. Location of WIPP Wells and Well pads). The water level monitoring will be
27 used to identify water level fluctuations.

28 In addition to the water level measurements, groundwater density is determined in the wells on
29 an annual basis. This density is used to convert the water level measurements to equivalent
30 freshwater heads for developing potentiometric surface maps.

31 **MON-3.2.2 Schedule**

32 Background water quality in both the upgradient and downgradient monitoring wells has been
33 established for the WIPP facility. The six WQSP monitoring wells constructed for the GWMP
34 are sampled on an annual basis to compare to the baseline water quality. Prior to 2012, sampling
35 was conducted semi-annually. The sampling frequency was changed to an annual basis, based
36 on 15 years of data that indicated little or no change in constituent concentrations. The change
37 also aligned the 40 CFR 194.42 Compliance Monitoring Program requirements with the WIPP

1 GDMPP. The change in the WIPP GDMPP was introduced through a NMED Class 2 Permit
 2 Modification Request.

3 The groundwater level is measured by monitoring the wells on at least a monthly basis.
 4 Groundwater level measurements are monitored and collected for other WIPP wells, as well as
 5 for the WQSP wells. The water levels are determined monthly in at least one accessible,
 6 completed interval at each available well pad, and quarterly in redundant wells at well pads
 7 where two or more wells are completed in the same interval. Groundwater level measurements
 8 are primarily used to examine changes in groundwater flow rate and direction to identify any
 9 changes pertinent to compliance.

10 The characteristics of the GWMP, such as the frequency of sampling and the location of the
 11 sampled wells, will be reevaluated if significant changes are observed in the groundwater flow
 12 direction or gradient. Reporting frequencies are listed in Table MON-2.

13 **Table MON-2. WIPP GWMP Sample Collection and Water Level Reporting Frequency**

Type of Well	Frequency
Water Quality Sampling	
WQSP wells (six)	Annually
Water Level Monitoring	
WQSP wells (six)	Monthly and before sampling events
Other available WIPP wells	Monthly and quarterly on selected wells

14

15 **MON-3.2.3 Program Outputs**

16 The groundwater samples are analyzed to quantify Culebra groundwater parameters and water
 17 quality parameters listed in Section MON-3.2.1.

18 The GWMP also generates Culebra water level data. The data and results of the GWMP are
 19 summarized and published on an annual basis in the WIPP Annual Site Environmental Report
 20 (U.S. DOE 2008a, U.S. DOE 2009c, U.S. DOE 2010b, U.S. DOE 2011b, and U.S. DOE 2012b).

21 **MON-3.3 Delaware Basin Drilling Surveillance Program**

22 The DBDSP is described in the Delaware Basin Drilling Surveillance Plan (Nuclear Waste
 23 Partnership LLC 2012c). This plan provides the framework for the surveillance of drilling
 24 activities within the Delaware Basin, with specific emphasis on the nine-township area
 25 surrounding the WIPP site. The DBDSP mandates the collection of information related to the
 26 following two parameters:

- 27 1. Probability of encountering a Castile brine reservoir
- 28 2. Drilling rate

1 In addition to the parameters listed above, the DBDSP collects information on the following
2 activities:

- 3 • Borehole plugging
- 4 • Enhanced recovery
- 5 • Natural gas storage
- 6 • Solution mining
- 7 • Potash mining
- 8 • Seismic events

9 **MON-3.3.1 Scope**

10 The DBDSP is to provide for active surveillance of drilling activities within the Delaware Basin.
11 The WIPP PA includes the impacts of drilling on the performance of the disposal system. The
12 number of deep boreholes drilled per square kilometer is a parameter used in PA calculations for
13 inadvertent intrusion scenarios. This parameter is based on actual drilling rates within the
14 Delaware Basin over the last 100 years, as required by 40 CFR § 194.33 (U.S. EPA 1996).

15 The results of the DBDSP continue to expand the existing database. The results of this program
16 are used to detect any substantial deviations from the assumptions used in the previous PA (see
17 Section MON-3.3.2, Table MON-3). Collecting additional information about resource
18 exploration and exploitation activities and practices in the Delaware Basin provides information
19 to determine whether the drilling scenarios, assumptions, and probabilities used in the PA will
20 continue to be valid for each five-year recertification of the WIPP disposal system.

