Software Requirements

BEST AVAILABLE COPY VR 5/0/15

NP 19-1 Revision 16 Page 21 of 35

NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT Sondia PROCEDURE Verification and Validation Plan Criteria Form Number: NP 19-1-3 Single PROCEDURE Procession Plan Criteria Page 1 of 1 1 Software Name: DRSPALL 2. Software Name: 122 3. Document Version: 1.22 4. ERMS F 50243 5. Software Name: Q Yes Date for VVP lentify unificant tast cases and acceptance orleria to ensure the final software and end product satisfies the requirements of the RD? (Check Yes if peer review is identified to fulfil the validation requirements) Q Yes 8. Adequacy of Test Cases Q Yes Do the tast case and acceptance orleria to ensure the final software and end produces valid results for problems encompassing the range of permitted usage? Yes N/A 7. Operational control, do tasts demonstrate required performance over the range of operation of the cortoled inclon or process? Yes N/A 8. Uniterated Functions and contrability with the code does not proform any unintended function ating of contrability with the code does not proform any unintended functionality) Yes N/A 9. The tereaulty will be comparatio proven problems, 			Appendix D		
2. Software Version: 1.22 3. Document Version: 1.22 4. ERMS #: 562643 Prior to sign-off off to VVP, all terms shall be appropriately addressed by the code sponsor so that "Yes" or "N/A" may be checked. Include this form as part of the VVP, all terms shall be appropriately addressed by the code sponsor so that "Yes" or "N/A" may be checked. Include this form as part of the VVP. 5. Sufficient Test Cases Image: Statistical States and acceptance or leries to ensure the final software and and product satisfies the requirements of the RD? (Check Yes if peer review is identified to fulfill the validation requirements) 6. Adequacy of Test Cases Image: State St	Nati	WASTE MANAGEMENT ia PROCEDURE		NP 1	9-1-3
3. Document Version: 1.22 4. ERMS #: 502263 Prior to lign-off the VVP, all terms shall be appropriately addressed by the code spansor so that "Yes" or "N/A" may be checked, include this form as part of the VVP. 5. Sufficient Test Cases X Yes Does the VVP identify sufficient test cases and acceptance oriteria to ensure the final software and end product satisfies the requirements of the RD7 (Check Yes If peer review is identified to fulfil the validation requirements) 6. Adequacy of Test Cases X Yes Do the test cases demonstrate that the code adequately performs all intended functions and produces valid results for problems encompassing the range of permitted usage? 7. Oparational Control Yes If the software is used for operational control, do tests demonstrate required performance over the range of operation of the cothold function or process? 8. Unintended Functions Yes Do the test cases show that the code does not perform any uninfonded function that either by itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? 9. Test Result Validation. (neck once or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) The test cases show that the code does not performed. • enderulations using comparable proven problems. • addiculations using comparable proven problems. • other validated software of similar purpose. • other validated rone	1.	Software Name:	DRSPALL		
4. ERMS #: 562843 Prior to sign-off of the VVP, all items shall be appropriately addressed by the code sponsor so that "Yes" or "N/A" may be decked. Include this form as part of the VVP. 5. Sufficient Test Cases:	2.	Software Version:	1.22		
Prior to sign-off of the VVP, all items shall be appropriately addressed by the code sponsor so that "Yes" or "NA" may be checked. Include this form as part of the VVP. Sufficient Test Cases Sufficient Test Cases Does the VVP identify sufficient test cases and acceptance criteria to ensure the final software and end product satisfies the requirements of the RDP (Check Yes if peer review is identified to fulfill the validation requirements) Yes 8. Adequacy of Test Cases Set Yes 9. Ob the test cases demonstrate that the code adequately performs all intended functions and produces valid results for problems encompassing the range of permitted usage? Yes 7. Operational Control do tests demonstrate required performance over the range of operation of the corticule function or process? Inintended Functions Do the test cases show that the code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? Yes N/A 9. Test Result Validation. (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) The test results will be compared to the following: - nand calculations. - end calculations. - e	3.	Document Version:	1.22		
checked. Include this form as part of the VVP. 5. Sufficient Test Cases X Does the VVP identify sufficient tast cases and acceptance criteria to ensure the final software and end product satisfies the requirements of the RDP (Check Yes if peer review is identified to fulfil the validation requirements) X 8. Adequacy of Test Cases X Yes Do the test cases demonstrate that the code adequately performs all intended functions and produces valid results for problems encompassing the range of permitted usage? Yes X 7. Operational Control Ot tests demonstrate required performance over the range of operation of the controled function or process? Yes N/A 8. Unintended Functions Check test cases show that the code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended ductomes of the software? Yes N/A 9. Test Result Validation, (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) The test results will be compared to the following: - hand calculations, - endpricat data and information from confirmed published data - other validated Software of similar purpose, - other validated Software of similar purpose, - other validated Software of similar purpose, - other validated Software applicable as based on code functionality? (a) requirements for hadver integration (b) requirements for hadver integration	4.	ERMS #:	562643		
5. Sufficient Test Cases ☑ Yes Does the VVP dentify sufficient test cases and acceptance oriteria to ensure the final software and end product satisfies the requirements of the RD? (Check Yes if peer review is identified to fulfil the validation requirements) ☑ Yes Adequacy of Test Cases ☑ Yes Do the test cases demonstrate that the code adequately performs all intended functions and produces valid results for problems encompassing the range of permitted usage? □ Yes ☑ N/A 1f the software is used for operational control, do tests demonstrate required performance over the range of operation of the controlled function or process? □ Yes ☑ N/A 20. Unintended Functions □ Yes ☑ N/A Do the test cases show that the code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? □ Yes ☑ N/A 1 The test results will be comparate to the following: - manual inspection, □ Yes W/A - empirical data and information from confirmed published data and corpetatorie software of similar purpose, - Wes W/A - other rudidated software of similar purpose, - Wes W/A W/A - other independent software of similar purpose, - Wes W/A W/A 10 Dote stace casee socicon tesuitis will be validated? Wes				/A" may be	
6. Adequacy of Test Cases ☑ Yes Do the test cases demonstrate that the code adqualely porforms all intended functions and produces valid results for problems encompassing the range of permitted usage? □ Yes ☑ N/A If the software is used for operational control, do tests demonstrate required performance over the range of permitted usage? □ Yes ☑ N/A If the software is used for operational control, do tests demonstrate required performance over the range of permitted functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? □ Yes ☑ N/A Do the test cases show that the code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? □ Yes □ N/A • Test Result Validations, (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) The test results will be compared to the following: • N/A • and correlations, and/or technical literature, • Wes □ N/A • other validate of similar purpose, • Wes □ N/A • other validate of the following, where applicable as based on code functionality? • N/A • other validate of software of similar purpose, • Wes □ N/A • other validate of ware of software of software? • Wes □ N/A 10 best the VVP specify the following, where applicable as based on code functionality? • Wes	5.	Sufficient Test Cases Does the VVP identify suf satisfies the requirements	ficient test cases and acceptance criteria to ensure the final software and end produc		
results for problems encompassing the range of permitted usage? <pre></pre>	6.		5	🛛 Yes	
7. Operational Control □ Yes □ Yes □ N/A If the software is used for operational control, do tests demonstrate required performance over the range of operation of the controlled function or process? □ Yes □ N/A B. Unintended Functions □ Yes □ N/A Do the test cases show that the code does not perform any unintended function that either by Itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? □ Yes □ N/A 9. Test Result Validation. (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) □ Yes □ N/A • emptrical data and information from confirmed published data and correlation's and/or technical literature, □ Yes □ N/A • other validated software of similar purpose, □ Yes □ N/A • other validated software of similar purpose, □ Yes □ N/A • other total columing, where applicable as based on code functionality? □ Yes □ N/A 10. Does the VVP specify the following, where applicable as based on code functionality? □ Yes □ N/A (c) citerification of the stages at which testing is required □ Yes □ N/A (d) orderia for estabilishing test cases □ N/A □ Yes □ N/A (d) orderia for estabilishing test cases □ Yes □ N/A □					
operation of the controlled function or process? 8. Unintended Functions Do the test cases show that the code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? 9. Test Result Validation. (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) The test results will be compared to the following: hand calculations, empirical data and information from confirmed published data and correlation's and/or technical ilterature, other validated software of similar purpose, other independent software of similar purpose, other validated software of similar purpose, do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Does the VVP specify the following, where applicable as based on code functionality? (a) required ranges of input parameters (b) required ranges of input parameters (c) identification of the stages at which testing is required (c) identification of the stages at which testing is required (d) oriteria for establishing test cases Installation and Regression Testing Are test cases which are usuable for installation testing and regression testing identified in the set of verification and validation test cases? Code Team/Sponsor's Name (print) Signature A Review	7.			🗋 Yes	🖾 N/A
8. Unintended Functions □ Yes N/A Do the test cases show that the code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? Image: Comparison of the function can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? 9. Test Result Validation. (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) Image: Code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination with other functions. Image: Code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination software? 9. Test Result Validation. (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) Image: Code does not performed. Image: Code does not per					
Do the test cases show that the code does not perform any unintended function that either by itself or in combination with other functions can degrade the intended outcomes of the software? 9. Test Result Validation. (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) The test results will be compared to the following: - hand calculations, - earloulations using comparable proven problems, - earloulation standy or technical literature, - other rulaficate Software of similar purpose, - other rulaficate Software of similar purpose, - other rule review will be performed. Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Do the test cases which test sequence Yes MAA (e) requirements for testing logic branches (f) requirements for testing logic branches (g) anticipated output values (g) anticipated output values (g) anticipated output values (g) anticipated output values (g) an	8.	A STATE AND A STAT		□ Yes	🖾 N/A
 9. Test Result Validation. (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality) The test results will be compared to the following: - hand calculations, - manual inspection, - empirical data and information from confirmed published data - empirical data and information from confirmed published data - other rudigues offware of similar purpose, - other rudigues of similar purpose, - other rudigues offware of similar purpose, - (a) required tests and test sequence - (b) required tests and test sequence - (c) rediffication of the stages at which testing is required - (c) rediffication and rudigues rudigues of similar purpose, - (c) rediffication and validation testing and regression testing identified in the set of verification and validation testing and regression testing - (c) rediffication and validation testing					2
The test results will be compared to the following: - hand calculations; N/A - manual inspection, Yes N/A - ealculations using comparable proven problems, Yes N/A - enducations using comparable proven problems, Yes N/A - enducations using comparable proven problems, Yes N/A - enducations and/or technical literature, Yes N/A - other validated software of similar purpose, Yes N/A - other independent software of similar purpose, Yes N/A A documented peer review will be performed. Yes N/A Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Yes N/A 10. Does the VVP specify the following, where applicable as based on code functionality? Yes N/A (a) required ranges of input parameters Yes N/A (c) identification of the stages at which testing is required Yes N/A (d) orderier for estabilishing test cases Yes N/A (e) requirements for hardware integration Yes N/A (f) acceptance criteria N/A Yes N/A (h) acceptance criteria Xiii Y	9.				
- other validated software of similar purpose, - other independent software of similar purpose, A documented peer review will be performed. Do the test cases describe how the code results will be validated? Yes N/A 10. Does the VVP specify the following, where applicable as based on code functionality? Yes N/A (a) required tests and test sequence Yes N/A (b) required tests and test sequence Yes N/A (c) identification of the stages at which testing is required Yes N/A (d) criteria for establishing test cases Yes N/A (e) requirements for tasting logic branches Yes N/A (f) nequirements for tasting logic branches Yes N/A (g) anticipated output values Yes N/A (h) acceptance criteria Yes N/A 11. Installation and Regression Testing identification and validation test cases? Yes N/A 12. Dwayne C. Kicker Yes Date 13. David K. Rudeen Yes Jate 14. Shelly R. Nielsen Yes Jate 15. Chris Camphouse Yes Yes Responsible Manager's Name (print) Signature Jate </td <td></td> <td>The test results will be con - hand calculations, - manual inspection, - calculations using com - empirical data and info</td> <td>mpared to the following: parable proven problems, rmation from confirmed published data</td> <td>X Yes X Yes X Yes X Yes</td> <td>N/A N/A</td>		The test results will be con - hand calculations, - manual inspection, - calculations using com - empirical data and info	mpared to the following: parable proven problems, rmation from confirmed published data	X Yes X Yes X Yes X Yes	N/A N/A
(a) required tests and test sequence Yes N/A (b) required ranges of input parameters Yes N/A (c) identification of the stages at which testing is required Yes N/A (d) criteria for establishing test cases Yes N/A (e) requirements for testing logic branches Yes N/A (f) requirements for hadware integration Yes N/A (g) articipated output values Yes N/A (h) acceptance criteria Yes N/A 11. Installation and Regression Testing Yes N/A Are test cases which are suitable for installation testing and regression testing identified in the set of verification and validation test cases? Signature 3/4/ 20/S 12. Dwayne C. Kicker Signature Jete 3/4/ 15/S 13. David K. Rudeen Signature 3/4/ 15/S Date 14. Shelly R. Nielsen Signature Jete Jete Jete 15. Chris Camphouse Yes Joate Jete		 other validated softwar other independent soft A documented peer review Do the test cases described 	e of similar purpose, ware of similar purpose. v will be performed. e how the code results will be validated?	Yes Yes	X N/A N/A X N/A
(f) requirements for hardware integration □ Yes ○ N/A (g) anticipated output values ○ Yes ○ N/A (h) acceptance criteria ○ Yes ○ N/A 11. Installation and Regression Testing ○ Yes ○ N/A Are test cases which are suitable for installation testing and regression testing identified in the set of verification and validation test cases? ○ Yes ○ N/A 12. Dwayne C. Kicker ○ Code Team/Sponsor's Name (print) ○ Signature ○ Date 13. David K. Rudeen ○ Murre ○ Date ○ Date 14. Shelly R. Nielsen ○ Chris Camphouse ○ Chris Camphouse ○ Chris Camphouse 15. Chris Camphouse ○ Chris Camphouse ○ Chris Camphouse ○ Chris Camphouse 16. Jennifer Long ○ Murre ○ Signature ○ Date	10.	10 P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P			
Are test cases which are suitable for installation testing and regression testing identified in the set of verification and validation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? 12. Dwayne C. Kicker Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? 13. David K. Rudeen Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? 14. Shelly R. Nielsen Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? 14. Shelly R. Nielsen Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? 15. Chris Camphouse Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? Image: Constant installation test cases? 16. Jennifer Long Image: Constant installation test cases? 16. Jennifer Long Image: Constant installation test cases? 16. Jennifer Long Image: Constan	44	 (b) required ranges of inpute (c) identification of the state (d) criteria for establishing (e) requirements for testing (f) requirements for hardw (g) anticipated output value (h) acceptance criteria 	ut parameters ges at which testing is required test cases g logic branches are integration es	IIYes	
12. Dwayne C. Kicker 3/4/20/5 Code Team/Sponsor's Name (print) Signature Date 13. David K. Rudeen Aurit, M. Kullur 3-4-15 Technical Reviewer's Name (print) Signature Jate 14. Shelly R. Nielsen Aurit, M. Kullur 3-4-15 QA Reviewer's Name (print) Signature Date 15. Chris Camphouse 4-15-15 Responsible Manager's Name (print) Signature Jate 16. Jennifer Long Market	11.	Are test cases which are s	suitable for installation testing and regression testing	🛛 Yes	
Code Team/Sponsor's Name (print) Signature 13. David K. Rudeen Technical Reviewer's Name (print) 14. Shelly R. Nielsen QA Reviewer's Name (print) 15. Chris Camphouse Responsible Manager's Name (print) 16.			TOUR	2/4	12015
13. David K. Rudeen Marrie / K. Rudeen 3 - 4 - 15 Technical Reviewer's Name (print) Signature 4 - 15 - 15 14. Shelly R. Nielsen Angel K. Rudeen 4 - 15 - 15 QA Reviewer's Name (print) Signature Date 15. Chris Camphouse 4 - 15 - 15 Responsible Manager's Name (print) Signature 4 - 15 - 15 16. Jennifer Long Jennifer Long	12.			-	
Technical Reviewer's Name (print) 14. Shelly R. Nielsen Sighafure Pate QA Reviewer's Name (print) Signature Date 15. Chris Camphouse Horizontic Responsible Manager's Name (print) Signature Jate 16. Jennifer Long Jennifer Long	13.				
Responsible Manager's Name (print) 16. Jennifer Long Signature 4/15/15	14.	Shell	R. Nielsen Apellon R. Nelsen	4-1	5-15
16. Jennifer Long Charles Aong 4/15/13	15.			4-15	-15-
	16.	Jen	nifer Long	_ 4/1	5/13

Information Only

1 of 86

Software Requirements

NP 19-1 Revision 16 Page 25 of 35

NUCLEAR WANAGE MAAGE Banda Isband	_			Appendix H				
2. Software Version: 1.22 3. Document Version: 1.22 3. Bocument Version: 1.22 Prior to sign-off of the VD, all items shall be appropriately addressed by the code sponsor so that "Yes" or "NA" may be checked: Include this form as part of the VD. 5. Is the following information included, where applicable? (a) computer program and version lested Yes (a) computer program and version lested Yes Yes N/A (a) date of test Yes N/A Yes N/A (a) date of near ecorder Yes Yes N/A (b) results and acceptability Yes N/A Yes N/A - freet Result Validation Yes N/A Yes N/A - emplical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A Yes N/A - enthical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A Yes N/A - enthic	Natio	WASTE MANAGEMENT la PROCEDURE mal	C					NP 19-1-7
3. Document Version: 1.22 4. ERMS #: 562643 Prior to sign-off of the VD, all items shall be appropriately addressed by the code sponsor so that "Yes" or "NA" may be checked. Include this form as part of the VD. 1 se the following information included, where applicable? (a) computer program and version tested Yes (b) computer hardware and operating system used Yes (c) test equipment and calibrations Yes (d) date of test Yes (e) tester or data recorder Yes (f) state problem input and output files Yes (g) atest problem input and output files Yes (f) action taken in connection with any deviations noted Yes Test Recult Validation Yes (f) action taken in connection or code functionality: Yes - manual inspection, Yes - manual inspection, Yes - activations, Yes - other validated software of similar purpose. Yes 7 test Documentation suffor technical iterative. Ye	1.	Software Name:	DRSPALL					
4. ERMS #: 562643 Prior to sign-off of the VD, all items shall be appropriately addressed by the code sponsor so that "Yes" or "NA" may be checked. Include this form as part of the VD. 5. Is the following information included, where applicable? (a) computer program and version lested Yes Yes (b) computer program and version lested Yes N/A (c) test equipment and calibrations Yes N/A (d) date of test Yes N/A (e) test problem input and output files Yes N/A (f) simulation models used, Yes N/A (g) test problem input and output files Yes N/A (f) results and acceptability Yes N/A (g) test problem input and output files Yes N/A (h) results and acceptability Yes N/A - Test Result Validation Yes N/A - the result validated of formation from confirmed published Yes N/A - endprical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - endprical data & information for confirmed published Yes N/A - other independent software of similar purpose. Yes N/A - ot	2.	Software Version:	1.22					
Prior to sign-off of the VD, all items shall be appropriately addressed by the code sponsor so that "Yes" or "WA" may be checked. Include this form as part of the VD. Is the following information included, where applicable? Yes (a) computer program and version tested Yes (b) computer hardware and operating system used Yes (c) test equipment and calibrations Yes (d) date of test Yes (e) tester or data recorder Yes (f) simulation models used, Yes (g) test problem input and output files Yes (h) results and acceptability Yes (h) action taken in connection with any deviations noted Yes The test results ware comparatel to the following (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality): Yes - manual inspection, Yes N/A - ealpricable as based on code functionality: Yes N/A - other validated software of similar purpose. Yes N/A - other validated software of similar purpose. Yes N/A 7 test Documentation Acceptability Yes N/A 7 test Documentation sufficient detail such that they can be repeated? Yes N/A 7 test Documentation sufficien	3.	Document Version:	1.22			_	_	
"MA" may be checked. Include this form as part of the VD. 5. Is the following information included, where applicable? (a) computer program and version lested (b) computer hardware and operating system used (c) test equipment and calibrations (d) date of test (e) test or data recorder (f) simulation models used, (a) cast problem input and output files (f) test data concretion with any deviations noted (f) results and acceptability (f) test exclus were compared to the following (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality): - hand calculations, - manual inspection, - empirical data å information from confirmed published data and correlations and/or technical literature, - other independent software of similar purpose. - Test Documentation Repeatability Do the tests meet the acceptance citerial identified in the approved VVP? R Test Documentation Repeatability Yes - are the test documented in sufficient detail such that they cond the acceptance to their location in a configuration management tool provide? 0 the tests math the acceptance to their location in a configuration management tool provide? 1 Test Documentation Are the	4.							
(i) action taken in connection with any deviations noted □ Yes N/A 6. Test Result Validation The test results were compared to the following (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality): - hand calculations, - manual inspection, - calculations using comparable proven problems, - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published data and correlations and/or technical literature, - other validated software of similar purpose, - other validated software of similar purpose, - other independent software of similar purpose, - other is signature Yes N/A 7. Test Documentation Are the tests documented in sufficient detail such that they can be understood by an independent, technically competent individual? Yes 11. Dwayne C, Kicker Code Team/Sponsor (print) Signature 3/4/2ois Date 12. David K, Rudeen Technical Reviewer (print) Signatur	5.	"N/A" may be checked. Is the following inform (a) computer program (b) computer hardwa (c) test equipment an (d) date of test (e) tester or data rec (f) simulation models (g) test problem input	Include this form nation included, m and version test and operating nd calibrations order s used, t and output files	n as part of the VD. where applicable? ted		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes		N/A
 6. Test Result Validation The test results were compared to the following (check one or more, where applicable as based on code functionality): -hand calculations, -manual inspection, - calculations using comparable proven problems, - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - empirical data & information from confirmed published Yes N/A - ether independent software of similar purpose. Yes N/A Yes N/A N/A<td></td><td></td><td></td><td>deviations noted</td><td>ñ</td><td></td><td></td><td>N/A</td>				deviations noted	ñ			N/A
11. Dwayne C. Kicker Signature 3/4/2015 Code Team/Sponsor (print) Signature Date 12. David K. Rudeen Nuite III Puttern 3-4-15 Technical Reviewer (print) Signature Date 13. Shelly R. Nielsen Multiplication 4-15-15 QA Reviewer (print) August and the second print of the second	7. 8. 9.	The test results were of where applicable as bat - hand calculations, - manual inspection, - calculations using of - empirical data & inf data and correlation - other validated soft - other independent s Test Documentation A Do the tests meet the a Test Documentation F Are the tests document they can be repeated? Computer File Docum Are the test case input Validation Document of configuration manager Understandability of D	compared to the fo sed on code funct comparable proves formation from cor as and/or technica ware of similar pur software of similar Acceptability ed in sufficient de entation and output files in a reference to the nent tool provided Documentation ods, test data, res	tionality): n problems, firmed published il literature, rpose, purpose. i identified in the approved ' tail such that cluded in the eir location in a ? sults, and conclusions docu	₩XX XX XX XX XX XX XX XX XX XX XX XX XX	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes		N/A N/A N/A N/A
Code Team/Sponsor (print) Signature Date 12. David K. Rudeen Nuit III Pudem 3-4-15 Technical Reviewer (print) Signature Date 13. Sheliy R. Nielsen Aulity R. Nielsen 4-15-15 QA Reviewer (print) Aulity R. Nielsen 4-15-15 14. Chris Camphouse 4-0-5 Responsible Manager (print) Signature 9 15. Jennifer Long Automation	11.	that can be understood	by an independe					3/4/2015
12. David K. Rudeen Nuit III Pudan 3-4-15 Technical Reviewer (print) Signature Date 13. Sheliy R. Nielsen Aulity Reviewer (print) 14. Chris Camphouse Aulity Reviewer (print) 15. Jennifer Long Date		Code Team/Spo	nsor (print)	Sign	ature		-	Date
QA Reviewer (print) Angle Chris Camphouse Date 14. Chris Camphouse Grad Signature Grad Signature 15. Jennifer Long Grad Signature Grad Signature	12.	David K. R	udeen	Daniel 14	Inder	~	_	Concession of the Owner of Concession of Concession, Name
Responsible Manager (print) Signature Date 15. Jennifer Long United States 4/15/15	13.			Ahellyk	2 Ne	lser	2	4-15-15 Date
	14.			- Chisign	ature		_	
	15.			- Jennes	ature /	}		4/15/15 Date

