

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
ANALYSIS/MODEL COVER SHEET

1. QA: QA
Page: 1 of 19

Complete Only Applicable Items

<p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis Check all that apply</p> <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:20%;">Type of Analysis</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Engineering</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Scientific</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:20%;">Intended Use of Analysis</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Input to Calculation</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input to another Analysis or Model</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Input to Technical Document</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input to other Technical Products</td> </tr> </table> <p>Describe use: Derives flowing interval spacing CDF (fractures that transmit fluid) as input for the Saturated Zone flow and transport model.</p>	Type of Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Engineering		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment		<input type="checkbox"/> Scientific	Intended Use of Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Input to Calculation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input to another Analysis or Model		<input type="checkbox"/> Input to Technical Document		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input to other Technical Products	<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Model Check all that apply</p> <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:20%;">Type of Model</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Conceptual Model</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Abstraction Model</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Mathematical Model</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> System Model</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2"><input type="checkbox"/> Process Model</td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:20%;">Intended Use of Model</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Input to Calculation</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Input to another Model or Analysis</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Input to Technical Document</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Input to other Technical Products</td> </tr> </table> <p>Describe use:</p>	Type of Model	<input type="checkbox"/> Conceptual Model	<input type="checkbox"/> Abstraction Model		<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematical Model	<input type="checkbox"/> System Model		<input type="checkbox"/> Process Model		Intended Use of Model	<input type="checkbox"/> Input to Calculation		<input type="checkbox"/> Input to another Model or Analysis		<input type="checkbox"/> Input to Technical Document		<input type="checkbox"/> Input to other Technical Products
Type of Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Engineering																															
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance Assessment																															
	<input type="checkbox"/> Scientific																															
Intended Use of Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Input to Calculation																															
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input to another Analysis or Model																															
	<input type="checkbox"/> Input to Technical Document																															
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input to other Technical Products																															
Type of Model	<input type="checkbox"/> Conceptual Model	<input type="checkbox"/> Abstraction Model																														
	<input type="checkbox"/> Mathematical Model	<input type="checkbox"/> System Model																														
	<input type="checkbox"/> Process Model																															
Intended Use of Model	<input type="checkbox"/> Input to Calculation																															
	<input type="checkbox"/> Input to another Model or Analysis																															
	<input type="checkbox"/> Input to Technical Document																															
	<input type="checkbox"/> Input to other Technical Products																															

4. Title:
Probability Distribution for Flowing Interval Spacing

5. Document Identifier (including Rev. No. and Change No., if applicable):
ANL-NBS-MD-000003 REV00 ICN 02

6. Total Attachments: 3	7. Attachment Numbers - No. of Pages in Each: I-9; II-3; III- 3 242 6/1/01
----------------------------	---

	Printed Name	Signature	Date
8. Originator	Stephanie Kuzio	SIGNATURE ON FILE	May 16, 01
9. Checker	Norma Biggar	SIGNATURE ON FILE	5/16/01
10. Lead/Supervisor	Al Eddebarh	SIGNATURE ON FILE	05-16-01
11. Responsible Manager	Bruce Robinson	SIGNATURE ON FILE	05/16/01

12. Remarks:
ICN 02 was prepared by Kathy Economy for Stephanie Kuzio

SIGNATURE ON FILE

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
 ANALYSIS/MODEL REVISION RECORD
Complete Only Applicable Items

1. Page: 2 of: 19

2. Analysis or Model Title:

Probability Distribution for Flowing Interval Spacing

3. Document Identifier (including Rev. No. and Change No., if applicable):

ANL-NBS-MD-000003 REV 00 ICN 02A

4. Revision/Change No.

5. Description of Revision/Change

REV 00

Initial Issue.

REV 00 ICN 01

Description of the changes for ICN 01 includes listing qualified source data DTNs in Section 4., revised Criteria in Section 4.2, made editorial correction in Section 5., updated Section 6.0 – 6.4 as needed, updated the table of contents, updated the list of Figures, updated the references to include the new DTNs in Section 8, made editorial corrections to figure captions. Note: that none of input values changed, therefore none of the figures, tables, or results changed. While minor in nature, these changes were extensive enough that Section 5.9d)2 of AP-3.10Q was followed. Therefore, vertical lines were not used in the margins to indicate changes.

REV 00 ICN 02

Update the Data in Table -1, Section 4, and References, Section 8, to include Q DTN.

