# Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Certification Application for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

**Appendix SMP** 





# United States Department of Energy Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

Carlsbad Area Office Carlsbad, New Mexico **Subsidence Monitoring Plan** 



	Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Certification Application
1	CONTENTS
2 3	ACRONYMS SMP-v
4 5	APPENDIX SMP SMP-1
6	SMP.1 Introduction
7	SMP.2 Subsidence Theory and Measurement SMP-1
8	SMP.3 Subsidence Baseline SMP-3
9	SMP.4 Monitoring Activities SMP-4
10	SMP.5 Instrumentation SMP-4
11	SMP.6 Quality Assurance SMP-7
12	
13	REFERENCES SMP-9
14	
15	



	Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Certification Application
1	FIGURES
2	
3	SMP-1. Subsidence Monitoring Benchmarks SMP-5
4	
5	



Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Certification Application
TABLES
SMP-1. Maximum Subsidence Predictions for the WIPP Site



 1
 THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

 2



		Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Certification Application
1		ACRONYMS
2		
3		
4	DOE	Department of Energy
5	GPS	Global Positioning System
6	NGS	National Geodetic Survey
7	QA	Quality Assurance
8	WID	Waste Isolation Division
9	WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
10		



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK





#### APPENDIX SMP

# SMP.1 Introduction

1 2

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28 29 30

31

Subsidence monitoring was chosen by the Department of Energy (DOE) as the basic longterm monitoring tool. Subsidence monitoring is a non-intrusive technique that can related to numerical predictions as a means of detecting substantial and detrimental deviations from expected repository performance by allowing a comparison of actual subsidence to that calculated numerically. Subsidence monitoring meets the regulatory requirements for longterm monitoring as stated in 40 CFR Part 191 (EPA 1993) as follows:

- It can be implemented without dependence on site utilities.
- It can provide useful data at reasonable cost over a long time period.
- It requires minimum maintenance.

This plan provides the following information with respect to subsidence monitoring:

- Subsidence Theory and Measurement
- Subsidence Baseline
- Monitoring Activities
- Equipment
- Quality Assurance

### SMP.2 Subsidence Theory and Measurement

Subsidence is defined as vertical movement of the land surface anywhere in the subsidence 32 basin. Subsidence monitoring is defined as the measurement of relative vertical movement of 33 the land surface. This movement can be up (uplift) or down (subsidence) and is relative to an 34 assumed fixed reference. This reference is assumed fixed, even though it may be subject to 35 the same factors that cause the surface movement and may also be moving. The techniques 36 used to monitor subsidence measure the vertical height difference between an array of markers 37 on the surface and is typically done with a leveling survey. Usually, one reference benchmark 38 (ideally outside the potential subsidence basin) is used as the standard and the relative 39 movement of other stations or benchmarks are measured to detect vertical movement over 40 time. 41

42

The error in subsidence measurements is determined by the equipment and distances between
the stations. A first-order survey has an error of one part in 100,000 and a second-order

1	survey has an error of one part in 20,000. With current technology, several thousandths of an
2	inch vertical movement can be measured to this precision.
3	
4	Subsidence can be caused by a variety of factors. Mining, hydrocarbon extraction, water
5	injection and extraction, geological deformation, and dissolution are potential factors that may
6	cause subsidence in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) vicinity. Major subsidence
7	features in the vicinity of the WIPP include Nash Draw, caused by dissolution of evaporites in
8	the upper Salado and lower Rustler and localized mine-induced subsidence associated with
9	areas in the potash mines in the vicinity of the WIPP where pillars have been removed as a
10	portion of the mine is abandoned (second-mined areas).
11	
12	Several documents related to subsidence in the vicinity of the WIPP have been completed.
13	Several documents describing particular aspects of the WIPP include estimates of subsidence
14	related directly to the excavations of the repository. These include the following:
15	
16	1. Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, DOE/EIS-
17	0026, DOE, 1980, (DOE 1980).
18	
19	2. Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, WP 02-09, WEC,
20	1990, (DOE 1990).
21	
22	3. Preliminary Comparison with 40 CFR §191, Part B for the Waste Isolation Pilot
23	Plant, December 1991, SAND91-0893, "Vol 1, Methodology and Results," SNL,
24	1991, (WIPP PA Division 1991).
25	
26	4. Backfill Engineering Analysis Report (BEAR), (WEC 1994).
27	
28	NUCR reports evaluate the potential for, and predict subsidence caused by the mining of the
29	wiPP repository's shalls, drifts, and waste disposal rooms. These calculations account for a
30	range of emplaced waste volumes, waste densities, and backfill types. Subsidence was also
31	calculated for conditions where no backing would be used. The calculated results from these
32	reports are summarized in Table SMP-1.
33	The studies listed above predict the maximum subsidence expected. These studies were not
34 25	The studies listed above predict the maximum subsidence expected. These studies were not
35	specifically performed to estimate subsidence for long-term repository performance
20	holmoning and do not account for other factors that may influence subsidence such as local
31 20	nyurocaroon extraction and iocar potasi mining.
20 20	The Rackfill Engineering Analysis Report (REAP) (WEC 1004) contains the most recent and
27 10	detailed analysis of subsidence. Contour mans are included in this report that detail
40	subsidence predictions using influence function and National Coal Roard method for
41 12	scenarios with and without backfill. The maximum subsidence was also calculated using the
42 12	mass conservation method
43	