WIPP PA

VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION PLAN / VALIDATION DOCUMENT

for

DRSPALL Version 1.22

Document Version 1.22

ERMS # 562643

April 2015

Table of Contents

1.0	INTI	RODUC	TION	6
	1.1	Softwar	e Identifier	6
	1.2	Points o	of Contact	6
	1.3		verview	
2.0			ENTS	
	2.1		nal Requirements	
	2.2		l Interface Requirements	
	2.3		nal Functionality to be Tested	
	2.4	Functio	nality Not Tested	8
3.0	TES	TING EN	NVIRONMENT	9
4.0	FUN	CTION	AL TESTING	9
4.0	4.1		se #1 – Porous Flow Verification	
	т.1	4.1.1	Test Objective	
		4.1.2	Problem Description	
		4.1.3	Analysis Methods	
		4.1.4	Test Procedure	
		4.1.5	Acceptance Criteria	
		4.1.6	Results	
		4.1.7	Conclusions	
	4.2		se #2 – Coalbed Methane Validation	
		4.2.1	Test Objective	
		4.2.2	Problem Description	
		4.2.3	Analysis Method	
		4.2.4	Test Procedure	
		4.2.5	Acceptance Criteria	
		4.2.6	Results	
		4.2.7	Conclusions	
	4.3	No Test	t Case #3 is Defined	.29
	4.4		se #4 – Internal Logic Checks	
		4.4.1	Test Objective	
		4.4.2	Problem Description	
		4.4.3	Analysis Methods	.31
		4.4.4	Test Procedure	.38
		4.4.5	Acceptance Criteria	.39
		4.4.6	Results	.41
		4.4.7	Conclusions	.69
	4.5	Test Ca	se #5 – Wellbore Flow Verification	.69
		4.5.1	Test Objective	.69
		4.5.2	Problem Description	.69
		4.5.3	Analysis Method	.71
		4.5.4	Test Procedure	.73

Table of Contents (Continued)

	4.5.5	Acceptance Criteria	.73
	4.5.6	Results	.74
	4.5.7	Conclusions	.80
5.0	CONCLUSI	ON	.80
6.0	INSTALLA	FION TESTING AND REGRESSION TESTING	.80
7.0	REFERENC	ES	.80
APP	ENDIX A:	SUMMARY OF FILES USED	.82

List of Tables

Table 4.0-1.	Requirements coverage by test case	10
Table 4.1-1.	Input parameters for Test Case #1.	15
Table 4.1-2.	Constants for functional fit to Djordjevic and Adams (2003) solution in	
	cylindrical geometry	17
Table 4.1-3.	Constants for functional fit to Djordjevic and Adams (2003) solution in	
	spherical geometry.	18
Table 4.1-4.	Maximum difference values for implicit solution in cylindrical and	
	spherical geometry.	21
Table 4.2-1.	Key coal well parameters	23
Table 4.2-2.	Input values and experimental results to be used and compared with	
	DRSPALL results.	
Table 4.2-3.	Field inferred and DRSPALL results comparison.	28
Table 4.4-1.	Nomenclature for stress calculations	
Table 4.4-2.	Nomenclature for fluidization calculations	35
Table 4.4-3.	Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_coupling.dat.	50
Table 4.4-4.	Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_stress.dat, run time = 124.080 sec.	53
Table 4.4-5.	Independent Excel calculations of stress profiles from pore pressure data	
	obtained from Table 4.4-4	54
Table 4.4-6.	Summary of differences between DRSPALL and Excel calculations for	
	stress verification.	
Table 4.4-7.	Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_fluidization.dat, run time = 124.67269 sec	56
Table 4.4-8.	Excel solution for minimum fluidization velocity U_f	
Table 4.4-9.	Excel solution for fluidization time, <i>t_f</i>	58
Table 4.4-10.	Drilling and spall volumes and masses from output CAMDAT file.	
Table 4.4-11.	Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_expulsion.dat near the time of penetration	60
Table 4.4-12.	Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_expulsion.dat near the time of early waste	
	expulsion at land surface	61
Table 4.4-13.	Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_expulsion.dat at late time nearing steady	
	conditions	
Table 4.5-1.	Run conditions for FLUENT comparison	
Table A-1.	Due conint files	82
	Run script files.	
Table A-2.	Input files.	82
Table A-3.	Input files CVS repositories	82 83
Table A-3. Table A-4.	Input files CVS repositories Log files	82 83 83
Table A-3.	Input files CVS repositories	82 83 83 83

List of Figures

Figure 4.1-1.	Schematic of cylindrical domain for porous flow test problem	12
Figure 4.1-2.	Schematic of spherical domain in porous flow test problem	
Figure 4.1-3.	Numerical solutions to the dimensionless pseudopressure profiles for	
-	cylindrical geometry	16
Figure 4.1-4.	Numerical solutions to the dimensionless pseudopressure profiles for	
	spherical geometry.	18
Figure 4.1-5.	Overlay of DRSPALL with Djordjevic and Adams solutions for the	
	cylindrical geometry with $\tau = 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10$	20
Figure 4.1-6.	Overlay of DRSPALL with Djordjevic and Adams solutions for the	
	spherical geometry with $\tau = 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10$	20
Figure 4.2-1.	Location of cavitated coalbed well (Khodaverdian et al. 1996).	
Figure 4.2-2.	Cavity radius (Khodaverdian et al. 1996).	
Figure 4.2-3.	Cavitation times and inferred bottomhole pressures (Khodaverdian et al.	
	1996). Red arrows added for this report.	25
Figure 4.2-4.	Interpreted cavity radii (based on tensile failure radii) from	
	Khodaverdian et al. (1996)	26
Figure 4.2-5.	SUMMARIZE input control file drs_tc2_summarize.inp	28
Figure 4.2-6.	Reported field results and DRSPALL results compared	29
Figure 4.4-1.	Drawing of a theoretical radial effective stress curve. Material is subject to	
	tensile failure where $\sigma_r'(r) < T_s$	33
Figure 4.4-2.	GROPECDB input command file drs_tc41_grope.inp	38
Figure 4.4-3.	Pressure history plot	42
Figure 4.4-4.	Radius history plot.	43
Figure 4.4-5.	Pressure history plot for time = 0 to 50 sec	45
Figure 4.4-6.	Fluidization time values from drs_122_tc41_fluidization_time.dat	59
Figure 4.4-7.	Properties from input CAMDAT file drs_tc42_ms.cdb for Case 4.2	63
Figure 4.4-8.	Input control file drs_v122_tc42.drs for Case 4.2.	64
Figure 4.4-9.	Excerpts from drs_122_tc42.dbg, diagnostics file for Case 4.2	66
Figure 4.5-1.	Schematic of wellbore flow test problem domain.	70
Figure 4.5-2.	GROPECDB input command file drs_tc5_grope.inp	
Figure 4.5-3.	Pressure and velocity profiles for static wellbore, Case 5.1.	75
Figure 4.5-4.	Pressure and velocity profiles for steady state and nominal mud density,	
	Case 5.2	75
Figure 4.5-5.	Pressure and velocity profiles for steady state and high mud density,	
	Case 5.3	76
Figure 4.5-6.		
	nominal mud density, and low gas injection rate, Case 5.5.	77
Figure 4.5-7.	Pressure, velocity, and gas volume fraction profiles for steady state,	
	nominal mud density, and medium gas injection rate, Case 5.6	78
Figure 4.5-8.	Pressure, velocity, and volume fraction profiles for steady state,	
	nominal mud density, medium gas and low solid injection rate, Case 5.7	79

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document describes how the DRSPALL program was tested, and the results of the testing. This combined Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document is in accordance with the Nuclear Waste Management Procedure NP 19-1 (Long 2014).

1.1 Software Identifier

Code Name: Version: CVS Repository:	DRSPALL 1.22 \$CVSLIB/WIPP_CODES/PA_CODES/DRSPALL
WIPP Prefix:	(\$CVSLIB is /nfs/data/CVSLIB) drs
Executable:	Build/Solaris/drspall (in \$CVSLIB/WIPP CODES/PA CODES/DRSPALL)
Link Date:	February 10, 2015
Link Platform:	Oracle Sun X6270 X2270 server / SunOS 5.11 11.0 i86pc i386 i86pc

1.2 Points of Contact

Code Sponsor:	Dwayne Kicker	dckicke@sandia.gov	(575) 628-0117
Code Testers:	Dwayne Kicker Todd Zeitler Amy Gilkey	dckicke@sandia.gov tzeitle@sandia.gov apgilke@sandia.gov	(575) 628-0117 (575) 234-0073 (505) 998-0047 x147
Run Control Consulta	ants: Amy Gilkey Jennifer Long	apgilke@sandia.gov jjlong@sandia.gov	(505) 998-0047 x147 (575) 234-0106

1.3 Code Overview

DRSPALL is written to calculate the spallings release, defined as the mass of waste subject to tensile failure and transport during an inadvertent drilling intrusion into a high-pressure WIPP repository. Cuttings removed by the direct action of the drillbit, and cavings removed by shear forces of the drilling mud against the drilled cavity wall are handled separately in the CUTTINGS_S code. DRSPALL uses both text-formatted and CDB input and output files, and calculates coupled repository and wellbore transient compressible fluid flow before, during, and after the drilling intrusion process. Mathematical models are included of multi-phase flow in the well, fluid expulsion at the surface, coupling of the well and the repository, repository spalling (tensile) failure associated with fluidized bed transport, and repository internal gas flow. The wellbore model is one-dimensional linear, and the repository model is one-dimensional, either spherical or cylindrical.



DRSPALL is based on the theory of one-dimensional, time-dependent compressible isothermal fluid flow. Somewhat different forms of that theory are used, depending on whether the flow is in the wellbore or the repository, and whether the wellbore currently penetrates the repository. The wellbore and repository flows are coupled at a specified boundary. Flow in the well is treated as a compressible, viscous, multi-phase mixture of mud, gas, salt, and possibly waste solids. Flow in the repository is treated as viscous, compressible single-phase gas flow in a porous solid. At the cavity forming the repository-wellbore boundary (following penetration), waste solids freed by drilling, tensile failure, and associated fluidization may enter the wellbore flow stream. Between the well and the repository, flow is treated according to the state of penetration.

The wellbore calculations use time-marching finite differences. These are part of a single computational loop. The numerical method is Eulerian in that zone boundaries are fixed, and fluid moves through the interfaces by convection. Quantities are zone-centered and integration is explicit in time.

The repository calculations also use time-marching finite differences that are part of a single computational loop. The method is implicit with spatial derivatives determined after the time increment.

2.0 REQUIREMENTS

The requirements for DRSPALL are listed in the *Requirements Document for DRSPALL Version* 1.00 (WIPP PA 2003a). Those requirements are repeated below for convenience.

2.1 Functional Requirements

In general DRSPALL shall calculate the volume of WIPP waste subject to material failure and transport to the surface as a result of an inadvertent drilling intrusion into the repository. More specifically DRSPALL will calculate the following:

R.1 Compressible, viscous, isothermal, multiphase mixture flow (mud, salt, waste, repository gas) in the wellbore using one-dimensional linear geometry and assuming a Newtonian fluid. Either laminar or turbulent flow shall be modeled depending on wellbore and fluid properties.

Wellbore flow output variables will be evaluated against results from a commercial computational flow model configured to run the same test problem.

R.2 Repository gas flow as single-phase Darcy porous flow using either one dimensional cylindrical or spherical geometry

Repository pressure distributions will be compared to independent solutions (numerical, analytic, or semi-analytic) of the governing equations obtained from published scientific literature.

R.3 Coupling of the wellbore and the repository flow models prior to and after penetration

This requirement will be tested by reporting intermediate variables (pore velocity, gas density, cavity area) describing the mass flow between the repository and wellbore as a function of time in order to confirm mass balance.

R.4 Spalling (tensile) failure of the homogeneous waste material using an effective stress law with seepage forces

The time-histories of the output variables pressure distribution, effective stress and tensile-failed volume will be examined for conceptually consistent behavior.

R.5 Fluidized bed transport of failed (disaggregated) waste material.

This requirement will be evaluated by comparing the DRSPALL fluidization velocity to that obtained from independent spreadsheet calculations.

R.6 Mixture expulsion at the surface

This requirement will be evaluated by reporting the time-history of waste expelled and computing a solids mass balance to assure that waste removed from the repository is accounted for at the surface.

2.2 External Interface Requirements

- **R.7** DRSPALL shall read an input control file, which may be pre-generated using a text processor. It will contain numerical control parameters and, optionally, material properties and problem geometry.
- **R.8** Properties and non-numerical control parameters will, optionally, be read from a CDB.
- **R.9** Grid, properties, parameters and spatial and time dependent results will be written to an output CDB.

2.3 Additional Functionality to be Tested

No additional functionality will be tested.

2.4 Functionality Not Tested

All functionality represented by the requirements will be tested.

3.0 TESTING ENVIRONMENT

DRSPALL Version 1.22 was tested in the following environment:

Platform:Oracle Sun X6270 M2 Blade / SunOS 5.11 11.0 i86pc i386 i86pcHost:gd.sandia.govTest Date:February 10-12, 2015 (multi-day test)

All DRSPALL test cases are run using the WIPP run control system on Solaris. The core of this system is the software configuration management system CVS (Concurrent Versions System) and the Python module *rc.py*. A small Python program *drspall_Test.py* calls the appropriate *rc.py* routines to check out all test inputs from CVS, runs all the test cases and associated processes (such as comparing files), and stores all test outputs in CVS. The test process is run from a small c-shell script *RunTest.csh* that checks out the Python code from CVS and executes the code to perform all tests. The log file for the testing is *drspall_122_Test.rtf*. All files related to validation testing are stored in CVS Repository \$CVSLIB/WIPP_CODES/PA_CODES/DRSPALL under the following test directories.

- Python code *drspall_Test.py* and *rc.py* and script *RunTest.csh* are in directory Test/RunControl/Solaris.
- Log file drspall 122 Test.rtf is in directory Test/RunControl/Solaris.
- All test input files are in directory Test/Input.
- All test output files are in directory Test/Output/Solaris 122.
- Auxiliary test files (e.g., Excel files) are in directory Test/Auxiliary/V122_Excel_Files.

Appendix A contains an extract of the log file showing the summary of files used.

4.0 FUNCTIONAL TESTING

DRSPALL 1.00 was originally validated in the Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00 (WIPP PA 2003b) on a Compaq ES40 in 2003. DRSPALL 1.21 was migrated to a Solaris system in 2014. The validation for DRSPALL 1.22 uses the same test set as the DRSPALL 1.00 validation, with slight modifications to the DRSPALL input files. DRSPALL 1.22 requires a constant zone size. Therefore, the growth rates in all DRSPALL input files have been changed to 1.0. Other changes to the DRSPALL input files are explained in the relevant test section.

The test set for DRSPALL consists of four test cases, numbered #1, #2, #4, and #5 (i.e., there is no Test Case #3). Each test case requires multiple DRSPALL executions. Each execution is

referred to as a "case" or "subcase" or "run", and the test files are labeled with the case number (e.g., tc52 for Case 5.2).

Section 2.0 lists the Functional Requirements and the External Interface Requirements that will be verified. Table 4.0-1 presents the relationship between the requirements and the test cases.

Requirement		Test	Case		
Type and Numbe	er	#1	#2	#4	#5
Functional	R.1		X		Х
Functional	R.2	Х	X		
Functional	R.3		X	Х	
Functional	R.4		Х	Х	
Functional	R.5		X	Х	
Functional	R.6		Х	Х	
External Interface	R.7		Х	Х	
External Interface	R.8			Х	
External Interface	R.9		Х	Х	

 Table 4.0-1. Requirements coverage by test case.

The entire test set was executed with DRSPALL Version 1.22 on a Solaris Blade with SunOS 5.11. Each test will be validated using the acceptance criteria listed in this document.

Each DRSPALL execution reads an input control file and an optional input CAMDAT file. Each subcase has its own input control file. In addition to the DRSPALL run parameters, each input control file contains the test subcase number (as "Validation Test Case"). DRSPALL responds to the test case number by creating special output files that contain information used for validation, by initializing conditions (e.g., boundary conditions) specific to the test case, and by limiting the processing to that necessary for validation. The *Design Document for DRSPALL Version 1.22* (WIPP PA 2015b) describes any non-standard processing that is dependent on the test case. Only one test case, Case 4.2, reads a CAMDAT file.

Each execution of DRSPALL generates an output CAMDAT file and a diagnostics file. In addition, a particular test case may generate additional text files to be used for validation only. These validation files are described under the relevant test case section. CAMDAT files are binary and cannot be examined directly. GROPECDB Version 2.13 (WIPP PA 1996 and 2012a) or SUMMARIZE Version 3.02 (WIPP PA 2005 and 2012b) is used to write relevant portions of the CAMDAT files as text for examination. The output text files are imported into Excel for post-processing and plotting, as described under the relevant test case section. The DRSPALL and GROPECDB/SUMMARIZE executions are run as part of the official test script described in Section 3.0, but the Excel post-processing is done manually by the tester.

The following sub-sections list and discuss the test results for each test case. Each test case is evaluated with respect to the acceptance criteria given in this document. The acceptance criteria

are the same as given in the Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00 (WIPP PA 2003b).

Each test sub-section contains the command lines used to run DRSPALL for the test. The commands indicate the test input files and test output files. Appendix A contains the summary tables of files used from the test log file. Input test files are listed in Table A-2 of the appendix, and exported from CVS directory Test/Input into working directory ./Input. Output files from the DRSPALL 1.22 Solaris test are listed in Table A-5, and stored in CVS directory Test/Output/Solaris_122 (working directory DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122). Excel files used in post-processing are stored in CVS directory Test/Auxiliary.

4.1 Test Case #1 – Porous Flow Verification

4.1.1 Test Objective

The purpose of this test case is to determine whether DRSPALL can accurately calculate transient gas pressures in the repository during the first few seconds after a borehole intrusion. The porous flow test problem is implemented by comparing the one-dimensional cylindrical and spherical pressure profiles generated by DRSPALL to those calculated using the utility code developed by Djordjevic and Adams (2003) for an identical problem.

Correctly performing this test case validates the satisfactory implementation of Functional Requirement R.2.

4.1.2 **Problem Description**

This test case involves solving the equations of transient, radial, isothermal, compressible gas flow through a porous medium. In this test case, no failure of the medium or transport of solids is allowed. Furthermore, the coupling of mass flow between the wellbore and repository is simplified to a zero pressure boundary condition. As such, the wellbore calculations in DRSPALL are ignored. The problem is solved in both cylindrical and spherical geometry.

4.1.2.1 Cylindrical Geometry Equations

The cylindrical domain comprises a porous solid with a given porosity φ and permeability k, shown in Figure 4.1-1. There is a cylindrical cavity of radius r_o aligned with the axis that represents a borehole that depressurizes the simulated repository. The domain begins filled with an ideal gas at an initial pressure of P_1 with viscosity η . At t > 0, the gas pressure p inside the borehole is set to zero, thus creating a pressure step that diffuses radially outward through the domain.



Figure 4.1-1. Schematic of cylindrical domain for porous flow test problem.

Starting with the governing equation for flow of gas through a porous material in a radially symmetric system gives:

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = \frac{k}{2\varphi\eta} \nabla^2 p^2, \quad p = p(r,t), \quad r \ge r_0, \quad t \ge 0$$
(4.1.1)

where p is the gas pressure in the porous medium at radius r and time t. The boundary and initial conditions are expressed as:

$$p(r_0, t) = f(t), \quad \lim_{r \to \infty} p(r, t) = p_{ff}, \quad p(r, 0) = p_{ff}$$
(4.1.2)

where p_{ff} is the far-field pressure at large r. For this problem, the pressure at the inner boundary r_o representing the wellbore wall is held constant at zero. As such, f(t) = 0 for t > 0.

A pseudopressure approach is introduced after Chan et al. (1993) utilizing the following change of variables:

$$\psi(p) = \frac{p^2}{\eta} \tag{4.1.3}$$

which leads to

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \frac{k}{\varphi \sqrt{\eta}} \sqrt{\psi} \nabla^2 \psi, \quad \psi = \psi(r, t), \quad r \ge r_{0}, \quad t \ge 0$$
(4.1.4)

and

$$\psi(r_0,t) = \frac{f^2}{\eta}, \quad \lim_{r \to \infty} \psi(r,t) = \frac{p_{ff}^2}{\eta}, \quad \psi(r,0) = \frac{p_{ff}^2}{\eta}$$
 (4.1.5)

Nondimensional parameters may be defined as follows:

$$\psi = \frac{p_{ff}^2}{\eta} \Psi \quad t = t_0 \tau, \quad t_0 = \frac{\varphi \eta r_0^2}{k p_{ff}}$$
(4.1.6)

and for cylindrical coordinates:

$$z = \ln(\frac{r}{r_0}) \tag{4.1.7}$$

which upon substitution into Equation 4.1.4 yields the transformed equation:

$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \tau} = e^{-2z} \Psi^{1/2} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial z^2}$$
(4.1.8)

Equation 4.1.8 is integrated numerically with the boundary and initial conditions

$$\Psi(0,\tau) = \frac{f^2}{p_{ff}^2}, \quad \lim_{z \to \infty} \Psi \to 1, \quad \Psi(z,0) = 1$$
(4.1.9)

4.1.2.2 Spherical Geometry Equations

For the spherical problem, the cavity is hemispherical in shape with radius r_o as shown in Figure 4.1-2.



Figure 4.1-2. Schematic of spherical domain in porous flow test problem.

Equations 4.1.4 to 4.1.6 apply to the spherical geometry, but in order to proceed, z must be redefined as:

$$z = \frac{r_o}{r} \tag{4.1.10}$$

The resulting transformed governing equation is then

$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \tau} = z^4 \Psi^{1/2} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial z^2}$$
(4.1.11)

Equation 4.1.11 is integrated numerically with the boundary conditions

$$\Psi(1,\tau) = \frac{f^2}{p_{ff}^2}, \quad \Psi(0,\tau) = 1, \quad \Psi(z,0) = 1$$
(4.1.12)

4.1.2.3 Boundary Conditions

The Djordjevic and Adams (2003) solution, modeled after Chan et al. (1993), requires that (1) the gas pressure at $r = r_o$, the face of the borehole, is set to zero at all times, and (2) pressure in the far field, where $r >> r_o$, remains at the initial pressure, P_1 . During normal execution of DRSPALL, the pressure at the inner boundary r_o is calculated by coupling mass flows from the repository and wellbore. However, for purposes of this test case, the cavity pressure variable is assigned a value of zero during each computational loop. This will cause the cavity mass to artificially increase, but will not cause inaccuracy in the validation procedure, since the cavity mass is irrelevant in this test case.