ACRONYMS

CDF	Cumulative Distribution Function
CFIS	Corrected Flowing Interval Spacing
CFS	Corrected Fracture Spacing in the Saturated Zone
D	Dips
DM	Degree of Welding
E	Existing Data
FIS	Flowing Interval Spacing
FMS	Flow Meter Survey Data
FSZ	Fracture Spacing in the Saturated Zone
LHS	Latin Hypercubed Sampling
OFR	Open File Report
Q	Qualified Data
SZ	Saturated Zone
WRIR	Water Resources Investigative Report
USGS	United States Geologic Survey

CONTENTS

	Page
ACRONYMS.....	3
1. PURPOSE.....	7
2. QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	8
3. COMPUTER SOFTWARE AND MODEL USAGE.....	8
4. INPUTS.....	10
4.1 CRITERIA.....	11
4.2 CODES AND STANDARDS.....	11
5. ASSUMPTIONS.....	11
6. ANALYSIS.....	12
6.1 METHODOLOGY JUSTIFICATION.....	12
6.2 APPROACH.....	12
6.3 INDEPENDENT REPETITION OF THE ANALYSIS.....	14
6.4 JUSTIFICATION OF ASSUMPTION THREE.....	14
7. CONCLUSIONS.....	15
8. INPUTS AND REFERENCES.....	16
8.1 DOCUMENTS CITED.....	16
8.2 CODES, STANDARDS, REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES.....	18
8.3 SOURCE DATA, LISTED BY DATA TRACKING NUMBERS.....	19
8.4 SOFTWARE.....	19
9. ATTACHMENTS.....	19

FIGURES

	Page
1. Example of Flowing Interval Spacing and Fracture Spacing as Identified from Borehole Flow Meter Survey Data	7
2. Flow Chart of Software Used in This Analysis	I-1
3. Histogram of the Flowing Interval Spacing Raw Data	I-2
4. Histogram of the Flowing Interval Spacing Dip Raw Data	I-2
5. CDF for Flowing Interval Spacing Used as Input to LHS Module in RIP	I-3
6. CDF for Flowing Interval Spacing Dip Used as Input to LHS Module in RIP	I-3
7. Probability Distribution of Corrected Flowing Interval Spacing.....	I-4
8. Histogram of the Raw Fracture Spacing Data	I-5
9. Histogram of the Raw Fracture Spacing Dip Data	I-5
10. CDF for Fracture Spacing Used as Input to RIP for LHS	I-6
11. CDF for Fracture Spacing Dips Used as Input to RIP for LHS.....	I-6
12. Comparison of the Probability Distributions of the Log of Corrected Flowing Interval Spacing and Corrected Fracture Spacing	I-7
13. Percentage of Flow in Each Flowing Interval per Hydrogeologic Unit	I-8
14. Box and Whisker Plot of Flowing Interval Spacing Data Points and the Number of Data Points Within Each Unit	I-8
15. Comparison of the Flow Meter Survey Borehole Information Used in this Analysis.....	I-9

TABLES

	Page
1. Borehole Input Data Table.....	10
2. Input to LHS in RIP for Flowing Interval Spacing.....	II-1
3. Input to LHS in RIP for Flowing Interval Spacing Dips	II-1
4. Input to LHS in RIP for Fracture Spacing in SZ	II-1
5. Input to LHS in RIP for Fracture Spacing Dips.....	II-2
6. Comparison of Statistics of the Logs of the Corrected Flowing Interval Spacing and the Logs of the Corrected Fracture Spacing.....	II-2
7. Statistical Test Results From Kruskal-Wallis Rank Test.....	II-2
8. Comparison of Frequency of Flowing Intervals with Rock Type	II-3
9. Comparison of Flowing Interval Spacing with Hydrogeologic Units	II-3

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this analysis is to develop a probability distribution for flowing interval spacing. A flowing interval is defined as a fractured zone that transmits flow in the Saturated Zone (SZ), as identified through borehole flow meter surveys (Figure 1). This analysis uses the term “flowing interval spacing” as opposed to fractured spacing, which is typically used in the literature. The term fracture spacing was not used in this analysis because the data used identify a zone (or a flowing interval) that contains fluid-conducting fractures but does not distinguish how many or which fractures comprise the flowing interval. The flowing interval spacing is measured between the midpoints of each flowing interval. Fracture spacing within the SZ is defined as the spacing between fractures, with no regard to which fractures are carrying flow. The Development Plan associated with this analysis is entitled, *Probability Distribution for Flowing Interval Spacing*, (CRWMS M&O 2000a). The parameter from this analysis may be used in the TSPA SR/LA Saturated Zone Flow and Transport Work Direction and Planning Documents: 1) *Abstraction of Matrix Diffusion for SZ Flow and Transport Analyses* (CRWMS M&O 1999a) and 2) *Incorporation of Heterogeneity in SZ Flow and Transport Analyses*, (CRWMS M&O 1999b).




