

# **Deliverable D5.3: Training material**

WP-Future

The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 847593.



http://www.ejp-eurad.eu/

#### **Document information**

Project Acronym	EURAD					
Project Title	European Joint Programme on Radioactive Waste Management					
Project Type	European Joint Programme (EJP)					
EC grant agreement No.	847593					
Project starting / end date	1 <sup>st</sup> June 2019 – 30 May 2024					
Work Package No.	5					
Work Package Title	Fundamental understanding of radionuclide retention					
Work Package Acronym	FUTURE					
Deliverable No.	D5.3					
Deliverable Title	Training Material: RN radionuclide transport and safety assessment					
Lead Beneficiary	PSI					
Contractual Delivery Date	May 2022					
Actual Delivery Date	November 2022					
Туре	Training Material					
Dissemination level	Public					
Authors	Bart Baeyens (PSI), Felix Brandt (FZJ), Cornelius Fischer (HZDR), Martin Glaus (PSI), Václava Havlova (ÚJV Řež), Thomas U. Kaempfer (Nagra), Martina Klinkenberg (FZJ), Norbert Maes (SCK CEN), Maria Marques (PSI), Ulrich Noseck (GRS), Andreas C. Scheinost (ESRF), Maria Siitari-Kauppi (Uni Helsinki), Lukáš Vondrovic (SÚRAO)					

#### To be cited as:

B. Baeyens, F. Brandt, C. Fischer, M. Glaus, V. Havlova, Th. U. Kaempfer, M. Klinkenberg, N. Maes, M. Marques, U. Noseck, A.C. Scheinost, M. Siitari-Kauppi, L. Vondrovic (2022): Title. Final version as of Training Material: RN radionuclide transport and safety assessment of deliverable D5.3 of the HORIZON 2020 project EURAD. EC Grant agreement no: 847593.

#### Disclaimer

All information in this document is provided "as is" and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user, therefore, uses the information at its sole risk and liability. For the avoidance of all doubts, the European Commission has no liability in respect of this document, which is merely representing the authors' view.

#### Acknowledgement

This document is a deliverable of the European Joint Programme on Radioactive Waste Management (EURAD). EURAD has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 847593.





Status of deliverable						
	Ву	Date				
Delivered (Lead Beneficiary)	Sergey Churakov	30.11.2021				
Verified (WP Leader)	Sergey Churakov	05.06.2022				
Reviewed (Reviewers)	Rainer Dähn	27.09.2022				
Approved (PMO)	Bernd Grambow	09.11.2022				
Submitted to EC (Coordinator)	Andra	09.11.2022				





# **Executive Summary**

Education and training event on radionuclide transport and retention took place on 17th November 2021. Several senior experts participating to Eurad have covered broad range of topics starting from RN transport and retention to uncertainty analysis in safety assessment calculations educational event which was primary targeting young scientists or researchers from other disciplines who would like to broaden their expertise.

# Table of content

Exec	cutive Summary
Tabl	e of content4
1)	GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL CONCEPTS: WP Future Education & Training Webinar
2a)	SORPTION: Retention processes for Radionuclides
2b)	REDOX: Interfacial redox reactions, X-ray absorption spectroscopy, and what they can do for the safety of radioactive-waste repositories
3a)	TRANSPORT CLAYS: Radionuclide transport in clay
3b)	TRANSPORT CRYSTALLINE: Transport processes in crystalline rock
4a)	Uncertainty management in safety assessment and its role in repository development 106 Th. U. Kaempfer (Nagra)
4b)	Implications of safety case and safety assessment progress for DGR and site selection development in Czech Republic











# GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL CONCEPTS WP Future Education & Training Webinar Norbert Maes (SCK CEN)

November 17, 2021



The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement n° 847593.

17/11/2021

EURAD WP FUTURE Education & Training webinar





Important Issue:

*"How to dispose of this waste?"* 



14 EU Member States without nuclear electricity production: Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Greece, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Austria, Poland, Portugal. Datafor 2019. Source: Eurostat (mg\_inf\_nuc)

ec.europa.eu/eurostat O



- Nuclear waste types vs. disposal requirements
- Disposal system
  - Safety functions
  - Multi-barrier principle
- Geological disposal
  - What, Why, History
  - · Geological disposal concept in "Clay" host rocks
  - Geological disposal concept in "Crystalline" host rocks
  - Geological disposal concept in "Rock Salt" host rocks





# THE NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE – DIFFERENT WASTE TYPES

- Wastes with **different properties** *different repositories* 
  - differences in required barrier properties, incl. geology
- Spent Fuel (SF) and vitrified high level waste (HLW) → HLW repository
- Long-lived intermediate waste (LL-ILW) → *HLW repository? L/ILW-repository?*
- Low and intermediate w (L/ILW)  $\rightarrow L/ILW$  /



## HAZARDS AND TIMESCALES - ex. L/ILW vs. SF&HLW













- Nuclear waste types vs. disposal requirements
- Disposal system
  - Safety functions
  - Multi-barrier principle
- Geological disposal
  - What, Why, History
  - Geological disposal concept in "Clay" host rocks
  - Geological disposal concept in "Crystalline" host rocks
  - Geological disposal concept in "Rock Salt" host rocks





#### **DISPOSAL SYSTEM**

 Disposal options are designed to *contain* the waste by means of passive engineered and natural features and *isolate* it from the accessible biosphere to the extent necessitated by the associated hazard



# FUTURe,

## **DISPOSAL SYSTEM – SAFETY FUNCTIONS**

#### Isolation

- means design to keep the waste and its associated hazard apart from the accessible biosphere
- It also means design to minimise the influence of factors that could reduce the integrity of the disposal facility

How?

- Selection of appropriate site and geology
- Emplacement at sufficient depth

#### Containment & Retardation

Implies designing the disposal facility to avoid or minimise the release of radionuclides

How?

- Stable and durable waste forms (slow release)
- *(multiple) engineered barrieres that provide containment and retardation*
- *Natural barrier(s) that provide retardation (limit water flow, high sorption)*





eurad

# DISPOSAL SYSTEM – MULTIPLE BARRIER PRINCIPLE

- Multiple barriers principle
  - State of matter of the waste (e.g., nuclear fuel pellet)
  - · Final disposal waste package or canister (e.g. fuel element in container)
  - Engineered barrier (e.g., bentonite clay)
  - Geological barrier (the geosphere)







## DISPOSAL SYSTEM - DEFENCE-IN-DEPTH (DID) PRINCIPLE

 design and optimise the disposal system according to the *defence-in-depth* principle:

 $\rightarrow$  The disposal system should be able to fulfill its safety functions despite uncertainties that may threaten their performance

- 1. Prevention level: avoid uncertainties or their effect
- 2. Component level: robustness to maintain performance
- 3. System level: complementary and independent barriers
- 4. Control level: detect incidents and perform corrective measures





### **SELECTION OF A DISPOSAL OPTION**

- Selection depends on many factors, both technical and administrative, such as:
  - Waste characteristics and inventory
  - The conditions of the country such as climatic conditions and site characteristics, availability of suitable host media
  - Radioactive waste management policy
  - Overall disposal strategy in the country (how many facilities)
  - · National legislative and regulatory requirements
  - Political decisions
  - Social acceptance







# DEEP GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL - WHAT?

- Geological disposal = Burial at several hundred metres depth in stable rock environments
  - Principle: the deep rock environment is stable and largely unaffected by environmental change for 100.000-1.000.000s years
- For spent fuel, high-level waste and intermediate-level waste
- · Provides isolation from man and environment
- Research is aimed at
  - Designing repository systems that will provide good containment
  - · Identifying the right types of geological environment
  - Evaluating how RNs will behave over long periods of time in the future





# **GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL - WHY?**

- Long time scales for decay
- Ethics/sustainability/security
  - Polluter pays (this generation pays)
  - Future generations may lack resources
  - Societal breakdown
  - Put beyond use





### DEEP GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL - A BIT OF HISTORY

- Earliest work from USA in 1950s and 1960s on deep salt formations
- EC commissioned work in 1975 to identify potentially suitable rock formations in Europe
  - Hard igneous and metamorphic rocks (granite, gneiss)
  - Clay-rich rocks
  - Salt formations
- Each country develops its own active R&D programme, depending on national geological conditions
- Basic R&D in the field and in the lab augmented by practical tests and (large-scale) experiments in specially constructed underground research facilities (URLs)
  - HADES, Mont-Terri, Bure, Aspö, Onkalo, Grimsel, Gorleben
- · Practical implementation slow due to political and social problems





# SEDIMENTARY ROCKS (E.G. CLAYS) AS HOST FORMATION

A wide spectrum of argillaceous media\* are being considered as potential host rocks for deep geological disposal of radioactive waste, because of their favourable properties:

- · thickness, continuity, relative homogeneity
- · low hydraulic conductivity
- chemical buffering capacity
- · plastic deformation and self-sealing of fractures
- geochemical characteristics that favour low solubility of radionuclides
- high sorption capacity

\*from plastic, soft, poorly indurated clays to brittle, hard mudstones or shales













eurad

# SAFETY OF A SYSTEM WITH CLAY HOST ROCKS

• **Difference of Importance** of individual **Barrier Elements** to achieve sufficient performance of the different **Safety Functions** 

	Waste Matrix	Canister	Buffer/Seals	Host Rock	Geological situation
Immobilisation/ containment	** _ ***	**			
Retention & Slow release	***		**	***	
Isolation & Stability			*	**	***

Adapted from P. Zuidema, NAGRA

FUTURe MAGMATIC AND METHAMORPHIC ROCKS (CRYSTALLINE ROCKS) AS HOST FORMATION • Impermeable, Stable

- Fractures!
- → RN pathways therefore: **Reliance** on long-lived canister







# **CRYSTALLINE ROCKS – COPPER CANISTERS**

• Canister with copper shell - *lifetime up to 1 Mio. years* 





# FUTURe REPOSITORY CONCEPT IN CRYSTALLINE ROCKS - KBS-3 CONCEPT USED IN SWEDEN AND FINLAND



developed by SKB and implemented by POSIVA

FUTURe DESIGN OF SF REPOSITORY IN FINLAND (OLKILUOTO) BY POSIVA OY - UNDER CONSTRUCTION





http://www.intoeternitythemovie.com/



FUTURe.

# SAFETY OF A SYSTEM WITH FRACTURED CRYSTALLINE ROCK

• **Difference of Importance** of individual **Barrier Elements** to achieve sufficient performance of the different **Safety Functions** 

	Waste Matrix	Canister	Buffer/Seals	Host Rock	Geological situation
Immobilisation/ containment	***	***			
Retention & Slow release	***		**	* _ **	
Isolation & Stability			*	*	***





# SALT ROCKS AS HOST FORMATION

- Dry environment for construction and underground operation
- High heat transfer
- Impermeable to groundwater
- Self-sealing (salt creep)



Example: Gorleben Salt Dome, Germany (Exploration site)





# SAFETY OF A SYSTEM WITH ROCK SALT

• **Difference of Importance** of individual **Barrier Elements** to achieve sufficient performance of the different **Safety Functions** 

	Waste Matrix	Canister	Buffer/Seals	Host Rock	Geological situation
Immobilisation/ containment	***	*		***	
Retention & Slow release	***				
Isolation & Stability			*	*	***

Adapted from P. Zuidema, NAGRA



## CURRENT STATUS FOR SF/HLW REPOSITORIES IN EUROPE

- Finland (crystalline rock): construction licence granted (2015) construction underway, operation licence application in preparation
- Sweden (crystalline rock): construction licence application submitted (2011), in final phase of discussion
- France (sediments): site selected, construction licence application in preparation, to be submitted in near future
- Switzerland (sediments): site selection is in advanced stage, 1 site is proposed for the submission of general licence application in ~ 2024
- Germany (several host rocks): site selection according to law in 2031 (with many steps in between)
- Belgium (Sedimentary rocks): design concept and Safety Case methodology was developed for Boom Clay as a potential host formation. But no decision host formation yet, requirement to explore other potential sedimentary rocks (from poorly indurated plastic clays – Boom Clay, Ypresian clays – to hard pelites, slates...) and to apply same methodology.
- Czech Republic (crystalline rock): 4 sites selected in 2020, final site and alternative will be european elected based on SA in 2030.