21 Drilling information for the study area is obtained through commercially available electronic
22 databases and the records of government agencies. The electronic database is updated weekly to
23 reflect drilling activities in the Delaware Basin. Records of government agencies are updated as
24 they become available.

1 **MON-3.3.2 Schedule**

2 Table MON-3 shows the frequency of DBDSP data collection.

Table MON-3. DBDSP Data Collection Schedule

Information Collected	Frequency
Borehole plugging	Weekly
Enhanced recovery	Monthly
Gas storage	Annually
Solution mining	Annually
Potash mining	Annually
Seismic events	Quarterly
Drilling-related	Weekly
Probability of encountering a Castile brine reservoir	Weekly
Drilling rate calculations	Quarterly

3

4 **MON-3.3.3 Program Outputs**

5 DBDSP results are used to update and maintain a database of drilling activities and related
 6 practices in the Delaware Basin. For the nine-township area surrounding the WIPP disposal
 7 system, the DBDSP updates and maintains a database containing the following information:

- 8 • Plugging and abandonment activities, including descriptions of plugging configurations
- 9 • The fraction of plugged and abandoned boreholes that are sealed
- 10 • Well conversion activities (injection, disposal, water)
- 11 • Injection well operations (disposal and secondary recovery)
- 12 • Drilling activities, including borehole depths, diameters, and type and amount of drilling
 13 fluid
- 14 • Ownership of state and federal minerals and hydrocarbon leases within the area
- 15 • Occurrences of pressurized brine within the Castile

16 Data collected and recorded as a result of the DBDSP are reported annually in the Delaware
 17 Basin Monitoring Annual Report (U.S. DOE 2008b, U.S. DOE 2009d, U.S. DOE 2010c, U.S.
 18 DOE 2011c, and U.S. DOE 2012c).

1 **MON-3.4 Subsidence Monitoring Program**

2 The SMP is described in detail in the WIPP Underground and Surface Surveying Program
3 (Nuclear Waste Partnership LLC 2012d). Subsidence monitoring measures vertical movement
4 of the land surface relative to a reference location using state-of-the-art leveling equipment. The
5 technique used to monitor subsidence involves measuring the vertical height difference between
6 two or more markers placed on a surface a known distance away from each other using a
7 leveling survey. A reference benchmark is used as the standard and the relative movement of the
8 other benchmark(s) is measured to detect vertical movement over time. Subsidence
9 measurements are relative because the reference is fixed only with respect to the subsidence
10 marker(s).

11 **MON-3.4.1 Scope**

12 The activities associated with the SMP are designed to:

- 13 • Provide time-related spatial information on surface subsidence within 152.4 meters (m)
14 (500 feet (ft)) surrounding the waste shaft during the operational phase of the repository
- 15 • Provide time-related spatial information on surface subsidence over the influence area of
16 the underground openings for comparison with subsidence predictions
- 17 • Maintain a database of subsidence data

18 With current technology, vertical elevation can be measured at a precision of 0.0305 centimeters
19 (cm) (0.001 ft). Subsidence monitoring was chosen by the DOE as a long-term monitoring tool
20 because it effectively meets the requirements in section 191.14(b). Subsidence monitoring is
21 conducted to detect substantial and detrimental deviations from expected repository performance
22 by comparing actual subsidence to predicted subsidence.

23 Subsidence data currently being compiled will be compared to subsidence predictions. In
24 addition, subsidence monitoring during the operational phase generates data to establish a
25 baseline against which long-term subsidence data and information may be evaluated.

26 **MON-3.4.2 Schedule**

27 Subsidence surveys are performed annually throughout the operations period. After closure of
28 the repository, subsidence surveys will be performed at 10-year intervals for at least 100 years or
29 until no further useful information may be obtained through continued monitoring.

30 **MON-3.4.3 Program Outputs**

31 The SMP generates annual surface subsidence data for 24.14 kilometers (km) (15 miles (mi)) of
32 leveling loops through 48 monuments. Results are reported annually in the WIPP Subsidence
33 Monument Leveling Survey (U.S. DOE 2008c, U.S. DOE 2009e, U.S. DOE 2010d, U.S. DOE
34 2011d, U.S. DOE 2012d, and U.S. DOE 2012e).