Figure 1. Example of Flowing Interval Spacing and Fracture Spacing as Identified from Borehole Flow Meter Survey Data.

A limitation of this analysis is that the probability distribution of flowing interval spacing may underestimate the effect of incorporating matrix diffusion processes in the SZ transport model because of the possible overestimation of the flowing interval spacing. Larger flowing interval spacing results in a decrease in the matrix diffusion processes. This analysis may overestimate the flowing interval spacing because the number of fractures that contribute to a flowing interval cannot be determined from the data. Because each flowing interval probably has more than one fracture contributing to a flowing interval, the true flowing interval spacing could be less than the

spacing determined in this analysis. Therefore, in terms of repository performance the results of this analysis may underestimate the effect of matrix diffusion processes in SZ transport models. In summary, performance analysis will be conservative if the flowing interval spacing determined by this study is used in the simulation of mass transport in the saturated zone instead of the fracture spacing.

2. QUALITY ASSURANCE

The Quality Assurance (QA) program applies to the development of this AMR. The Performance Assessment Department (PAD) responsible manager has evaluated this activity in accordance with QAP-2-0 *Conduct of Activities* (CRWMS M&O 1999c) as prepared by Bob Andrews and approved by Dan Wilkins on 9/30/99. The applicable implementing procedures are defined in the Development Plan, *Probability Distribution of Flowing Interval Spacing* (CRWMS M&O 2000a). The electronic control of data was accomplished in accordance with the controls specific in the development plan; Performance Assessment Process Control Evaluation (Andrews 2000) dated 4/11/00 and developed in accordance with AP-SV.1Q. The following procedures have been followed in the process of completing this report: AP-3.10Q, *Analysis and Models*; AP-3.15Q, *Managing Technical Product Inputs*; AP-SI.1Q, *Software Management*; AP-SIII.3Q, *Submittal and Incorporation of Data to the Technical Data Management System* and AP-SV.1Q *Control of the Electronic Management of Data*.

3. COMPUTER SOFTWARE AND MODEL USAGE

See Figure 2 for a flow chart of the software used for this analysis. The software cited below is appropriate for use in this application. The computer used for this analysis was a DELL OptiPlex GX1, Sandia serial number is R429068. The range of validation for the LHS portion of RIP, Excel, Statistica, and PV Wave is the set of real numbers.

Repository Integrated Program (RIP) Version 5.19.01 (Note: This software has been “retired” since the use of this software in REV 00 of this AMR. The “retired” software is controlled through the software configuration management “retired” baseline.)

CSCI: 30055 V5.19.01

DI: 30047-2003, REV2

The RIP 5.19.01 code (Golder and Associates 1999) was obtained from CM and installed by means of DI 30047-2003, Rev 2 and MI 30047-MO4-001, Rev. 2.

Only the Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) module of Rip was used to run the 1000 realizations of fracture spacing dip, flowing interval spacing dip, flowing interval spacing and fracture spacing.

Commercially available software:

Statistica REV 5 1997

Used for the statistical analysis and graphing of flowing interval spacing, fracture spacing and dip data.

Excel 97-SR-1

Used for spreadsheet calculations for flowing interval spacing, fracture spacing and dip data.

PV-Wave 6.21

Used to create Figure 15, comparison of the flow meter survey borehole information used in this analysis.