# **SORPTION:**

# **Retention processes for Radionuclides**

F. BRANDT, N. MAES, B. BAEYENS, M. MARQUES FERNANDES & M. KLINKENBERG

The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement n° 847593.



FUTURe.

### THE LONG-TERM SAFETY OF A DEEP GEOLOGICAL NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY

#### **Geochemical aspects**

Aim: Prediction of the geochemical evolution of a nuclear waste repository system over geological time scales.

Including: the multi-barrier system of waste matrix, canisters, tunnel backfill, surrounding rock

Required: sound understanding of

- Radionuclide migration
- Retention processes



17.11.2021



### DISPOSAL SYSTEM FOR HIGH LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE

#### Complex multiphase system

In contact with water: geochemical gradients, especially at the interfaces of the different components of the disposal system

#### Secondary phase formation

- Radionuclide (RN) structural uptake
- RN adsorption
- $\rightarrow$  RN retention

Engineered barrier system (EBS)

Waste package Backfill + liner (waste form + container)



Host rock

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting



4

**SORPTION** 

#### Adsorption processes

RN accumulated on a surface in a reversible way

- lon exchange
- Surface complexation

#### Structural uptake

1. Electrostatic Adsorption



3. Coprecipitation/Solid Solution





FUTURe.

2. Chemical Adsorption



4. Precipitation





17.11.2021



### ADSORPTION ON CLAY MINERALS

#### **Clay minerals**

Layers of Si-O tetraheders with Al-O octaheders Plate like structure forming stacks



17.11.2021





Future 3rd Annual Meeting



FUTURe.

# RN ADSORPTION ON CLAYS: EXCHANGEABLE CATIONS

#### Ion exchange

Ion exchange sites are typical for clay minerals due to:

 Substitution of Si or Al by an element of lower valency, Si(IV) by Al(III), Al(III) by Mg(II), a permanent negative charge is created.



- Neutralization by hydrated cations: Na<sup>+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, Ca<sup>2+</sup>,... which form the exchangeable cations in the interlayers of the clay
- Ion exchange reaction:  $S-Na + K^+ \Leftrightarrow S-K + Na^+$



17.11.2021



#### RN ADSORPTION ON CLAYS: SURFACE COMPLEXATION

#### Functional groups on mineral surfaces

Most important functional groups are -OH type groups:

- present on aluminosilicates (AI-OH & Si-OH)
- oxide surfaces (M-OH) and
- organics (carboxyl, carbonyl, phenolic) functional groups

**Depending on the pH** they are protonated, developing a positive charge or deprotonated, developing a negative charge

S-OH + H <sup>+</sup>	$\Leftrightarrow$	S-OH <sub>2</sub> +
S-OH	$\Leftrightarrow$	$S-O^- + H^+$





FUTURe.

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting



# RN ADSORPTION ON CLAYS - MODELING

#### Mechanistic interpretation: Surface complexation/ion exchange models

Based on interaction constants ( $K_{SOM}$ ,  $K_{Na/K}$ ) with the surface functional groups and ion exchange sites (thermodynamic basis)

S-OH + M <sup>n+</sup>	$\Leftrightarrow$ S-OM <sup>(n-1)+</sup>	+ H+	К <sub>som</sub>
S-Na + K <sup>+</sup>	⇔ S-K	+ Na+	K <sub>Na/K</sub>

→ Valid for different chemical conditions

→Complex but robust – based on chemical understanding

#### Experimental data needed: Measuring adsorption as function of

- pH (edges)
- Electrolyte concentration
- RN concentration (isotherms)



# FUTURe

#### **RN ADSORPTION ON CLAYS: BATCH EXPERIMENT**

The solid-liquid distribution ratio  $R_d$  (K<sub>d</sub>)



log [c<sub>eq</sub>(M)]

17.11.2021





Adsorption edges (R<sub>d</sub> vs. pH)





FUTURe.

# RN ADSORPTION IN NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORIES

#### The example of <sup>226</sup>Ra

In some scenarios, as a result of the <sup>238</sup>U decay chain <sup>226</sup>Ra dominates the dose during the late stages

Corrosion of spent fuel can lead to release and migration of <sup>226</sup>Ra into the near field of a nuclear waste repository

Adsorption on buffer materials or host rock (e.g. clay)?





SKB, 2010



#### ADSORPTION ON CLAY MINERALS: EXAMPLE FROM EURAD-FUTURE (PSI - FZJ)

#### <sup>226</sup>Ra and Ba adsorption on montmorillonite (SWy)

Montmorillonite as model system for bentonite buffer

#### **Scientific questions**

- Quantitative understanding of <sup>226</sup>Ra and Ba adsorption
- Derivation of a mechanistic adsorption model
- Is Ba a suitable analogue for <sup>226</sup>Ra?
  - → Use of Ba as carrier for the <sup>226</sup>Ra tracer in adsorption isotherm

	Type of	[X <sup>a</sup> ] <sub>init/eql</sub> (M) <sup>b</sup>	Ionic strength	S/L (g L <sup>-1</sup> )	pH
	experiment		NaCI (M)		
<sup>133</sup> Ba	Edge	3.3.10-8 - 3.9.10-8	0.03	2.91	3.3 - 9.3
<sup>133</sup> Ba	Edge	4.3.10-8 - 3.7.10-8	0.3	2.96	2.6 - 10.6
<sup>226</sup> Ra	Edge	2.0.10-7	0.02	2.21	5.5 - 10.2
<sup>226</sup> Ra	Edge	1.9.10-8	0.14	8.33	5.6 - 10.2
<sup>226</sup> Ra	Edge	1.8.10-8	0.3	13.95	5.7 - 9.9
<sup>137</sup> Ba/ <sup>133</sup> Ba	Isotherm	2.03·10 <sup>-9</sup> - 1.8·10 <sup>-2</sup>	0.02	0.88 - 4.39	6.9 - 7.1
1370 /260	Isotherm	<sup>[137</sup> Ba] 0.0 - 1.7·10 <sup>-2</sup>	0.02	0.04 4.00	6.5. 5.0
<sup>15</sup> /Ba/ <sup>21</sup> Ra	Isotherm	[ <sup>226</sup> Ra] 4.3·10 <sup>-9</sup> - 5.9·10 <sup>-9</sup>	0.02	0.84 - 4.29	6.5 - 7.0
a X=Ba or Ra: b	For edges initi	al concentrations and for is	otherms equilib	rium concentrat	tions are given

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting

Klinkenberg et al., 2021



FUTURe

#### **ADSORPTION OF Ba ON MONTMORILLONITE (I)**

#### Ba pH adsorption edges

Adsorption mainly dominated by a **single cation exchange reaction** of Ba<sup>2+</sup> with respect to Na<sup>+</sup> on montmorillonite

For the more pronounced Ba uptake at high pH and IS, the **surface complexation of Ba** on edge sites modelled by one single surface complexation constant. This was fixed in all model calculations.







FUTURe

#### ADSORPTION OF <sup>226</sup>Ra AND Ba ON MONTMORILLONITE

#### Ba and Ra pH adsorption edges: cation exchange

At low ionic strength: selectivity coefficients for Ba and Ra in good agreement (log  $K_c$  values vary between 0.70 and 0.84).

At high ionic strength, the  $K_c$  (Ba-Na) slightly higher compared to the low ionic strength data.

K<sub>c</sub> (Ra-Na) exhibits a clear dependency on ionic strength



17.11.2021





#### ADSORPTION OF 226Ra AND Ba ON MONTMORILLONITE

#### Ba and Ra pH adsorption edges: cation exchange

At low ionic strength: selectivity coefficients for Ba and Ra in good agreement (log  $K_c$  values vary between 0.70 and 0.84).

At high ionic strength, the  $K_c$  (Ba-Na) slightly higher compared to the low ionic strength data.  $K_c$  (Ra-Na) exhibits a clear dependency on ionic strength

Experiment	Kine	Kinetics Edges			Isotherms		
NaCl concentration (M)	0.02	0.1	0.01	0.02	0.14	0.3	0.02
Cation exchange reaction	log K <sub>c</sub>						
$2Na-SWy + Ba^{2+} \Leftrightarrow Ba-SWy + 2Na^{+}$	-	-	-	0.70	-	0.90	0.70
$2Na\text{-}SWy + Ra^{2+} \Leftrightarrow Ra\text{-}SWy + 2Na^{+}$	0.84	1.34	0.70	0.70	1.14	1.34	0.70



17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting

26

Klinkenberg et al., 2021



#### ADSORPTION OF <sup>226</sup>Ra AND Ba ON MONTMORILLONITE

#### Ba and Ra pH adsorption edges: cation exchange

At low ionic strength: selectivity coefficients for Ba and Ra in good agreement (log  $K_c$  values vary between 0.70 and 0.84).

At high ionic strength, the  $K_c$  (Ba-Na) slightly higher compared to the low ionic strength data.  $K_c$  (Ra-Na) exhibits a clear dependency on ionic strength

Experiment	Kinetics		Edges			Isotherms	
NaCl concentration (M)	0.02	0.1	0.01	0.02	0.14	0.3	0.02
Cation exchange reaction	log K <sub>c</sub>						
$2Na-SWy + Ba^{2+} \Leftrightarrow Ba-SWy + 2Na^{+}$	-	-	-	0.70	-	0.90	0.70
$2Na\text{-}SWy + Ra^{2+} \Leftrightarrow Ra\text{-}SWy + 2Na^{+}$	0.84	1.34	0.70	0.70	1.14	1.34	0.70

#### and surface complexation

The contribution of surface complexation to the overall adsorption is the same for Ba and Ra and is independent of ionic strength.

Ra and Ba surface complexation can be described with an identical model

Site type	Capacity
$\equiv S^{W2}OH$	4.0·10 <sup>-2</sup> mol·kg <sup>-1</sup>
Surface complexation reactions	Constants
$\equiv \! S^{W2}OH + H^+ \Leftrightarrow \equiv \! S^{W2}OH_2^+$	$\log K^{+} = 6.0$
$\equiv S^{W2}OH \Leftrightarrow \equiv S^{W2}O^- + H^+$	$\log K = -10.5$
$\equiv\!\!S^{W2}OH + Ba^{2+} \Leftrightarrow \equiv\!\!S^{W2}OBa^+ + H^+$	$\log K_1 = -5.0$
$\equiv\!\!S^{W2}OH + Ra^{2+} \Leftrightarrow \equiv\!\!S^{W2}ORa^{+} + H^{+}$	$\log K_1 = -5.0$

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting

Klinkenberg et al., 2021



FUTURe

#### ADSORPTION OF 226Ra AND Ba ON MONTMORILLONITE

#### Ba and Ra isotherms

Very similar behaviour at pH = 7 and low ionic strength

#### Conclusions

Ba is good analogue for  $^{\rm 226}\text{Ra}$  regarding the adsorption on montmorillonite at ionic strengths < 0.1 M and pH < 8

Ra deviates in its behaviour at higher ionic strength.

A plausible explanation for this observation: larger ionic radius of Ra compared to Ba  $\rightarrow$  favours its selectivity behaviour on Na-montmorillonite.



Klinkenberg et al., 2021





Adsorption processes

Structural uptake Solid-solutions: abundant in nature, leading to lower RN solubilities compared to pure phases.

Lacking thermodynamic data: so far limited applicability in HLW safety assessments

 $\rightarrow$  conservatisms in assessments?

17.11.2021

1. Electrostatic Adsorption



3. Coprecipitation/Solid Solution



2. Chemical Adsorption



4. Precipitation





Future 3rd Annual Meeting

FUTURe

WHAT IS A SOLID SOLUTION?

#### Example: Solid solution formation from the endmembers BA and CA

#### B, C = cations, A = anion

Phase BA Phase CA



#### Solid solution

a single phase which exists over a range in chemical composition.

Most minerals in nature are solid solutions.