CONDITION/AREA	PREDICTED SUBSIDENCE
FEIS	
70-percent backfill density	1-foot (0.3-meter) subsidence
50-percent backfill density	1.6-foot (0.5-meter) subsidence
No backfill	3.28-foot (1.0-meter) subsidence
FSAR	
Shaft pillar area (backfill type and amount not specified)	1- to 1.2-foot (0.3- to 0.38-meter) subsidence
SNL	
35° angle	0.3-foot (0.09-meter) subsidence
25° angle	0.4-foot (0.13-meter) subsidence
BEAR	
No backfill	1.3- to 2-foot (0.40- to 0.60-meter) subsidence
Highly compacted backfill	1- to 1.7-foot (0.30- to 0.52-meter) subsidence

#### SMP.3 Subsidence Baseline

During the initial site selection process, 195 miles (314 kilometers) of first order, Class 1 leveling survey was performed by the National Geodetic Survey (NGS) in 1977. Later, new survey lines were established that connected the previous first-order benchmarks through Carlsbad, to second-order survey lines through Eunice and Hobbs. Benchmarks were placed over the Nash Draw from the north end to the Remuda Basin, over potash mines, the WIPP site, and the San Simon Sink (Powers 1993). Independent of the National Geodetic Survey benchmarks, an additional 52 benchmarks were installed over the WIPP site and surrounding area. 

The National Geodetic Survey network was resurveyed in 1981 and the relative movement between Carlsbad and the WIPP site was measured to be about 0.8 inches (2 centimeters). Relative motion across the network was down to the east and up to the west (Powers 1993).

The relationships between subsidence and potash mining in the WIPP vicinity are discussed in Powers (1993). From data in this report, potash mining was shown to have caused significant subsidence at mines close to the WIPP. Two benchmarks over the Mississippi Chemical

Corporation mine measured relative to Carlsbad show 10- and 40-inch (25.4- and 102.7-1 centimeter) movement downward from 1977 to 1981. Powers (1993) also discusses mining 2 effects on surface subsidence at other mines and correlated a relationship between mining and 3 the surface area effects. This work allows the possible effects of potash mining to be taken 4 into account when evaluating WIPP-induced subsidence. Powers (1993) also includes an 5 assessment of the effects resulting from the production of brine from WIPP 12. 6 7 **SMP.4** Monitoring Activities 8 9 The WIPP Subsidence Monitoring Program is performed annually and then allows for a 10 comparison of the data, development of a database, and analysis of subsidence characteristics 11 at the WIPP Site. The program includes surface subsidence monitoring involving twenty (20) 12 miles of leveling loops through approximately fifty (50) monuments (S-Caps). Subsidence 13 monitoring surveys include the Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) and surveys of the S-Caps. 14 Figure SMP-1 identifies approximately 50 benchmarks (those designated "S" and "PT") 15 distributed throughout the area of influence of the repository. The annual survey is completed 16 so as to achieve closures better than the minimum standard of Second Order Class II for 17 verticle control surveys. State-of-the-art digital leveling technology is employed for all 18 subsidence surveys. 19 20 A National Geodetic Survey was performed in 1996, however the final report has not yet been 21 published. The current plan is to resurvey about every 10 years. The last National Geoditic 22 Survey was performed in 1981. 23 24 Subsidence data are currently being compiled into a database that will be evaluated as part of 25 this monitoring plan and will include a comparison with subsidence predictions such as those 26 in the BEAR (WEC 1994). The subsidence monitoring study will also investigate factors that 27 influence subsidence to the extent that these factors are identified in the failure scenarios 28 considered in the performance assessment. The goal of the study is to document the most 29 reliable subsidence predictions for the repository and to define the bounding limits of 30