1 **MON-3.5 Waste Inventory Monitoring Based on WIPP Waste Data System**

2 Information on the waste activity parameter is measured or estimated by generator sites through
 3 waste characterization activities. Sites are required to report certain information in the WIPP
 4 WDS, formerly called the WIPP Waste Information System, or WWIS. Reports are generated to
 5 tabulate key waste parameters for waste that has been emplaced in the WIPP repository. The
 6 waste activity parameter includes tracking the total waste material parameter weights and curie
 7 content of the 10 radionuclides listed in Section MON-3.5.3.

8 **MON-3.5.1 Scope**

9 Radionuclide inventory data and material parameter weights for every container of waste placed
 10 in the WIPP underground repository are submitted to the WDS database at the time waste is
 11 certified for shipment to the WIPP facility. The waste activity parameters being tracked and
 12 reported include radiological activity (in curies) emplaced during the 40 CFR § 194.4(b)(4) (U.S.
 13 EPA 1996) reporting period and the cumulative activity since waste was first emplaced in the
 14 repository. The radionuclides being tracked (in curies) include:

- 15 • americium-241
- 16 • plutonium-238
- 17 • plutonium-239
- 18 • plutonium-240
- 19 • plutonium-242
- 20 • uranium-233
- 21 • uranium-234
- 22 • uranium-238
- 23 • strontium-90
- 24 • cesium-137

25 The material parameter weights that are annually tracked and reported in the section 194.4(b)(4)
 26 report include:

- 27 • A repository maximum limit for emplaced cellulose, plastic and rubber materials of 2.2
 28 $\times 10^7$ kg
- 29 • A repository minimum for emplaced ferrous metals of 2×10^7 kg
- 30 • A repository minimum for emplaced nonferrous metals of 2×10^3 kg

1 **MON-3.5.2 Schedule**

2 A current collection of radionuclide inventory data and material parameter weights for the WIPP
3 is maintained within the WDS, and data reports can be generated at any time.

4 **MON-3.5.3 Program Outputs**

5 The data collected for the waste activity parameter is tracked by the WDS. The WDS annually
6 generates a Waste Emplacement Summary Report that is submitted each November to the EPA
7 in the annual 40 CFR § 194.4(b)(4) report (U.S. DOE 2008d, U.S. DOE 2009f, U.S. DOE 2010e,
8 U.S. DOE 2011e, and U.S. DOE 2012f). . In addition, to aid the EPA, an EPA Dashboard is
9 available on the WDS for their use and they can call up any of the following reports at their
10 discretion.

- 11 • Container Query
- 12 • Nuclide Report
- 13 • Waste Emplacement Report
- 14 • Summary of Waste Emplacement Inventory Report
- 15 • Emplacement By container Type Report
- 16 • Emplacement History Overview

17 **MON-4.0 Postclosure (Long Term) Monitoring**

18 The final Postclosure Monitoring Plan will be developed prior to final facility closure (sealing of
19 the shafts), but will not be implemented until after facility closure. When the final Postclosure
20 Monitoring Plan is written, the historic monitoring data collected per the requirements of this
21 Preclosure Monitoring Plan that will support postclosure monitoring will be analyzed.

22 **MON-5.0 Monitoring Programs Quality Assurance Requirements**

23 The quality of the work performed under the DOE CMP is accomplished per the criteria of 40
24 CFR § 194.22(a)(2)(ii) (U.S. EPA 1996) and controlled by the application of the CBFO Quality
25 Assurance Program Document (QAPD) (U.S. DOE 2010f). Waste information is controlled by
26 implementing the relevant quality assurance requirements at generator sites.

27 In addition to the management requirements, such as document and record control established in
28 the QAPD, requirements related to sampling and monitoring activities are specified. In
29 particular, the following two sections of the QAPD are directly related to the performance of
30 monitoring work and the control of samples:

- 31 • Section 2.4 – Inspection and Testing

- 1 – Qualification of personnel
 - 2 – Inspection
 - 3 – Test requirements
 - 4 – Monitoring, measuring, testing, and data collection
 - 5 – Use and control of measuring and test equipment
 - 6 – Calibration
 - 7 • Section 4.0 – Sample Control Requirements
 - 8 – Sample control
 - 9 – Sample identification
 - 10 – Handling, storing, and shipping samples
 - 11 – Disposition of nonconforming samples
- 12 WIPP monitoring programs are subject to EPA inspections in accordance with 40 CFR § 194.21
13 (U.S. EPA 1996).
- 14 The CMP relies on the individual monitoring plan’s QA program to ensure compliance with
15 DOE WIPP requirements for data quality assessments, objectives, and analyses. Each sampling
16 and monitoring program is implemented through individual implementation plans, which include
17 the QA descriptions, objectives, and references to the applicable governing QA document.