17.11.2021



#### THE STABILITY OF SOLID SOLUTIONS

#### **Boundary conditions**

#### Size difference

of the ions or atoms being mixed. If ionic radii differ by less than 15%, extensive or complete solid solution is often observed.

#### Flexibility of the crystal structure

extend of solid solution depends on the ability of the structural framework to flex and accomodate differently-sized atoms

#### Ion charge

difference in bonding character, valence of ions being mixed, electron configuration effects

Future 3rd Annual Meeting



FUTURe

## WHY ARE SOLID-SOLUTIONS IMPORTANT?!

#### ..once again: the example of <sup>226</sup>Ra

#### Relevance of the solid solution formation for the solubility:

Simplified example: 0.1 n NaCl background electrolyte, 25 °C

Solubility of pure RaSO<sub>4</sub>

2 · 10<sup>-5</sup> mol/L

Full equilibration of 0.5 g/L BaSO<sub>4</sub> to (Ba,Ra)SO<sub>4</sub>,  $a_0 = 0$ final c(Ra)<sub>eq</sub>  $4 \cdot 10^{-8}$  mol/L



SKB, 2010

Phase B<sub>x</sub>C<sub>1-x</sub>A





### RADIUM, SULFATES AND SOLID SOLUTION FORMATION

#### .. the historical background

- 1898: Marie and Pierre Curie discover RaCl<sub>2</sub> separated due to similar behaviour with Ba; pure Ra metal separated by M. Curie and A.-L. Debierne
  Lind et al. 1918: Solubility of RaSO<sub>4</sub>
- Ground-breaking papers by Doerner and Hoskins (1925), Co-precipitation of Radium and Bariumsulfates; Doerner-Hoskins Partition Coefficient, Hahn (1926): Solubility of RaSO<sub>4</sub>. Nikitin and Tolmatscheff (1936), solubility of RaSO<sub>4</sub>
- Jucker and Treadwell (1954): Uptake of Ra in barite and celestite
- Weigel and Tinkl, (1967): Crystal structure of RaSO<sub>4</sub>
- 1970s Solid solution-aqueous solution equilibria: Lippmann theory
- Langmuir and Riese (1985): Thermodynamics of Radium
- Zhu (2004): Binary Mixing Properties BaSO<sub>4</sub> RaSO<sub>4</sub>
- NEA (2007): solid solutions and radioactive waste management
- Bosbach et al. (2010), Curti et al. (2010): Recrystallisation of  $BaSO_4$  in the presence of  $^{226}\text{Ra}$
- FZJ IEK-6: Vinograd et al., 2013, Klinkenberg et al., 2014, Brandt et al. 2015, Weber et al., 2016, Prieto et al., 2016, Weber et al. 2017, Vinograd et al., 2018a, Vinograd et al., 2018b, Klinkenberg et al., 2018, Bosbach et al., 2020, Brandt, et al. (2020)

17.11.2021



FUTURe.

#### THE ISOSTRUCTURAL SOLID SOLUTION



	RaSO₄	BaSO <sub>4</sub>	SrSO <sub>4</sub>
Cation radius CN 12 [Å]	1.70	1.61	1.44
a [Å]	9.16	8.87	8.36
b [Å]	5.56	5.54	5.35
c [Å]	7.30	7.14	6.87
Log Ksp	-10.26	-9.97	-6.63

Orthorhombic



17.11.2021



### **Ra SOLUBILITY IN THE PRESENCE OF SOLID SOLUTIONS?**

What do we need to know?

#### Prediction of the thermodynamic properties

- Molecular level **mixing model** → interaction parameters describing the ideality of the solid-solution
- Thermodynamic properties (**solubility**) of the endmembers BaSO<sub>4</sub>, RaSO<sub>4</sub>, SrSO<sub>4</sub>

# Validation of the theoretical model and detailed process understanding of <sup>226</sup>Ra-uptake

- Recrystallization experiments
- Microscopic analyses of the solid









FUTURe



17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting

# HOW TO TACKLE THE QUESTION OF RA UPTAKE PREDICTION?

#### Approach





17.11.2021



### HOW TO TACKLE THE QUESTION OF Ra UPTAKE PREDICTION?

### The system Ra - Ba - SO<sub>4</sub> - H<sub>2</sub>O

Solubility products	BaSO <sub>4</sub> RaSO <sub>4</sub>	$log(K_{SP}) = -9.97 \text{ to } -9.98$ $log(K_{SP}) = -10.26 \text{ to } -10.41$
Relevant Ra-species	Ra(s), Ra <sup>2+</sup> , RaOH <sup>+</sup> , RaCl <sup>+</sup> , RaCO <sub>3</sub> (aq), RaCO <sub>3</sub> (s) RaSO <sub>4</sub> (aq), RaSO <sub>4</sub> (s)	

#### Interaction Parameters of the solid solution Ra<sub>x</sub>Ba<sub>1-x</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>

a<sub>0</sub> = 0.35 (Zhu et al.) to 2.5 (Curti et al.)



FUTURe

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting

# THEORETICAL APPROACHES: INTERACTION PARAMETER

#### (Ba,Ra)SO<sub>4</sub> solid solution

Atomistic calculations, single defect approach DFT calculations with CASTEP Exchange-correlation functional of Wu & Cohen (2006) Ultra-soft OTFG pseudopotentials Plane wave cutoff 910 eV

### $a_0 (Ba,Ra)SO_4 = 1.0 \pm 0.4$



Vinograd et al. 2014



#### **RECRYSTALLIZATION EXPERIMENT**

#### Why recrystallization and not co-precipitation?

Co-precipitation can lead to

- Kinetic entrapment during co-precipitation
- Chemical inhomogeneity of the solid phase

Careful at ultra trace RN concentration levels!

Re-crystallization experiments are carried out at close-toequilibrium conditions between solid and aqueous solution to avoid these effects





17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting









Klinkenberg et al. ES&T, 2014

eurad

eurad



#### **COMPARISON EXPERIMENT - PREDICTIONS**



#### Excellent agreement with thermodynamic prediction at $a_0 = 1.0$ and log $K_{sp}(RaSO_4) = -10.41$

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting



eurad

Brandt et al. GCA, 2015

THE UPTAKE PROCESS - MICROSCOPY

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting

composition APT



#### **THE UPTAKE PROCESS - MICROSCOPY**

#### **Electron Microscopy**







HAADF STEM image

FIB cross-section

STEM image

### SEM, TEM and STEM observation of the layered structure of barite

#### This structure consists of nano-scaled pores

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting

Weber et al., 2016



FUTURe

# **THE UPTAKE PROCESS - MICROSCOPY**

#### Stage 2: STEM-EDX Mapping with ChemiSTEM and Super-EDX









At intermediate stages of the recrystallization of BaSO<sub>4</sub> to (Ba,Ra)SO<sub>4</sub>:

The Ra distribution is not homogeneous, higher Ra concentrations occur near to pores

Pores are reactive sides  $\rightarrow$  kinetics of Ra uptake depend on internal structure and surface of BaSO<sub>4</sub>



17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting

Weber et al., 2017



#### SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

#### Sorption of RN: adsorption and solid solution formation

- The example of <sup>226</sup>Ra shows that both mechanisms can be relevant and can be described by thermodynamic models
- <sup>226</sup>Ra adsorption on clay: Ra behaves similar but not identical to Ba, can be modeled with existing surface complexation and cation exchange models
- <sup>226</sup>Ra uptake in solid solutions can have a significant effect upon the solubility, depending on the total Ba and SO<sub>4</sub> inventory and uptake kinetics
- Not presented but also available as a solid solution model: the ternary system of BaSO<sub>4</sub>-SrSO<sub>4</sub>-RaSO<sub>4</sub> in solution

#### **Open questions:**

- Crystallization of the (Ba,Ra)SO<sub>4</sub> solid solution in confined spaces (EURAD-Future)
- Competition of adsorption and solid solution formation? ..to be investigated

17.11.2021

Future 3rd Annual Meeting



FUTURe

# THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ATTENTION....






FUTURE 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting 16.-17.11.2021

## Interfacial redox reactions, X-ray absorption spectroscopy, and what they can do for the safety of radioactive-waste repositories

#### Andreas C. Scheinost

The Rossendorf Beamline @ ESRF, Grenoble, France Institute of Resource Ecology @ HZDR, Dresden, Germany Institute of Geological Sciences @ University of Berne, Switzerland



Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de

## Nuclear waste

#### Sources



### Inventory TBq (World)

	Low/inter- mediate level	Spent fuel	Reprocessing
Power plants	1.2·10 <sup>6</sup>	2.8·10 <sup>10</sup>	4.2·10 <sup>7</sup>
Institutional	7.0·10 <sup>5</sup>		
Military	7.0·10 <sup>5</sup>		3.1.107

Source: IAEA-TECDOC-1591 (2007)

Switzerland: 2% India: 2% (?) Germany: 3% Korea (Rep.): 4% UK: 5% France: 6% Japan: 7% Russia: 10% (?) Canada: 19% USA: 28%







## Steel/clay interface at anoxic conditions



#### Magnetite formation: 3 Fe(s) + 4 $H_2O \rightarrow Fe_3O_4(s)$ + 4 $H_2(g)$



#### Fe<sup>II</sup> water/mineral interfaces with significant reduction potential





Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de





41

Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de





# Selenium

Se



### Se Retention of selenium by concrete barriers Structure and sorption of an elusive anion, HSe<sup>-</sup>



HSe<sup>-</sup> is barely sorbed by most minerals, posing a significant risk for the safe disposal of this longlived fission product. The cement barrier foreseen for intermediate-level waste repositories, however, contains AFm phases, which due to their anion exchanging properties may be able to retain HSe<sup>-1</sup>.



HSe<sup>-</sup> is significantly sorbed in the interlayers of AFm-HC, and also better protected against re-oxidation HSe<sup>-</sup> is lesser sorbed by AFm-MC due to the lesser accessibility of its interlayer space.

H. Rojo, A. C. Scheinost, B. Lothenbach, A. Laube, E. Wieland and J. Tits, Dalton Transactions 2018, 47, 4209-4218.

ber of the Heln



Np

## Neptunium





Member of the Helmholtz Ass Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de





A. C. Scheinost, R. Steudtner, R. Hübner, S. Weiss, F. Bok, Environ. Sci. Technol. 50, 10413-10420 (2016).

Member of the Helmholtz Ass Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de

## NP Formation of nanosized Np<sup>IV</sup> silica colloids

Np<sup>IV</sup> carbonate+silicate solutions, simulating Np release in alkaline near-field, which is diluted with neutral water in the far-field









- Complete reduction of Tc<sup>VII</sup> to Tc<sup>IV</sup>
- Low [Tc]<sub>ini</sub>: ES/CS coordination to FeO<sub>6</sub>-octahedra, partial incorporation into magnetite structure (⇔ complete incorporation observed by Kobayashi et al. 2013 at lower pH 6.5)
- High [Tc]<sub>ini</sub>: Sorption of [TcO<sub>2</sub>]-dimers in addition to structural incorporation of monomers
- Initial concentration explains previous contradictory results on Tc<sup>IV</sup> speciation in reducing environments (Morris & coworkers, Zachara & coworkers,...)

E. Yalçıntaş, A. C. Scheinost, X. Gaona, M. Altmaier, Dalton Trans. 45, 17874-17885 (2016).



Member of the Helmholtz A Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de

## Tc<sup>VII</sup> retention mechanisms by magnetite and mackinawite



### Tc Even a simple structure like TcO<sub>2</sub> xH<sub>2</sub>O seems to be elusive.....

Tc

Alternating short (2.62 Å) "metallic", and long (3.08 Å) oxidic Tc-Tc distances like in crystalline  $TcO_2$ (Rodriguez et al. 2007).....



...or only short (2.57 Å) "metallic" Tc-Tc distances as derived by EXAFS for  $TcO_2 xH2O$  (Lukens et al. 2002)?

We can fit both models.....