4. INPUTS

Table 1. Borehole Input Data Table

Borehole	Report # and Reference	Input Parameters	DTN	Accession #
H-3	N/A	FMS Fig. 3 Dip Table 4	MO0007FLWINTH3.000	N/A
	USGS OFR-84-149 (Thordarson et al. 1984, p. 11)	DM Fig. 2	N/A	NNA.19870406.0056
H-1	N/A	FMS Fig. 4 and 5 Dip Table 6	MO0007FLWINTH1.000	N/A
	USGS OFR-83-141 Rush et al. 1983, p.7	DM Fig 3	N/A	HQS.19880517.1835
H-4	N/A	FMS Fig. 3 Dip Fig. 3	MO0007FLWINTH4.000	N/A
UE-25c#3	N/A	FMS Table B-3	MO0012FLOW25C3.001	N/A
	N/A	Dips Table 12	MO0007FDIP25C3.000	N/A
UE-25c#2	N/A	FMS Table 5 Dip Table 11	MO0007FLWINTC2.000	N/A
UE-25c#1	N/A	FMS Table 4 Dip Table 10	MO0007FLWINTC1.000	N/A
G-4	N/A	FMS Figure 8	MO0007FLWDEPG4.000	N/A
	USGS OFR-84-789 (Spengler and Chornack 1984, Plate 1)	DM Plate 1	N/A	NNA.19890804.0012
UE-25P#-1	N/A	FMS Figure 5 Dip Plate1	MO0007FLWINTP1.000	N/A
	* USGS OFR-86-175 (Carr et al. 1986, Plate 1)	DM Plate 1	N/A	HQS.19880517.2633

Notes: FMS = Flow meter survey data; D = Dips; DM = Degree of Welding, rock type
See the Document Input Reference Sheet for data qualification status information.

4.1 CRITERIA

This analysis report complies with the Department of Energy (DOE) interim guidance (Dyer 1999). Subparts of the interim guidance that apply to this analysis or modeling activity are those pertaining to the characterization of the Yucca Mountain site (Subpart B, Section 15), the compilation of information regarding hydrology of the site in support of the License Application (Subpart B, Section 21(c)(1)(ii)), and the definition of hydrologic parameters and conceptual models used in performance assessment (Subpart E, Section 114(a)). A discussion of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Issue Resolution Status Report (IRSR) Criteria (NRC 1999) as it pertains to the SZ is discussed in the SZ Process Model Report (PMR) (CRWMS 2000b).

4.2 CODES AND STANDARDS

This section is not applicable to this analysis. At this time, there are no known standards or codes for this type of analysis.

5. ASSUMPTIONS

Assumptions utilized throughout this analysis include the following:

1. Boreholes are vertical.

This assumption was necessary to apply the correction that was used to ensure that the distance measured between flowing intervals was normal to the borehole. This is inherent in the equation used to make the correction by Terzaghi, 1966.

2. Not all fractured zones in the SZ transmit water.

It has been well documented in various reports referenced in this analysis, (Erickson and Waddell 1985, p. 1, Rush et al. 1983, p.12, and Craig and Robison 1984, p.6) that only some of the fractures within the saturated zone contribute to the flow.

3. There is no correlation between flowing intervals and hydrogeological units.

This was assumed primarily because of the lack of enough correlative data points for each hydrogeologic unit. There were only 32 data-points for flowing interval spacing within five hydrogeologic units and some of these spanned adjoining hydrogeologic units. This assumption will be justified through three analyses that will be explained further in Section 6.4.

4. There is no correlation between the flowing interval spacing and the dips.

This was assumed because the dip data were not associated with a particular flowing interval, therefore it was not possible to examine the correlation between the flowing interval spacing and the dips.

6. ANALYSIS

6.1 METHODOLOGY JUSTIFICATION

This analysis develops a probability distribution for flowing interval spacing using borehole flow meter survey data. Fracture spacing has been shown to be a key hydrologic parameter in matrix diffusion, which could serve as an important retardation mechanism at Yucca Mountain. Previous studies in the UZ assumed that fracture spacing is correlated with hydrogeologic units. It would not be appropriate to use the UZ fracture spacing approach in the SZ for the primary reason that only portions of the fractures in the SZ contribute to the total flow in a particular flowing interval. It is well documented in the borehole flow meter survey reports cited in this analysis (Erickson and Waddell 1985, p. 1, Rush et al. 1983, p.12, and Craig and Robison 1984, p.6) that only a portion of the fractures in the SZ contribute to the total flow in a borehole. UZ fracture spacing is significantly less than flowing interval spacing, and the use of UZ fracture spacing in the SZ would overestimate the effect of matrix diffusion.