1 **MON-6.0 Reporting and Assessment**

2 Information flow is controlled to ensure important monitoring results are communicated to the
3 appropriate individuals and groups.

4 **MON-6.1 Monitoring Data Reporting**

5 The monitoring programs that generate data used in the CMP are implemented and coordinated
6 by the M&OC.

7 **MON-6.1.1 CMP Assessment Report**

8 The results of the CMP are reported in the compliance assessment report (Wagner and
9 Hillesheim 2008 and Wagner and Hillesheim 2009; Wagner and Kuhlman 2010; Wagner,
10 Kuhlman and Johnson 2011 and Wagner, Kuhlman and Johnson 2012). The Sandia National
11 Laboratories Annual Compliance Monitoring Parameter Assessment Reports are provided to the
12 EPA with each recertification as references to Appendix DATA.

13 The CMP results may indicate two general cases: normal or expected conditions, in which
14 results are generally consistent with existing data, parameter values, and conceptual models; and
15 anomalous conditions, in which results are inconsistent with existing data, parameter values, or
16 conceptual models. The DOE determines whether these results are consistent with expected
17 conditions modeled in the PA or screening decisions used to support the compliance
18 determination. The report also recommends if the CMP should be modified based on results of
19 the monitoring programs.

20 **MON-6.1.2 External Reporting**

21 The DOE reviews the recommendations of the M&OC and the Scientific Advisor to evaluate
22 their significance. Significance is determined based on consideration of the following criteria:

- 23 • Containment requirements established pursuant to 40 CFR § 191.13 (U.S. EPA 1993) are, or
24 are expected to be, exceeded.
- 25 • Releases from previously emplaced waste that lead to committed effective doses that are, or
26 are expected to be, in excess of those established pursuant to 40 CFR § 191.15 (U.S. EPA
27 1993) (not including emissions from operations covered pursuant to Part 191 Subpart A).
- 28 • Releases that have caused, or are expected to cause, concentrations of radionuclides (or
29 estimated doses due to radionuclides in underground sources of drinking water in the
30 accessible environment) to exceed the limits established pursuant to Part 191 Subpart C.

31 If monitoring results meet any of these criteria, the results are considered significant. Significant
32 monitoring results are promptly reported to the EPA. The report is accompanied by a
33 recommended course of action, including the appropriate external reporting. If the monitoring
34 results exceed or possibly exceed containment requirements or release limits as specified in 40

1 CFR § 194.4(b)(3)(ii), the CBFO will immediately cease emplacement of waste in the WIPP
2 repository and notify the EPA within 24 hours.

3 If the DOE discovers a condition or activity that differs significantly from what is indicated in
4 the most recent compliance application, but does not involve conditions or activities listed in
5 section 194.4(b)(3)(ii), then the difference shall be reported in writing to the EPA within 10
6 calendar days of discovery. For normal conditions where monitoring results are within
7 expectations, the CMP assessment documents these conditions (Wagner and Hillesheim 2008
8 and Wagner and Hillesheim 2009; Wagner and Kuhlman 2010; Wagner, Kuhlman and Johnson
9 2011 and Wagner, Kuhlman and Johnson 2012).

1 **MON-7.0 References**

2 (*Indicates a reference that has not been previously submitted.)

3 Kirkes, R. and S. Wagner. 2003. *MONPAR Reassessment*. ERMS 533098. Carlsbad, NM:
4 Sandia National Laboratories.

5 Marcinowski, F. 2002. *Letter to I.R. Triay*. 15 March 2002. Washington, DC: U.S.
6 Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation.

