

Concepts in Designing a Disposal System

John R. Cochran

(jrcochr@sandia.gov)

Sandia National Laboratories

Albuquerque, New Mexico

15 December 2008

Topics

- ❖ Design by Objective
- ❖ Designers Tools
- ❖ Specific Topics
- ❖ Example Designs

- ❖ For disposal of VLLW, LLW and ILW

Design by Objective

- ❖ Design must be for specific set of objectives !
- ❖ If you don't know the objectives, you can't design and evaluate the design

Typical Design Objectives

- ❖ Keep people from accidentally contacting wastes
- ❖ Keep wastes from migrating to people
- ❖ Long-term stability without active human controls
- ❖ Cost effective

Design Tools

- ❖ Site characteristics
- ❖ Waste form
- ❖ Waste package
- ❖ Engineered barriers

Keep people from accidentally contacting wastes

- ❖ **Site characteristics** – avoid population centers, avoid resource rich areas (future minerals extraction), avoid future farming areas
- ❖ **Waste form** – set limits on what is buried (part of the Waste Acceptance Criteria or WAC), keep specific activities of each packages low
- ❖ **Waste package** – make package and hazard recognizable for long time frames
- ❖ **Engineered barriers** – use depth of burial, deeper is better, use intruder barriers, warning markers (some people believe markers may *attract* future intruders looking for treasure)

Keep wastes from migrating to people

- ❖ **Site characteristics** – arid site is better, because water dissolves waste and moves it, deep water table is better – if there is no water, there is ~ no movement of radionuclides (except by intrusion)
- ❖ **Waste form** – insoluble waste form, no liquids!, set limits on what is buried using the WAC
- ❖ **Waste package** – use long-lived water-tight packages to keep water from dissolving and carrying waste
- ❖ **Engineered barriers** – use impermeable caps to keep water off wastes

Long-term stability without active human controls

- ❖ **Site characteristics** – avoid: tectonically active areas, volcanically-active areas, landslide areas, floodplains
- ❖ **Waste form** – use stable waste forms
- ❖ **Waste package** – do not bury voids, compressible wastes and wastes that will decay (like wood and cardboard)
- ❖ **Engineered barriers** – should be in harmony with geo-environment, avoid “leachate-collection systems” requires active human control

Cost-effective

- ❖ **Site characteristics** – pick “simple” sites that are easy to characterize and easy model, pick sites near population centers to reduce travel time
- ❖ **Waste form** – for ALARA and cost, limit the amount of conditioning before disposal
- ❖ **Waste package** – do not use packages or use inexpensive packages
- ❖ **Engineered barriers** – do not use engineered barriers or use inexpensive natural materials

Special Topics: Multiple Barriers


- ❖ **Use multiple barriers**
- ❖ **If one barrier fails, the other barrier can still work**
(for example; arid site + insoluble waste form)
- ❖ **A barrier is any material or structure that prevents or substantially delays movement of water or radionuclides:**
 - ❖ a geologic structure
 - ❖ a waste form that significantly decreases the mobility of radionuclides,
 - ❖ a canister/container that significantly decreases the mobility of radionuclides, and
 - ❖ a material placed over and around waste that substantially delays movement of water or radionuclides.

Special Topics: Impermeable Base

- ❖ Use free draining base
- ❖ Impermeable liners will cause moisture to collect in waste and are only good so long a humans can pump leachate

Special Topics: Prevent Future Subsidence

- ❖ Several early US radioactive waste landfills failed in < 10 years,
- ❖ Cap was destroyed by subsidence of landfill contents (also wet climate and impermeable liner contributed to the failure)
- ❖ Do not bury voids and wastes that will decay and rot
- ❖ Subsidence can destroy cap and focus precipitation



As Constructed



Differential Subsidence
During Active Subsidence



Differential Subsidence
in the Long Term


Balancing

- ❖ Must balance different design elements – for example, it is less expensive to characterize and use a disposal site near a population center, but more protective of human health to move disposal facility far from populations centers
- ❖ Look for lowest-cost option that still meets performance objectives

Example Designs

- ❖ **Proposed design by Waste Control Specialists, Andrews Texas**
- ❖ **Actual design EnergySolutions, Clive Utah**
- ❖ **Conceptual Design**


Waste Control Specialist, USA


 C
CO. 12


CWF CROSS SECTION POST CLOSURE

NOTE: VERTICAL SCALE EXPANDED (5:1)

THIS DOCUMENT IS RELEASED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PERMITTING/LICENSING; IT IS NOT TO BE USED FOR BIDDING OR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES.	
URS	
755 E. Main Street, Suite 400 San Jose, CA 95112 (800) 364-4000 (800) 364-4000	
DES BY CDP DR BY ABS CHK BY CHA APP BY NSD	2/20/2004 DATE 1/20/2004 SCALE ADJUSTMENT 0/20/2004 LICENSE APPROVAL 0/20/2004 APP BY
PROJECT NO. 39400004 SHEET OF 1	
WASTE CONTROL SPECIALISTS LLC 1710 New Boundary, Andrews, Texas 76714	
WASTE CONTROL SPECIALISTS LICEN. LICENSE APPLICATION CHF - WASTE DISPOSAL SECTION	THE SIGNATOR APPROVING ON THIS DOCUMENT WAS AUTHORIZED BY MARK S. DAY 93463 ON 07/23/2005
SHEET REFERENCE NUMBER C1 - 6	



Conceptual 3 m x 5 m deep trench



Summary

- ❖ **Design by Objective**
- ❖ **Designers Tools**
 - ❖ Site characteristics
 - ❖ Waste form
 - ❖ Waste package
 - ❖ Engineered barriers
- ❖ **Specific Topics**
 - ❖ Multiple barriers
 - ❖ Impermeable base
 - ❖ Prevent subsidence
- ❖ **Example Designs**