6.2 APPROACH

The approach for this analysis consists of determining the spacing between flowing intervals using graphical and tabular data from USGS reports cited in Table 1. The boreholes used for this analysis and associated reports are shown in spreadsheet 6.1 (Attachment III, DTN: SN9907T0571599.001). The boreholes selected for this study had orientation data as well as flow meter survey data. Fracture orientation data were required to make a correction to the flowing interval spacing measured normal to the borehole, which will be explained further below. The flowing intervals were determined from the flow meter survey graphs that indicate the percentage of flow within an interval. Flowing intervals were identified at the location where the slope of the flow meter survey graph changed. The spacing between the midpoint of each identified flowing interval was then considered the spacing between the flowing intervals as shown in spreadsheet 6.1 (Attachment III, DTN: SN9907T0571599.001). Histograms of flowing interval spacing raw data and associated dips can be seen in Figures 3 and 4 respectively.

A cumulative distribution function (CDF) was generated from the flowing interval spacing data (Figure 5). To input the CDF in the LHS module of RIP, ten data points from the raw data were selected to generate 1000 realizations of flowing interval spacing. In Figure 5 the curve labeled “data input to LHS”, is the data that was input to the LHS module of RIP. The input data to the LHS module in Rip is shown in Table 2. Dip data were recorded for flowing intervals from USGS reports as shown on spreadsheet 6.2 (Attachment III, DTN: SN9907T0571599.001) and a CDF generated (Figure 6). G-4 was the only borehole dip data not used as part of the data set. The dip data for G-4 did not distinguish between the entire saturated zone and the dips that were within the flowing intervals, therefore these data were not used. Similar to the procedure described for the flowing interval spacing, ten data points from the CDF were used as input to the LHS module of RIP for 1000 realizations, see spreadsheet 6.3 (Attachment III, DTN: SN9907T0571599.001) and Table 3. The resulting 1000 output data points for dip and flowing interval spacing were then used to correct for flowing intervals measured normal to the borehole using an equation after Terzaghi (1966, pp. 295):

$$F_{smc} = F_{sm} \cos (D_f) \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

where F_{smc} is the corrected flowing interval spacing, F_{sm} is the uncorrected flowing interval spacing from the LHS realizations, and D_f is the flowing interval spacing dip from the LHS realizations. The results of this calculation are shown in the file, `resul_fis2.xls` (Attachment III, DTN: SN9907T0571599.001). A probability distribution of the corrected flowing interval spacing data was then developed using the industry standard software STATISTICA. A normal distribution of the log transformed corrected flowing interval spacing data was developed as shown in Figure 7. The mean of the log transformed data was found to be 1.29 m compared to the uncorrected flowing interval spacing mean of 1.68 m. The standard deviation of the log-transformed data was determined as 0.43 m.

For comparison purposes a second probability distribution was developed for the fracture spacing within the SZ. This includes all fracture spacing in the SZ, not just the flowing intervals. The same procedure was followed for this second distribution as outlined above for dips and flowing interval spacing including the correction using equation 1. Fracture spacing data and fracture dip data are shown on spreadsheet 6.4 and 6.5, respectively (Attachment III, DTN: SN9907T0571599.001). The data used to identify fracture spacing and dip data consisted of graphical data and tabular data. An explanation of how the data was extracted for each borehole are discussed below:

C-wells (C#-1, C#-2 and C#-3) Tables 10, 11 and 12 in USGS WRIR 94-4177 (Geldon 1996), were used to determine spacing between fractures and the dip angle. The spacing was determined as an average for a 10-foot interval. When the spacing exceeded 10', the spacing greater than 10' was used. The spacing was averaged over ten foot intervals because many of the fractures were very close together. Spacing that exceeded ten feet was used directly because it was felt that a measurement greater than ten feet would be an accurate measurement.

G-4 Figure 13 in USGS OFR 84-789 (Spengler et al. 1984, p. 36), was used to determine the dips. Figure 13 gives the percentage of fractures for each 10-degree dip interval. There was a total number of 300 fractures and associated dip angles recorded for the saturated zone interval. The number of dips for a 10-degree average dip was calculated as shown on spreadsheet "fracture_dips2.xls", worksheet "dipsz&cdf". The fracture spacing for the saturated zone was determined from Plate 1 (Spengler et al. 1984). Fracture frequency was given for 10-foot intervals. Fracture spacing was determined from the reciprocal of the fracture frequency given for 10-foot intervals.

H-4 Figure 3 in USGS WRIR 85-4066 (Erickson and Waddell 1985) was used to determine the dips and the fracture spacing. Data points for dip angles were extracted from Figure 3 directly. Fracture spacing was measured between the data points when possible. When the data points were clustered together an average spacing was calculated based on the length of the cluster divided by the number of data points.