Member of the Helmholtz Association

HZDR

## Tc Structure of TcO<sub>2</sub> x 2H<sub>2</sub>O chains: Atomistic calculations



Putonium

## Plutonium





Member of the Helmholtz As Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de



#### Pu

Pu

#### Plutonium retention by coprecipitating magnetite: Kinetic entrapment versus sorption

	Component	mponent 1			Magnetite		Component 2		
	Incorporate	d Pu(III)	Pu(III)			Oh site #		Sorbed Pu(III)	
Paths	CN	R/Å	σ²/Ų	ΔE <sub>0</sub> /eV	$\chi_{res}/\%$	CN	R/Å	CN	R/Å
Pu-O <sub>1</sub>	4.5	2.22	0.0089ª	8.4	11.1	6	2.06		
Pu-O <sub>2</sub>	3.8	2.45	0.0089ª					9	2.45
Pu-Fe <sub>1</sub>	2.7	3.68	0.0032 <sup>b</sup>			6	2.95	3	3.54
Pu-Fe <sub>2</sub>	1.9	3.93	0.0032 <sup>b</sup>			6	3.46	3	4.20
Pu-Fe <sub>3</sub>	12*	5.17	0.0150 <sup>c</sup>			12	5.11		
Pu-Fe	8*	5.47	0.0150 <sup>c</sup>			8	5.42		







- Pu(III) can be incorporated by magnetite, by creating a pyrochlore-like local cluster within the magnetite structure
- But only up to 50%, and with time/recrystallization, this amount decreases to 33%
- Surface complexation seems to be thermodynamically more import
- Incorporation seems to proceed through kinetic entrapment





Member of the Helmholtz A Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de

#### EXAFS: Experiments with strict conservation of oxidation states



## The Rossendorf Beamline (ROBL-II) @ ESRF





- ✓ Operated at ESRF (The European Synchrotron, Grenoble, France) by Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf since 1998
- Embedded within Helmholtz Association's (HGF) research program NUSAFE (Nuclear Waste Management)
- Dedicated to the chemistry of actinoides (Th, Pa, U, Np, Pu, Am, Cm,...,Cf,...) and fission products (Se, Tc, Sn, I, lanthanoides)
- X-ray absorption spectroscopy to study oxidation state (XANES) and local structure (EXAFS) of these elements
- ✓ 2016-2020 major upgrade (4.5 Mio EUR) of ROBL into a synchrotron toolbox for actinide research (ROBL-II)
- ✓ 2016-2020 major upgrade (150 Mio EUR) of ESRF into 4<sup>th</sup> generation synchrotron (Extremely Brilliant Source)



### **ROBL-II:** A synchrotron toolbox for actinide research







## Time-resolved X-ray pair distribution function: Structural modification of vernadite $(\delta - MnO_2)$ by Ni



- Complementary to XRD: allows for a detailed analysis of structural modifications, at the molecular scale
- PDF data are collected as a function of time. Upon substraction of the initial da allows probing any structural modificat ons (d-PDF analysis)
- For example, for clay minerals (figures sorption by  $\delta$ -MnO<sub>2</sub>): determination of the mechanisms of Ni adsorption
- Complementary to EXAFS: correlations can be observed up to several tens of nanometers, but (i) lower sensitivity than EXAFS and (ii) any modification of the sorbing phase will induce complexity in data analysis, because changes will be reflected in the d-PDF



All correlations observed in the d-PDF are consistent with Ni sorption above a vacancy



After Grangeon et al., Chemical Geology, 2017

ZDR ber of the He

Andreas Scheinost scheinost@esrf.fr I www.hzdr.de



We are happy to welcome you at ROBL-II....









## WP5 - FUTURE: 3<sup>RD</sup> ANNUAL MEETING Radionuclide transport in clay

17 November 2021 • Zoom • Martin Glaus

The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement n° 847593.



#### OUTLINE

#### • Diffusion processes:

Concentration gradients (solution phase) as the driving force

#### Experimental methods and information gained

- Inert media: steady-state phase vs. transient phase
- Charged clay media
- Effects of surface charges in clays:
  - Surface diffusion of cations
  - Anion exclusion
- Diffusion parameters in charged clays
  - Dependence on chemical conditions of solution phase (ionic strength, pH, competing ions)
- Application in performance assessment:
  - Bottom-up approach for diffusion
- Conclusions





eurad

#### **DIFFUSION IN DILUTE BULK SOLUTIONS**





A. Fick (1829 - 1901)

$$J = -D\frac{\partial C}{\partial x}$$

D: Diffusion coefficient

Focus on concentration-driven diffusion in the following presentation!





#### **DIFFUSION IN INERT POROUS MEDIA: 'PORE DIFFUSION MODEL'**



#### Effective diffusion coefficient D<sub>e</sub>:

$$D_e = \varepsilon \frac{\delta}{\tau^2} D_0 = \frac{\varepsilon}{G} D_0 = \dots$$

- $D_e$ : Effective diffusion coefficient
- $D_0$ : Bulk diffusion coefficient
- ε: Porosity —> affecting cross section area
- $\delta$ : Constrictivity —> affecting mobility
- $\tau$ : Tortuosity —> affecting diffusion path (also termed as 'geometry factor' *G*)

Further parameter influences, see: Shackelford, C.D., Daniel, D.E. (1991) *J. Geotech. Eng. ASCE* 117, 467–484.





"Steady-state (approx)": Flux(upstream) = Flux(downstream => linear profile in clay Primary observables: Changes of mass/concentration (solution)as a function of time Concentration (gradient)/difference in clay Derived quantities: Flux [mol/m<sup>2</sup>/s] (from time derivative of concentration in solution)  $D_e$  [m<sup>2</sup>/s] (from concentration gradient/differences in clay)





#### **DIFFUSION IN INERT POROUS MEDIA**



#### The rock capacity factor ( $\alpha$ )

$$\alpha = \varepsilon + \rho_{bd} R_d$$

- ε: Porosity
- $\rho_{bd}$ : Bulk dry density (kg m<sup>-3</sup>)

 $R_{\rm d}$ : Sorption distribution coefficient (m<sup>3</sup> kg<sup>-1</sup>)

- ... is reflected by:
- 1. the breakthrough behaviour
- 2. The concentration ratio 'clay/aqueous phase'







R<sub>d</sub> D<sub>e</sub>



Concentration ratio

Flux in steady-state phase





#### **CONFINING FILTERS**



 $D_{e,all} = rac{D_{e,f} D_{e,c} \left( 2l_f + l_c 
ight)}{2l_f D_{e,c} + l_c D_{e,f}}$ 

Glaus et al (2015) J. Contam. Hydrol. 177-178, 239-248.

#### "Steady-state phase":

Primary observables:  $J_{all}$  (overall flux),  $\Delta C_{all}$  (overall concentration difference)

Derived:

 $\Delta C_{clay}$ ,  $D_{e,c}$  (effective diffusion coefficient in clay)



FUTURe.

#### **OUT-DIFFUSION**

- Following through-diffusion
- Crux: Knowledge of initial conditions







#### **IN-DIFFUSION**

- Concentration depletion in reservoir (0 t)
- Concentration profile (at time t)





<sup>2</sup> Distance (cm)

- Sampling in solution
- Tracer concentration in reservoir (as a function of time)
- Slicing of clay sample
- Tracer profile in clay (as a function of distance)





#### **DO's AND DON'Ts**

#### • Setup:

- Use filter confinement only if required
- Avoid advection (gradients in hydraulic head)
- Materials (diffusion cell + filters): Contamination of solutions / uptake of solutes

#### • Dimensions of diffusion geometry:

- Optimisation of geometry necessary (avoiding filter dominance)
- Thickness <--> gradients, flux
- Cross section area <—> flux
- Volumes of clay and filter (--> change mass transfer)
- Time aspects:
  - Diffusion length <—> apparent diffusion coefficient (D<sub>a</sub>)
  - Through-diffusion: Duration 6x Break-through time
  - In-diffusion: Profile resolution
- Cross-check of results:
  - Outdiffusion, profile analysis





#### **DO's AND DON'Ts**

- Through-diffusion:
  - Probing of boundaries (only!)
  - Independent checks most valuable (out-diffusion, profile)
  - Verification of modelling assumptions necessary









#### DIFFUSION PROCESSES IN CHARGED CLAYS: "SIMPLE CATIONS + ANIONS"





#### **DIFFUSION IN CHARGED POROUS MEDIA**



 $\Rightarrow$  Smaller fluxes of anions



eurad

#### DIFFUSION OF Sr<sup>2+</sup> IN COMPACTED MONTMORILLONITE





- Increasing flux with decreasing ionic strength
- ± same breakthrough times
- $\Rightarrow$   $D_{\rm e}$  and  $R_{\rm d}$  correlated ( $D_{\rm a}$  ± same)
- $\Rightarrow$  Cation-exchange species mobile?!
- $\Rightarrow$  "Interlayer diffusion"

$$D_e = -J_{(t)} \left(\frac{\Delta C}{\Delta x}\right)_t^{-1}$$





eurad



#### DIFFUSION OF CATIONS AND ANIONS IN DIFFERENT CLAY TYPES



 $\Rightarrow D_{e}$  depends on "chemical enrichment factors"

Glaus et al. (2017). PSI Bericht 17-08.



#### **CONCLUSIONS: PARAMETER SCHEME FOR RETARDED TRANSPORT**





#### DIFFUSION PROCESSES IN CHARGED CLAYS: SURFACE COMPLEXING CATIONS







#### IN-DIFFUSION OF Co<sup>2+</sup> IN COMPACTED ILLITE, pH 5 AND 9



- Increasing diffusion depth
- $D_{\rm e} ({\rm pH} 5) = D_{\rm e} ({\rm pH} 9)$

Glaus et al. (2015). Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 165, 376-388.



Bradbury & Baeyens (2017). Nagra Technical Report NTB 17-13.

 $=> D_{e}$  increasing with decreasing ionic streng

FUTURe.

eurad

eurad



eurac

#### 2SPNE SC/EDL DIFFUSION + SORPTION MODEL



EDL = Electrical double layer

Mobile species:Aqueous phase, Diffuse layer (open symbols)Immobile species:Stern layer species, Strong + weak sites (closed symbols)Red / blue circles:Different cationic species

Glaus et al. (2021). ACS Earth Space Chemistry 5, 2621-2625.



## FUTURe,

#### PORE GEOMETRY IN EDL MODEL



Volume =  $\pi r^2 L$ Surface  $\cong 2\pi r L$ Volumetric-specific surface =  $2/r_p$ 

=> Pore radius from specific surface area



=>  $d_{DL}$  = Debye length(I) ·  $n_{DL}$ =>  $f_{free}$  from "difference between pore radius and Donnan thickness  $d_{DL}$ "

Glaus et al. (2015). Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 165, 376-388.



FUTURe.

ANIONS: CONCENTRATION DEPLETION versus COMPLETE EXCLUSION









#### FROM CLAY MINERALS TO CLAY ROCKS

eurad

eurad

 $c_{j},\,\mu_{j},\Psi=\,0$ 

⇔ Diffusive transport



Appelo et al. (2010). Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 74, 1201-1219.

Non-swelling clay \_\_\_\_\_ mineral (e.g. kaolinite

illite)

~1 nm



#### FROM MODEL TO REAL SYSTEMS

- Pure mineral phases
- Single electrolytes •
- Synthetic pore water
- Isotropic diffusion
- Equilibrium situation
- Representative nuclide
- Bottom-up step
- Bottom-up step
- Mineral assemblage, clay rock
- Equilibrium pore water
- Anisotropic diffusion
- Kinetic phenomena, long-term processes
- Periodic system of elements / species

#### Bottom-up scheme in WP Future:

Bottom-up I: from disperse minerals to compacted minerals Bottom-up II: from single minerals to clay rock



Glaus et al. (2021). ACS

Earth Space Chemistry **5**, 2621-2625.

eurad

eurad

#### **COMPETITION EFFECTS IN EDL DIFFUSION**



<sup>57</sup>Co<sup>2+</sup> diffusion in illite (pH 5, NaCl 0.1 M, 1700 kg m<sup>-3</sup>)

FUTURe.