At the outer boundary (r = R), DRSPALL uses a no-flow condition. Djordjevic and Adams (2003) and Chan et al. (1993), however, use a constant pressure in the far-field, p_{ff} . This difference will not be recognized by the models for the short execution times used in this test case because the pressure impulse travels at a finite speed away from the borehole, and will not reach the outer boundary in the time specified for this test. This can be confirmed by computing the approximate depth of penetration of a "dividing surface" defined as the point inside which $P(r) < P_1$, and outside which $P(r) = P_1$.

Chan et al. (1993) gives an approximate location of the dividing surface, R(t), for small values of t in the cylindrical domain as follows:

$$\frac{R(t)}{a} = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{t}{t_o}} \tag{4.1.13}$$

The default outer radius in DRSPALL is 19.2 m. Recognizing that $t/t_o = \tau$, the expression above evaluates to R = 0.649 m when $\tau = 10$ and a = 0.156 m. $\tau = 10$ represents the longest scaled time evaluated in this test problem. The dividing surface is therefore clearly interior to the outer boundary for this and shorter times.

Chan gives another expression for the approximate location of the dividing surface at large t:

$$\frac{R(t)}{a} \approx \frac{(t/t_o)^{0.5}}{[\log(t/t_o)]^{0.5}}$$
(4.1.14)

If the DRSPALL outer boundary of 19.2 m is substituted into Equation 4.1.14 for R, and t_o is evaluated with the input values given in Table 4.1-1, the resulting time t that satisfies the expression is $t \approx 2600$ seconds. Thus, for the short times (t < 4 sec) examined in this test case, the pressure impulse will not reach the boundary of the domain and the specific boundary conditions are irrelevant.

4.1.2.4 Input Parameters

Relevant input parameters for this test case are given in Table 4.1-1. To avoid tensile failure of the repository material, tensile strength (T_s) is set to a high value of 0.690E+06 Pa (100 psi). The Forchheimer Beta input parameter was set to zero for Test Case #1, resulting in a constant permeability by removing the velocity-dependence. The DRSPALL input files $drs_v122_tc11.drs$ and $drs_v122_tc12.drs$ are stored in CVS directory Test/Input. Note that the zone size growth rates were changed to 1.0 for the DRSPALL 1.22 validation, as explained in Section 4.0.

Symbol	Definition	Units	Value
P_1	Initial gas pressure	Pa	0.145E+08
φ	Porosity	_	0.575
η	Gas viscosity	Pa-s	0.8934E-05
k	Permeability	m ²	2.400E-13
Ts	Tensile strength	Pa	0.690E+06

Table 4.1-1. Input parameters for Test Case #1.

4.1.2.5 Repository Zoning

The zoning scheme in the repository domain in DRSPALL is set to a constant zone size of 0.002 m.

4.1.3 Analysis Methods

Chan et al. (1993) present numerical results as the dimensionless pseudopressure, Ψ , versus the dimensionless plotting parameter, ζ , for selected values of scaled time, τ . The dimensionless plotting parameter, comparable to a dimensionless radius, is defined as:

$$\zeta = \frac{\left(e^{z} - 1\right)}{\tau^{1/2}} \tag{4.1.15}$$

This analysis entails comparing DRSPALL and Djordjevic and Adams (2003) pseudopressure profiles at designated scaled times. DRSPALL output in the form P(r, t) are thus converted to $\Psi(\zeta,\tau)$ at the four scaled times 0.01, 0.1, 1.0, 10. Output from DRSPALL and Djordjevic and Adams (2003) are displayed both graphically and in tabular form.

To provide a quantitative means for comparing DRSPALL and the independent solutions, the difference in $\Psi(\zeta)$ is computed for corresponding scaled times as follows:

$$DIFF(\zeta) = |\Psi(\zeta)_{DR_{SPALL}} - \Psi(\zeta)_{Chan}|$$
(4.1.16)

For each array of DIFF values, a maximum value is calculated.

4.1.3.1 Cylindrical Case Output from Djordjevic and Adams (2003)

The cylindrical case solutions were obtained using the independent utility code developed by Djordjevic and Adams (2003). Dimensionless pseudopressure profiles were produced at four dimensionless times, $\tau = 0.01, 0.1, 1.0, 10$. The solutions are illustrated graphically in Figure 4.1-3. Tabular results are given in Appendix B.2 of the *Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (WIPP PA 2003b).



Figure 4.1-3. Numerical solutions to the dimensionless pseudopressure profiles for cylindrical geometry.

Since the numerical grid used in DRSPALL may be different from that used in the comparison solutions shown in Figure 4.1-3, a curve was fit to the comparison data to facilitate computation of the difference defined in Equation 4.1.16. The general form of the function fit to the comparison data was:



$$\Psi(\zeta) = 1 - \exp\{-(C_1\zeta + C_2\zeta^2 + C_3\zeta^3)\} \quad \text{for } 0 \ge \zeta \ge 1$$
(4.1.17)

where C₁, C₂, and C₃ are constants determined by minimizing the sum of squares:

$$SUM = \sum_{i} \left[\Psi(\zeta)_{a} - \Psi(\zeta)_{b} \right]^{2}$$
(4.1.18)

where the subscript *a* denotes the solution calculated by Djordjevic and Adams (2003), the subscript *b* denotes the value of the functional fit, and the sum is taken over all the reported grid indices *i*. The constants calculated for the four dimensionless times in the cylindrical geometry are given in Table 4.1-2. Details of the fitting procedure are provided in Appendix B.6 of the *Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (WIPP PA 2003b).

 Table 4.1-2. Constants for functional fit to Djordjevic and Adams (2003) solution in cylindrical geometry.

τ	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃
0.01	0.715	0.167	0.000
0.1	0.803	0.157	0.000
1	1.032	0.101	0.000
10	1.505	-0.071	0.000

4.1.3.2 Spherical Case Output from Djordjevic and Adams (2003)

The spherical case solutions were obtained using an independent utility code developed by Djordjevic and Adams (2003). Dimensionless pseudopressure profiles were produced at the same four dimensionless times ($\tau = 0.01, 0.1, 1.0, 10$) as for the cylindrical case. The solutions are illustrated graphically in Figure 4.1-4. Tabular results are given in Appendix B.2 of the *Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (WIPP PA 2003b). Functions in the form of Equation 4.1.17 were fit to the data using a least squares method with associated constants reported in Table 4.1-3, and details of the fitting procedure shown in Appendix B.6 of the *Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (WIPP PA 2003b).





Figure 4.1-4. Numerical solutions to the dimensionless pseudopressure profiles for spherical geometry.

Table 4.1-3. Constants for functional fit to Djordjevic and Adams (2003) solution in spherical geometry.

τ	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃
0.01	1.331	-0.073	0.000
0.1	1.000	0.126	0.000
1	1.537	-0.033	0.000
10	3.500	-2.229	0.858

4.1.4 Test Procedure

DRSPALL is executed twice: once in cylindrical geometry and once in spherical geometry. Case 1.1 (tc11) refers to cylindrical geometry; Case 1.2 (tc12) refers to spherical geometry.

DRSPALL generates a "chan" validation file (e.g., *drs_122_tc11_chan.dat*) for each case. The validation files are imported to Excel file *drs_v122_tc1.xlsx* for post-processing and plotting. The output CAMDAT files are not examined.

The following command lines run both cases:

./drspall ./Input/drs_v122_tc11.drs DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc11.dbg CANCEL DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc11.cdb > DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc11.crt

./drspall ./Input/drs_v122_tc12.drs DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc12.dbg CANCEL DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc12.cdb > DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc12.crt

4.1.5 Acceptance Criteria

Test Case #1 will pass if the following statements are true for both the cylindrical case and the spherical case:

- Acceptance Criterion 1-1 Visual inspection of the pressure profiles generated by DRSPALL indicates a close approximation to the solutions by Djordjevic and Adams (2003) for corresponding dimensionless times.
- Acceptance Criterion 1-2 Maximum difference for Ψ (dimensionless) between DRSPALL and Djordjevic and Adams (2003) for corresponding times does not exceed 0.1.

4.1.6 Results

The dimensionless pseudopressure (Ψ) is plotted versus the dimensionless plotting parameter (ζ) at four selected values of dimensionless time (τ). The comparison curves on each plot were generated from the parameters in Table 4.1-2 for the cylindrical geometry and Table 4.1-3 for the spherical geometry. Conceptually, the curves represent the evolution of the pore pressure profile. The initial condition is set to $\Psi = 1$ throughout the domain. For $\tau > 0$, Ψ at the inner boundary of the domain, $\zeta = 0$, is set to zero representing zero pressure in the wellbore. The outer boundary Ψ is held at unity representing a constant far-field pressure. The tendency of the curves at different τ to nearly overlay one another is related, in part, to the presence of the $t^{-0.5}$ in the plotting parameter function (Equation 4.1.15).

Figure 4.1-5 shows the results of Case 1.1 in the cylindrical geometry, and Figure 4.1-6 show the results of Case 1.2 in the spherical geometry. Visual inspection indicates that in both cases the DRSPALL results overlay the Djordjevic and Adams (2003) solutions quite closely, so **Acceptance Criterion 1-1** (Section 4.1.5) is met. The magnitude and shape of the curves match well over the entire range of interest.





Figure 4.1-5. Overlay of DRSPALL with Djordjevic and Adams solutions for the cylindrical geometry with $\tau = 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10$.





The simple statistical analysis that reports the maximum value of DIFF also indicates close overlay, with values below 0.05 for all τ examined. The DIFF values for all times examined for both cylindrical and spherical geometry are summarized in Table 4.1-4. DIFF values for the cylindrical case ranged from 0.007 to 0.045, representing a favorable match between DRSPALL and the comparison solution. For the spherical case, the maximum differences fall at 0.016 or below, indicating close agreement between solutions. All maximum differences are less than 0.1, so Acceptance Criterion 1-2 (Section 4.1.5) is met.

τ	Case 1.1 Cylindrical MAX DIFF	Case 1.2 Spherical MAX DIFF
0.01	0.045	0.016
0.1	0.016	0.006
1	0.007	0.007
10	0.014	0.013

Table 4.1-4. Maximum difference values for implicit solution in cylindrical and spherical geometry.

4.1.7 Conclusions

The discussion in Section 4.1.6 verifies that all acceptance criteria (Section 4.1.5) for this test case are met for both the cylindrical and spherical geometry. Thus, this test case passes.

The successful completion of this test case demonstrates that the DRSPALL solutions to transient, compressible, ideal gas flow compare favorably to those generated by an independent utility code developed by Djordjevic and Adams (2003). Both codes utilize an implicit solution algorithm to solve an initial boundary value problem that represents the evolution of pore pressure and resulting blowdown in a simplified gas repository following intrusion by an underbalanced (low-pressure) borehole.

4.2 Test Case #2 – Coalbed Methane Validation

4.2.1 Test Objective

The purpose of this test case is to demonstrate that DRSPALL can simulate the results of a fieldscale coalbed cavitation completion experiment. Since this process of completing a coalbed methane well involves injecting high-pressure air and allowing a controlled blowout to occur which fails the coal and transports coal particles to the surface, it would appear to be an acceptable analog of the repository drilling intrusion spall phenomenon. The coalbed data chosen for comparison are reported by Khodaverdian et al. (1996).

Test Case #2 demonstrates the applicability of DRSPALL to simulating a drilling intrusion into the WIPP repository by modeling a field scale experiment that has similar characteristics. Test Cases #1, #4, and #5 are used to verify that DRSPALL correctly implements all requirements. Test Case #2 exercises all requirements except R.8 (input from CAMDAT file), but does not explicitly address any requirements directly. Some requirements are only partially exercised, i.e. there is no mud flow.

4.2.2 Problem Description

4.2.2.1 Coalbed Cavitation

Coal is a naturally fractured organic material. The fractures, usually orthogonal and closelyspaced, are called "cleats." In-situ, the cleats are normally saturated with water and methane.

Cleat porosity is usually a few percent. Coal, however, is different than most other geologic materials in that its matrix can hold abundant methane in an adsorbed state. When a coal reservoir is de-watered, this adsorbed methane can flow to the cleats and then to a well. As a result, the amount of methane producible from some coal reservoirs is as if porosity was several tens of percent, rather than just a few percent. Because of this, these coal reservoirs are often drilled and produced as a methane source.

Wells in parts of certain coal reservoirs are most successfully completed using the "cavitation" process. To do this, the well is first drilled and cased to the top of the coal seam. Drilling then continues through the coal seam, which is left as an open hole. The completion process then takes several days to more than a week. The well is cyclically open to atmosphere and allowed to blow down, and then shut in and allowed to build up. When this is done (rarely) without any surface pumping, it is called "natural" cavitation. More often, air is introduced by high-pressure pumping at the surface to downhole pressures somewhere between reservoir pressure and lithostatic. This is "induced" cavitation. Anywhere from a few to many tens of cycles may be used, with possible bit runs between cycles to clean out the hole. When a cavitated well is blowing, a strongly flowing mixture of air, coal fines, methane, and some water comes to the surface. This is, in effect, an induced but controlled blowout. If successful, the cavitation process produces a cavity of a few meters in diameter in the coal and leads to greatly enhanced water and ultimately, methane production.

4.2.2.2 An Acceptable Analog

Coalbed cavity completions would appear to be analogs to the WIPP drilling intrusion. This is because cavitated coal seams may be:

- in the same depth regime
- in the same thickness regime
- in the same mechanical property regime
- gas-pressurized during cavitation to the same pressure regime
- blown down in the same time regime as possible drilling intrusion occurrences

Possible shortcomings of coalbed cavitation as an analog are that peak coal cavitation pressures are somewhat lower than peak possible WIPP pressures and the strength of coal may be outside the WIPP tensile strength range, with particulate properties that may be different than degraded WIPP waste.

4.2.3 Analysis Method

4.2.3.1 Selected Field Test for Comparison

The cavitation experiments on the GRI COAL Site Well I#2 (Khodaverdian et al. 1996) have been selected for numerical simulation using DRSPALL. This selection was made based on the availability and quality of data. The well is in the Fruitland coals located in the San Juan Basin of New Mexico, and shown in Figure 4.2-1. The well was cavitated in July of 1991.





The key parameters, as reported by Khodaverdian et al. (1996), of the selected coal well are given in Table 4.2-1.

Parameter	Value (US)	Value (SI)	
Depth	3150 ft	960 m	
Thickness	45 ft	13.7 m	
Bit Radius	0.5 ft	0.15 m	
Post-Drilling (washout) Radius	1.0 ft	0.3 m	
Horizontal Stress	2220 psi	15.3 MPa	
Pore Pressure	1020 psi	7.0 MPa	
Permeability	25 md	$2.5 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m}^2$	

Table 4.2-1. Key coal well parameters

After all cavitation procedures were finished, the final cavity diameter was determined by sonar logging, and is shown in Figure 4.2-2.



Figure 4.2-2. Cavity radius (Khodaverdian et al. 1996).

4.2.3.2 Approach

The authors (Khodaverdian et al. 1996) used observed surface injection pressures to estimate bottomhole pressures over time for the various cavitation cycles, as shown for the first day of cavitation activities, in Figure 4.2-3.



Figure 4.2-3. Cavitation times and inferred bottomhole pressures (Khodaverdian et al. 1996). Red arrows added for this report.

The first day saw 6 cavitation cycles. Khodaverdian et al. felt most cavity growth was completed in that time, and have assumed so for their analysis. As can be seen from Figure 4.2-3, they assumed an instantaneous drawdown to 80 psi downhole upon the start of each cavitation blowdown. In actuality, the drawdown rate would depend on pipe flow to surface and take some time (a minute or so) to develop. DRSPALL simulates the drawdown time and rates, since it includes viscous pipe flow. The relevant values in the figure are thus the peak injection pressures and the cavitation time intervals. These pressures and times are simulated in DRSPALL. The duration of the last blowdown interval is not reported, but is assumed by us to be the same as #5.

Khodaverdian et al. used a numerical model (without accounting for wellbore flow) to reproduce their interpretation of the final cavity diameter (after 6 cycles) from Figure 4.2-2. Their model used the tensile failure radius as the cavity radius. Their calculations for earlier cycles thus were used to infer the cavity diameters vs. time. They used a number of permeability values (2.5, 25 and 250 md) in an attempt to match the measured results, and found that a 25 md permeability gave the best match. This was accepted for their primary interpretation, supported also by rough laboratory measurements and other observations. Considerable uncertainty is added by having to interpret an average cavity size from the irregular data shown in Figure 4.2-2. Their final matching interpretations are shown in Figure 4.2-4. The input pressures and times, and results to compare with DRSPALL, as we obtain from the author's figures, are shown in Table 4.2-2.



Figure 4.2-4. Interpreted cavity radii (based on tensile failure radii) from Khodaverdian et al. (1996).

 Table 4.2-2. Input values and experimental results to be used and compared with DRSPALL results.

Cycle	Pressure, MPa	Duration, s	Cavity Radius, m Best Estimate	Cavity Radius, m Range
1	3.8	300	0.31	.31 – .31
2	6.2	360	0.49	.49 – .61
3	10.1	660	0.61	.61 – .91
4	9.6	900	0.73	.61 – .91
5	11.0	1680	0.91	.91 – 1.65
6	11.4	1680	1.37	.91 - 1.8

4.2.3.3 Input Parameters

DRSPALL is set up for these runs to only model the wellbore from the cavity to the surface, with flow allowed in the annulus. Also, only gas (air) and coal particles are allowed to flow. The code is run in cylindrical symmetry to best match the observed cavity geometry. For each of the six runs required, an initial formation (repository) gas pressure is set to match the value in Table 4.2-2 and an initial cavity size is set to match the previous run results. The first cavity size is 0.31 m. Each run continues for the reported time. Recall that the duration of the last cavitation cycle is unknown, which adds additional uncertainty to the results for the last cavitation cycle.



DRSPALL results will depend on the tensile strength and permeability assumed in DRSPALL. It is unclear as to the exact tensile strength Khodaverdian et al. assumed. They discuss cohesion in detail as it pertains to shear failure, but not tensile strength explicitly. The DRSPALL input files $drs_v122_tc21.drs$ through $drs_v122_tc26.drs$ are stored in CVS directory Test/Input. All runs are the same, except for initial pressure, initial cavity size, and run time. Note that the zone size growth rates were changed to 1.0 for DRSPALL 1.22, as explained in Section 4.0. The following parameters that were assumed for the DRSPALL 1.21 validation have remained unchanged in the 1.22 validation: tensile strength is 0.25 MPa, permeability is 3.0 md (3.0E-15 m²), and the minimum characteristic velocity is 0.5 m/s.

4.2.4 Test Procedure

DRSPALL is executed six times, once for each run. Each of the six DRSPALL runs is a subcase (Cases 2.1 through 2.6, labeled as tc21 through tc26).

For this validation, the cavity radius is extracted from the output CAMDAT files with a single SUMMARIZE (WIPP PA 2005 and 2012b) execution; for the DRSPALL 1.00 validation the same data was manually extracted from each diagnostics file. The SUMMARIZE input file is shown in Figure 4.2-5. The SUMMARIZE output is imported to Excel file $drs_v122_tc2.xlsx$ for plotting.

The following command lines show the DRSPALL execution for Case 2.1 (Cases 2.2 through 2.6 are similar), and the single SUMMARIZE execution:

./drspall ./Input/drs_v122_tc21.drs DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc21.dbg CANCEL DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc21.cdb > DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc21.crt ... similarly for tc22, tc23, tc24, tc25, tc26 ./summarize ./Input/drs_tc2_summarize.inp DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc2^.cdb DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc2_summarize.tbl drs 122 tc2 summarize.log NO > x.x



```
! For DRSPALL Test Case 2, all 6 subcases
! Derived from GROPECDB file of HVAR CAVRAD at TIME 10000
! Note that final cdb times range from 300 to 1680. Requesting a large time
! will read the item from the last time step. The time on the output file
! will always be 9999 and should be ignored.
*times
     read= years
     input= years
     output= years
       time= 9999
*vectors
       vector= 1 to 6
       id=
*items
     type= history
       name= CAVRAD
*output
     driver= text
     write= vector vs item
*end
```



4.2.5 Acceptance Criteria

This test case is used as validation to show that DRSPALL can adequately simulate a drilling intrusion into the WIPP repository. The validation will be acceptable if DRSPALL reasonably predicts cavity growth over six cavitation cycles. Graphical comparisons of cavity radius as a function of time will be evaluated for consistent shape and scale.

4.2.6 Results

Table 4.2-3 and Figure 4.2-6 show the results of the DRSPALL runs and the comparison with field results. The DRSPALL results are for tensile failed and fluidized radii.

Cycle	Field Inferred Cavity Radius, m	DRSPALL V1.22 CAVRAD
1	0.31	0.30000
2	0.49	0.30000
3	0.61	0.64104
4	0.73	0.88227
5	0.91	1.10815
6	1.37	1.30824

Table 4.2-3. Field inferred and DRSPALL results comparison.



Figure 4.2-6. Reported field results and DRSPALL results compared.

4.2.7 Conclusions

The shape and scale of the cavity radius as a function of cavitation time show reasonable agreement as demonstrated in Figure 4.2-6 and, therefore, meets the acceptance criteria established in Section 4.2.5 for this test case. Thus, this test case passes.

As discussed in Section 4.2.2.2, the coalbed methane cavitation process is an acceptable analog to the WIPP drilling intrusion-created spall process. The analog is good because of the similarities between the DRSPALL conceptual model and the coalbed cavitation process, both in behavior and scale.

4.3 No Test Case #3 is Defined

4.4 Test Case #4 – Internal Logic Checks

4.4.1 Test Objective

This test case demonstrates that DRSPALL accurately calculates:

- 1. Coupling of flows in the wellbore and the repository
- 2. Tensile failure of homogenous waste material using effective stress and seepage laws
- 3. Fluidized bed transport of disaggregated waste material
- 4. Expulsion of disaggregated waste material at the land surface.

Correctly performing this test case validates the satisfactory implementation of Functional Requirements R.3, R.4, R.5, and R.6 and External Interface Requirements R.7, R.8, and R.9.

4.4.2 **Problem Description**

The evolution of the WIPP underground over the 10,000-year regulatory period could result in a gas-filled repository at near-lithostatic pressure. DRSPALL is designed to estimate the mass of WIPP waste subject to tensile failure (spalling) and transport to the surface, if a drilling intrusion penetrates such a high-pressure repository. The problem domain here is a WIPP repository at a high, initial repository pressure in which a drilling intrusion results in a significant well blowout at the land surface. The repository domain is cast in hemispherical geometry.

This test case differs from the other DRSPALL test cases in that DRSPALL output are not compared against an independent model or experimental data. Rather, the selected intermediate and standard output variables are reported in tabular and graphical format to facilitate tests of (1) the program logic, and (2) verification or proper implementation of the mathematics outlined in the *Design Document for DRSPALL Version 1.22* (WIPP PA 2015b).