7 New Mexico Environment Department (NMED). 2012a. Letter from Dave Martin, Cabinet
8 Secretary, to Edward Ziemianski, Interim Manager of the Carlsbad Field Office, and Farok
9 Sharif, Washington TRU Solutions (Subject: *Approval and Partial Denial of Permit*
10 *Modification Requests to Update Ventilation Langaue, Add a Shielded Container, and Revise*
11 *the WIPP Groudwater Detection Monitoring Program Plan, WIPP Hazardous Waste Facility*
12 *Permit, EPA I.D. Number NM4890139088*). 31 January 2012.*

13 New Mexico Environment Department (NMED). 2012b. WIPP Hazardous Waste Facility
14 Permit, May 8, 2012, Part 5 – *Groundwater Detection Monitoring*. Carlsbad, NM: U.S.
15 Department of Energy.

16 Nuclear Waste Partnership LLC (NWP). 2012a. *WIPP Geotechnical Engineering Program*
17 *Plan* (Rev. 7, November 19). WP 07 1. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*

18 Nuclear Waste Partnership LLC (NWP). 2012b. *WIPP Groundwater Monitoring Program Plan*
19 (Rev. 12, November 30). WP 02 1. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*

20 Nuclear Waste Partnership LLC (NWP). 2012c. *Delaware Basin Drilling Surveillance Plan*
21 (Rev. 5, November 27). WP 02-PC.02. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*

22 Nuclear Waste Partnership LLC (NWP). 2012d. *WIPP Underground and Surface Surveying*
23 *Program* (Rev. 6, November 30). WP 09 ES.01. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*

24 Triay, I.R. 2002. Letter to F. Marcinowski (1 Enclosure). 3 January 2002. Carlsbad, NM: U.S.
25 Department of Energy, Carlsbad Field Office.

26 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 1996. *Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Certification*
27 *Application for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant* (October). 21 vols. DOE/CAO-1996-2184.
28 Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.

29 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2008a. *Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Annual Site*
30 *Environmental Report: Calendar Year 2007* (September). DOE/WIPP 08-2225. Carlsbad, NM:
31 Carlsbad Field Office.*

32 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2008b. *Delaware Basin Monitoring Annual Report*
33 (September 2008). DOE/WIPP-08-2308. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*

34 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2008c. *WIPP Subsidence Monument Leveling Survey 2007*
35 (December). DOE/WIPP-08-2293. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*

- 1 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2008d. *Annual Change Report 2007/2008* (November 15).
2 DOE/WIPP 0408-3317. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 3 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2009a. *Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Recertification*
4 *Application for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant* (March). DOE/WIPP 2009-3424. Carlsbad, NM:
5 Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 6 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2009b. *Geotechnical Analysis Report for July 2007 - June*
7 *2008* (March). 2 vols. DOE/WIPP 09-3177. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 8 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2009c. *Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Annual Site*
9 *Environmental Report: Calendar Year 2008*. DOE/WIPP 09-2225. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad
10 Field Office.*
- 11 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2009d. *Delaware Basin Monitoring Annual Report*
12 (September 2009). DOE/WIPP 09-2308. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 13 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2009e. *WIPP Subsidence Monument Leveling Survey 2008*
14 (December). DOE/WIPP 09-2293. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 15 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2009f. *Annual Change Report 2008/2009*(November 13).
16 DOE/WIPP 09-0335. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 17 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2010a. *Geotechnical Analysis Report for July 2008 - June*
18 *2009* (April). 2 vols. DOE/WIPP 10-3177. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 19 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2010b. *Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Annual Site*
20 *Environmental Report: Calendar Year 2009*. DOE/WIPP 10-2225. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad
21 Field Office.*
- 22 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2010c. *Delaware Basin Monitoring Annual Report*
23 (September 2010). DOE/WIPP-10-2308. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 24 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2010d. *WIPP Subsidence Monument Leveling Survey 2009*
25 (December). DOE/WIPP-10-2293. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 26 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2010e. *Annual Change Report 2009/2010* (November).
27 DOE/WIPP-10-1660. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 28 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2010f. *Quality Assurance Program Document* (Revision
29 11, June). DOE/CBFO-94-1012. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.
- 30 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2011a. *Geotechnical Analysis Report for July 2009-June*
31 *2010* (March). 2 vols. DOE/WIPP 11-3177. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 32 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2011b. *Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Annual Site*
33 *Environmental Report: Calendar Year 2010*. DOE/WIPP 11-2225. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad
34 Field Office.*