#### CATION COMPETITION IN SINGLE MINERAL (ILLITE): DIFFUSION BEHAVIOUR OF 57Co<sup>2+</sup>



- $\mathsf{Ca}^{2*}$  competes with  $\mathsf{Co}^{2*}$  in the double layer ٠
  - $=> D_{\rm e}$  depends on Ca<sup>2+</sup> concentration No competition at edge surfaces (strong + weak sites)  $\Rightarrow R_d$  almost not affected
- Glaus et al. (2021). ACS Earth Space Chemistry 5, 2621-2625.



eurad

#### FROM ILLITE -> OPALINUS CLAY

Measured tracer profile + semi-blind prediction



Glaus et al. (2021). ACS Earth Space Chemistry 5, 2621-2625.

#### **Extrapolation to Opalinus Clay:**

- Scaling of cation-exchange capacity •
- Scaling of specific surface .
- Slight adaptation of strong site complexes (taking into account competition with FeII)





#### **IMPACT ON STRONGLY SORBING RADIONUCLIDES**

	Sorption (K <sub>d</sub> )	Effective diffusivity ( <i>D</i> <sub>e</sub> )
Solution parameters		
Ionic strength	weak: only cation exchange	strong: Enrichment factor
рН	strong: edge species (strong, weak)	strong: hydrolysed RN's
Competing alkaline earths	weak: only cation exchange	strong: Enrichment factor
Competing transition metals	strong: edge species (strong, weak)	weak: Conc. too low
Ligands	strong: edge species (strong, weak)	strong: Enrichment factor
Surface parameters		
CEC	weak: only cation exchange	strong: Enrichment factor
Index cation	weak: only cation exchange	strong(?): Enrichment factor
Edge sites	strong	weak
		eur



#### **CONCLUSIONS**

- Methods for diffusion measurements are well established:
  - Pitfalls awaiting
  - Interpretation not straightforward in all respects
- Use of effective diffusion coefficients implies:
  - Careful evaluation of diffusion/retardation parameters necessary when deducing the properties of intact rock from ideal model systems
  - Consistency required for sorption and diffusion models
- Simplifications for application in performance assessment are defensible, provided they are based on sufficient process understanding
- Open issues (technical/conceptual):
  - Dissolution/precipitation phenomena in nanoscale pores
  - How to include solid-solution phenomena in 'retardation factors' and apparent diffusion coefficients  $(D_a)$



#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

#### Our thanks go to

- Nagra for partial financial support
- L. Van Loon, S. Frick, P. Bunic, W. Müller
- C.A.J. Appelo
   (Phreeqc modelling)
- Eurad project organisation










# **WP FUTURE** *Training materials* **Transport processes in crystalline rock**

#### Václava Havlova (ÚJV Řež), Cornelius Fischer (HZDR), Ulrich Noseck (GRS), Maria Siitari-Kauppi (Uni Helsinki)

The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement n° 847593.

17.11.2021

FUTURE WP, Annual meeting, 17.11.20221



# CONTENT

- **1.** Introduction: Deep Geological Repository in Crystalline rock
- **2.** Crystalline rocks
- **3.** Main RN transport processes in crystalline rock
  - 1. Advection and dispersion
  - 2. Retention
  - 2.1 Diffusion
  - 2.2 Sorption

### 4. Transport data used in safety assessment

- How to gain data?
  - 1. Laboratory studies
  - 2. In situ studies
  - 3. Natural analogues
- **5. Conclusions**







# 1. Introduction: Deep geological repository (DGR) in crystalline rocks





# Future, 1. Introduction: Why we have to think over long time periods?



M. Herod, *GeoPoll:* What should we do with radioactive waste?, 2015.





### 1. DGR in crystalline rock







## 1. Crystalline host rock Safety functions

- Isolation of the waste
  - Protection of the technical barriers
  - Low water flow in / around near-field
  - Favourable chemical conditions
- Transport barrier for radionuclides
  - Long transport times
  - Radioactive decay
- Dispersion / Dilution
  - Diffusion / dispersion / dilution in space (3-D)
  - Dispersion in time (for peak release from near-field)







### 2. Crystalline massives in Europe



• Scandinavia (Sweden, Finland)

FUTURe

- Central Europe (Czech Republic, Germany, France)
- Spain

A

Alpine countries

### **DGR in crystalline**

- Sweden, Finland
- Czech Republic
- Slovakia (?), Spain (?), GB(?), Germany (?)

https://earthlymission.com/what-do-you-tread-on-in-different-parts-of-western-europe/

# 2. Crystalline rocks

### Magmatic (Igneous) rocks



Hrádek (CZ)



Äspö (SE)

- formed through the cooling and solidification of magma within the Crust
- composition: quartz, plagioclase, feldspar, mica, accesoric minerals

### Metamorphic rocks





URL Bukov (Kraví hora)

- transformation of existing rock types. The original rock (protolith) is subjected to heat (temperatures greater than 150 to 200 °C) and pressure (150 megapascals (1,500 bar))<sup>,</sup> causing profound physical or chemical change
- composition: differs according to original rock
- Migmatites: similar composition to granites; anphibolites or granulites: differ



FUTU(R)e

# 2. Fractured crystalline massives

# FUTURe



calcite infill - FUTURE WP

**Rock Matrix** 

Äspö (SE) Fissure







Horka (CZ)



Open fracture (Bukov URL) FUTURE WP





## 3. RN and colloids in the fracture



# 3. Factors influencing radionuclide migration in FUTURe granitic rock environment

#### **Tracer properties**

Atomic/molecule size Charge Chemical properties Redox behaviour Precipitation Complex formation Solubility

#### Rock properties

Rock density Fracture density and length Transmissivity, strength distribution Porosity Mineralogial composition Hydraulic conductivity Hydrochemical parameters





# 3.1 Transport processes: Advection (Darcy's law) FUTURe

Velocity of water movement in the direction of lower hydraulic gradient

Crystalline rocks: flow in fractures





Crystalline rocks: bulk groundwater movement in fractures

Non-sorbing radionuclides: follow the velocity of the groundwater flow can be delayed due mechanical dispersion

Sorbing radionuclides: interaction with fracture walls  $\rightarrow$  sorption  $\rightarrow$  retention

<u>Special case</u>: interaction with colloids/organics in the GW  $\rightarrow$  movement with flowing water

Important fracture property: flow wetted surface, fracture aperture and infill



FUTU(R)e



# 3.1 Transport processes: Advection

### Flow wetted surface

## Fracture surface Chanelling



Project TH02030543, artificial fracture,; MODFLOW modelling flow 1 ml.min<sup>-1</sup> T+1000s, KBr





## 3.2 Porosity and pore network



Porosity types (SEM) (Bongiolo et al., 2007): A – intragranulárn microcracks in amphibolite, B – transgranulár mikrocracks in feldspar, C – continuous systém of intergranular fissures, D – intragranulárfissures at amphibole and intergranulár microfissure at the grain boundary





### Connected pore network is assumed to be infinite in crystalline rock Crystalline rock porosity: ~ 0,5% (undisturbed rock)

Freire – Liszta et al. (2015)



FUTURe

3.2 Porosity

- $\varepsilon$  total porosity
- $\varepsilon_t$  flow porosity (advection)
- $\varepsilon_t$  effective porosity (diffusion)
- $\varepsilon_r$  residual porosity (dead end pores)



 $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_f + \varepsilon_t + \varepsilon_r$ 

Tortuosity (A)
Constrictivity (B)





Net transport of molecules from a region of higher concentration to one of

3.2 Diffusion process (M. Glaus presentation)

FUTUR)e



# 3.2 Diffusion in fractured rock environment

I. Pore diffusion coefficient

$$D_p = D_w \frac{\delta_D}{\tau^2}$$

D

II. Effective diffusion coefficient (diffusion in pores)

$$D_e = \varepsilon_t D_p = \varepsilon_t D_w \frac{\delta_D}{\tau^2} = F_f D_w \quad F_f = \frac{D_e}{D_w}$$

I. Apparent diffusion coefficient (includes sorption)

$$R = 1 + \rho \frac{(1 - \varepsilon_t)K_d}{\varepsilon_t}$$
$$D_a = \frac{D_p}{R} = \frac{D_e}{\alpha} = \frac{D_e}{\varepsilon_t + \rho K_d}$$

García-Gutiérrez et al. (2003)

- *D<sub>w</sub>* diffusion coefficient in free water
- F formation factor (F=  $\varepsilon_t \delta_D / \tau^2$ )
- $K_d$  distribution coefficient (m3/kg)
- R retardation coefficient
- $\alpha$  rock capacity factor ( $\alpha = \varepsilon_t + \rho K_d$ )
- $\delta_{\rm D}$  constrictivity
- $\varepsilon_t$  flow porosity (advection)
- $\varepsilon_t$  effective porosity (diffusion)
- $\varepsilon_r$  residual porosity (dead end pores)
  - rock density
- au tortuosity

ρ



# 3.2 Outerganular and interganular pores: Pathways to diffuse in the rock matrix



Porosity types (SEM) (Bongiolo et al., 2007): A – intragranulárn microcracks in amphibolite, B – transgranulár mikrocracks in feldspar, C – continuous systém of intergranular fissures, D – intragranulárfissures at amphibole and intergranulár microfissure at the grain boundary



Freire - Liszta et al. (2015)



Äspö (SE)

Uni Helsinki Porosity determination in crystalline rock



# 3.3 Retardation processes (F. Brandt presentation)

### Chemical retardation (Adsorption)

- Electrostatic adsorption (ionic exchange, surface complexation)
- Precipitation/co-precipitation
- Incorporation into mineral lattice
- Physical retardation
  - Diffusion into dead-end pores
  - Molecular filtration
  - Ionic exclusion
  - Reversion osmosis



FUTURe

# 3.3 Retardation processes: Important properties

- content of rock forming minerals and secondary/fissure infill minerals with higher surface area and CEC
- porosity
- presence of organic matter and microbes (redox processes and precipitation)
- composition of groundwater
- concentration of RN in groundwater
- presence of competing ions (in groundwater)



FUTU(R)e



### 3.3 Retardation processes – cont.

### Ionic exchange

Metal ions /Radionuclides contained in an aqueous solution are exchanged with ions contained in a solid material

### $R^--H^+ + A^+ \rightarrow R^--A^+ + A^+$ typical for for Cs – exchanges with K<sup>+</sup>



 $https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260028005\_Low-temperature\_magnetic\_anisotropy\_in\_micas\_and\_chlorite/figures?lo=1$ 

# 3.3 Retardation processes – cont.

# Surface complexation (specific adsorption)

Complexes are formed between functional groups on the surface (OH<sup>-</sup>,  $CO_3^{2-}$ , F<sup>-</sup>,  $PO_4^{3-}$ ) with species in the solution

#### Inner sphere complexes



#### Outer sphere complexes





D. Arcos\_Amphos21



# 3.3 Retardation processes – continuation

### Precipitation/Co-precipitation

- formation of pure RN phases
- · formation of solid solutions via coprecipitation or recrystallization

#### Ionic exclusion

Due to negative charge in mineral surfaces anions are repelled and cannot go through nanometer scale pores (I-, CI-). Not as important as in clays (and bentonite) where large portion of the pores are in nanometer scale .

### Molecular filtration

<u>Influence of pore size</u>: Too big molecules/colloids binding radionuclides cannot migrate through too narrow pores. Tracers /radionuclides cannot even get concentrated due to this process.