4.4.2.1 Boundary Conditions

The boundary conditions are set by the default conditions in DRSPALL. This includes a constant mud pump rate into the drill pipe at the inlet to the wellbore, a constant pressure (1 atm) boundary condition at the outlet from the wellbore, and a no-flow gas boundary at the outer edge of the repository domain.

4.4.2.2 Input Parameters

The DRSPALL input file $drs_v122_tc41.drs$ is stored in CVS directory Test/Input. In order to assure a spalling event, the repository initial pressure will be near lithostatic pressure at 14.8 MPa, and the tensile strength will be set to a low value in its range, 1.2E+05 Pa (17.4 psi). Note that the zone size growth rates were changed to 1.0 for the DRSPALL 1.22 validation, as explained in Section 4.0. Also note that the fluidized particle shape factor was changed to 0.25 for the DRSPALL 1.22 validation.

4.4.3 Analysis Methods

4.4.3.1 Coupling of the Wellbore and the Repository Flow Models

The coupling of the wellbore and repository flow models in DRSPALL is handled differently before and after bit penetration into the repository. Before penetration, a cylinder of alteredpermeability salt material (called the drilling-damaged zone, or DDZ) with diameter equal to the drillbit moves ahead of the drillbit and is assumed to carry limited porous gas flow from the repository to the wellbore. Gas flow is driven by the difference between the gas pressure at the face of the waste and the gas pressure in the bottom of the approaching wellbore. Once the repository is penetrated, these two pressures equalize and gas flow from the repository is added directly to the wellbore. In order to avoid forcing gas to flow to a point in the 1-D, radially symmetric repository domain prior to bit penetration, a preliminary cavity, referred to throughout the DRSPALL documentation as the "pseudocavity," is formed where the repository meets the DDZ. The volume of this cavity is small, with a surface area equal to that of a circle with a diameter equal to the bit diameter. The purpose of this pseudocavity is to avoid forcing gas flow to converge to a single point (spherical geometry) or line (cylindrical geometry) at the origin of the radial coordinate system.

Coupling of the wellbore and repository flow models will be tested by reporting intermediate variables near the time of bit penetration. The variables include:

- Run time (sec)
- Bit above repository (m) Distance between bit and top of repository
- Repository penetrated (true/false)
- Cavity pressure (Pa) Gas pressure in the preliminary cavity created at the point where the repository domain meets the DDZ
- Wellbore bottomhole pressure (Pa)
- Total gas in well (kg) Spatial integral of gas mass over entire wellbore domain
- Total gas injected (kg) Time integral of gas mass injected at bottom of well
- Gas mass in repository (kg) Spatial integral over entire pore space in repository
- Gas mass from repository (kg) Difference between starting gas mass in repository and current gas mass in repository
- Gas in storage¹ (kg) Gas removed from repository by removal of repository zones is added to "storage" before it is released to the cavity

¹ Both gas and solids removed from the repository by drilling are moved into "storage" before being released to the wellbore domain. Mass in storage is then released to the wellbore over a mixing time = (radius/superficial gas velocity) where the radius is the center of the cell that forms the cavity wall, the first intact repository zone. This is done because instantaneously adding the entire contents of one computational zone to the cavity causes numerical noise, and the controlled release from store dampens the numerical shock.



• Mass balance error (-) – Error in the mass of gas in the entire repository and wellbore system relative to time 0.

While distance of the bit above the repository is greater than zero, the logical variable, repository penetrated, should be false. In addition, the cavity pressure at the face of the repository and wellbore bottomhole pressure should converge as gas bleeds from the repository to the wellbore through the drilling-damaged zone. Once the height of the bit above the repository reaches zero, repository penetrated should be true. The cavity pressure and well bottomhole pressure should then be the same. Also, the spatial integral of total gas in well should be equivalent to the time integral of gas injected into the bottom of the well until gas is ejected at the annulus outlet at the land surface. The 'gas mass from repository' should be similar to but not necessarily the same as the 'total gas injected.' Recall that pressure is the dependent variable in the repository model and gas density and flux are found by post processing using the equation-of-state and Darcy's law, respectively. 'Gas mass from repository' includes all mass sources and sinks in the repository model including the wellbore boundary, far-field boundary and local mass balance errors due to errors in the pressure solution. The wellbore boundary should dominate the term and therefore be similar in value to total gas injected. The 'total gas injected' is calculated using Darcy's law applied at the interior boundary of repository domain and requires an approximation of the pressure gradient at the boundary which is discontinuous.

4.4.3.2 Tensile Failure of Waste Material

In DRSPALL, the radial effective stress at any radius r is calculated as the sum of the radial seepage and elastic stress, minus the pore pressure:

$$\sigma_r'(r) = \sigma_{sr}(r) + \sigma_{er}(r) - \beta p(r)$$
(4.4.1)

where the radial seepage stress is evaluated with the following integral:

$$\sigma_{sr}(r) = (m-1)\beta \left(\frac{1-2\nu}{1-\nu}\right) \frac{1}{r^m} \int_{r_c}^r (p(r) - p_{ff}) r^{m-1} dr$$
(4.4.2)

and the radial elastic stress is evaluated as:

$$\sigma_{er}(r) = \left\{ \sigma_{ff} \left[1 - \left(\frac{r_c}{r}\right)^m \right] + p_c \left(\frac{r_c}{r}\right)^m \right\}$$
(4.4.3)

and the pore pressure, p(r), is obtained from the transient solution to porous flow. The terms for Equations 4.4.1 to 4.4.3 are defined in Table 4.4-1.

Symbol	Definition	Units
т	Geometry exponent (<i>m</i> =3 for spherical, <i>m</i> =2 for cylindrical)	_
p(r)	Gas pressure at a distance r from wellbore axis	Pa
p_c	Pressure at cavity face	Pa
p_{ff}	Pressure in far-field (constant)	Pa
r	Radius	m
r _c	Radius at cavity face	m
T_s	Tensile strength	Pa
β	Biot's constant	-
$\sigma_{\!f\!f}$	Stress in far-field (constant)	Pa
$\sigma_{sr}(r)$	Radial seepage stress	Pa
$\sigma_{er}(r)$	Radial elastic stress	Pa
$\sigma_r'(r)$	Radial effective stresses	Pa
υ	Poisson's ratio	-
L_t	Characteristic length for testing tensile failure	m
Ι	Zone index in discretized repository domain	-

Table 4.4-1. Nomenclature for stress calculations



Figure 4.4-1. Drawing of a theoretical radial effective stress curve. Material is subject to tensile failure where $\sigma_r'(r) < T_s$.

Tensile failure of the solid waste material is determined by comparing the radial effective stress $(\sigma_r'(r))$ at every point in the repository domain to the tensile strength T_s of the solid, shown graphically in drawing in Figure 4.4-1. DRSPALL uses the convention that a positive stress denotes compression, while a negative stress denotes tension. The maximum effective radial stress in tension (where $\sigma_r'(r) < 0$) will typically appear near the cavity wall and transition to compression ($\sigma_r'(r) > 0$) as r increases to the far-field. As such, tensile failure in the solid starts near the cavity wall and moves outward.

In the DRSPALL discretized repository domain, the failure criterion is tested according to the following expression:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_{r,i}}{n} < T_s, \text{ then failure is initiated over } L_t$$
(4.4.4)

where the sum is evaluated over *n* repository zones in a characteristic length L_t . Note that since T_s is represented by negative constant in the current calculations, a tensile stress exceeding T_s would actually evaluate to less than T_s , hence the "less than" symbol in Equation 4.4.4. Failure in DRSPALL thus occurs only when the mean radial effective stress (in tension) over a characteristic length, L_t , exceeds the tensile strength. L_t in this analysis was 2 cm. The characteristic length concept is introduced because without it, the stress formulations in Equations 4.4.1 to 4.4.3 preclude tensile failure in zones near the wall at small zone size. Close examination of Equations 4.4.1 to 4.4.3 will reveal that the radial effective stress is exactly zero at the cavity wall. This is also illustrated in Figure 4.4-1. A zone size can always be found in which the very first zone representing the cavity wall has an effective stress insufficient to fail the solids. Also, numerical noise at the cavity boundary can cause spurious failure of the first zone, independent of the physical conditions in the simulation. For these reasons, a characteristic length is introduced that averages the stress over the first several repository zones to capture the expected physical behavior rather than allow failure, or lack thereof, from numerical artifacts.

Tensile failure of waste material will be tested by reporting the following output variables for selected times:

- Run time (sec)
- Cavity pressure (Pa)
- Cavity radius (m)
- Drilled radius (m)
- Cavity volume (m³)

For computational cells in the repository in the vicinity of the wellbore, the following will be reported as a function of selected times:

- Repository cell index (-)
- Radius of cell center (m)
- Pore pressure in cell (Pa)
- Radial elastic stress in cell (Pa)
- Radial seepage stress in cell (Pa)
- Radial effective stress in cell (Pa)
- Tensile failure started (true/false)
- Fraction of cell fluidized (-)

In addition, elastic stress, seepage stress and effective stress will be calculated from Equations 4.4.1 to 4.4.3 in an independent spreadsheet analysis using a pore pressure profile, p(r), generated by DRSPALL at one selected time. The spreadsheet values will be compared to those output from DRSPALL to verify that the stress calculations in DRSPALL are implemented correctly.

4.4.3.3 Fluidized Bed Transport of Disaggregated Waste Material

Once tensile failure occurs, material is moved from the repository to the wellbore by fluidized bed transport. In DRSPALL, the Ergun (1952) equation:

$$\frac{1.75}{a\phi^3} \left(\frac{d_p U_f \rho}{\eta}\right)^2 + 150 \left(\frac{1-\phi}{a^2\phi^3}\right) \left(\frac{d_p U_f \rho}{\eta}\right) = \frac{d_p^{-3} \rho(\rho_w - \rho)g}{\eta^2}$$
(4.4.5)

is solved for fluidization velocity, and compared with the superficial gas velocity perpendicular to the cavity wall. The superficial gas velocity is defined as the volume flow rate divided by the area perpendicular to flow direction. If the superficial gas velocity exceeds the fluidization velocity, the failed solids are assumed fluidized and added to the wellbore. The terms for Equation 4.4.5 are defined in Table 4.4-2.

Symbol	Definition	Units
а	Particle shape factor	-
d_p	Diameter of particles (mean)	m
g	Acceleration of gravity	m/s ²
U_{f}	Fluidization velocity	m/s
η	Viscosity of gas	kg /m s
ρ	Density of gas	kg/m ³
$ ho_w$	Density of waste solids	kg/m ³
φ	Porosity	-
U_s	Superficial fluid velocity	m/s
r _{cl}	Radius to center of first intact cell	m
t_f	Fluidization time	S

 Table 4.4-2.
 Nomenclature for fluidization calculations

In DRSPALL, the fluidization velocity is nearly constant for a given set of input parameters, though it does change slightly as pressure near the cavity decreases and gas density decreases as a result.

Fluidization of a given zone requires a finite period of time, defined by the fluidization time t_f.

$$t_f = \frac{r_{c1}}{U_s}$$
(4.4.6)

Fluidized bed transport will be tested by reporting the following output variables as a function of time:

- Runtime (sec)
- Cavity pressure (Pa)
- Cavity radius (m)
- Fluidization velocity (m/s)
- Superficial gas velocity at the cell center (m/s)
- Total waste in well (kg)

For computational cells in the repository in the vicinity of the wellbore, the following will be reported as a function of time:

- Cell index (-)
- Radius of cell center (m)
- Tensile failure completed (true/false)
- Fluidization started (true/false)
- Fluidization completed (true/false)
- Fraction fluidized (-)

Also, the fluidization velocity and fluidization time will be calculated given specific input variables using Equation 4.4.5, independent of DRSPALL. These values will be compared to output from DRSPALL to verify that DRSPALL computed the values correctly.

Finally, the volume and mass of material removed from the repository due to drilling (cuttings) and/or failure and fluidization will be verified by spreadsheet calculations based on the repository computational grid and zone removal tracking variables stored on the CAMDAT output file. The CAMDAT variables to be verified are:

- CUTMASS mass of material removed by drilling (kg)
- TOTMASS total mass of material remove due to either drilling or spall (kg)
- SPLMASS difference between TOTMASS and CUTMASS (kg
- SPLMAS2 incrementally summed mass of material removed due to failure and fluidization (spall) (kg)

- CUTVOLEQ equivalent uncompacted volume of material removed by drilling (m³)
- TOTVOLEQ equivalent uncompacted total volume of material remove due to either drilling or spall (m³)
- SPLVOLEQ difference between TOTVOLEQ and CUTVOLEQ (m³)
- SPLVOL2 incrementally summed equivalent uncompacted volume of material removed due to spall (m³)

4.4.3.4 Expulsion of Disaggregated Waste Material

Upon transport of the waste material from the cavity at the bottom of the wellbore to the land surface, DRSPALL expels the waste from the problem domain and calculates the total mass of waste expelled as a function of time.

Expulsion of disaggregated waste material at the land surface will be tested by displaying the following output variables at selected times:

- Run time (sec)
- Repository penetrated (true/false)
- Zones removed from repository domain (-) Actual number of computational cells removed from the inner wall of the repository domain due to cutting action of the drillbit or spalling
- Mass of waste removed (kg) Mass of waste solids removed from repository domain
- Waste in store (kg) Mass of waste in "store" after fluidization of a zone has completed but before it is released to the cavity
- Total waste in well (kg) Spatial integral of waste mass in wellbore domain
- Waste mass ejected (kg) Time integral of waste mass ejected at annulus outlet to land surface
- Waste position in well (m) Position of waste front in well, where \sim -655 m is the well bottom, and 0 m is the land surface
- Mass balance error (-) Relative difference between mass removed from repository domain and mass ejected to the surface.

Once the bit penetrates the repository, waste cuttings and potentially spallings will be transported up the wellbore to the surface. Monitoring the position of the waste front in the well will indicate how close it is to the land surface. Once the front reaches the surface, the quantity ejected will increase from zero. The mass of waste removed from the repository should balance with the sum of the waste in the well and the waste ejected.

4.4.4 Test Procedure

DRSPALL is executed once to 450 seconds (Case 4.1) to verify DRSPALL processing (Functional Requirements R.3 through R.6). DRSPALL is executed again (Case 4.2) for a short period of time to verify the External Interface Requirements R.7 through R.9 only.

DRSPALL generates four validation files for Case 4.1 (tc41), as follows.

- *drs_122_tc41_coupling.dat* coupling data at selected times.
- *drs_122_tc41_stress.dat* pore pressure and stress profiles.
- drs_122_tc41_fluidization.dat fluidization data at selected times.
- drs_122_tc41_expulsion.dat solids transport data.

For Case 4.1, the output CAMDAT file is post-processed with GROPECDB (WIPP PA 1996 and 2012a), using the input control file shown in Figure 4.4-2. The diagnostics file is also examined. The validation files, GROPECDB output, and diagnostics file for Case 4.1 are imported to Excel file $drs_v122_tc4.xlsx$ for post-processing and plotting.

DIGITS 8 !apg V1.22 use 8 digits for all 1 !apg For history plots in VD (were done by BLOTCDB) SELECT ALLTIMES SELECT HVAR CAVPRS BOTPRS PRINT HVAR SELECT HVAR DRILLRAD TENSRAD CAVRAD !apg may not be used PRINT HVAR 1 !v1.22 fluidization time comes from separate file **!!!SELECT HVAR FLUIDTIM** 1 !apg For drilling and spall volume and masses table in VD lapg DIGITS 8 SELECT PROP CAVRADO PRINT PROP SELECT TIME 450 SELECT HVAR CUTMASS TOTMASS SPLMASS SPLMAS2 & CUTVOLEQ TOTVOLEQ SPLVOLEQ SPLVOL2 PRINT HVAR 1 !For Excel SPLVOL CHECK SELECT TIME 450 SELECT BLOCK 2 !FLUDSTOP defined in REPOS only SELECT EVARS COORD FLUDSTOP PRINT EVARS Ţ EXIT

Figure 4.4-2. GROPECDB input command file drs_tc41_grope.inp

The following command lines run DRSPALL and GROPECDB for Case 4.1:

./drspall ./Input/drs_v122_tc41.drs DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc41.dbg CANCEL DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc41.cdb > DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc41.crt

./gropecdb DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc41.cdb ./Input/drs_tc41_grope.inp DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc41.gr > x.x

Case 4.2 is the only test case that inputs a CAMDAT file. For Case 4.2, the diagnostics file is examined to verify that DRSPALL is setting the input parameters as instructed by the DRSPALL input file using the properties in the input CAMDAT file. The output CAMDAT file is not examined. The four validation files mentioned above are generated, but are not examined.

The following command line runs DRSPALL for Case 4.2 (tc42). Note that this is the only case that reads an input CAMDAT file (*drs_tc42_ms.cdb*):

./drspall ./Input/drs_v122_tc42.drs DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc42.dbg ./Input/drs_tc42_ms.cdb DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc42.cdb > DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc42.crt

4.4.5 Acceptance Criteria

Note that Acceptance Criteria 4-1 through 4-15 (Sections 4.4.5.1 through 4.4.5.4) and Acceptance Criterion 4-17 (Section 4.4.5.5) are addressed by Case 4.1. Acceptance Criterion 4-16 (Section 4.4.5.5) is verified for Case 4.2 only.

4.4.5.1 Coupling of the Wellbore and the Repository Flow Models

As the bit approaches the repository [Bit Above Repository > 0], the following should be observed:

- Acceptance Criterion 4-1 Cavity pressure decreases and well bottomhole pressure increases with time (after they stabilize).
- Acceptance Criterion 4-2 Repository has not yet been penetrated, indicated by the logical variable Repository Penetrated = "F" (false).
- Acceptance Criterion 4-3 The total mass of gas in the bottom of the well is updated by adding gas from the waste. The total mass balance error should be less than 0.10.

When the bit intersects the repository [Bit Above Repository ≤ 0], the following should be observed:

• Acceptance Criterion 4-4 — Cavity pressure and well bottomhole pressure are equal.

Informa³⁹**ion Only**

- Acceptance Criterion 4-5 Repository has been penetrated, indicated by the logical variable Repository Penetrated = "T" (true).
- Acceptance Criterion 4-6 The total mass of gas in the well is updated by adding gas from the waste. The total mass balance error should be less than 0.10.

4.4.5.2 Tensile Failure of Waste Material

This test will pass if, for a selected output time, the following is observed:

- Acceptance Criterion 4-7 The radial effective stress is equal to the sum of the component stresses per Equation 4.4.1.
- Acceptance Criterion 4-8 If the average radial effective stress over characteristic length $L_t = 2$ cm exceeds the material tensile strength, then tensile failure is started, otherwise, tensile failure has not started.
- Acceptance Criterion 4-9 Independent spreadsheet calculations of the radial effective stress, radial seepage stress, and radial elastic stress based on Equations 4.4.1 to 4.4.3 and the given DRSPALL pore pressure profile demonstrate agreement within a relative difference of 1E-4.

4.4.5.3 Fluidized Bed Transport of Disaggregated Waste Material

This test will pass if, for a selected output time, the following is observed:

- Acceptance Criterion 4-10 If the superficial gas velocity for any cell within the characteristic length exceeds the critical fluidization velocity, the fluidization of the disaggregated waste should be started.
- Acceptance Criterion 4-11 The fluidization velocity calculated independently using the Ergun equation (Equation 4.4.5) is consistent with the value reported by DRSPALL to within a relative difference of 1E-4.
- Acceptance Criterion 4-12 The volume and mass of waste material removed by drilling and spall agree with independent calculations to within a relative difference of 1E-4.

4.4.5.4 Expulsion of Disaggregated Waste Material

Once waste has been transported up the borehole, it must be ejected at the land surface. This test will pass if the following is observed:

• Acceptance Criterion 4-13 — The position of the waste front in the well must move from the bottom (-653 m) to the top (0 m) as time progresses after repository penetration.

- Acceptance Criterion 4-14 The cumulative mass of waste ejected must be small (< 1.0 kg) before the waste position in the well reaches z = 0, after which the cumulative mass of waste ejected will be a monotonically increasing positive number.
- Acceptance Criterion 4-15 The mass of waste removed from the repository must correspond with the mass of waste present in the cavity, wellbore, and ejected to the land surface. The relative mass balance error must not exceed 0.01.

4.4.5.5 External Interfaces

The proper use of external interfaces will be verified if:

- Acceptance Criterion 4-16 The program successfully reads the DRSPALL parameters from the input control file and the input CAMDAT file, as confirmed by the parameter values listed on the diagnostics file.
- Acceptance Criterion 4-17 An output CAMDAT file is generated by DRSPALL. The file must be readable by the BLOTCDB utility or the GROPECDB utility to confirm that it is a valid CAMDAT file.

Test Case #4 will pass if all criteria listed in Sections 4.4.5.1 - 4.4.5.5 are satisfied.

4.4.6 Results

The presentation of results starts with a general description of the run behavior, and then breaks out into discussions of specific functionality.

Key history variables for this run are shown in Figure 4.4-3 and Figure 4.4-4. Note that the code was executed for 450 seconds DRSPALL time. This was sufficient time to allow for the cavity pressure to stabilize (Figure 4.4-3), drilling to complete and failure of repository material to stop and cavity radius to stabilize (Figure 4.4-4). Output variable names shown in the figures represent the CAMDAT variable names, described in the DRSPALL user's manual (WIPP PA 2004, 2013, and 2015a). The plot data was extracted from the output CAMDAT file with GROPECDB, and plotted with Excel.

Understanding DRSPALL output typically begins with studying the pressure and cavity radius history plots. The pressure history plot in Figure 4.4-3 shows the fluid pressure at the bottom of the well (BOTPRS) and the repository pressure at the point of impending intrusion (CAVPRS). At the start of the simulation, BOTPRS is near hydrostatic (~8 MPa), and CAVPRS is at the initial repository pressure, 14.8 MPa. The well pressure is a little noisy at startup because the initial pressure distribution is chosen arbitrarily, and stable, dynamic flowing solution must be found, which takes a few seconds of DRSPALL time. The important issue here is for the wellbore pressure to settle down before bit penetration of the repository, which it does in all DRSPALL runs. As the bit nears the repository, gas bleed between the repository and wellbore cause BOTPRS and CAVPRS to converge and reach a common value near 9.5 MPa at the time of intrusion. After intrusion, direct coupling between the high-pressure repository and wellbore causes the drilling mud column to blow out, resulting in a drop in BOTPRS to near 3.0 MPa



where it stays for the remainder of the run. The pressure spikes observed between 130 and 200 seconds are caused by tensile failure of repository solids and subsequent entrainment into the wellbore flow stream.

Also instructive is the radius history plot, shown here in Figure 4.4-4. Recall that the repository geometry is hemispherical in this study. Note that the initial cavity radius (CAVRAD) is small but not zero, representing the radius of the pseudocavity (Section 4.4.3.1) created prior to bit penetration. The cavity then grows upon penetration of the repository, starting at 34 seconds. Until about 107 seconds, all radial variables grow due to drilling. After 107 seconds, tensile failure occurs, and tensile radius (TENSRAD) and cavity radius (CAVRAD) grow accordingly. Drilled radius (DRILLRAD) continues along its path independent of the growing cavity in front of it, and stops only when the drill bit would have hit the bottom of the repository in the real system. In this case, the effective (spherical) drilled radius is 0.48 m. The cavity radius and tensile-failed radius settle to constant values of 0.71 m and 0.73 m, respectively. The tensile-failed radius (TENSRAD) identifies solid material that has failed due to the stress state, but has not mobilized into the flow stream. The tensile-failed radius is equal to or greater than the cavity radius. The difference between the tensile-failed radius and the drilled radius represents the material considered to be "spalled" in this conceptual model.