UE25P#-1 Plate 1 in USGS OFR-86-175 (Carr et al. 1986), was used to determine fracture spacing and dip angles. Data points for dip angles were extracted from Plate 1 directly. Fracture spacing was measured between the data points.

H-1 Table 6 in USGS OFR-83-141 (Rush et al. 1983) was used to determine dip angles directly. Only three data points were available for dip angle. Fracture spacing in the saturated zone was not available for this borehole.

H-3 Table 4 in USGS OFR-84-149 (Thordarson et al. 1984) was used to determine dip angles directly. Fracture spacing in the saturated zone was not available for this borehole.

The procedure outlined for flowing interval spacing regarding the data input to the LHS module of RIP, was also followed for the fracture spacing and dip data. The corresponding histograms of fracture spacing and associated dips raw data can be seen in Figures 8 and 9. The CDF's of the fracture spacing and the dips are shown in Figures 10 and 11 respectively. Tables 4 and 5 list the data input to the LHS module of RIP.

A normal distribution of the log transformed data of the corrected fracture spacing was developed resulting in a mean of -0.59 m compared to the uncorrected fracture spacing mean of -0.25 m and the standard deviation was calculated to be 0.63 m. The lognormal probability distribution for the corrected flowing interval spacing and fracture spacing are compared and shown in Figure 12. Table 6 shows a comparison of the descriptive statistics (based on the logs) for the flowing interval spacing and the fracture spacing distributions.

6.3 INDEPENDENT REPETITION OF THE ANALYSIS

See Attachment III and DTN: SN9907T0571599.001, for a listing of the input files required to reproduce the analysis cited herein. Also see Figure 2 for a flow chart of the software used in this analysis.

6.4 JUSTIFICATION OF ASSUMPTION THREE

To justify the assumption that the flowing interval spacing is not correlated with the hydrogeologic units, three analyses were completed. The first analysis included a statistical test for significant differences between the hydrogeologic units based on the percentage of flow within each flowing interval. This analysis was done using a nonparametric rank test called the Kruskal-Wallis test which assesses the hypothesis that different samples in the comparison were drawn from the same distribution (StatSoft, Inc. 1995, pg. non-1601). The software STATISTICA was used to run this test. The Kruskal-Wallis test results show the difference in flow as not significant. Thus, based on the percentage of flow in each hydrogeologic unit, the hydrogeologic units were not significantly different from each other; see Table 7, Attachment 2. If the results from this test had been significant this would indicate that the units were significantly different from one another based on the percentage of flow in each hydrogeologic unit. In other words, based on this data set the statistical test does not show a significant difference between the percentages of flow among hydrogeologic units.

The second analysis examined the possibility of correlation between rock type and frequency of flowing intervals. The four rock types considered were Partially Welded, Welded, Non-Welded and Bedded. The data for the rock types for each flowing interval are identified in spreadsheet "Fracture_dips2.xls", worksheet "FIS" (Attachment III and DTN: SN9907T0571599.001). The source data used to determine the rock types are identified in Table 1 except for the C-hole data,

which was found in the Site Characterization Plan (DOE 1988, p. 8.3.1.2-388). The percentage of rock type for each of the identified rock types was calculated as shown in spreadsheet "Fracture_dips2.xls", worksheet "rocktype" Attachment III and DTN: SN9907T0571599.001. The frequency of flowing intervals was calculated by dividing the number of flowing intervals that were within the rock type by the total length of rock type; see Table 8. Partially Welded and Non-Welded rock types have similar frequencies of 0.0099 and 0.0094 respectively although Partially Welded comprises 77% of the total rock type. Welded and Bedded only have 1 data point, which limits the use of this datum for comparison. This limited data set shows no correlation between rock type and frequency of flowing intervals.

The third analysis included calculating the total length of each hydrologic unit as a function of the number of flowing intervals within a particular hydrogeologic unit. The five hydrogeologic units examined were the Calico Hills, Prow-Pass, Bullfrog, Tram and the Lithic. This calculation results in a spacing of flowing intervals within each hydrogeologic unit. The data are shown in worksheet "FIS", and the calculation is shown on worksheet "rocktype", in spreadsheet "Fracture_dips2.xls". Table 9 compares the spacing of flowing intervals within each hydrogeologic unit. The spacing calculated within Prow-Pass, Bullfrog and Tram is, 19.5, 21.4, and 21.0 m respectively. Since the flowing interval spacing is essentially the same for the three hydrogeologic units, we can conclude that there is no correlation between spacing of the flowing intervals and the hydrogeologic units. Note the flowing interval spacing calculated for this analysis has not been corrected for dip. The Lithic and Calico Hills only have a frequency of occurrence of 2 and 1, respectively. Therefore these units were not compared with the other results.