FUTU(R)e



# 4. Transport data used in safety assessment

- <u>Safety assessment</u> is a key tool to prove that repository components fulfill their safety function
- Abstraction of real systém into simplified form of conservative (less positive) model





R. Červinka, prezentace



eurad

## 4. How to gain transport data?

- 4.1 Laboratory studies
  - 4.1a Sorption
  - 4.1b Diffusion
  - 4.1c Advection-retention
  - 4.1d Advanced transport studies
- 4.2 In situ studies
- 4.3 Natural analogues



### 4.1a Representation of sorption in Safety assessment

- Current safety assessment: Reactive transport codes utilizing conservative K<sub>d</sub>-concept with constant distribution coefficients (K<sub>d</sub>-values)
- But: Changing geochemical conditions due to climatic changes (e.g. thawing permafrost, marine transgression) have a significant impact on sorption behavior
  - Need to describe RN transport / sorption as a function of important geochemical / environmental parameters
  - New: Coupling of "Smart Kd-concept" with transport program (here: d<sup>3</sup>f – code, GRS)





eurad







# 4.1a Alternative approach using the smart Kd-concept

Smart K<sub>d</sub>-concept: One possibility to predict variations in sorption as a consequence of changing physicochemical conditions

- Based on mechanistic surface complexation models (SCM) & ion exchange (IX)
- Geochemical speciation code (PHREEQC) coupled with user interface (UCODE) and external statistical analysis (SIMLAB) to form one tool
- Strategy has numerous benefits:
  - Smart K<sub>d</sub>-values can easily be computed for large numbers of environmental parameter combinations
  - Variable geochemistry is taken into account more realistically
  - Uncertainty Analysis and Global Sensitivity Analysis are accessible
  - Higher efficiency in computing time than in case of a direct coupling of PhreeqC with transport program

# 4.1a The Smart K<sub>d</sub>-Concept

Conceptual model for the consideration of temporally and spatially variable influencing parameters

- A priori: Compute multidimensional K<sub>d</sub>-matrices for relevant sediments and relevant geochemical conditions (PHREEQC)
- d<sup>3</sup>f++: Determine nearest neighbors for environmental parameters specific for each point in time and space
- Interpolation of appropriate smart K<sub>d</sub> (red point) from pre-calculated multidimensional smart K<sub>d</sub>-matrix
- Averaged value is transferred back to d<sup>3</sup>f++ for transport calculations



Pre-calculated matrix

pC024

Example for a multidimensional matrix of smart K<sub>d</sub>-values and search for nearest neighbors.



Higher efficiency in computing time than a direct coupling of PHREEQC with transport programs



eurad



Time-space point

for d<sup>3</sup>f++



# 4.1a The Smart Kd-Concept



- A priori: Compute multidimensional K<sub>d</sub>-matrices for relevant sediments and relevant geochemical conditions (PHREEQC)
- d<sup>3</sup>f++: Determine nearest neighbors for environmental parameters specific for each point in time and space
- Interpolation of appropriate smart K<sub>d</sub> (red point) from pre-calculated multidimensional smart K<sub>d</sub>-matrix
- Averaged value is transferred back to d<sup>3</sup>f++ for transport calculations



Concrete example: 3D-plot from 5D smart  $K_{d}$ -matrix for Uranium(VI) as a function of pH, calcium (Ca) and dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC).

eurad

# Higher efficiency in computing time than a direct coupling of PHREEQC with transport programs







0

2 days

1

Anion diffusion anions through Aare granite

(LTD Phase III., project, E. Hofmanová)

3

4

eurad



# 4.1b Data example: Range of D<sub>e</sub> in magmatic and metamorphic rocks



The results were gained within SURAO funded projects Research and development support for DGR safety assessment" and "Long term diffusion Phase III." V. Havlova, Migration 2017, Barcelona, Spain



- Diffusivities of ions and molecules in water are about 0.5-2 x10<sup>-9</sup>m<sup>2</sup>/s
- Ions and molecules' diffusivities in granitic rock are about 10<sup>-14</sup> 10<sup>-12</sup>m<sup>2</sup>/s
- Non sorbing radionuclide penetrates about **5 cm** in a year in granitic rock
- Strongly sorbing radionuclide penetrates less than 0.5 cm in a year in granitic rock
- Distribution coefficient of I-129 is 0.001 kg/m<sup>3</sup> and that of Cs-134 is 0.5 kg/m<sup>3</sup>



Technique is based on intruding C-14-labelled methyl methacrylate (MMA) into a centimetre scale rock core.

The distribution of this radioactive tracer is then characterized using autoradiography. Quantitative porosity measurements are achieved with digital image analysis.

Impregnation

Polymerisation

Autoradiography and Digital Image analysis



# 4.1b Steps in the method





- Drying of rock samples
  - Impregnation of centimetric scale rock cores with C-14 labelled METHYLMETHACRYLATE (low viscosity) in vacuum
  - Polymerisation of MMA into PMMA
  - Autoradiography of sawn and polished rock surfaces
  - Digital image processing of autoradiographs
  - Final result : Multiscale and Quantitative mapping of rock porosity!











Photograph of Grimsel granite sample



C-14-PMMA autoradiograph



FUTURe

# **4.**1b **Autoradiography** ⇔ **Porosity**

- > Digitised grey levels of the autoradiograph are treated as intensities
- Conversion of grey levels to optical densities
- Conversion of optical densities to activities according to calibration sources and a correction factor
- >Initial tracer activity is considered to be diluted by the minerals at the scale of the pixel





Darker the shade - higher the porosity!

eurad

eurad

10 cm



An example of metatexitic gneiss sample from Onkalo, Olkiluoto, Finland.



# 4.1c Advection-interaction: Column experiments

- Transport of radionuclides through crushed crystalline rock in presence of bentonite colloids in dynamic column arrangement
- Transport of radionuclides through crushed crystalline rock



Fig. 1. The results breakthrough curves of different tracers through granite

Performed within FP  $\vec{E}_{U}$  project BELBAR



Fig. 2. Instrumental set-up of column experiments



# 4.1d Tomographic and surface-sensitive methods for transport analysis

### Combination of methods

• (1) X-ray microtomography (µCT)

Analysis of complex bundles of fracture geometries

- (2) Vertical Scanning Interferometry (VSI) Analysis of surface topography with high spatial resolution
- (3) Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Analysis of the flow field in fractures, validation of numerical flow field prediction

### Motivation for this combination of methods

- Providing sufficient information for transport model geometry
  - Simplification vs. oversimplification: Quality of the transport model results
  - Validation of numerical results







# 4.1d X-ray tomography: µCT

#### X-rays are generated in an X-ray source

- are transmitted through the sample
- are recorded by the X-ray detector as a 2D projection image
- Sample is then rotated a fraction of a degree on the rotational stage
  - Again: another X-ray projection image is taken
  - This step is repeated through a 180-degree turn (or sometimes 360 degrees, depending on sample type)
- Spatially-resolved detection of the degree of attenuation of the incident X-rays
  - Chemical composition
  - Material density (porosity, path length)
- 3D image of the absorptive power of the sample is computed from the 2D projections, so-called "reconstruction" process
  - X-ray absorption is encoded as grey values in a stack of grey-scale images, Stack of (x, y) data, thickness: z



- Each dataset consists of voxels (volumetric pixels) containing volumetric information
  - Statistical analysis
  - Image analysis
  - Geometrical analysis, segmentation
- Slices can be analyzed, further processed into 3D models, made into movies, printed into 3D physical objects, ...

# 4.1d µCT Spatial resolution vs. field-of-view (FOV) FUTUR



https://www.ozeankruste.uni-bremen.de/index.php/de/labore/micro-ct-de/142-micro-ct-de.html



- Position of the sample within the beam cone
- Small sample, close to the X-ray source vs. large sample close to the detector
  - Small sample (1 2 mm): voxel size of about 1  $\mu$ m
  - Large samples: voxel size of 20 40 μm
- Multi-focus setup (similar to synchrotron-based CT):
  - magnification is achieved by a two-stage technique (→ green-colored cone)
  - beam path through the sample with very little divergence
  - large working distances, multiple objectives for magnification



## 4.1d µCT data reduction and interpretation







Ketcham et al 2010



Kyle et al., 2008

et al.

#### Fracture in a welded tuff sample

- (a) example slice, pumice clast at fracture surface
- (b) fracture aperture map

#### Ore analysis

Main Grasberg intrusion breccia magnetite (mt), chalcopyrite (cp), bornite (bn) and gold (Au)

- Fluid flow analysis (very limited opportunities!)
- Residual non-aqueous phase liquid (NAPL; organic) (yellow)
- water (blue) in bead pack (transparent)

d = 16.4 mm, h = 22.48 mm

residual saturation a) after freeze-thaw cycle 10 b)



•

Differentiating between metallic mineral grains with

straightforward for isolated monominerallic grains or

relatively small differences in density, e.g., bornite (5.1 g/cm<sup>3</sup>) from chalcopyrite (4.2 g/cm<sup>3</sup>), is relatively

composites in a similar lower-density matrix

· Difficulties: typical intergrown ore minerals



# **4.**1d Physical principle of interferometry: Height difference(s) derived from optical path difference analysis





Calculation of the envelope courve and envelope peak of each pixel:



Fig. 5 Localization of interference fringes within the coherence length of white light

# **4.1**d Simplified scheme of a vertical scanning interferometer (VSI)









### 4.1d Sequences of surface topography analysis: → Rate map calculations recipe





Fischer & Lüttge (2017), EPSL

- You can analyze the topography and use it together with  $\mu\text{CT}$  data
- Alternatively, you can proceed with the analysis of surface maps → which are a sequence of maps of a changing surface
  - Inert surface section: height reference
  - Calculation of height difference maps
  - Height difference (dz) per reaction time (dt) of each (x, y) map point contains information about the height retreat velocity (dz/dt)
  - material flux map is used to calculate the rate map by dividing each (*dz*/*dt*) value by the molar volume V<sub>m</sub>
  - Comparisons to mean reaction rates are calculated by using the mean height retreat of all *dz* (*x*, *y*) values



Fig. 2. Dissolution rate heterogeneity of polycrystalline calcile analyzed using (Å) rate map visualization based on interferometry data and (B) rate spectra, based on three subsections of (Å), cach area is 1600 um<sup>3</sup>. The arrow indicates the highest reactivity at the grain boundary in-between grains 2 and 3.

# 4.1d Positron Emission Tomography (PET)



Radioactive decay of positron-emitting radionuclides: Positrons ( $e^+$ ) and neutrinos ( $v_e$ ) are emitted

• Example: <sup>18</sup>F radionuclide

$${}_{9}^{18}\mathrm{F} \rightarrow {}_{8}^{18}\mathrm{O} + e^{+} + v_{e} + \mathrm{energy}$$

- Positrons travel through the surrounding material, loose energy, slow c
  - NOW:  $e^+$  can combine with an electron  $(e^-)$ 
    - Annihilation event:
- $e^+ + e^- \rightarrow \gamma + \gamma$
- Positron's travel distance ~ 1 mm, this defines the spatial resolution



eurad

• Positron annihilation produces two γ photons, emitted in opposite directions

each with an energy of 511 keV, cf. special Theory of Relativity ( $E = mc^2$ ), with m = e- rest mass



# - 4.1 d Application: Validation of simulation calculation $\overline{15 \sqrt{100}}$

- (a)-(c) 2.5D Transport model (COMSOL) (Stoll et al., 2019)
- (d)-(f) corresponding time steps of a GeoPET experiment (Pingel, 2019)

#### Validation and conclusions:

- Flow field analysis, shape (both methods: a, d)
- Channeling (d, e)
- Increasing heterogeneity (f)



# 4.2. In situ studies



Grimsel test site (CH). Photo





# 4.2 In-situ transport parameter determination FUTURe

PAMIRE project: HTO injection in the rock fractures systém (2018) URL Josef

- Fracture properties, permeability



Fracture model in PAMIRE project -preliminary results Josef URL PAMIRE - http://www.ujv.cz/cz/pamire. TA04020986

# Long term diffusion Phase III. project (2011 – 2018)

<sup>3</sup>H, <sup>22</sup>Na, <sup>133</sup>Ba, <sup>134</sup>Cs and non-active Se(VI); Grimsel test site (GTS, CH)



LTD Phase III. experiment concept. Figure NAGRA Long term diffusion Phase VI. project http://www.grimsel.com/gts-phase-vi/ltd/ltdintroduction



### FUTURe 4.3 Natural analogues (<u>www.natural</u> analogues.com)

- Identification of paleo-water pathways in crystalline rock can be done on the basis of natural processes (e.g. El Berrocal, Spain; Palmottu, Finland)
- Scale: m to X00 m
- Identification of paleo pathways due to identification of Fe oxide coating in fractures; El Berrocal, Spain; *Montoto and Mateos (2004)*.
- Migration of radionuclides through fracture (paleo-fissures in granite mapped using <sup>235</sup>U fission tracks) El Berrocal, Spain; Montoto and Mateos (2004)



# 4.3 Natural analogue Palmottu

- Identification of large scale flow channels
- Hydraulic head measurements
- Tracer tests
- <sup>234</sup>U/<sup>238</sup>U ratio
- •Blind prediction modelling test etc.