Relative difference is used several times in this section. It is calculated as:



Figure 4.4-3. Pressure history plot.



Figure 4.4-4. Radius history plot.

4.4.6.1 Coupling of the Wellbore and Repository Flow Models

An excerpt from the coupling file (as formatted by Excel) is shown in



Table 4.4-3. The information shown in this table relates to gas transport from the repository domain to the wellbore domain. The table columns are defined in Section 4.4.3.1. Figure 4.4-5 shows a pressure versus time plot.

Reporting

in

Table 4.4-3 starts at a run time of approximately 28.28 seconds. The bit is 0.02428 m above the top of the repository at this point, and the Repository Penetrated logical is "F" (false). Gas pressure in the repository (Cavity Pressure = 13.67 MPa) is greater than Well Bottom Pressure at 8.48 MPa. This causes some gas to bleed from the repository to the well bottom through the drilling-damaged zone (DDZ), resulting in a nonzero and growing Total Gas in Well = 1.90 kg. As the bit proceeds downward with time, Cavity Pressure and Well Bottom Pressure converge to a common value of 9.69 MPa at approximately 33.77 seconds when the repository is penetrated. A horizontal line is drawn in the table at the time of penetration. The pressure behavior is also illustrated graphically in Figure 4.4-5, where data from Figure 4.4-3 is plotted on a time scale from 0 to 50 seconds to zoom in on events around the time of intrusion. The plot data was extracted from the output CAMDAT file with GROPECDB, and plotted with Excel.





An

examination

Information Only

of

Table 4.4-3 and drs_122_tc41_coupling.dat confirms that Acceptance Criteria 4-2 and 4-5(Section 4.4.5.1) are met: the Repository Penetrated is always "F" (false) when Bit AboveRepository is greater than zero, and always "T" (true) when Bit Above Repository is less than orequaltozero.Anexaminationof

.

Table 4.4-3 and Figure 4.4-5 confirms that Acceptance Criterion 4-1 (Section 4.4.5.1) is met: Cavity Pressure (CAVPRS) decreases and Well Bottom Pressure (BOTPRS) increases (after CAVPRS stabilizes) as the bit approaches the repository. Further examination confirms that Acceptance Criterion 4-4 (Section 4.4.5.1) is met: Cavity Pressure (CAVPRS) and Well Bottom Pressure (BOTPRS) are equal when the bit intersects the repository.

In

Table 4.4-3, the spatial integral Total Gas In Well agrees closely with the time integral Total Gas Injected until gas transports all the way to the top of the wellbore at the land surface (run time approximately 107 seconds) at which point gas is ejected to the atmosphere and out of the problem domain. Mass of gas injected and gas mass from repository are similar as expected and explained in Section 4.4.3.1. The global mass balance error remains on the order of 1E-3 to 1E-7 for all reported times in

Table 4.4-3 and in $drs_122_tc41_coupling.dat$, so Acceptance Criteria 4-3 and 4-6 (Section 4.4.5.1) are met. The global mass balance error is defined as the absolute value of [Initial Gas in Repository – (Gas Mass In Repository + Gas Storage + Total Gas Injected)] / Initial Gas in Repository.

Initial Gas in Repository (kg): 1.021635964442423E+05										
Runtime (sec)	Bit Above	Repository Penetrated (T/F)	Cavity Pressure (Pa)	Well Bottom Pressure (Pa)	Total Gas In Well (kg)	Total Gas Injected (kg)	Gas Mass In Repository (kg)	Gas Mass From Repository (kg)	Gas Storage (kg)	Mass Balance Error (-)
28.28294	0.02428	F	13.66737E+06	8.47892E+06	1.90195		102161.71000	1.88951	0.00E+00	the second s
28.44442	0.02356	F	13.63988E+06	8.49156E+06	1.92857	1.92857	102161.68000	1.91522	0.00E+00	1.31E-07
28.60589	0.02285	F	13.61106E+06	8.50489E+06	1.95578		102161.65000	1.94147	0.00E+00	
28.76736	0.02213	F	13.58077E+06	8.51871E+06	1.98359		102161.63000	1.96829	0.00E+00	
28.92883	0.02141	F	13.54890E+06	8.53302E+06	2.01205		102161.60000	1.99570	0.00E+00	
29.09030	0.02069	F	13.51535E+06	8.54812E+06	2.04118	2.04118	102161.57000	2.02372	0.00E+00	1.71E-07
29.25178	0.01998	F	13.48000E+06	8.56410E+06	2.07101	2.07101	102161.54000	2.05239	0.00E+00	
29.41325	0.01926	F	13.44268E+06	8.58076E+06	2.10157	2.10157	102161.51000	2.08173	0.00E+00	1.94E-07
29.57472	0.01854	F	13.40319E+06	8.59812E+06	2.13290	2.13290	102161.48000		0.00E+00	2.07E-07
29.73619	0.01782	F	13.36138E+06	8.61638E+06	2.16504	2.16504	102161.45000		0.00E+00	2.20E-07
29.89766	0.01710	F	13.31705E+06	8.63566E+06	2.19804	2.19804	102161.42000	2.17413	0.00E+00	
30.05914	0.01639	F	13.26995E+06	8.65596E+06	2.23193	2.23193	102161.39000	2.20652	0.00E+00	2.49E-07
30.22061	0.01567	F	13.21982E+06	8.67730E+06	2.26677	2.26677	102161.36000	2.23976	0.00E+00	2.64E-07
30.38208	0.01495	F	13.16635E+06	8.69971E+06	2.30260	2.30260	102161.32000	2.27392	0.00E+00	2.81E-07
30.54355	0.01423	F	13.10920E+06	8.72335E+06	2.33949	2.33949	102161.29000	2.30903	0.00E+00	2.98E-07
30.70503	0.01352	F	13.04803E+06	8.74839E+06	2.37749	2.37749	102161.25000	2.34515	0.00E+00	
30.86650	0.01280	F	12.98239E+06	8.77489E+06	2.41668	2.41668	102161.21000	2.38235	0.00E+00	3.36E-07
31.02797	0.01208	F	12.91177E+06	8.80287E+06	2.45713	2.45713	102161.18000	2.42068	0.00E+00	3.57E-07
31.18944	0.01136	F	12.83557E+06	8.83246E+06	2.49891	2.49891	102161.14000	2.46022	0.00E+00	3.79E-07
31.35091	0.01065	F	12.75318E+06	8.86390E+06	2.54212	2.54212	102161.10000	2.50104	0.00E+00	4.02E-07
31.51239	0.00993	F	12.66383E+06	8.89736E+06	2.58685	2.58685	102161.05000	2.54323	0.00E+00	4.27E-07
31.67386	0.00921	F	12.56662E+06	8.93294E+06	2.63320	2.63320	102161.01000	2.58688	0.00E+00	4.53E-07
31.83533	0.00849	F	12.46047E+06	8.97078E+06	2.68130	2.68130	102160.96000	2.63210	0.00E+00	4.82E-07
31.99680	0.00777	F	12.34416E+06	9.01112E+06	2.73127	2.73127	102160.92000	2.67898	0.00E+00	5.12E-07
32.15827	0.00706	F	12.21623E+06	9.05425E+06	2.78325	2.78325	102160.87000	2.72767	0.00E+00	5.44E-07
32.31975	0.00634	F	12.07493E+06	9.10041E+06	2.83741	2.83741	102160.82000	2.77829	0.00E+00	5.79E-07
32.48122	0.00562	F	11.91813E+06	9.14985E+06	2.89391	2.89391	102160.77000	2.83101	0.00E+00	6.16E-07
32.64269	0.00490	F	11.74323E+06	9.20285E+06	2.95296	2.95296	102160.71000	2.88598	0.00E+00	6.56E-07
32.80416	0.00419	F	11.54708E+06	9.25980E+06	3.01477	3.01477	102160.65000	2.94341	0.00E+00	6.98E-07
32.96563	0.00347	F	11.32579E+06	9.32110E+06	3.07960	3.07960	102160.59000	3.00351	0.00E+00	7.45E-07
33.12711	0.00275	F	11.07443E+06	9.38719E+06	3.14771	3.14771	102160.53000		0.00E+00	7.95E-07
33.28858	0.00203	F	10.78673E+06	9.45848E+06	3.21943	3.21943	102160.46000	3.13271	0.00E+00	8.49E-07
33.45005	0.00131	F	10.45457E+06	9.53546E+06	3.29511	3.29511	102160.39000	3.20239	0.00E+00	9.08E-07
33.61152	0.00060	F	10.06728E+06	9.61869E+06	3.37513	3.37513	102160.32000	3.27591	0.00E+00	9.71E-07
33.77299	-0.00012	Т	9.69412E+06	9.69412E+06			102160.24000		0.00E+00	1.04E-06
33.93447	-0.00084	Т	9.71260E+06	9.71260E+06			102160.16000		0.00E+00	
34.09594	-0.00156	Т	9.72454E+06	9.72454E+06			102160.09000		0.00E+00	
34.25741	-0.00227	Т	9.72844E+06	9.72844E+06			102160.01000		0.00E+00	
34.41888	-0.00299	Т	9.74328E+06	9.74328E+06			102159.93000	3.66460	6.10E-04	
34.58035	-0.00371	T	9.71818E+06	9.71818E+06			102159.85000	3.74358	3.32E-04	
34.74183	-0.00443	T	9.68029E+06	9.68029E+06			102159.77000	3.82273	1.80E-04	
34.90330	-0.00515	T	9.64311E+06	9.64311E+06			102159.69000		9.69E-05	
35.06477	-0.00586	T	9.62382E+06	9.62382E+06			102159.61000	3.98317	6.87E-04	
35.22624	-0.00658	T	9.58827E+06	9.58827E+06			102159.53000	4.06500	3.74E-04	and the second se
35.38771	-0.00730	T	9.53688E+06	9.53688E+06			102159.45000	4.14709	2.03E-04	
35.54919	-0.00802	T	9.48198E+06	9.48198E+06			102159.37000	4.22963	1.09E-04	
35.71066	-0.00873	T	9.44647E+06	9.44647E+06				4.31375	7.42E-04	
				lines a		and the second				

Table 4.4-3. Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_coupling.dat.

Runtime (sec)	Bit Above Repository (m)	Repository Penetrated (T/F)	Cavity Pressure (Pa)	Well Bottom Pressure (Pa)	Total Gas In Well (kg)	Total Gas Injected (kg)	Gas Mass In Repository (kg)	Gas Mass From Repository (kg)	Gas Storage (kg)	Mass Balance Error (-)
105.14554	-0.31737	Т	6.65570E+06	6.65570E+06	87.05083	87.05083	102083.33000	80.26217	1.04E-03	6.65E-05
105.30703	-0.31809	Т	6.64657E+06	6.64657E+06	87.34003	87.34003	102083.07000	80.52825	7.84E-04	6.67E-05
105.46852	-0.31881	Т	6.63731E+06	6.63731E+06	87.62923	87.62923	102082.80000	80.79439	5.91E-04	6.69E-05
105.63001	-0.31953	Т	6.62789E+06	6.62789E+06	87.91847	87.91847	102082.54000		4.46E-04	6.71E-05
105.79150		Т	6.61837E+06	6.61837E+06	88.20778	88.20778	102082.27000		3.36E-04	6.74E-05
105.95299	-0.32096	Т	6.60877E+06	6.60877E+06	88.49717	88.49717	102082.00000		2.53E-04	6.76E-05
106.11448	-0.32168	Т	6.60276E+06	6.60276E+06	88.79001	88.79001	102081.73000		2.31E-03	
106.27597	-0.32240	Т	6.56678E+06	6.56678E+06	89.06987	89.06987	102081.44000		1.77E-03	and the second se
106.42141	-0.32304	T	6.55711E+06	6.55711E+06	89.31080	89.31080	102081.18000		1.40E-03	
106.54897	-0.32361	T	6.60301E+06	6.60301E+06	89.54398	89.54398	102080.94000		1.54E-02	-
106.71046	-0.32433	T	6.57967E+06	6.57967E+06	89.85990	89.85990	102080.63000	-	1.19E-02	
106.85322	-0.32496	T	6.56536E+06	6.56536E+06	90.12532	90.12532	102080.37000		9.54E-03	
106.99329	-0.32559	T	6.60298E+06	6.60298E+06	90.40881	90.40881	102080.09000		1.96E-02	
107.15478		T	6.59833E+06	6.59833E+06	90.74304	90.74304	102079.78000		1.53E-02	
107.31627	-0.32702	T	6.59661E+06	6.59661E+06	91.07486	91.07487	102079.48000		1.20E-02	
107.47776		T	6.59429E+06	6.59429E+06	91.40513	91.40514	102079.18000		9.40E-03	
107.63925	-0.32846	T	6.58948E+06	6.58948E+06	91.73435	91.73436	102078.88000		7.37E-03	
107.80075	-0.32917	T	6.58518E+06	6.58518E+06	92.06277	92.06279	102078.58000		5.77E-03	
107.96224		T	6.57868E+06	6.57868E+06	92.39061	92.39066	102078.27000		4.52E-03	
107.90224		T		6.57261E+06	92.39001	92.39000	102078.27000		4.32E-03 3.54E-03	
	-0.33061	T	6.57261E+06		93.04506	93.04519	102077.67000		2.78E-03	-
108.28523			6.56647E+06	6.56647E+06						-
108.44672	-0.33205	T	6.55919E+06	6.55919E+06	93.37183	93.37205	102077.37000		2.17E-03	
108.60821	-0.33276	T	6.55179E+06	6.55179E+06	93.69837	93.69876	102077.07000		1.70E-03	-
108.76971	-0.33348	T	6.54416E+06	6.54416E+06	94.02467	94.02534	102076.77000		1.33E-03	-
108.93120	-0.33420	T	6.53579E+06	6.53579E+06	94.35072	94.35188	102076.47000		1.04E-03	
109.09269	-0.33492	T	6.52740E+06	6.52740E+06	94.67640	94.67838	102076.17000		8.16E-04	
109.25419		T	6.51884E+06	6.51884E+06	95.00156	95.00489	102075.87000		6.38E-04	
109.41568		T	6.51012E+06	6.51012E+06	95.32596	95.33142	102075.57000		4.99E-04	
109.57718		T	6.50126E+06	6.50126E+06	95.64932	95.65799	102075.27000	the second se	3.90E-04	
109.73867	-0.33779	Т	6.49224E+06	6.49224E+06	95.97128	95.98462	102074.96000		3.05E-04	
109.90016	-0.33851	Т	6.48311E+06	6.48311E+06	96.29149	96.31132	102074.66000		2.38E-04	
110.06166		T	6.47385E+06	6.47385E+06	96.60959	96.63810	102074.36000		1.86E-04	
110.22315	-0.33994	Т	6.46448E+06	6.46448E+06	96.92522	96.96498	102074.06000		1.45E-04	-
110.38465	-0.34066	Т	6.45500E+06	6.45500E+06	97.23805	97.29196	102073.76000		1.13E-04	-
110.54614		Т	6.44541E+06	6.44541E+06	97.54777	97.61905	102073.46000		8.80E-05	
110.70764		Т	6.43570E+06	6.43570E+06	97.85409		102073.16000		6.85E-05	
110.86913		Т	6.42590E+06				102072.85000			
111.03063	-0.34353	Т	6.41604E+06				102072.55000			
111.19212	-0.34425	Т	6.40613E+06	6.40613E+06	98.75014		102072.25000			
111.35362	-0.34497	Т	6.39614E+06	6.39614E+06		99.25634	102071.95000	91.64789	2.51E-05	7.45E-05
111.51512	-0.34568	Т	6.38610E+06	6.38610E+06	99.32628	99.58420	102071.65000	91.95018	1.95E-05	7.47E-05
111.67661	-0.34640	Т	6.37600E+06	6.37600E+06	99.60746		102071.34000		1.52E-05	7.50E-05
111.83811	-0.34712	Т	6.36583E+06	6.36583E+06	99.88383	100.24034	102071.04000	92.55518	1.18E-05	7.52E-05
111.99961	-0.34784	Т	6.35559E+06	6.35559E+06	100.15530	100.56863	102070.74000	92.85788	9.14E-06	7.55E-05
				lines	deleted					
258.43264	-0.99873	Т	3.18546E+06	3.18546E+06	50.72704	801.32800	101220.54000	943.05560	1.35E-15	1.39E-03
258.59483		Т	3.18540E+06	3.18540E+06			101219.46000			

Table 4.4-3. Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_coupling.dat. (Continued)

4.4.6.2 Tensile Failure of Waste Material

An excerpt from the stress output file (as formatted by Excel) is shown in Table 4.4-4. The header to this table gives information such as run time, cavity pressure, cavity radius, drilled radius, cavity volume, far-field pressure at the no-flow outer boundary (R = 19.2 m), and first intact zone. The first intact zone is defined as the repository computational cell corresponding to the intact cavity wall. Zones that are failed and fluidizing are considered intact until the fluidization process is complete. Below the header is a listing of repository cells in the vicinity of the cavity wall showing selected properties related to stress and material failure. Shown are the cell index, radius of the cell center relative to the origin of the repository domain, pore (gas) pressure, radial elastic stress, radial seepage stress, radial effective stress, logical flag for tensile failure, and fraction of the zone fluidized. Tensile strength for this test case is 0.12 MPa.

Acceptance Criterion 4-7 (Section 4.4.5.2) states that the radial effective stress must equal the sum of the component stresses. This criterion is checked by Excel calculations of the radial effective stress for every zone, shown as "*Excel EffStre*" (in italics) in Table 4.4-4. In each case, the DRSPALL-calculated radial effective stress EffStre is equal to the Excel-calculated stress (*Excel EffStre* = SeepStr + ElastStr – PorePres) for all digits shown. Thus, Acceptance Criterion 4-7 (Section 4.4.5.2) is met.

4.4.6.2.1 Stress and failure logic

Reviewing Table 4.4-4 allows for an examination of the logic that controls waste material failure due to stresses in the solid. Starting with the first intact zone 104, if radial effective stress is less than tensile strength ($T_s = -0.12$ MPa), the material is subject to failure. Section 8.4.3.2 of the *Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (WIPP PA 2003b) explains that negative stress denotes tension. Recall that failure is allowed only if the mean radial effective stress in the cells that cover the specified characteristic length, L_t , exceeds the tensile strength. For this problem, $L_t = 2$ cm or 11 zones for the region where zone size is constant at slightly less than 0.2 cm. Examination of the radial effective stress EffStre for zones 104-114 reveals that the mean stress = -4.2340E+05 Pa, which is less than $T_s = -0.12$ MPa, and the logical variable Failed is thus True for zones within the characteristic length. Zones beyond the characteristic length are not allowed to fail until all the zones within the characteristic length have fluidized. The Failed variable value of "T" (true) for zones 104-114 (within the characteristic length), and "F" (false) for zones 115-124 (outside the characteristic length) confirms that Acceptance Criterion 4-8 (Section 4.4.5.2) is met.

C: C: D C: Pf	untime(sec) avPres(Pa) avRadius(n rilledRad(n avityVol(m ff(Pa) rstIntactZo	$\begin{array}{rcl} &=& 5.47(\\ n) &=& 3.148\\ n) &=& 2.73(\\ \wedge 3) &=& 1.016\\ &=& 1.479\end{array}$	080283E+02 070376E+06 027842E-01 076705E-01 003354E-01 065369E+07					
Zone Index	Radius (m)	PorePres (Pa)	ElastStr (Pa)	SeepStr (Pa)	EffStre (Pa)	Excel EffStre (Pa)	Failed (T/F)	Fluidized (-)
94	0.295937	5.50255E+06	5.65951E+06	4.13257E+00	1.56962E+05	1.56962E+05	Т	1.00
95	0.297925	5.53753E+06	5.84331E+06	8.81201E+00	3.05783E+05	3.05783E+05	Т	1.00
96	0.299914	5.57201E+06	6.02226E+06	1.33505E+01	4.50269E+05	4.50269E+05	Т	1.00
97	0.301902	5.60565E+06	6.19653E+06	1.77529E+01	5.90903E+05	5.90903E+05	Т	1.00
98	0.303891	5.63846E+06	6.36627E+06	2.20241E+01	7.27838E+05	7.27838E+05	Т	1.00
99	0.305879	5.67046E+06		2.61687E+01	8.61193E+05	8.61193E+05	Т	1.00
100	0.307868	5.70170E+06	6.69274E+06	3.01913E+01	9.91075E+05	9.91075E+05	T	1.00
101	0.309856	5.73221E+06	6.84974E+06	3.40960E+01	1.11757E+06	1.11757E+06	Т	1.00
102	0.311845	5.76226E+06	7.00276E+06	3.78869E+01	1.24054E+06	1.24054E+06	Т	1.00
103	0.313834	5.79445E+06	7.15193E+06	4.15672E+01	1.35752E+06	1.35752E+06	Т	1.00
104	0.315822	5.47070E+06	5.47070E+06	-4.51746E+04	-4.51746E+04	-4.51746E+04	Т	0.00
105	0.317811	5.92116E+06	5.64660E+06		-3.62702E+05		Т	0.00
106	0.319799	6.13043E+06	5.81814E+06	-1.28458E+05			T	0.00
107	0.321788	6.28300E+06	5.98547E+06	-1.66932E+05			Т	0.00
108	0.323776	6.41925E+06	6.14872E+06	-2.03784E+05			Т	0.00
109	0.325765	6.54813E+06	6.30800E+06	-2.39119E+05			Т	0.00
110	0.327753	6.67183E+06	6.46344E+06	-2.73013E+05			Т	0.00
111	0.329742	6.79108E+06	6.61515E+06	-3.05530E+05			Т	0.00
112	0.331730	6.90624E+06	6.76325E+06	-3.36731E+05	-4.79723E+05	-4.79723E+05	Т	0.00
113	0.333719	7.01760E+06	6.90784E+06	-3.66674E+05	-4.76430E+05	-4.76430E+05	Т	0.00
114	0.335708	7.12537E+06	7.04902E+06	-3.95412E+05	-4.71754E+05	-4.71754E+05	Т	0.00
115	0.337696	7.22976E+06	7.18690E+06	-4.22997E+05			F	0.00
116	0.339685	7.33096E+06	7.32157E+06	-4.49476E+05		CALCULATION STRATEGICAL CONTRACTOR STRATEGICA	F	0.00
117	0.341673	7.42914E+06	7.45312E+06	-4.74896E+05		and the second state provides the second state state and	F	0.00
118	0.343662	7.52446E+06	7.58164E+06	-4.99300E+05			F	0.00
119	0.345650	7.61707E+06	7.70723E+06	-5.22729E+05			F	0.00
120	0.347639	7.70709E+06	7.82995E+06	-5.45224E+05			F	0.00
121	0.349627	7.79465E+06	7.94990E+06	-5.66821E+05			F	0.00
122	0.351616	7.87986E+06	8.06716E+06	-5.87556E+05			F	0.00
123	0.353604	7.96284E+06	8.18178E+06	-6.07463E+05			F	0.00
124	0.355593	8.04368E+06	8.29386E+06	-6.26575E+05			F	0.00

	Table 4.4-4.	Excerpt from	n drs 122 tc41	<i>stress.dat</i> , run time = 124.080 sec.
--	--------------	---------------------	----------------	---

4.4.6.2.2 Verification of stress calculations

The data from Table 4.4-4 was used to verify the stress calculations with Excel (Table 4.4-5). The DRSPALL pore pressure profile shown in Table 4.4-4 was used to calculate a stress profile, which is compared back to the stress profile calculated by DRSPALL. Table 4.4-5 displays the new stress profile calculations.