Figure 13 demonstrates the percentage of flow within a flowing interval per hydrogeological unit. This figure does not show a correlation between the percentage of flow and hydrogeologic unit. Figure 14 is a box and whisker plot that shows the flowing interval spacing for each hydrogeologic unit and the number of data points located within each unit. Note that many of the flowing interval data points span two units.

Figure 15 shows all of the boreholes and the flowing intervals used in this analysis. The shaded area indicates the flowing intervals, including the percentage of flow within the indicated interval. This figure also shows the limited number of data points within each interval and how the flowing interval spacings span adjoining hydrogeological unit

7. CONCLUSIONS

Probability distributions for flowing interval spacing and fracture spacing in the SZ were determined through this analysis. The output data from this AMR is contained in the DTN: SN9907T0571599.001. The flowing interval spacing distribution was derived from flow meter survey data. This analysis did not correlate flowing interval spacing with the hydrogeologic units as was previously done in studies of the UZ. This assumption was justified through various analyses, which included testing for statistical differences between the hydrogeological units based on the percentage of flow in each interval. A second analysis examined the flowing interval frequencies within the four rock types identified in this analysis. The third analysis investigated the number of flowing intervals within each hydrogeologic unit versus the total length of an identified hydrogeologic unit. The three analyses confirm the following: 1) there is

no correlation between percentage of flow within an interval and hydrogeological unit, 2) rock type and the frequency of flowing intervals show no correlation, and 3) flowing interval spacing within each hydrogeologic unit displays no correlation.

The corrected flowing interval spacing and fracture spacing in SZ resulted in a lognormal probability distribution function for both variables and is shown in Figure 12. The mean of the log transformed corrected flowing interval and fracture spacing data is 1.29 m and -0.59 m, respectively. For a complete statistical summary of the developed variables, flowing interval spacing and fracture spacing, See Table 6. As mentioned earlier, this analysis may be considered conservative in terms of the effect of matrix diffusion, since the flowing interval spacing calculated from the raw data is probably greater than the true spacing between the flowing intervals. The result of this analysis is a probability distribution for flowing interval spacing that may be used in the TSPA SR/LA, SZ Work Direction and Planning Documents entitled *Abstractions of Matrix Diffusion and Incorporation of Heterogeneity in the SZ Flow and Transport*.

It should be noted that a limitation to the borehole data used for this analysis is the number of possible missed vertical fractures using a vertical borehole. It is difficult to discern with the available data if the intersection of more vertical fractures would result in a significant change in the flowing interval spacing. Additionally, the data is limited because of the inability to determine the packer spacing used for each borehole. Different packer spacing may create inconsistencies in comparing flowing interval spacing data from different boreholes.

Another limitation of the use of borehole flow meter survey data is the differences in the types of flow meter tests. The data used in this analysis include flow meter survey tests such as radioactive-tracer tests (while water is pumped into or out of the borehole), spinner tests, and heat pulse flowmeter tests. The various tests may introduce biases that may add additional uncertainties to the results.

8. INPUTS AND REFERENCES

8.1 DOCUMENTS CITED

Andrews, R.W. 2000. "AP-SV.1Q Control of the Electronic Management of Data Evaluation for Natural Systems Analysis/Model Reports." Letter from R.W. Andrews (CRWMS M&O) to S.P. Mellington (DOE/YMSCO), April 11, 2000, LV.PA.RWA.04/00-039, with enclosure. ACC: MOL.20000412.0785.

Carr, M.D.; Waddell, S.J.; Vick, G.S.; Stock, J.M.; Monsen, S.A.; Harris, A.G.; Cork, B.W.; and Byers, F.M., Jr. 1986. *Geology of Drill Hole UE25p#1: A Test Hole Into Pre-Tertiary Rocks Near Yucca Mountain, Southern Nevada*. Open-File Report 86-175. Menlo Park, California: U.S. Geological Survey. ACC: HQS.19880517.2633.