(Blomqvist et al., 2000, Rasilainen et al., 2001, Suksi et al., 2006, SKB TR-01-20)

#### 4.3 Natural analog Ruprechtov (GRS - ÚJV – HU - GFZ - FZK INE - Krakow University) (www.natural-analogues.com) More than 10 year of hydrogeological monitoring and research of U migration in clays Paleo-Valley Studies of U behaviour in the system of U - smectite clay - granite - Fe - S microbes + Granite (variscan basement) https://www.natural-analogues.com/the-Sand / Sandstone Late variscan faults eurac --- Kaolinized granite Clay / Claystone natural-analogues/radionuclide-V Neovolcanics Coal / Coal seam Uranium occurence retardation-in-sediments-ruprechtov











# **5. CONCLUSIONS**

- · crystalline rocks are important part of multibarrier systém of DGR
- · their safety function has to be fulfilled in order to consider DGR safety
- · evaluation of their transport properties enters safety assessment calculations
- Need to combine labortory and in situ approaches; natural analogues are also usefull
- open questions remaining:
  - crystalline rock is heterogeneous multicomponent material (prediction of property on longer distance) eurad
  - fissure property incorporation in SA models
  - upscaling





### Aknowledgement

Presented results were supported by

- **EURAD EJP project** The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement n° 847593.
- SURAO, Czech Technology agency; EU projects BELBAR, CROCK





### UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT IN SAFETY ASSESSMENT AND ITS ROLE IN REPOSITORY DEVELOPMENT

### EURAD Education & Training webinar WP FUTURE November 17, 2021 • Th. U. Kaempfer, Nagra, Switzerland



The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement n° 847593.

2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar

#### CONTENT

- · Iterative, step-wise repository development
  - role of uncertainty management
  - safety oriented approach
- Uncertainty management strategy
  - types of uncertainty
  - options for dealing with uncertainty
- · Handling uncertainty in safety assessments
  - reducing uncertainty in the assessment basis
  - · assessing the impact of remaining uncertainty



#### **CONTENT – AND SOURCES**

- Iterative, step-wise repository development
  - role of uncertainty management
  - · safety oriented approach
- Uncertainty management strategy
  - types of uncertainty
  - · options for dealing with uncertainty
- Handling uncertainty in safety assessments
  - reducing uncertainty in the assessment basis
  - assessing the impact of remaining uncertainty

#### MATERIAL BASED ON

**EURAD UMAN - THE WORK PACKAGE** DEDICATED TO NETWORKING ON UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT

- inspired by discussions with many •
- some slides by Frank Lemy, BelV

NAGRA'S DISPOSAL PROGRAM -CURRENTLY AT THE 3RD AND LAST STAGE OF SITE SELECTION

- Nagra's approach on uncertainty management
- inspired by discussions and material by Nagra experts and contractors
- and personal experience

2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar



#### **CONTENT - AND SOURCES**



- Nagra, Switzerland
  - Since 2017
  - Section head safety analysis
  - Thomas.kaempfer@nagra.ch
- AF-Consult (now AFRY)
  - 2009-2017
  - Head groundwater protection and waste disposal
  - Projects for Andra France, BFE Germany, Nagra, etc.
- Research fellow at SLF Davos, Switzerland and ERDC CRREL, NH, USA
- PhD Computational Materials Science, EPFL Lausanne, Switzerland
- MS Mathematics, EPFL Lausanne, Switzerland

#### MATERIAL BASED ON

#### **EURAD UMAN - THE WORK PACKAGE** DEDICATED TO NETWORKING ON UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT

- inspired by discussions with many
- some slides by Frank Lemy, BelV

#### NAGRA'S DISPOSAL PROGRAM -CURRENTLY AT THE 3RD AND LAST STAGE OF SITE SELECTION

- Nagra's approach on uncertainty management
- inspired by discussions and material by Nagra experts and contractors
- and personal experience



eura

2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar

#### STEP-WISE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTING A DEEP GEOLOGICAL REPOSITORY



- Iterative process along phases
  - requirements
  - design
  - analysis, including safety assessments
- For important milestones, a formal safety case is synthesized
- Uncertainty management must be adapted to the milestone & decision ahead

eurad

2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar

#### UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT ADAPTED TO THE DECISION AHEAD

- · We demonstrate that, despite remaining uncertainty
  - safety is given and
  - decisions are robust
- · This requires a sound management of uncertainty
  - but it is neither required nor feasible to eliminate all uncertainty
- · How to deal with an uncertainty "now"?
  - How can it be characterized now?
  - Must it (and can it in practice) be reduced, mitigated or avoided now?
  - Outlook: For future milestones, can it (and must it) be:
    - (better) characterized
    - reduced, mitigated, avoided
- Also to be assured: Robustness w.r. to «new» uncertainties



2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar
#### UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY - HIGH-LEVEL PICTURE (1)

\_\_\_\_\_

General principles & strategies

Management of uncertainty in the safety assessment eurad

2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar

#### UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY - HIGH-LEVEL PICTURE (1)



2021-11-17/Kaempfer



2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar

#### **UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY - HIGH-LEVEL PICTURE (2)**

UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY - HIGH-LEVEL PICTURE (1)



2021-11-17/Kaempfer

#### TYPES OF UNCERTAINTY – A CLASSIFICATION SCHEME DEVELOPED IN WP UMAN

#### Program uncertainties

Uncertainties associated with initial characteristics

Uncertainties in the evolution of the disposal system and its environment

Uncertainties associated with data, tools and methods used in the safety case

Uncertainties associated with the completeness of the FEPs considered in the safety case

2021-11-17/Kaempfer

#### **1. associated with the waste management programme and** other prevailing circumstances (societal, resources, ...)

#### associated with the disposal system

- 2. initial characteristics: of the waste, site, and engineered components
- 3. evolution: including effects of events and processes that may affect the initial characteristics and long-term evolution (climatic, geologic,...)

#### associated (mostly) with the assessment itself

- 4. data, tools and methods: uncertainties related to methods (e.g., QA/AC), concepts (models), and parameters (data)
- 5. completeness: uncertainty arising when overlooking certain aspects relevant for safety



WP FUTURE Webinar

#### PROPER MANAGEMENT OF UNCERTAINTY ASSURES SAFETY



2021-11-17/Kaempfer

#### TYPES OF UNCERTAINTY - BASED ON AVAILABILITY & USE OF KNOWLEDGE

	Information is available		Information is not available	
Level of information is used	(know knowns)	And	known unknowns	
Level of information is not used	unknown knowns		unknown unknowns	

Adapted form 2nd Joint Workshop IGSC/FSC, 9 October 2019, Perspectives on risk and uncertainty, A. Eckhardt

2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar



#### **UNCERTAINTY TABLE**

# 5. Uncertainties associated with completeness

	Known Unknowns	Unknown/Ignored Knowns	Unknown Unknowns
1. Programme uncertainties	e.g. uncertainties in available disposal sites & stakeholder conditions,	e.g. ignored lack of financial resources	e.g. unforeseen political instabilities
2. Uncertainties associated with initial characteristics	e.g. uncertainties in site characteristics	e.g. ignored safety-relevant site characteristics	e.g. unknown uncertainty in safety-relevant site characteristics
<b>3.</b> Uncertainties in the evolution of the disposal system & its environment	e.g. uncertainties in magnitude, time of occurrence or consequences of events & processes	e.g. ignored possible magnitudes of disturbing events (e.g. Fukushima)	e.g. unknown events & processes
4. Uncertainties associated with data, tools & methods	e.g. accuracy of measurements and modelling results,	e.g. ignored mistakes in implementing safety-related activities (e.g. 2 <sup>nd</sup> WIPP incident)	e.g. unknown errors in modelling results
	4		eura

# ELEMENTS OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY – MANAGING THE UNKNOWN (UN)KNOWN





- Safety oriented processes and principles and an appropriate safety culture help to avoid «unknown/ignored knowns»
- Robustness and safety margins together with the iterative approach allow us to react to newly appearing «unknown unknowns»
- Regular stakeholder dialog enhances awareness and contributes significantly to a good process



2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar

ELEMENTS OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY – FOCUSING ON KNOWN UNCERTAINTY



#### ELEMENTS OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

#### Prevailing circumstances

State of	Waste	Available	National	Regulatory	Stakeholder
Knowledge	inventory	resources	Policies	framework	conditions
				·,	



WP FUTURE Webinar



#### ELEMENTS OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

#### Prevailing circumstances

State of	Waste	Available	National	Regulatory	Stakeholder
Knowledge	inventory	resources	Policies	framework	conditions
<ul> <li>Examples for site &amp; geosphere related uncertainty:</li> <li>Knowledge of (potential) site characteristics</li> <li>Potentially available host rocks &amp; sites</li> <li>Site selection criteria set by the regulator</li> <li>Conditions set by local communities regarding site location</li> <li>What should be considered as a "natural resource"</li> <li></li> </ul>					



#### ELEMENTS OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

#### Prevailing circumstances



#### ELEMENTS OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Prevailing circumstances



#### UNCERTAINTY REPRESENTATION IN THE SAFETY ASSESSMENT

### Prevailing circumstances



#### ELEMENTS OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY



#### ELEMENTS OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY



#### **OPTIONS FOR THE REDUCTION, MITIGATION OR AVOIDANCE**

Prevailing circumstances



#### **ITERATIVE NATURE OF AN UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**



### nagra.

#### EXAMPLE – 3RD STAGE OF SITE SELECTION IN SWITZERLAND (1 – OVERVIEW)

# Prevailing circumstancesState of<br/>KnowledgeWaste<br/>inventoryAvailable<br/>resourcesNational<br/>PoliciesRegulatory<br/>frameworkStakeholder<br/>conditions

- · Inventory: Spent fuel and high-level waste & low- / intermediate level waste
- · Deep geological repository required by law
- Financial resources secured through funds (required by law)
- · Sound regulatory framework, idependent roles
- · Most stakeholders accept the need for a repository and agree with the site selection process
- Advanced knowledge (disposal feasibility demonstrated 1988 / 2006)



2021-11-17/Kaempfer

#### EXAMPLE - 3RD STAGE OF SITE SELECTION IN SWITZERLAND (2 - STATUS)

- Site selection in three stages (Sachplan Geologische Tiefenlager)
  - safety driven site selection process
  - · participatory process for e.g., sites for surface facility
- Result after 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> stage / start of stage 3: Three siting regions to be further investigated
  - all with host-rock Opalinus Clay
  - all show high potential for safe repository project: Preliminary safety assessments demonstrate compliance with safety criteria and ample safety margin





2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar

nagra.

#### EXAMPLE – 3RD STAGE OF SITE SELECTION IN SWITZERLAND (3 – EXPECTATIONS)

Last stage in site selection

3.1.3 Etappe 3: Standortwahl und Rahmenbewilligungsverfahren für SMA und HAA

Im letzten Schritt gilt es, die verbliebenen Standorte vertieft zu untersuchen und die standortspezifischen geologischen Kenntnisse falls nötig mittels erdwissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen (Seismik, Bohrungen) auf einen Stand zu bringen, der im Hinblick auf die Vorbereitung der Rahmenbewilligung einen vertieften Vergleich aus sicherheitstechnischer Sicht ermöglicht. Das Lagerprojekt wird unter Einbazu der Standortereinn weiter konkreitigt und die sozioäkopamischen Auswirkungen werden

- Reduction of uncertainty if needed by geological investigations (seismics, drilling) so as to allow for a more detailed safety based site comparision
  - geometric uncertainty (available space, thickness of host rock, faults, ...)
  - uncertainty of safety relevant properties (diffusion, permeability, ...)
- · Safety case for the general license application
  - Sufficient knowledge

Für den gewählten Standort müssen genügend Kenntnisse vorliegen, um ein Rahmenbewilligungsgesuch einreichen zu können (Anhang IV). Etappe 3 leitet zum Rahmenbewilligungsverfahren und zur

• Confirmation, that **remaining uncertainty does not compromise** (post-closure) **safety** ... and also not technical feasibility, operational safety, ...