The header in Table 4.4-5 contains global properties such as Far-Field Stress, Tensile Strength, Poisson's Ratio, Geometry Index (2 = cylindrical, 3 = spherical), Far-Field Pressure, Biot's Beta,

and the prefactor which is a convenient coupling of terms to create an intermediate variable as follows:

$$prefactor = (m-1)\beta\left(\frac{1-2\nu}{1-\nu}\right)$$
(4.4.8)

The calculations start at the first intact zone 104 and are carried through to zone 124. The following notes apply:

- r_o/r denotes the ratio cavity radius to zone center radius
- The Radial Elastic Stress is calculated per Equation 4.4.3
- The Integral Over dr represents the integral in Equation 4.4.2 over one zone
- The sum is the integral over all zones from First Intact Zone to the given zone
- The Radial Seepage Stress is calculated by Equation 4.4.2
- The Radial Effective Stress is calculated by Equation 4.4.1

The Excel-calculated stress values are compared to DRSPALL values and the results appear in Table 4.4-6. The maximum relative difference was 9.01E-14 for Radial Elastic Stress, 1.09E-12 for Radial Seepage Stress, and 1.11E-12 for Radial Effective Stress. The small differences for the three stresses confirm that Acceptance Criterion 4-9 (Section 4.4.5.2) is met.

Table 4.4-5. Independent Excel calculations of stress profiles from pore pressure data obtained from Table 4.4-4.

		Far-field stress	1.4	900E+07		
		Tensile strength	1.20	000E+05		
		Poisson's ratio	3.8	000E-01		
		Geometry index		3		
		Far-field pressure	e 1.4'	797E+07		
		Biot Beta		000E+00		
		Prefactor		419E-01		
Zone Index	r _c /r	Radial Elastic Stress	Integral over dr	Sum	Radial Seepage Stress	Radial Effective Stress
104	1.0000000	5.470704E+06	-1.838115E+03	-1.838115E+03	-4.517464E+04	-4.517464E+04
105	0.9937430	5.646596E+06	-1.816171E+03	-3.654286E+03	-8.813467E+04	-3.627022E+05
106	0.9875638	5.818140E+06	-1.772526E+03	-5.426812E+03	-1.284583E+05	-4.407510E+05
107	0.9814610	5.985471E+06	-1.757721E+03	-7.184533E+03	-1.669320E+05	-4.644633E+05
108	0.9754331	6.148715E+06	-1.749671E+03	-8.934204E+03	-2.037841E+05	-4.743210E+05
109	0.9694789	6.307998E+06	-1.743497E+03	-1.067770E+04	-2.391194E+05	-4.792461E+05
110	0.9635969	6.463439E+06	-1.738103E+03	-1.241580E+04	-2.730127E+05	-4.814001E+05
111	0.9577858	6.615153E+06	-1.733218E+03	-1.414902E+04	-3.055298E+05	-4.814530E+05
112	0.9520444	6.763251E+06	-1.728757E+03	-1.587778E+04	-3.367312E+05	-4.797228E+05
113	0.9463714	6.907840E+06	-1.724677E+03	-1.760246E+04	-3.666740E+05	-4.764296E+05
114	0.9407657	7.049024E+06	-1.720948E+03	-1.932340E+04	-3.954121E+05	-4.717540E+05
115	0.9352259	7.186901E+06	-1.717545E+03	-2.104095E+04	-4.229966E+05	-4.658534E+05
116	0.9297510	7.321569E+06	-1.714446E+03	-2.275540E+04	-4.494758E+05	-4.588670E+05
117	0.9243399	7.453120E+06	-1.711630E+03	-2.446703E+04	-4.748957E+05	-4.509190E+05
118	0.9189913	7.581644E+06	-1.709081E+03	-2.617611E+04	-4.992996E+05	-4.421203E+05
119	0.9137043	7.707227E+06	-1.706781E+03	-2.788289E+04	-5.227292E+05	-4.325706E+05
120	0.9084778	7.829953E+06	-1.704716E+03	-2.958760E+04	-5.452237E+05	-4.223593E+05

Zone Index	r _c /r	Radial Elastic Stress	Integral over dr	Sum	Radial Seepage Stress	Radial Effective Stress
121	0.9033108	7.949903E+06	-1.702872E+03	-3.129047E+04	-5.668207E+05	-4.115667E+05
122	0.8982022	8.067155E+06	-1.701236E+03	-3.299171E+04	-5.875557E+05	-4.002654E+05
123	0.8931510	8.181784E+06	-1.699797E+03	-3.469151E+04	-6.074629E+05	-3.885207E+05
124	0.8881563	8.293864E+06	-1.698544E+03	-3.639005E+04	-6.265747E+05	-3.763916E+05

Table 4.4 5. Independent Excel calculations of stress profiles from pore pressure data obtained from Table 4.4 4. (Continued)

Table 4.4-6. Summary of differences between DRSPALL and Excel calculations for stress verification.

Zone	Radial Ela	stic Stress	Radial Seep	age Stress	Radial Effe	ctive Stress
Index	Absolute Diff	Relative Diff	Absolute Diff	Relative Diff	Absolute Diff	Relative Diff
104	0.000E+00	0.00E+00	4.938E-08	1.09E-12	4.993E-08	1.11E-12
105	1.695E-07	3.00E-14	9.577E-08	1.09E-12	4.761E-08	1.31E-13
106	2.813E-07	4.83E-14	1.389E-07	1.08E-12	2.226E-07	5.05E-13
107	5.392E-07	9.01E-14	1.789E-07	1.07E-12	3.501E-07	7.54E-13
108	1.034E-07	1.68E-14	3.149E-08	1.55E-13	1.750E-07	3.69E-13
109	1.397E-08	2.21E-15	7.066E-08	2.96E-13	3.027E-09	6.32E-15
110	2.477E-07	3.83E-14	1.090E-07	3.99E-13	4.849E-08	1.01E-13
111	3.884E-07	5.87E-14	1.398E-07	4.58E-13	2.191E-07	4.55E-13
112	5.392E-07	7.97E-14	1.683E-07	5.00E-13	3.402E-07	7.09E-13
113	1.024E-07	1.48E-14	4.738E-08	1.29E-13	1.200E-07	2.52E-13
114	1.248E-07	1.77E-14	7.747E-08	1.96E-13	5.763E-08	1.22E-13
115	2.729E-07	3.80E-14	1.125E-07	2.66E-13	1.199E-07	2.57E-13
116	4.312E-07	5.89E-14	1.329E-07	2.96E-13	2.972E-07	6.48E-13
117	1.248E-07	1.67E-14	3.626E-08	7.64E-14	1.302E-07	2.89E-13
118	3.818E-08	5.04E-15	6.013E-08	1.20E-13	5.239E-08	1.18E-13
119	1.332E-07	1.73E-14	8.586E-08	1.64E-13	6.804E-08	1.57E-13
120	2.384E-07	3.04E-14	1.051E-07	1.93E-13	1.527E-07	3.61E-13
121	4.303E-07	5.41E-14	1.311E-07	2.31E-13	2.992E-07	7.27E-13
122	4.098E-08	5.08E-15	4.878E-08	8.30E-14	6.967E-08	1.74E-13
123	9.779E-08	1.20E-14	7.311E-08	1.20E-13	5.541E-08	1.43E-13
124	2.161E-07	2.61E-14	9.057E-08	1.45E-13	4.488E-08	1.19E-13
Maximum	5.392E-07	9.01E-14	1.789E-07	1.09E-12	3.501E-07	1.11E-12

4.4.6.3 Fluidized Bed Transport of Disaggregated Waste Material

An excerpt from the fluidization output file (formatted in Excel) is shown in Table 4.4-7. The header to this table gives information such as run time, cavity pressure, cavity radius, gas density in the cavity, minimum fluidization velocity, superficial gas velocity at the cavity wall, mass of waste in well, and the first intact zone. The first intact zone is defined as the repository computational cell corresponding to the intact cavity wall. Zones that are failed and fluidizing are considered intact until the fluidization process is complete. Below the header is a listing of repository cells in the vicinity of the cavity wall showing selected properties related to fluidization: cell index, radius of the cell center relative to the origin of the repository domain, logical flags for failure of the cell completed, fluidization started, and fluidization completed, and the fraction of the cell fluidized. A value of -1.0 in the Fraction Fluidized column indicates that



Cav Cav Gas Flui Sup Wa	ntime (sec) vity Pressure (Pa) vity Radius (m) s Density (kg/m^3) idization Velocity perficial Gas Veloc (First Intact Zon ste In Well (kg) stIntactZone	= 5.516316 $= 3.367017$ $= 4.467293$ $(m) = 2.773254$ Sity (m) $= 5.068605$	58699803E+02 58803599E+06 79085049E-01 32317824E+00 42845385E-01 54509911E-01 59478159E+01		
Cell Index	Radius (m)	Failure Completed (T/F)	Fluidization Start (T/F)	Fluidization Complete (T/F)	Fraction Fluidized
105	0.3178107	Т	Т	Т	1
106	0.3197992	Т	Т	Т	1
107	0.3217877	Т	Т	Т	1
108	0.3237763	Т	Т	Т	1
109	0.3257648	Т	Т	Т	1
110	0.3277534	Т	Т	Т	1
111	0.3297419	Т	Т	Т	1
112	0.3317304	Т	Т	Т	1
113	0.3337190	Т	Т	Т	1
114	0.3357075	Т	Т	Т	1
115	0.3376961	Т	Т	F	0.0001
116	0.3396846	Т	Т	F	0.0001
117	0.3416731	Т	Т	F	0.0001
118	0.3436617	T	Т	F	0
119	0.3456502	F	F	F	0
120	0.3476388	F	F	F	0
121	0.3496273	F	F	F	0
122	0.3516158	F	F	F	0
123	0.3536044	F	F	F	0
124	0.3555929	F	F	F	0
125	0.3575815	F	F	F	0
126	0.3595700	F	F	F	0
127	0.3615586	F	F	F	0
128	0.3635471	F	F	F	0
129	0.3655356	F	F	F	0
130	0.3675242	F	F	F	0
131	0.3695127	F	F	F	0
132	0.3715013	F	F	F	0
133	0.3734898	F	F	F	0
134	0.3754783	F	F	F	0
135	0.3774669	F	F	F	0

Table 4.4-7. Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_fluidization.dat, run time = 124.67269 sec.

the cell was removed by drilling, while a 1.0 indicates that the zone was removed by tensile failure and fluidized bed transport.

4.4.6.3.1 Fluidization logic

At the point in the code execution shown in Table 4.4-7, 114 computational cells in the repository have been removed and transported into the cavity and wellbore by a combination of

drilling and tensile failure/fluidization. The first intact zone that forms the cavity wall is cell 115. Zones 105-114 were completely removed by tensile failure and fluidization (Fraction Fluidized = 1.0). Zones 115-118 have failed in tension (Failure Completed = T), and zones 115-117 are currently fluidizing (Fraction Fluidized > 0). In order for zones to fluidize, the superficial gas velocity at the cavity wall must exceed the minimum fluidization velocity. The header in Table 4.4-7 confirms that the Superficial Gas Velocity at the first intact zone (115) =0.5069 m/s, while the Fluidization Velocity = 0.2773 m/s. As such, the failed zone 115 is subject to fluidization, and fluidization is currently in process. Acceptance Criterion 4-10 (Section 4.4.5.3) is met because the Fluidization Start = "T" (true) in zone 115 confirms that fluidization has started in the first intact zone. Zones must complete fluidization in sequence such that zone 116 cannot completely fluidize until after zone 115 has completely fluidized. Also, zones require a finite time to fluidize. The progress of a particular zone through the fluidization process is given by the fraction fluidized, which varies from 0.0 (not fluidized) to 1.0 (fully fluidized). Notice that zones 115-117 are just starting to fluidize in Table 4.4-7 (run time 124.67269, line 4871 in drs 122 tc41 fluidization.dat). These zones are fully fluidized at run time 125.34018 sec (line 5135 in drs 122 tc41 fluidization.dat).

4.4.6.3.2 Verification of fluidization velocity

Data from Table 4.4-7 were imported into an EXCEL spreadsheet (Table 4.4-8) in order to verify proper calculation of Ergun's minimum fluidization velocity (Equation 4.4.5). The dependent variable in Ergun's formula is U_{f_2} which can be solved for by the quadratic formula:

$$AU_{f}^{2} + BU_{f} + C = 0 ag{4.4.9}$$

$$U_f = \frac{-B \pm \sqrt{B^2 - 4AC}}{2A}$$
(4.4.10)

Equation 4.4.5 was rearranged to form the constants A, B, and C, defined in Equation 4.4.9, which are evaluated in Table 4.4-8. The final lines in Table 4.4-8 compare the fluidization velocity calculated by Excel to that calculated by DRSPALL for the given input conditions. The relative difference evaluated to 1.30E-14. This small relative difference is less than 1E-4, so **Acceptance Criterion 4-11** (Section 4.4.5.3) is met.

4.4.6.3.3 Verification of fluidization time

The Excel calculation of the fluidization time is shown in Table 4.4-9. For the given conditions, the fluidization time using parameters from run time = 124.67267 sec was $t_f = 0.666$ seconds. For comparison, the fluidization time, t_f provided in output file drs_{122} tc41 fluidization_time.dat for zone 115 is 0.665 sec (Figure 4.4-6).

Parameter	Value	Units
run time	1.2467269E+02	sec
gas density	4.4672932E+00	kg/m ³
porosity	5.7500000E-01	-
waste density	2.6500000E+03	kg/m ³
gas viscosity	8.9339000E-06	Pa*sec
particle diameter	1.000000E-03	m
shape factor	2.500000E-01	-
gravity	9.8067000E+00	m/sec ²
a	9.2066419E+06	
b	2.6828724E+06	
с	-1.4521060E+06	
b ² -4ac	6.0673883E+13	
Excel fluidization velocity	0.27732543	m/s
DRSPALL fluidization velocity	0.27732543	m/s
Relative difference	1.30E-14	

Table 4.4-8. Excel solution for minimum fluidization velocity U_{f} .

Confirmation of proper implementation of t_f in DRSPALL is possible by examining the amount of time required to completely fluidize zone 115 that started to fluidize near run time = 124.67267 sec. The reporting frequency in $drs_122_tc41_fluidization.dat$ is not sufficient to capture both the beginning and ending of fluidization for zone 115, but the report of fraction fluidized at two times may be used to extrapolate an approximate fluidization time. This strategy is shown in the lower half of Table 4.4-9, with runtime #1 and runtime #2 representing the two selected run time reports from which the fluidization time is extrapolated. The projected fluidization time from this coarse method is 0.646 sec. This compares favorably with the values calculated by Excel ($t_f = 0.666$ sec) and from output file $drs_122_tc41_fluidization_time.dat$ (Figure 4.4-6, zone 115, $t_f = 0.665$).

Parameter	Value	Units
run time	124.67267	sec
radius to center of first intact cell	0.3376961	m
superficial gas velocity	0.5071014	m/sec
fluidization time	0.6659340	sec
From drs_122_tc41_fluidization.dat		
runtime #1	124.67267	sec
fraction fluidized #1	0.00010	-
runtime #2	124.67274	sec
fraction fluidized #2	0.00020	-
projected fluidization time	0.646	sec

Table 4.4-9. Excel solution for fluidization time, t_f .

Informa[®]ion Only

	•	_122_tc41_fluidization_time.dat	
Program D	R_SPALL - WIPP PA 2003		
ASCII Out	put file for Test Case #4		
Zone	Fluidization Time		
71	4.65E-01		
72	2.93E-01		
line	s deleted		
114	5.25E-01		
115	6.65E-01		
116	4.00E-01		
line	s deleted		
311	1.26E+00		
312	1.30E+00		

Figure 4.4-6. Fluidization time values from drs_122_tc41_fluidization_time.dat.

4.4.6.3.4 Verification of drilling and spall volumes and masses

The Excel calculations of waste volumes and masses removed from the repository due to drilling and spall (failure and fluidization) are shown in Table 4.4-10. The table also gives the values that were extracted from the diagnostics file and the output CAMDAT file. The difference in CAVRAD0 between the diagnostics and CAMDAT files is due the precision in the displayed number not the actual value. The maximum relative difference evaluated to 4.31E-06 for SPLMASS. This small relative difference is less than 1E-4, so Acceptance Criterion 4-12 (Section 4.4.5.3) is met.

CAMDAT Variable	Description	Diagnostics File	Output CAMDAT File	Excel Calculation	Relative Difference
CAVRAD0	Initial pseudo-cavity radius	1.100E-01	1.10008E-01	1.10008E-01	2.29E-08
CUTMASS	Cuttings mass	2.60780E+02	2.60779E+02	2.60779E+02	2.36E-06
TOTMASS	Total mass	8.35980E+02	8.35976E+02	8.35978E+02	2.23E-06
SPLMASS	Spall mass	5.75200E+02	5.75197E+02	5.75200E+02	4.31E-06
SPL2MASS	Incremental spall mass	8.02610E+02	8.02610E+02	8.02608E+02	2.36E-06
CUTVOLEQ	Equivalent uncompacted cuttings volume	6.56050E-01	6.56048E-01	6.56047E-01	2.34E-06
TOTVOLEQ	Equivalent uncompacted total volume	2.10310E+00	2.10309E+00	2.10309E+00	2.21E-06
SPLVOLEQ	Equivalent uncompacted spall volume	1.44700E+00	1.44704E+00	1.44704E+00	4.28E-06
SPLVOL2EQ	Equivalent uncompacted incremental spall volume	2.01910E+00	2.01915E+00	2.01914E+00	2.38E-06

Table 4.4-10. Drilling and spall volumes and masses from output CAMDAT file.

4.4.6.4 Expulsion of Disaggregated Waste Material

Excerpts from the expulsion output file (as formatted by Excel) show data at various run times as follows:

- a) Table 4.4-11 shows data near the time of penetration (run time = 33.2 to 34.8 sec).
- b) Table 4.4-12 shows data exhibiting early waste expulsion (run time = 113.5 to 115.3 sec).
- c) Table 4.4-13 shows late time waste expulsion data approaching steady conditions (run time = 404.0 to 405.7 sec).

4.4.6.4.1 Near bit penetration

Table 4.4-11 shows the expulsion data at several times near bit penetration at 33.9 sec. Prior to bit penetration, the logical variable Repository Penetrated = "F" (false), and no zones have been removed from the repository. Also, all of the waste mass accounting variables (i.e., total waste in well) are zero, and the waste position in the well is -653 m, representing the well bottom. After bit penetration, the number of zones removed increases monotonically due to drilling. The drill bit must completely penetrate a zone before that zone is removed from the repository, so there is a time lag between bit penetration (33.9 sec) and the removal of the first zone (34.5 sec). Mass Waste Removed is the sum of Waste in Store + Total Waste In Well + Waste Mass Ejected. Waste Mass Ejected is still zero since it has not had time to transport 653 m to the land surface, and Waste Position In Well shows that the location of the waste front moves upward with time.

Runtime (sec)	Repository Penetrated (T/F)	Zones Removed (-)	Mass Waste Removed (kg)	Waste In Store (kg)	Total Waste In Well (kg)	Waste Mass Ejected (kg)	Waste Position In Well (m)	Mass Balance Error (-)
33.20878	F	0	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	-653.0	0.00E+00
33.37025	F	0	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	-653.0	0.00E+00
33.53172	F	0	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	-653.0	0.00E+00
33.69319	F	0	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	-653.0	0.00E+00
33.85467	Т	0	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	-653.0	0.00E+00
34.01614	Т	0	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	-653.0	0.00E+00
34.17761	Т	0	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	-653.0	0.00E+00
34.33908	Т	0	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	-653.0	0.00E+00
34.50055	Т	1	0.17339	0.11157	0.06182	0.00000	-651.0	7.20E-16
34.66203	Т	1	0.17339	0.06056	0.11284	0.00000	-649.0	6.80E-16
34.82350	Т	1	0.17339	0.03273	0.14066	0.00000	-648.0	8.36E-15

Table 4.4-11. Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_expulsion.dat near the time of penetration.

4.4.6.4.2 Early waste expulsion at surface

Table 4.4-12 shows the expulsion data near the time of the first arrival of waste solids at the land surface. Note that the position of the waste front in the well approaches z = 0 with time, and waste is first expelled at the surface at about 114.7 seconds. The Waste Mass Ejected variable reflects a time integral at the wellbore outlet, and the leading "tail" of the waste causes this variable to compute small but nonzero releases prior to the arrival of the "front" defined by Waste Position in Well. The mass balance error in this table is defined as the absolute value of



[Mass Waste Removed – (Waste In Store + Total Waste In Well + Waste Mass Ejected)] / Mass Waste Removed.

Runtime	Repository Penetrated	Zones Removed	Mass Waste Removed	Waste In Store	Total Waste In Well	Waste Mass Ejected	Waste Position In	Mass Balance
(sec)	(T/F)	(-)	(kg)	(kg)	(kg)	(kg)	Well (m)	Error (-)
113.53477	Т	81	43.84768	0.00029	43.83104	0.01635	-29.1	6.49E-13
113.69626	Т	81	43.84768	0.00022	43.82632	0.02114	-25.1	6.43E-13
113.85776	Т	81	43.84768	0.00017	43.82042	0.02709	-21.0	6.40E-13
114.01926	T	81	43.84768	0.00013	43.81313	0.03441	-17.0	6.48E-13
114.18076	Т	81	43.84768	0.00010	43.80423	0.04335	-12.0	6.61E-13
114.34226	Т	81	43.84768	0.00008	43.79345	0.05415	-6.0	6.56E-13
114.50376	Т	81	43.84768	0.00006	43.78052	0.06709	-2.0	6.50E-13
114.66526	Т	81	43.84768	0.00005	43.76516	0.08247	0.0	6.56E-13
114.82676	Т	81	43.84768	0.00004	43.74706	0.10058	0.0	6.48E-13
114.98825	T	81	43.84768	0.00003	43.72592	0.12173	0.0	6.56E-13
115.14975	Т	81	43.84768	0.00002	43.70142	0.14623	0.0	6.48E-13
115.31125	Т	81	43.84768	0.00002	43.67327	0.17439	0.0	6.44E-13

 Table 4.4-12. Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_expulsion.dat near the time of early waste expulsion at land surface.

4.4.6.4.3 Late time waste expulsion

Table 4.4-13 shows expulsion data at late time (run time > 404 sec) showing steady state behavior with a total of 301 zones removed, corresponding to 836.0 kg of waste removed from the repository and an identical 836.0 kg of waste expelled to the surface. The mass balance error is reported as 6.69E-12.

Table 4.4-13.	Excerpt from drs_122_tc41_expulsion.dat at late time nearing steady	r
	conditions.	