- 31 measurement that will indicate poor repository performance.
- Additional benchmarks will be added, as necessary, to ensure adequate coverage of the
   subsidence basin.
- 34 subsidence basin.35
- 36 SMP.5 Instrumentation
- 37
- 38 State-of-the-art leveling equipment is specified for subsidence measurement. The following is
- a list of technical specifications for typical leveling equipment used for subsidence
- 40 monitoring:
- 41
- 42





THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



1 2

1	Standard deviation	
2	(1kilometer double-run leveling)	
3	Electronically	1.5 millimeters
4	Optically	2.0 millimeters
5		
6	Range	
7	Electronically	1.8 meters to 100 meters
8	Optically	0.6 meters upwards
9		
10	Distance measurements	
11	Electronically	3 millimeters - 5 millimeters/10
12	Optically	0.2 meters - 0.5 meters
13		
14	Temperature range	
15	Measurement	$-20^{\circ}$ C to + 50°C
16	Storage	$-40^{\circ}$ C to + 70°C
17		
18	Compensator	Pendulum compensator with electronic range
19		cneck.
20	Working range	+12 fact
21	Setting accuracy	$\pm 12$ let
22	Setting accuracy	
25	Sensitivity of circular hubble	8feet/2 millimeters
2 <del>4</del> 25	Sensitivity of chedidal babble	Stoci 2 minimeers
25	Horizontal circle	rotable
20 27	Diameter	108 millimeters
28	Units	400 gon or 360°
29	Graduation interval	l gon or 1°
30	Estimate to	~ 0.2 interval
31		
32	SMP.6 Quality Assurance	
33		
34	Subsidence surveying is performed by a qua	alified contractor under the supervision of the
35	Waste Isolation Division (WID) Site Survey	y Group. Vendors who perform surveying work
36	must meet the following minimum standard	15:
37		
38	• Five years experience in surveying f	ïeld
39		
40	<ul> <li>Proficient in using the precision level</li> </ul>	eling equipment specified for the program
41		
42	<ul> <li>Proficient in using related surveying</li> </ul>	g software
43		
44	<ul> <li>Proficient in using global positionin</li> </ul>	g satellite equipment and software

**1**, 2, 2, 1

1 2 3	Quality Assurance (QA) requirements for Procurement of outside vendors to perform quality affecting work are in Section 2.3 of the CAO Quality Assurance Program Document (QAPD) (see Appendix QAPD).
4	
5	Maintenance and calibration of equipment used for monitoring is addressed in Section 2.4.3 of
6	the CAO QAPD (see Appendix QAPD). For subsidence measurements, maintenance and
7	calibration are performed by the equipment vendor in accordance with national standards.
8	Equipment is only procured from, maintained by, and calibrated by vendors on the WIPP
9	approved Qualified Supplier's List.
10	
11	Operational tests to verify that leveling instruments are in calibration are performed daily
12	when equipment is in use.
13	
14	Data, plots, graphics, and reports generated as a result of the subsidence surveys are reviewed
15	by cognizant technical engineering personnel to ensure their adequacy and accuracy in
16	accordance with DOE and DOE/WIPP Quality Assurance/Review procedures.
17	



	Title 40 CFR Part 191 Compliance Certification Application
1	REFERENCES
2 3	DOE (U.S. Department of Energy). 1980. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Waste
4	Isolation Pilot Plant. DOE/EIS-0026. Vols. 1 and 2. Assistant Secretary for Defense
5	Programs. Washington, D.C. WPO 38835, WPO 38838, WPO 38839.
6	
7	DOE (U.S. Department of Energy). 1990. Final Safety Analysis Report. WP 02-9, Rev. 0,
8	May 1990. Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Carlsbad, NM.
9	
0	EPA, 1993. 40 CFR Part 191: Environmental Standards for the Management and Disposal of
1	Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Wastes; Final Rule. Federal
2	Register, Vol. 58, No. 242, p. 66398. December 20, 1993. Office of Radiation and Air,
3	Washington, D.C.
4	
5	Powers, D.W. 1993. Background Report on Subsidence Studies for the Potash Mines and
6	WIPP Site Area, Southeastern New Mexico, in Sandia National Laboratories' Nuclear Waste
7	Management Library, UN02678.
8	
9	Westinghouse Electric Corporation (WEC). 1994. Backfill Engineering Analysis Report,
0	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Waste Isolation Division,
1	Carlsbad, NM. WPO 37909.
2	
3	WIPP PA (Performance Assessment) Division. 1991. Preliminary Comparison with 40 CFR
1	Part 191, Subpart B, for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, December 1991, Vol. 1, Methodology
5	and Results. SAND91-0893/1. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
7	

٠. ÷ . . . \*\*\* \*\*\*

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



1 2