- 1 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2011c. *Delaware Basin Monitoring Annual Report*
2 (September 2011). DOE/WIPP-11-2308. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 3 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2011d. *WIPP Subsidence Monument Leveling Survey 2010*
4 (December). DOE/WIPP-11-2293. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 5 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2011e. *Annual Change Report 2010/2011* (August).
6 DOE/WIPP-11-3479. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 7 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012a. *Geotechnical Analysis Report for July 2010 to June*
8 *2011* (May). DOE/WIPP-12-3408. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 9 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012b. *Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Annual Site*
10 *Environmental Report Calendar Year 2011*. DOE/WIPP 12-3489. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad
11 Field Office.*
- 12 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012c. *Delaware Basin Monitoring Annual Report*
13 (September 2012). DOE/WIPP-12-2308. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 14 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012d. *WIPP Subsidence Monument Leveling Survey 2011*
15 (December). DOE/WIPP 12-2293. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 16 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012e. *WIPP Subsidence Monument Leveling Survey 2012*
17 (December). DOE/WIPP 12-3497. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 18 U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). 2012f. *Annual Change Report 2011/2012: 7* (October).
19 DOE/WIPP-12-3496. Carlsbad, NM: Carlsbad Field Office.*
- 20 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1993. *40 CFR Part 191: Environmental*
21 *Radiation Protection Standards for the Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-*
22 *Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes; Final Rule*. Federal Register, vol. 58 (December 20,
23 1993): 66398–416.
- 24 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1996. *40 CFR Part 194: Criteria for the*
25 *Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's Compliance with the 40*
26 *CFR Part 191 Disposal Regulations; Final Rule*. Federal Register, vol. 61 (February 9, 1996):
27 5223–45.
- 28 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1998a. *40 CFR Part 194: Criteria for the*
29 *Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's Compliance with the*
30 *Disposal Regulations: Certification Decision; Final Rule*. Federal Register, vol. 63 (May 18,
31 1998): 27353–406.
- 32 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1998b. CARD No. 42: Monitoring.
33 *Compliance Application Review Document Number 42 for the Criteria for the Certification and*
34 *Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's Compliance with the 40 CFR 191 Disposal*
35 *Regulations: Final Certification Decision* (May) (pp. 42-1 through 42-24). Washington, DC:
36 Office of Radiation and Indoor Air.

- 1 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2006. *40 CFR Part 194: Criteria for the*
2 *Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's Compliance with the*
3 *Disposal Regulations: Recertification Decision* (Final Notice). Federal Register, vol. 71 (April
4 10, 2006): 18010–021.*
- 5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2010. *40 CFR Part 194: Criteria for the 15*
6 *Certification and Recertification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's Compliance with the 16*
7 *Disposal Regulations: Recertification Decision; Final Rule*. Federal Register, vol. 75 17
8 (November 18, 2010): 70584-595.*
- 9 Wagner, S.W. 2008. *Reassessment of MONPAR Analysis for Use in the 2009 Compliance*
10 *Recertification Application*. ERMS 548948. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- 11 Wagner, S.W. and M. Hillesheim. 2008. *Sandia National Laboratories Annual Compliance*
12 *Monitoring Parameter Assessment for 2008* (January). WBS 1.3.1. Carlsbad, NM.*
- 13 Wagner, S.W. and M. Hillesheim. 2009. *Sandia National Laboratories Annual Compliance*
14 *Monitoring Parameter Assessment for 2009* (January). WBS 1.3.1. Carlsbad, NM. *
- 15 Wagner, S.W. and K. Kuhlman 2010. *Sandia National Laboratories Annual Compliance*
16 *Monitoring Parameter Assessment for 2010* (November). WBS 1.3.1. Carlsbad, NM.*
- 17 Wagner, S.W., K.L. Kuhlman., and P.B. Johnson. 2011. *Sandia National Laboratories Annual*
18 *Compliance Monitoring Parameter Assessment for 2011* (December). WBS 1.3.1. Carlsbad,
19 NM.*
- 20 Wagner, S.W., K.L. Kuhlman. and P.B. Johnson. 2012. *Sandia National Laboratories Annual*
21 *Compliance Monitoring Parameter Assessment for 2012* (November).*
- 22 Wagner, S.W. 2013. *Reassessment of MONPAR Analysis for Use in the 2014 Compliance*
23 *Recertification Application*. ERMS 560164. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.*