Runtime (sec)	Repository Penetrated (T/F)	Zones Removed (-)	Mass Waste Removed (kg)	Waste In Store (kg)	Total Waste In Well (kg)	Waste Mass Ejected (kg)	Waste Position In Well (m)	Mass Balance Error (-)
404.01292	Т	301	835.97639	9.80E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
404.17662	Т	301	835.97639	9.12E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
404.34033	Т	301	835.97639	8.49E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
404.50403	Т	301	835.97639	7.90E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
404.66774	Т	301	835.97639	7.35E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
404.83145	Т	301	835.97639	6.84E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
404.99516	Т	301	835.97639	6.36E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
405.15887	Т	301	835.97639	5.92E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
405.32258	Т	301	835.97639	5.51E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
405.48630	Т	301	835.97639	5.12E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12
405.65001	Т	301	835.97639	4.77E-41	-1.22E-11	835.97639	-653.0	6.69E-12

4.4.6.4.4 Summary

The acceptance criteria for the expulsion of disaggregated waste material will be confirmed by examining *drs_122_tc41_expulsion.dat* (excerpts of which are shown in Table 4.4-11, Table 4.4-12, and Table 4.4-13). Waste Position In Well decreases from -653 to 0, so Acceptance



Criterion 4-13 (Section 4.4.5.4) is met. Waste Mass Ejected is very small (< 0.08 kg) before z = 0 (when Waste Position in Well reaches 0), then it monotonically increases, confirming the **Acceptance Criterion 4-14** (Section 4.4.5.4) is met. The Mass Balance Error is small ($\leq 6.69E-12$) for all times, so **Acceptance Criterion 4-15** (Section 4.4.5.4) is met.

4.4.6.5 External Interfaces

The output CAMDAT file from Case 4.1 was successfully examined with GROPECDB in the analysis presented above (Section 4.4.6.1), confirming that the output file is in the proper CAMDAT file format, so Acceptance Criterion 4-17 (Section 4.4.5.5) is met.

Case 4.2 is the only test case that reads data from an input CAMDAT file. The GROPECDB excerpt of all properties of the input CAMDAT file for Case 4.2 is shown in Figure 4.4-7. The input control file for Case 4.2 is shown in Figure 4.4-8. Many of the inputs are from properties on the input CAMDAT file; some values are explicitly specified; and some are set to DEFAULT. The excerpt of the diagnostics file for Case 4.2 is shown in Figure 4.4-9. An examination of this file confirms that the DRSPALL parameters are being read correctly from the input control file and the input CAMDAT file.

The diagnostics file echoes the input file (not shown in Figure 4.4-9), then echoes the input file with numeric values replacing all CAMDAT properties and DEFAULT values, then lists the parameters used in the run. Note that under "Parameters used in this run", the parameters are listed in order within category in the input control file, as explained in the DRSPALL user's manual (WIPP PA 2004, 2013, and 2015a). The parameter identifier in the input control file is just a comment and may not match the identifier in the diagnostics file.

When a CAMDAT property is referenced in the input control file, its value matches the value listed in the diagnostics file with one exception: Exit Pipe Diameter under "Parameters used in this run". When a value is explicitly specified in the input control file, the value matches the value listed in the diagnostics file with two exceptions: Total Thickness and First Wellbore Zone under "Parameters used in this run". Note that the "Input Echo (with numeric values)" always lists the input values. The calculations below apply to "Parameters used in this run" only.

Exit Pipe Diameter is read from CAMDAT property DRSPALL:EXITPDIA (0.2032), but there is no exit pipe, i.e., the Exit Pipe Length (DRSPALL:EXITPLEN) is zero. The Exit Pipe Diameter is overwritten with the annulus diameter. The annulus diameter is calculated with the Bit Diameter (DRSPALL:BITDIAM) = 0.31115 and Pipe Diameter (DRSPALL:PIPEDIAM) = 0.11430. Thus, the Exit Pipe Diameter is calculated as follows:

ExitPipeDiameter =
$$2\sqrt{\frac{\pi(BitDiameter/2)^2 - \pi(PipeDiameter/2)^2}{\pi}} = 0.2894$$

Total Thickness is specified as 0.0 by the user, so it is calculated internally from the initial repository height (H = constant 3.96), the uncompacted waste porosity (φ_u = constant 0.85) and the input initial waste porosity (φ_i = 0.575 = DRSPALL:REPIPOS) as follows:

$$T_{rep} = H\left(\frac{1-\varphi_u}{1-\varphi_i}\right) = 3.96\left(\frac{1-0.85}{1-0.575}\right) = 1.3976$$

First Wellbore Zone is a flag indicating whether downward flow inside of the pipe is modeled. If the input value is greater than zero (only the flow up the annulus is modeled), First Wellbore Zone is set to the index of the computational cell at the bottom of wellbore, or 651 for this problem.

Tensile Velocity, Bit Nozzle Number, Bit Nozzle Diameter, and Choke Efficiency request DEFAULT values in the input control file. The default values as specified in the DRSPALL user's manual (WIPP PA 2004, 2013, and 2015a) are: 1000.0, 3.0, 0.011112, and 0.9, respectively.

CAMDAT File: /home/run_mast/Test_Run/DRSPALL/DRSPALL/Input/drs_tc42_ms.cdb
PROPERTIES
Element Block 1) "GLOBAL " 1=ID 1 elements (11)
Element Block 2) "DRSPALL " 2=ID 0 elements SURFELEV REPOSTOP REPOSTCK DRZTCK DRZPERM REPOTRAD 1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.4200E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 REPIPRES FFPORPRS FFSTRESS REPIPOR REPIPERM BIOTBETA 1.4800E+07 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.0000E+00 POISRAT COHESION FRICTANG TENSLSTR PARTDIAM GASBSDEN 3.800E-01 1.3000E+05 4.5800E+01 1.2000E+05 1.0000E-03 8.2000E-02 GASVISCO INITMDEN MUDVISCO ANNUROUG MUDSOLMX MUDSOLVE 8.9339E-06 1.2100E+03 1.1000E-02 3.9400E-04 6.1500E-01 -1.5000E+00 BITDIAM PIPEDIAM COLRDIAM PIPEID COLRLNGT DRILRATE 3.1115E-01 1.1430E-01 2.0320E-01 9.7180E-02 1.8290E+02 4.4450E-03 INITBAR MUDPRATE DDZTHICK DDZPERM STPDVOLR STPPVOLR 1.5000E-01 2.0181E-02 <
2.0320E-01 2.7500E+07 Element Block 3) "REFCON " 3=ID 0 elements PI GRAVACC 3.1416E+00 9.8067E+00 Element Block 4) "BLOWOUT " 4=ID 0 elements RGAS TREPO RHOS 4.1160E+03 3.0000E+02 2.6500E+03 Element Block 5) "BRINESAL" 5=ID 0 elements COMPRES

Figure 4.4-7. Properties from input CAMDAT file drs_tc42_ms.cdb for Case 4.2.

REPOSITORY Land Elevation (m): DRSPALL SURFELEV	
Repository top (m): DRSPALL REPOSTOP	
Total Thickness (m): 0.0	
DRZ Thickness (m): DRSPALL DRZTCK	
DRZ Permeability (m ²): DRSPALL DRZPERM	
Outer Radius (m): 1.9200E+01	
Far-Field In-Situ Stress (m): DRSPALL FFSTRESS	
WASTE	
Porosity (-): DRSPALL REPIPOR	
Permeability (m ²): DRSPALL REPIPERM	
Forchheimer Beta (-): DRSPALL FRCHBETA	
Biot Beta (-): DRSPALL BIOTBETA	
Poisson's Ratio (-): DRSPALL POISRAT	
Cohesion (Pa): DRSPALL COHESION	
Cohesion(Pa):DRSPALL COHESIONFriction Angle(deg):DRSPALL FRICTANG	
Tensile Strength (Pa): DRSPALL TENSLSTR	
Lt (m): 0.02 Particle Diameter (m): DRSPALL PARTDIAM	
Gas Viscosity (Pa-s): DRSPALL GASVISCO	
Gas VISCOSICY (Pa-S): DRSPALL GASVISCO	
MUD	
Density (kg/m ³): DRSPALL INITMDEN	
Viscosity (Pa-s): DRSPALL MUDVISCO	
Wall Roughness Pipe (m): DRSPALL PIPEROUG	
Wall Roughness Annulus (m) · DRSPALL ANNUROUG	
Max Solids Vol. Frac. (Pa-s): DRSPALL MUDSOLMX	
Solids Viscosity Exp. (Pa-s): DRSPALL MUDSOLVE	
WELLBORE/DRILLING	
Bit Diameter (m): DRSPALL BITDIAM	
Pipe Diameter (m): DRSPALL PIPEDIAM	
Collar Diameter (m): DRSPALL COLRDIAM	
Pipe Inside Diameter (m): DRSPALL PIPEID	
Collar Length (m): DRSPALL COLRLNGT	
Exit pipe Length (m): DRSPALL EXITPLEN	
Exit Pipe Diameter (m): DRSPALL EXITPDIA	
Drilling Rate (m/s): DRSPALL DRILRATE	
Bit Above Respository(init.) (m): DRSPALL INITBAR	
Mud Pump Rate (m ³ /s): DRSPALL MUDPRATE	
Max Pump Pressure (Pa): 27.5d6	
DDZ Thickness (m): DRSPALL DDZTHICK	
DDZ Permeability (m ²): DRSPALL DDZPERM	
Stop Drill Exit Vol Rate (m ³ /s): DRSPALL STPDVOLR	
Stop Pump Exit Vol Rate (m ³ /s): DRSPALL STPPVOLR	
Stop Drilling Time (s): DRSPALL STPDTIME	

Figure 4.4-8. Input control file drs_v122_tc42.drs for Case 4.2.

COMPUTATIONAL	
Spherical/Cylindrical	(S/C): S
Allow Fluidization	(Y/N): Y
Max Run Time	(s): 1.0
Respository Cell Length	(m): 0.002
	(m,-): 0.5, 1.0 !V1.22 growth always 1, was 1.03
Wellbore Cell Length	Provide to compare the
	e (-): 1.0 !V1.22 growth always 1, was 1.01
First wellbore Zone	
Well Stability factor	
Repository Stability fact	tor (-): 5.0
Mass Diffusion factor	(-): 0.002
Momentum Diffusion factor	c (-): 0.002
VALIDATION	
Validation Test Case	(-): 4.2
PARAMETERS	
Pi	(-): REFCON PI
Atmospheric Pressure	(Pa): 1.0170E+05
gravity	(m/s ²): REFCON GRAVACC
	(J/kg K): BLOWOUT RGAS
Repository Temperature	(K): BLOWOUT TREPO
Water Compressibility	(1/Pa): 12.4e-10
	(kg/m ³): BLOWOUT RHOS
	$(kg/m^3): 2.1800E+3$
Shape Factor	(-): DRSPALL SHAPEFAC
Tensile Velocity	(m/s): DEFAULT
Bit Nozzle Number	(-): DEFAULT
Bit Nozzle Diameter	(m): DEFAULT
Choke Efficiency	(-): DEFAULT

Figure 4.4-8. Input control file drs_v122_tc42.drs for Case 4.2. (Continued)



Verification and Validation Plan / Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.22

ERMS # 562643 April 2015

Input Echo (with numeric value				
REPOSITORY				
surfaceElevation		1.037300E+03	!!DRSPALL	VELEGATION
repositoryTop		3.853100E+02		
repositoryThickness		0.0		KHI OD I OI
dRZThickness	:	8.500000E-01	!!DRSPALL	הספתכע
dRZPerm		1.000000E-15	!!DRSPALL	
repositoryOuterRadius		1.9200E+01	: :DRSFADD	DIGHERIN
repositoryInitialPressure		1.480000E+07	!!DRSPALL	DEDIDDEC
farFieldStress			! !DRSPALL	
WASTE	•	1.49000004407	: DKSFADD	FFSIKESS
repositoryInitialPorosity	:	5.750000E-01	!!DRSPALL	PEDIDAP
repositoryInitialPerm	:		!!DRSPALL	
forchBeta	:		!!DRSPALL	
biotBeta	:	1.000000E+00	!!DRSPALL	
poissonsRatio		3.800000E-01	!!DRSPALL	
cohesion	:		!!DRSPALL	
frictionAngle	:		! !DRSPALL	
tensileStrength	:		! !DRSPALL	
Lt		0.02	: IDKSPALL	TENSUSIK
particleDiameter		1.000000E-03	!!DRSPALL	אקדרוייים אמ
gasViscosity			! !DRSPALL	
MUD	•	8.933900E-06	I IDRSPALL	GABVISCO
initialMudDensity		1.210000E+03	!!DRSPALL	TNTTMDEN
mudViscosity	:		!!DRSPALL	
wallRoughness(1)		5.000000E-05	! !DRSPALL	
		3.940000E-04	!!DRSPALL	
mudSolidsMax		6.150000E-01	!!DRSPALL	
mudSolidsViscosityExponent		-1.500000E+00	!!DRSPALL	
WELL	·	1.5000001100		HODDOLIVE
bitDiameter	:	3.111500E-01	!!DRSPALL	BTTDTAM
pipeDiameter		1.143000E-01	! !DRSPALL	
collarDiameter	:		!!DRSPALL	
pipeInsideDiameter		9.718000E-02	!!DRSPALL	
collarLength	:		! !DRSPALL	
exitPipeLength		0.000000E+00	! !DRSPALL	
exitPipeDiameter	:		! !DRSPALL	
drillingRate			!!DRSPALL	
initialBitAboveRepository	-		! !DRSPALL	
mudPumpRate		2.018100E-02	! !DRSPALL	and a state of the
maxPumpPressure	:	27.5D6		
dDZThickness	:	1.600000E-01	!!DRSPALL	DDZTHICK
dDZPerm		1.000000E-14	!!DRSPALL	
stopDrillingExitVolRate	:	1.000000E+03	!!DRSPALL	
stopPumpingExitVolRate		1.000000E+03	!!DRSPALL	
stopDrillingTime	:	1.000000E+03	!!DRSPALL	
COMPUTATIONAL				
geometry	:	S		
allowFluidization	:	- Y		
maxTime		1.0		
initialReposZoneSize		0.002		
radius, growthRate	:	0.5, 1.0 !V1.22	GROW	
initialWellZoneSize	:	1.0	Language (1999) (2019) (1999)	
wellGRowthRate	:	1.0		
firstWellZone	:	10		
wellStabilityFactor	:	0.02		
and a second	D.	over and TWO PA		

Figure 4.4-9. Excerpts from drs_122_tc42.dbg, diagnostics file for Case 4.2

reposStabilityFactor	: 5.0			
massDiffusionFactor	: 0.00	02		
momentumDiffusionFactor	: 0.00	02		
VALIDATION				
ValidationTestCase	: 4.2			
PARAMETER				
Pi		L41593E+00	!!REFCON PI	
AtmosphericPressure		170E+05		
gravity			!!REFCON GRAVE	
GasConstant		L16000E+03		
ReposTemp		000000E+02	!!BLOWOUT TREE	20
WaterCompressibility	: 12.4			
WasteDensity		550000E+03	!!BLOWOUT RHOS	3
SaltDensity		300E+3		
ShapeFactor		500000E-01	!!DRSPALL SHAP	PEFAC
TensileVelocity		00000E+03	! ! DEFAULT	
BitNozzleNumber		000000E+00		
BitNozzleDiameter		L11250E-02		
ChokeEfficiency	: 9.0	00000E-01	! IDEFAULT	
VALIDATION TEST CASE: 4	SUBCASE:	2		
VALUEATION TEST CASE. 4	DODCADE.	2		
*****	******	****	*****	*****
PARAMETERS USED IN THIS RUN				
		the second s	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	******
*****	*******	********		
	******	* * * * * * * * * * * *		
REPOSITORY				
REPOSITORY Land Elevation	(m) :	1.0373E+03		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top	(m) : (m) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness	(m) : (m) : (m) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness	(m) : (m) : (m) : (m) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01		
**************************************	(m) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m ²) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius	(m) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m^2) : (m) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability	(m) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m^2) : (m) : (m) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure	(m) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m^2) : (m) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE	(m) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m^2) : (m) : (m) : (m) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity	(m) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m^2) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability	(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m):	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Duter Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta	(m) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m ²) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m) : (m ²) : (m ²) :	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Fotal Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Duter Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta	(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m^2): (-):	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Duter Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio	(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-):	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Duter Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion	(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-): (-): (Pa):	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle	<pre>(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m</pre>	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 4.5800E+01		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength	<pre>(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m</pre>	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 4.5800E+01 1.2000E+05		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt	<pre>(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m</pre>	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 4.5800E+01 1.2000E+05 2.0000E-02		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt Particle Diameter	<pre>(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-): (-): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa): (m):</pre>	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 4.5800E+01 1.2000E+05 2.0000E-03		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Duter Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt Particle Diameter	<pre>(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m</pre>	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 4.5800E+01 1.2000E+05 2.0000E-02		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt Particle Diameter Gas Viscosity	<pre>(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-): (-): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa): (m):</pre>	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 4.5800E+01 1.2000E+05 2.0000E-03		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt Particle Diameter Gas Viscosity MUD	<pre>(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-): (-): (Pa): (deg): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa-s):</pre>	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 4.5800E+01 1.2000E+05 2.0000E-03 8.9339E-06		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt Particle Diameter Gas Viscosity MUD Density	<pre>(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-): (-): (Pa): (deg): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa-s):</pre>	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 2.0000E-03 8.9339E-06 1.2100E+03		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt Particle Diameter Gas Viscosity WUD Density Viscosity	(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-): (-): (Pa): (deg): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa-s):	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 2.0000E-02 1.0000E-03 8.9339E-06		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt Particle Diameter Gas Viscosity WUD Density Viscosity Wall Roughness Pipe	(m): (m): (m): (m): (m2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-): (-): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa-s): (Pa-s): (m):	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 2.0000E-03 8.9339E-06 1.2100E+03 1.1000E-02 5.0000E-05		
REPOSITORY Land Elevation Repository top Total Thickness DRZ Thickness DRZ Permeability Outer Radius Initial Gas Pressure Far-Field In-Situ Stress WASTE Porosity Permeability Forchheimer Beta Biot Beta Poissons Ratio Cohesion Friction Angle Tensile Strength Failure Characteristic Lengt Particle Diameter Gas Viscosity WUD Density Viscosity	(m): (m): (m): (m): (m^2): (m): (m): (m): (m): (m): (-): (-): (-): (-): (Pa): (deg): (Pa): (Pa): (Pa-s):	1.0373E+03 3.8531E+02 1.3976E+00 8.5000E-01 1.0000E-15 1.9200E+01 1.4800E+07 1.4900E+07 5.7500E-01 1.7000E-13 1.1500E-06 1.0000E+00 3.8000E-01 1.3000E+05 2.0000E-03 8.9339E-06 1.2100E+03 1.1000E-02 5.0000E-05 3.9400E-04		

Figure 4.4-9. Excerpts from drs_122_tc42.dbg, diagnostics file for Case 4.2. (Continued)

WELLBORE/DRILLING		
Bit Diameter	(m) :	3.1115E-01
Pipe Diameter	(m) :	1.1430E-01
Collar Diameter	(m) :	2.0320E-01
Pipe Inside Diameter	(m):	9.7180E-02
Collar Length	(m) :	1.8290E+02
Exit Pipe Length	(m) :	0.0000E+00
Exit Pipe Diameter	(m) :	2.8940E-01
Drilling Rate		4.4450E-03
Bit Above Respository		1.5000E-01
Mud Pump Rate		2.0181E-02
Max Pump Pressure		2.7500E+07
DDZ Thickness		1.6000E-01
DDZ Permeability		1.0000E-14
		1.0000E+03
Stop Pump Exit Vol Rate		1.0000E+03
Stop Drilling Time	(s):	1.0000E+03
COMPUTATIONAL	(7 (7)	-
Spherical/Cylindrical	(S/C):	
Allow Fluidization	(Y/N/A):	
Max Run Time		1.0000E+00
Respository Cell Length	(m):	2.0000E-03
Radius, Growth Rate Wellbore Cell Length	(m, -):	0.500 1.000 1.0000E+00
Wellbore Cell Growth Rate		
First Wellbore Zone	(-):	
Well Stability factor		2.0000E-02
Repository Stability factor	(-).	5.0000E+02
Mass Diffusion factor		2.0000E-03
Momentum Diffusion factor		2.0000E-03
	().	
VALIDATION		
Validation Test Case	(-):	4.2
Initial Cavity Radius		0.0000E+00
Minimum Characteristic Ve		1.0000E-06
Minimum Number Zones/Lt	(-):	
PARAMETERS		
Pi		3.1416E+00
Atmospheric Pressure	(Pa):	
gravity		9.8067E+00
Gas Constant	(J/kg K):	4.1160E+03
Repository Temperature	(K):	
Reference gas Density	(kg/m ³):	
Water Compressibility	(1/Pa):	
Waste Density	(kg/m^3):	
Salt Density	(kg/m^3):	
Shape Factor	(-):	
Tensile Velocity	(m/s):	
Bit Nozzle Number	(-):	
Bit Nozzle Diameter	(m) :	
Choke Efficiency	(-):	9.0000E-01

Figure 4.4-9. Excerpts from drs 122_tc42.dbg, diagnostics file for Case 4.2. (Continued)

Initial Cavity Radius, Min Characteristic Velocity and Min Number Zones/Lt are listed in the diagnostics file under "Parameters used in this run", but not in the input control file. These are optional input parameters that were not specified in the input control file and were set to default values.

Comparisons of the input CAMDAT file, and input control file with the excerpt from the diagnostics file indicated that all parameters were properly set to CAMDAT property values, set explicitly, or set to default values as directed by the input control file. This confirms that **Acceptance Criterion 4-16** (Section 4.4.5.5) is met.

4.4.7 Conclusions

The discussion in Section 4.4.6 verifies that all acceptance criteria (Section 4.4.5) for this test case are met. Thus, this test case passes.

The successful completion of this test case verifies that DRSPALL demonstrates the correct, expected behavior for the functionality examined. Coupling data shows that the gas transported from the repository is successfully accounted for in the wellbore and ejected at the land surface. An analysis of the stress data indicates proper implementation of the stress equations and failure logic. A similar analysis of the fluidization data reveals proper calculation of the fluidization velocity and mobilization of solids by fluidized bed theory. The waste expulsion analysis demonstrates proper accounting for waste solids drilled or spalled from the repository, transported up the wellbore, and ejected at the land surface. Finally, (1) examination of the diagnostic file indicating correct specification of input parameters and (2) proper execution of the GROPECDB utility verifies the external interfaces to CAMDAT files.

4.5 Test Case #5 – Wellbore Flow Verification

4.5.1 Test Objective

The objective of this test case is to verify the wellbore flow model against an independent computational fluid dynamics model FLUENT (2003). Details of the FLUENT runs are provided in Section 8.5.3.7 of the *Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (WIPP PA 2003b).

Correctly performing this test case validates the satisfactory implementation of Functional Requirement R.1.

4.5.2 **Problem Description**

This test case will focus on the wellbore model, and thus decouple its behavior from the repository. Known boundary conditions will be imposed to observe the model's response to steady flow of:

1. mud

- 2. mud and gas
- 3. mud, gas, and solids

Independent calculations will be run in parallel with the commercial computational fluid dynamics code FLUENT (2003).

The problem domain is the wellbore annulus in a typical WIPP intrusion. The geometric description of the wellbore is given in the *Parameter Justification Report for DRSPALL* (Hansen et al. 2003), and default values are used for most DRSPALL parameters. A schematic of the domain is shown in Figure 4.5-1.