# EXAMPLE – 3RD STAGE OF SITE SELECTION IN SWITZERLAND (4A – REDUCTION OF UNCERTAINTY *TO ALLOW FOR A SAFETY DRIVEN SITE SELECTION*)

#### Programmatic activities

			Identification of uncertainties that need to be <b>reduced</b> , mitigated or avoided	
Further site c	Eurther site characterisation			
	Data			
	acquisition			

 Uncertainty in rock properties must be bound well enough as not to «mask» potential differences in candidate sites

- → Reduction of known uncertainty w.r. to rock properties (data uncertainty, e.g., diffusion)
- → Reduction of conceptual (model) uncertainty, e.g., diffusion ~ f(porosity)
- → Might lead to new knowledge (and new uncertainty)

2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar



nagra.

# EXAMPLE – 3RD STAGE OF SITE SELECTION IN SWITZERLAND (4B – REDUCTION OF UNCERTAINTY *TO ALLOW FOR A SAFETY DRIVEN SITE SELECTION*)

Targeted reduction of uncertainty → targeted data aquisition

- Confirm (already ample) knowledge about host rock Opalinus Clay
  - systems understanding
  - diffusion data is the Opalinus Clay equally favorable in all three sites?
- Enhance data set and knowledge regarding confining units (less clay rich)
  - broader uncertainty expected (higher variability)
  - are there significant differences between sites regarding barrier property?









2021-11-17/Kaempfer

# EXAMPLE – 3RD STAGE OF SITE SELECTION IN SWITZERLAND (4C – REDUCTION OF UNCERTAINTY *TO ALLOW FOR A SAFETY DRIVEN SITE SELECTION*)



EXAMPLE – 3RD STAGE OF SITE SELECTION IN SWITZERLAND (5A – UNCERTAINTY REPRESENTATION IN SAFETY ASSESSMENT)

Programmatic activities

Uncertainty representation & evaluation in the Safety Assessment

ſ

#### **Typical options:**

• Deterministic vs. probabilistic approaches

• Conservative & bounding values/assumptions

· Remaining uncertainty does not undermine safety / a (safety) statement

· Safety margins are significant

Note: For a safety case, it must also be shown that the assessment is comprehensive (-> completeness)



2021-11-17/Kaempfer

# EXAMPLE – 3RD STAGE OF SITE SELECTION IN SWITZERLAND (5B – UNCERTAINTY REPRESENTATION IN SAFETY ASSESSMENT)



2021-11-17/Kaempfer

WP FUTURE Webinar

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A systematic and safety oriented approach is essential for a high level of safety and the success of a disposal program – this includes a systematic and safety oriented uncertainty management



#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A systematic and safety oriented approach is essential for a high level of safety and the success of a disposal program - this includes a systematic and safety oriented uncertainty management

a good (safety driven) process

a good (safe) system

a good (error free) analysis



#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A systematic and safety oriented approach is essential for a high level of safety and the success of a disposal program - this includes a systematic and safety oriented uncertainty management





#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A systematic and safety oriented approach is essential for a high level of safety and the success of a disposal program - this includes a systematic and safety oriented uncertainty management









### Safety case for radioactive waste disposal

- A collection of scientific, technical, managerial and administrative arguments and evidences in support of the safety of a disposal facility
- Safety assessment: systematic quantification of the exposure dose and comparison with dose criteria
- Safety case is developed in a step by step approach reflecting increasing technical knowledge and disposal concept maturity





EURAD FUTURE

JURAO | ODPADŮ

### Legislative requirements for Safety case

The annual effective dose to the representative person from the most exposed members will remain below 0.25 mSv under all possible features, events and processes that can ocurr during operational and postclosure period of the repository

The site must enable to prepare with good describility and predictability

- Geological model
- Hydrogeological model
- Geomechanical model
- Geochemical model

There is no geothermal energy source at site

20.06.2022

SÚRAO SPRAVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

# Legislative requirements for Safety case (example)

- depth extent and dimensions of the rock mass suitable for the siting of the deep geological repository and the distance from geological interfaces and tectonic faults that may act as pathways for the transport of radioactive substances,
- structural-geological properties of the rock environment in which the deep geological repository is to be located, including brittle and ductile tectonics,
- · origin and expected development of the rock environment,
- suitability of the mechanical properties of the rocks in terms of ensuring the stability of the natural barrier of the deep geological repository,
- petrographic and mineralogical composition of the rock environment
- etc...

20.06.2022





SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

# Safety related requirements based on the analysis of safety functions "Isolate and Contain" (IAEA SSR 5)

#### Capability to isolate radioactive waste from the environment

- Availability of homogenous rock domains in suitable depths several hudreds meters
- Geological stability (protection from external effect, eg. earthquakes, uplift, climatic changes
- Good groundwater flow properties (based on hydrogeological models)
- · Good transport properties
- · Low probability of future human actions able to disturb repository

#### Capability to support EBS containment safety functions of

- Waste forms
- Waste packages
- · Buffer, backfil and sealing materials

#### Describility and predictability of sites - necessity to understand site

20.06.2022

SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠT RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

### Components of DGR development in Czech Republic for safety case development

#### Concept building

Development of disposal concept for conditions of crystalline host rock in Bohemian massif

#### Site selection

Select final and backup site for DGR

Case study: Shortlisting of number of sites 2019-2020



EURAD FUTURE

### Site selection process

Aim: Select final and backup site for DGR in 2030 by step-wise approach

- 2019-2020: Site shortlisting 9 to 4 sites
- · Preparation of demonstrational safety case
- · Application of safety case based criteria
- Data from surface (any drillings)



20.06.2022

SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

### Kraví hora safety case

- · To learn to prepare site specific safety assessment studies
- To get a deeper understanding of site specific problems
- To get feedback for further identification and specification of site specific features, events and processes
- · Demonstration of capability of preparation of safety case





### Kraví hora safety case – demonstration of safety

- · Safety function description
- · FEP and scenarios development
- Disposal system description
- · Site descriptive models creations
- Transport modelling from WDP to biosphere
- Dose estimation
- · Uncertainity management

20.06.2022



SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

# Site selection (key criteria)

- The siting characteristics of the individual localities must be compared in terms of the current stage of development of the DGR
- Characteristics that can be estimated based on current knowledge and that do not display mutual correlation
- Divided into partial indicators that represent the properties of specific sites
- Technical feasibility (C1, C2), Long term and operational safety (C3-C9), environmental assessment (C10-C13)



• 13 key criteria, 38 indicators

20.06.2022

EURAD FUTURE

# Site selection



20.06.2022

SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠT RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

EURAD FUTURE

# Long-term safety criteria

#### C3: Describability and predictability of the homogeneous blocks



The geological conditions must be such that they can be described to an extent that is accurate enough for the creation of 3D structural-geological models of the potential sites. This criterion included the definition of both the rock block considered for the construction of the underground part of the DGR and the geological conditions in the wider surroundings of the sites.

Indicators:

- · degree of the brittle failure of the rock mass fault structures
- · degree of the brittle failure of the rock mass fracture systems
- · degree of ductile deformation

### Used data: geophysical measurements, remote sensing, geological mapping

# Long-term safety criteria



#### C4 Variability of the geological properties

A degree of variability of the relevant geological properties that is so high that it does not allow for the preparation of reliable 3D geological, hydrogeological and geochemical models constituted one of the exclusion criteria. However, in this phase of the DGR site selection process (the reduction in the number of potential sites from 9 to 4), concerning which mostly surface geological research only has been conducted to date, this factor serves for site comparison purposes.

Indicators:

- · the spatial variability of the rock environment
- · the petrological variability of the rocks

Used data: geological models, surface geophysics, microstructural data

20.06.2022

SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

EURAD FUTURE

# Long-term safety criteria



C5 Water flow characteristics in the vicinity of the DGR and the transport characteristics

The assessment of the hydrogeological and transport characteristics of the site constitutes important input material for the safety assessment of the DGR. The most important way in which radionuclides may spread into the surrounding environment (biosphere) is generally considered to be their migration via groundwater flow.

Indicators:

- · flow time from the DGR to drainage areas
- · flow rate at the DGR level
- permeability in the DGR area
- · the descending vertical flow component
- the maximum permeability of the fracture zones up to 500 m from the limits of the DGR
- specific flow in the DGR area
- dilution ratio
- · Used data: hydraulic models of sites

20.06.2022

### Long-term safety criteria

### C6 Identification

#### C6 Identification and location of drainage bases

Locations at which groundwater will potentially drain from the DGR (the so-called drainage base) influence the safety of the site. Groundwater flow is an important factor that influences the mobility of radionuclides in the rock environment. The DGR should be located in such a way that the transport pathways for radionuclides towards the drainage base(s) are as long as possible and the transport of radionuclides as slow as possible. Therefore, based on hydraulic models of the sites, indicators were defined that included various aspects of the anticipated radionuclide transport pathways from the repository level to the biosphere, i.e. to where water flows from the repository, to how many streams and the distance of the DGR from the nearest drainage base.

Indicators:

- the number of drainage streams
- · representation of the drainage from the DGR area in the form of a single stream
- representation of the drainage from the DGR area in the form of a single catchment area,
- · horizontal distance from the DGR site to the drainage site

#### Used data: hydraulic models of sites

20.06.2022

SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

EURAD FUTURE

# Long-term safety criteria

#### C7 Seismic and geodynamic stability



The geological structure of the area intended for the siting of the DGR must guarantee the stability of the facility for at least hundreds of thousands of years. According to Section 18, paragraph 2, g), i) and j) of Decree No. 378/2016 Coll. The following factors must be assessed: the occurrence of endogenous and exogenous phenomena (g) the anticipated development of the climate (i) and the vulnerability of the rock environment to long-term climate change (j).

Indicators:

- · maximum horizontal seismic acceleration value
- · altitude gradient
- percentage share of the relief area affected and deformed by recent cycles of reverse erosion and slope deformation
- occurrence of volcanic rocks of Paleogene to Holocene age and acids

Used data: climatic and seismic predictions, morphological analyses

20.06.2022

### Long-term safety criteria



### C8 Characteristics that might lead to intrusion into the DGR due to future human activities

According to international recommendations, intrusion into the repository as a consequence of future human activities may occur for two main reasons, i.e. either intrusion in order to use the disposed of waste as a secondary raw material or intrusion with the intention of the exploitation of other raw material resources in the area. With respect to the latter, it will, therefore, be important to prevent unintentional intrusion into the repository by humans following the potential loss of information on the existence of the facility.

Indicators:

· mineral deposit conditions at the site

Used data: geological databases, archives

20.06.2022

SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

EURAD FUTURE

# **Operational safety criteria**

#### C9 Phenomena that influence the spread of radioactive materials



With respect to the DGR, this criterion primarily concerns the assessment of the impact of a possible emergency situation regarding the so-called hot chamber in which spent nuclear fuel will be removed from storage and transport containers and inserted into waste disposal packages. The spread of radioactive materials could also occur in the event of an emergency during the transportation of the SNF from the storage facility to the DGR.

Indicators:

- distribution and density of the population and its development in terms of the spread of radioactive materials
- · distance from a nuclear power plant

Used data: preliminary calculation of "collective dose"

- · Preparation of site specific safety cases
- Knowlegde of site specific grounwater properties and hydrochemical zonality in essential
- Site specific knowledge of transport properties of host rock
- Using of data related with isolation part of repository (sorption, disffusion, Kd etc) implication from FUTURE project

20.06.2022

SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

SÚRAO SPRÁVA ÚLOŽIŠŤ RADIOAKTIVNÍCH ODPADŮ

### General implications of safety assesment

- Disposal concept is important since the beginning of the process of siting
- Constructibility gains increasing importance in the later phases of site
- Geology data importance increases toward early stages and confirmation process
- Sensitivity analyses can provide feedback on what aspect of the site and design that are important

EURAD FUTURE