Figure 4.5-1. Schematic of wellbore flow test problem domain.

4.5.2.1 Boundary Conditions

Boundary conditions are set to simulate a WIPP intrusion scenario, however the bottom of the wellbore is decoupled from the repository and controlled directly to facilitate comparison between DRSPALL and the FLUENT code. The inlet boundary to the wellbore annulus is a constant volumetric flow rate. The outlet boundary from the wellbore annulus is constant at atmospheric pressure, 0.1 MPa. Gas and solids are added at pre-determined mass flow rates at the lower boundary to the annulus.

4.5.2.2 Input Parameters

Input parameters for the wellbore domain represent a typical WIPP intrusion. Repository flow parameters are irrelevant since the domains are decoupled in this test case. There are several run-


specific parameters such as mud density, mud pump rate, and gas/solids loading rate that vary among runs and are discussed below. The DRSPALL input files $drs_v122_tc51.drs$ through $drs_v122_tc57.drs$ are stored in CVS directory Test/Input. Note that the zone size growth rates were changed to 1.0 for the DRSPALL 1.22 validation, as explained in Section 4.0.

4.5.3 Analysis Method

Six runs will be executed under this test case. The run matrix is shown in Table 4.5-1. More detailed descriptions are given in the text that follows.

Case	Mud Density, kg/m ³	Mud Flow Rate, m ³ /s	Gas Flow Rate, kg/s	Solid Flow Rate, kg/s	Description
5.1	1210	0	0	0	Static mud in wellbore
5.2	1210	0.02081	0	0	Mud-only, steady flow, nominal mud density
5.3	1380	0.02081	0	0	Mud-only, steady flow, high-end mud density
5.4	_	_	_	-	Not used
5.5	1210	0.02081	0.25	0	Steady mud flow, gas added to flow at low, constant rate
5.6	1210	0.02081	2.5	0	Steady mud flow, gas added to flow at medium, constant rate
5.7	1210	0.02081	2.5	2.5	Steady mud flow, gas added to flow at medium, constant rate; solids added at low constant rate

Table 4.5-1. Run conditions for FLUENT comparison

<u>Steady-state runs.</u> Steady state runs will be examined to establish that the steady pressure profiles in the wellbore are matched reasonably between DRSPALL and FLUENT. Three basic types of runs will be required:

- 1. Mud only
- 2. Mud and gas
- 3. Mud, gas, and solids

For mud only, two mud densities will be examined. In addition, a static case will be run with no mud pumping to assure that the mud column settles to an equilibrium hydrostatic distribution. For the mud and gas case, gas input rate will be controlled as the independent variable. For the three-phase run (Case 5.7), gas and solid loading rates representative of near-steady conditions in a WIPP spallings intrusion will be tested.

Specific test run information is given below.

4.5.3.1 Case 5.1 – Static Mud in Wellbore

The mud pump will be turned off and the pressure distribution will be monitored to assure that it settles to a hydrostatic distribution. The boundaries at the pump inlet and annulus outlet will both be set to atmospheric pressure. No gas or solids will be added to the wellbore domain. Mud density will be set to the DRSPALL default value 1210 kg/m³. DRSPALL is a transient code, and the initial pressure distribution in the wellbore is arbitrary. The objective of this seemingly simple test is to see whether DRSPALL will eventually arrive at a stable solution demonstrating the hydrostatic pressure distribution.

4.5.3.2 Case 5.2 – Mud-only, Steady Flow, Nominal Mud Density

Volumetric mud flow rate at the pump inlet and mud density will be set to the DRSPALL default values of 0.02081 m³/sec and 1210 kg/m³, respectively. No gas or solids will be added.

4.5.3.3 Case 5.3 – Mud-only, Steady Flow, High-end Mud Density

This test run is the same as Case 5.2, Section 4.5.3.2 above, except that the mud density is increased to $\rho = 1380 \text{ kg/m}^3$, the highest value in its sampling range recommended in the *Parameter Justification Report for DRSPALL* (Hansen et al. 2003). The slightly higher density should lead to a proportionally higher pressure at the bottom of the well due to the weight of the mud column.

4.5.3.4 Case 5.5 – Gas Added to Flow at Low, Constant Rate

This test run will add hydrogen gas to the flow stream at the bottom of the well. Mudflow rate and physical properties are set to defaults as in Case 5.2. The hydrogen mass flow rate is fixed at 0.25 kg/sec, a value representative of the gas flow rate into the wellbore through the DDZ just prior to bit penetration of the repository.

4.5.3.5 Case 5.6 – Gas Added to Flow at Medium, Constant Rate

This test run will add hydrogen gas to the flow stream at the bottom of the well. Mud flow and physical properties are set to defaults as in Case 5.2. The hydrogen mass flow rate = 2.5 kg/sec, a value representative of the gas flow rate into the wellbore during a blowout while the mud column is accelerating.

4.5.3.6 Case 5.7 – Gas Added to Flow at Medium, Constant Rate; Solids Added at Low, Constant Rate

This test run is the same as Case 5.6, Section 4.5.3.5, with gas flowing into the well bottom, except solids are also added. A solids loading rate of 2.5 kg/sec is selected to represent a slow, steady material failure case. In normal model executions where a spalling event occurs, this mass loading rate tends to spike early and diminish to zero. The constant rate was selected here for simplicity in implementation and comparison between models.



4.5.4 Test Procedure

DRSPALL is executed once for each of the six cases: Cases 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7 (there is no Case 5.4).

DRSPALL generates a "wellbore" validation file for each case, but these files are not examined. Each output CAMDAT file is post-processed with GROPECDB (WIPP PA 1996 and 2012a) to extract the pressure, fluid velocities and volume fraction profiles in the wellbore. The GROPECDB data are imported into Excel file *drs_v122_tc5.xlsx* for comparison with the corresponding data generated from FLUENT. The GROPECDB input command file is shown in Figure 4.5-2.

The following command lines run DRSPALL and GROPECDB for Case 5.1 (tc51). The other cases are similar:

```
./drspall ./Input/drs_v122_tc51.drs DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc51.dbg
CANCEL DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc51.cdb
> DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc51.crt
./gropecdb DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc51.cdb
./Input/drs_tc5_grope.inp
DRSPALL/Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc51.gr > x.x
```

```
select block 1
select property INITMDEN GASESDEN WASTDENS MUDPRATE
print property
!apg WELLGSVF is only needed for TC55-TC57
!apg WELLWSVF is only needed for TC57
select time 450. !apg select final time step, may be <450
select block 4
select evar COORD WELLPRS WELLVEL WELLGSVF WELLWSVF
print evar
exit</pre>
```

```
Figure 4.5-2. GROPECDB input command file drs_tc5_grope.inp
```

4.5.5 Acceptance Criteria

This test will pass if the following are observed when comparing DRSPALL and FLUENT output:

- Acceptance Criterion 5-1 The fluid pressure agrees within 20%.
- Acceptance Criterion 5-2 The volume fraction of gas in two- and three-phase runs (Cases 5.5, 5.6, 5.7) agrees within 0.02.
- Acceptance Criterion 5-3 The volume fraction of waste in the three-phase run (Case 5.7) agrees within 20%.

• Acceptance Criterion 5-4 — The velocity of the mixture agrees within 25%. Analytical velocities will be used as the basis of comparison for Case 5.2 and 5.3. Case 5.1 is static, therefore, velocities should be near zero (< 1E-4).

Verification will be evaluated by visual comparison of graphical results that contain error bounds consistent with the acceptance criteria.

4.5.6 Results

Results for each case are presented individually in the following subsections. Results consist of graphical comparisons of pressure, fluid velocity and volume fractions as a function of wellbore position. The DRSPALL values are extracted from output CAMDAT file element variables WELLPRS (pressure), WELLVEL (fluid velocity), WELLGSVF (gas volume fraction), WELLWSVF (waste volume fraction), and COORD (wellbore position) for all elements in element block UP_WB (the wellbore annulus). The bottom of the wellbore is located at 0.0 and the land surface is located at 653 m. FLUENT actually solves the steady state problem. DRSPALL solves the transient problem for constant boundary conditions. DRSPALL cases were run until pressure and velocity maintained a relatively constant value, therefore run time varied for each subcase.

This validation uses the same FLUENT curve data as the *Verification and Validation Plan and Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (WIPP PA 2003b), so the FLUENT calculations are not repeated.

4.5.6.1 Case 5.1 – Static with Nominal Mud Density

Results for Case 5.1 are summarized by the pressure and velocity profile comparisons shown in Figure 4.5-3. DRSPALL results are at 90 s because it takes some time for the code to settle to a steady pressure profile after the arbitrary starting profile. The results visually overlay, and are within the 20% error bounds, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-1** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. A simple hydrostatic model gives the expected bottomhole pressure as $\rho gh = 7.75$ MPa, where $\rho = 1210 \text{ kg/m}^3$ is the mud density, $g = 9.81 \text{ m/s}^2$, and h = 653 m is the wellbore height. In the code results, the pressure decreases linearly to 0.1 MPa at the land surface. FLUENT calculated a bottomhole pressure value of 7.74 MPa. DRSPALL calculated a value of 7.77 MPa. The velocities for this test case should be zero. But, because DRSPALL uses a transient algorithm, a small residual velocity can be expected. The velocities shown in Figure 4.5-3 are well below 1E-4, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-4** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. (**Acceptance Criteria 5-2 and 5-3** do not apply to this case.) While this test problem may seem trivial, stable behavior of a transient code under steady-state conditions is not guaranteed. Correct and stable solution of this problem lends confidence that the differencing scheme and mass balance are working as designed.

Informa⁷⁴ion Only



Figure 4.5-3. Pressure and velocity profiles for static wellbore, Case 5.1.

4.5.6.2 Case 5.2 – Steady Flow, Nominal Mud Density

The results for Case 5.2 (mud pumping rate = $0.02018 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ and nominal mud density = 1210 kg/m^3) are summarized by the pressure and fluid velocity profiles at 90 s shown in Figure 4.5-4 are similar to Case 5.1 with only very minor differences due to dynamic effects. Pressures are within the 20% error bars, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-1** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. The velocity profiles show the effects of the two annulus areas – one for the collar region just above the well bottom and another for the drill pipe extending to the land surface. Velocities are within the 25% error bars, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-4** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. Fluid velocities, u_i can be determined analytically from the pumping rates, R = 0.02018, and the annulus cross sectional areas, $A_1 = 0.044$, $A_2 = 0.066$, as follows: $u_i = R/A_i$, where, i=1 is the collar region and 2 is the drill pipe region. This gives analytic values for the fluid velocities of 0.46 m/s and 0.31 m/s for the collar and drill pipe regions, respectively. (**Acceptance Criteria 5-2 and 5-3** do not apply to this case.)



Figure 4.5-4. Pressure and velocity profiles for steady state and nominal mud density, Case 5.2.

Informa⁷⁵ion Only

4.5.6.3 Case 5.3 – Steady Flow, High Mud Density

The results for Case 5.3 (constant mud pumping rate = 0.02018 m³/s and a high mud density = 1380 kg/m³) are summarized by the pressure and fluid velocity profiles at 90 s shown in Figure 4.5-5. The results from FLUENT and DRSPALL visually overlay. The pressure profiles are similar to Case 5.2 except for an increase in bottomhole pressure due the increase in mud density. Pressures are within the 20% error bars, so Acceptance Criterion 5-1 (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. The estimated value of bottomhole pressure is $\rho gh = 8.84$ MPa, where $\rho = 1380$ kg/m³ is the mud density, g = 9.81 m/s², and h = 653 m is the wellbore height. The calculated values for bottomhole pressure were 8.85 MPa and 8.89 MPa for FLUENT and DRSPALL, respectively. The velocity profiles show the effects of the two annulus areas – one for the collar region just above the well bottom and another for the drill pipe extending to the land surface. Velocities are within the 25% error bars, so Acceptance Criterion 5-4 (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. The expected values of fluid velocities are the same as in Case 5.2. (Acceptance Criteria 5-2 and 5-3 do not apply to this case.)



Figure 4.5-5. Pressure and velocity profiles for steady state and high mud density, Case 5.3.

4.5.6.4 There is no Case 5.4

4.5.6.5 Case 5.5 – Low Gas Injection Rate

The results for Case 5.5 (constant mud pumping rate = 0.02018 m^3 /s, nominal mud density = 1210 kg/m³, and a low gas injection rate = 0.25 kg/s) are summarized by the pressure, fluid velocity, and gas volume fraction profiles at 450 s shown in Figure 4.5-6. The pressure profile results from FLUENT and DRSPALL visually overlay. Pressures are within the 20% error bars, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-1** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. Note that the bottomhole pressures have dropped from 9 MPa to 0.5 MPa because of the large amount of gas in the wellbore. Gas volume fractions are around 98% with differences between FLUENT and DRSPALL less than 0.2. Gas volume fractions are within the 0.01 error bars and the acceptance criterion of 0.02, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-2** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. The fluid velocity profiles show increasing fluid acceleration with height because of the decrease in gas density and pressure. The drop in velocity at about 180 m is at the collar drill pipe interface and indicates the increase in annulus area. Velocities are within the 25% error bounds, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-4** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. (**Acceptance Criterion 5-3** does not apply to this case.)



Figure 4.5-6. Pressure, velocity, and gas volume fraction profiles for steady state, nominal mud density, and low gas injection rate, Case 5.5.

4.5.6.6 Case 5.6 – Medium Gas Injection

The results for Case 5.6 (constant mud pumping rate = 0.02018 m^3 /s; nominal mud density = 1210 kg/m^3 ; and a medium gas injection rate = 2.5 kg/s) are summarized by the pressure, fluid velocity, and gas volume fraction profiles at 120 s shown in Figure 4.5-7. The gas injection rate was ten times larger than in Case 5.5. The bottomhole pressure, gas volume fraction, and fluid velocity have increased relative to Case 5.5 because of the increased gas injection rate. Pressure profiles compare very well. Pressures are within the 20% error bars, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-1** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. Gas volume fractions are above 99% for both DRSPALL and FLUENT. Gas volume fractions are within the 0.01 error bars and the acceptance criterion of 0.02, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-2** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. DRSPALL fluid velocities are slightly low relative to FLUENT because of the slightly lower gas volume fraction. Velocities are within the 25% error bars, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-4** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. (Acceptance Criterion 5-3 does not apply to this case.)



Figure 4.5-7. Pressure, velocity, and gas volume fraction profiles for steady state, nominal mud density, and medium gas injection rate, Case 5.6.

4.5.6.7 Case 5.7 – Medium Gas and Low Solid Injection

The results for Case 5.7 (constant mud pumping rate = $0.02018 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$; nominal mud density = 1210 kg/m^3 ; medium gas injection rate = 2.5 kg/s; and low solid injection rate = 2.5 kg/s) are summarized by the pressure, fluid velocity and gas and solid volume fraction profiles at 100 s shown in Figure 4.5-8. The gas injection rate was the same as in Case 5.6. The pressure profiles essentially overlay with an increase in bottomhole pressure relative to Case 5.6 due to the presence of solids in the wellbore. Pressures are within the 20% error bars, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-1** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. Gas volume fractions are near 99% but are lower than Case 5.6 because of the solids. Gas volume fractions are within the 0.01 error bars and the acceptance criterion of 0.02, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-2** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. Solid volume fractions are very small, near 5E-4. Solid volume fractions are within the 20% error bars, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-3** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case. The fluid velocity profiles are very similar to Case 5.6 because of the dominance of the gas. Velocities are within the 25% error bars, so **Acceptance Criterion 5-4** (Section 4.5.5) is met for this case.



Figure 4.5-8. Pressure, velocity, and volume fraction profiles for steady state, nominal mud density, medium gas and low solid injection rate, Case 5.7.

4.5.7 Conclusions

The discussion in Section 4.5.6 verifies that all acceptance criteria (Section 4.5.5) for this test case are met. Thus, this test case passes.

Comparisons of the FLUENT and DRSPALL results for both the static (Case 5.1) and steady state, mud-only (Cases 5.2, 5.3) calculations show very close agreement. All steady state cases with mud and gas injection (Cases 5.5, 5.6) or mud, gas and solid injection (Case 5.7) are also in good agreement. Much of the differences are probably due to the way friction loss is handled in the two models. DRSPALL uses an empirical friction factor that is a function of wall roughness and Reynolds number. FLUENT calculates shear forces in its two-dimensional cylindrical flow domain and assumed smooth walls for this analysis.

The successful completion of this test case confirms that DRSPALL is properly calculating the multi-component mixture flow in the wellbore.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Testing for DRSPALL Version 1.22 has been completed and all test cases meet the acceptance criteria. The testing verifies that DRSPALL satisfies all the requirements listed in the *Requirements Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (WIPP PA 2003a).

6.0 INSTALLATION TESTING AND REGRESSION TESTING

Test Case #4 is suitable for regression and installation testing. Although Test Case #4 does not seek to specifically validate all the functional requirements of the code, it does exercise all of the major features of the model: repository flow, wellbore flow, repository and wellbore boundary conditions, tensile failure of waste, and fluidization of waste.

7.0 REFERENCES

- Djordjevic, S. and M. Adams 2003. Memo to David Lord Re: Utility Code for Spallings Model Porous Flow Validation. June 5, 2003. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #524400.
- Chan, D.Y.C., B.D. Hughes, and L. Paterson 1993. "Transient Gas Flow Around Boreholes." *Transport in Porous Media*, 10:137-152.
- Ergun, S. 1952. "Fluid Flow Through Packed Columns," Chemical Engineering Progress, 48:89-94.

FLUENT 2003. FLUENT 6.1 User's Guide. Lebanon, NH: Fluent, Inc. February 2003.

Hansen, F.D., T.W. Pfeifle, and D.L. Lord 2003. *Parameter Justification Report for DRSPALL*. SAND2003-2930. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #531057.

- Khodaverdian, M.F., J.D. McLennan, I.D. Palmer, H.H. Vaziri, and X. Wang. 1996. "Cavity Completions for Enhanced Coalbed Methane Recovery." GRI-95/0432, report by Terra Tek, Inc. to the Gas Research Institute, June 1996.
- Long, J. J. 2014. Nuclear Waste Management Procedure NP 19-1 Software Requirements, Revision 16. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #562870.
- WIPP PA 1996. User's Manual for GROPECDB Version 2.12. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #237496.
- WIPP PA 2003a. *Requirements Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00* (document version 1.20). Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #531278.
- WIPP PA 2003b. Verification and Validation Plan / Validation Document for DRSPALL Version 1.00. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #524782.
- WIPP PA 2004. User's Manual for DRSPALL Version 1.10. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #533151.
- WIPP PA 2005. User's Manual for SUMMARIZE Version 3.00. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #540110.
- WIPP PA 2012a. Addendum to User's Manual for GROPECDB Version 2.13. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #557792.
- WIPP PA 2012b. Addendum to User's Manual for SUMMARIZE Version 3.02. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #557813.
- WIPP PA 2013. Addendum to User's Manual for DRSPALL Version 1.21. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #560048.
- WIPP PA 2015a. Addendum to User's Manual for DRSPALL Version 1.22. Carlsbad, NM Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #562642.
- WIPP PA 2015b. *Design Document for DRSPALL Version 1.22*. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. ERMS #562640.



APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF FILES USED

This appendix contains an extract of test log file *drspall_122_Test.rtf* showing the summary of files used. All test files are available in CVS, as described in Section 3.0. A summary of files used is provided in Tables A-1 through A-6.

Note that all output CAMDAT test files (that is, all files in Table A-5 with extension .cdb) are automatically compressed by the rc.py code before they are stored in CVS with the Unix gzip -c -f command. The compressed file has extension .cdb.gz in CVS. It may be converted to a normal CAMDAT file with the Unix gunzip -f command.

Table A-1. Run script files.

Repository	Comment
\$CODE/DRSPALL	Main control script
\$CODE/DRSPALL	Python run control script
	\$CODE/DRSPALL

NOTE: \$CODE = /nfs/data/CVSLIB/WIPP_CODES/PA_CODES

Table A-2. Input files.

File	Repository	Comment
Test/Input/drs_tc2_summarize.inp	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs tc41_grope.inp	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs tc42 ms.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs tc5 grope.inp	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc11.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc12.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs_v122_tc21.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs_v122_tc22.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc23.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc24.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc25.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc26.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc41.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc42.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc51.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc52.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc53.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc55.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc56.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/drs v122 tc57.drs	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input
Test/Input/ReadMe	\$CODE/DRSPALL	test input

NOTE: \$CODE = /nfs/data/CVSLIB/WIPP_CODES/PA_CODES

Table A-3. CVS repositories.

CVS Repositories				
\$CODE/DRSPALL				
\$CODE/GROPECDB				
\$CODE/SUMMARIZE				

Table A-4. Log files.

File	Repository	Comment
est/RunControl/Solaris/drspall 122 Test.log	\$CODE/DRSPALL	log file
est/RunControl/Solaris/drspall 122 Test.rtf	\$CODE/DRSPALL	Formatted log file (Word file)
solution solution solution and		Form

NOTE: \$CODE = /nfs/data/CVSLIB/WIPP_CODES/PA_CODES

Table A-5. Output files produced.

File	Repository	Comment
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc11.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc11.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc11.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc11_chan.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc12.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc12.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc12.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc12_chan.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc21.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc21.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc21.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc22.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc22.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc22.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc23.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc23.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc23.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc24.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc24.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc24.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc25.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc25.crt	SCODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122_tc25.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc26.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc26.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122_tc26.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc2 summarize.tbl	\$CODE/DRSPALL	SUMMARIZE output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc41.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc41.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc41.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc41.gr	\$CODE/DRSPALL	GROPECDB output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc41 coupling.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc41 expulsion.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc41 fluidization time.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output

File	Repository	Comment
Fest/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc41_fluidization.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc41_stress.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc42.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris_122/drs_122_tc42.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc42.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc42 coupling.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc42 expulsion.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc42 fluidization time.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc42 fluidization.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc42 stress.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc51.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc51.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc51.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc51.gr	\$CODE/DRSPALL	GROPECDB output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc51 wellbore.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc52.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc52.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc52.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc52.gr	\$CODE/DRSPALL	GROPECDB output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc52 wellbore.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc53.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc53.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc53.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Test/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc53.gr	\$CODE/DRSPALL	GROPECDB output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc53 wellbore.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc55.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc55.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc55.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc55.gr	\$CODE/DRSPALL	GROPECDB output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc55 wellbore.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc56.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc56.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc56.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc56.gr	\$CODE/DRSPALL	GROPECDB output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc56 wellbore.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc57.cdb	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc57.crt	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL screen output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc57.dbg	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc57.gr	\$CODE/DRSPALL	GROPECDB output
Fest/Output/Solaris 122/drs 122 tc57 wellbore.dat	\$CODE/DRSPALL	DRSPALL output

Table A-5. Output files produced. (Continued)

NOTE: \$CODE = /nfs/data/CVSLIB/WIPP_CODES/PA_CODES

Table A-6. Executable files.

File	Repository	Comment	
Build/Solaris/drspall (Ver: 1.22)	\$CODE/DRSPALL	Computes volume of waste from drilling	
Build/Solaris/gropecdb (Ver:2.13)	\$CODE/GROPECDB	Displays CAMDAT data in text form	
Build/Solaris/summarize (Ver:3.02)	\$CODE/SUMMARIZE	Writes tables of data from many CAMDAT fi	
NOTE: \$CODE = /nfs/data/CVSLI	- de		