Craig, R.W. and Robison, J.H. 1984. *Geohydrology of Rocks Penetrated by Test Well UE-25p#1, Yucca Mountain Area, Nye County, Nevada*. Water-Resources Investigations Report 84-4248. Denver, Colorado: U.S. Geological Survey. ACC: NNA.19890905.0209.

CRWMS M&O 1999a. *Abstraction of Matrix Diffusion for SZ Flow and Transport Analyses, Rev. 01. ID: B1080, Activity: SPP3025*. Work Direction and Planning Document. Las Vegas, Nevada: CRWMS M&O. ACC: MOL.19990707.0107.

CRWMS M&O 1999b. *Incorporation of Heterogeneity in SZ Flow and Transport Analyses, Rev. 01. ID: B1060, Activity: SPP3000*. Work Direction and Planning Document. Las Vegas, Nevada: CRWMS M&O. ACC: MOL.19990707.0109.

CRWMS M&O 1999c. *Conduct of Performance Assessment*. Activity Evaluation, September 30, 1999. Las Vegas, Nevada: CRWMS M&O. ACC: MOL.19991028.0092.

CRWMS M&O 2000a. *Probability Distribution for Flowing Interval Spacing*. Development Plan TDP-NBS-MD-000012 REV 00. Las Vegas, Nevada: CRWMS M&O. ACC: MOL.20000815.0311.

CRWMS M&O 2000b. *Saturated Zone Flow and Transport Process Model Report*. TDR-NBS-HS-000001 REV 00. Las Vegas, Nevada: CRWMS M&O. ACC: MOL.20000502.0238.

DOE (U.S. Department of Energy) 1988. *Site Characterization Plan Yucca Mountain Site, Nevada Research and Development Area, Nevada*. DOE/RW-0199. Nine volumes. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. ACC: HQO.19881201.0002.

Dyer, J.R. 1999. "Interim Guidance Pending Issuance of New U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Regulations for Yucca Mountain, Nevada." Letter from J.R. Dyer and D.G. Horton (DOE/OCRWM) to D.R. Wilkins (CRWMS M&O), June 18, 1999, OL&RC:AVG:1435, with enclosure, "Interim Guidance Pending Issuance of New NRC Regulations for Yucca Mountain." ACC: MOL.19990712.0039.

Erickson, J.R. and Waddell, R.K. 1985. *Identification and Characterization of Hydrologic Properties of Fractured Tuff Using Hydraulic and Tracer Tests--Test Well USW H-4, Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada*. Water-Resources Investigations Report 85-4066. Denver, Colorado: U.S. Geological Survey. ACC: NNA.19890713.0211.

Geldon, A.L. 1996. *Results and Interpretation of Preliminary Aquifer Tests in Boreholes UE-25c #1, UE-25c #2, and UE-25c #3, Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada*. Water-Resources Investigations Report 94-4177. Denver, Colorado: U.S. Geological Survey. ACC: MOL.19980724.0389.

NRC (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission) 1999. *Issue Resolution Status Report Key Technical Issue: Radionuclide Transport*. Rev. 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. ACC: MOL.19991214.0621.

Rush, F.E.; Thordarson, W.; and Bruckheimer, L. 1983. *Geohydrologic and Drill-Hole Data for Test Well USW H-1, Adjacent to Nevada Test Site, Nye County, Nevada*. Open-File Report 83-141. Denver, Colorado: U.S. Geological Survey. ACC: HQS.19880517.1835.

Spengler, R.W. and Chornack, M.P. 1984. *Stratigraphic and Structural Characteristics of Volcanic Rocks in Core Hole USW G-4, Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada with a Section on Geophysical Logs by D.C. Muller and J.E. Kibler*. Open-File Report 84-789. Denver, Colorado: U.S. Geological Survey. ACC: NNA.19890804.0012.

StatSoft 1995. *Statistica. Volume 1, General Conventions and Statistics I*. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Statsoft. TIC: 239795.

Terzaghi, R.D. 1966. "Sources of Error in Joint Surveys." *Geotechnique, 11 to 15*, 287-304. London, England: Institution of Civil Engineers. TIC: 239078.

Thordarson, W.; Rush, F.E.; Spengler, R.W.; and Waddell, S.J. 1984. *Geohydrologic and Drill-Hole Data for Test Well USW H-3, Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada*. Open-File Report 84-149. Denver, Colorado: U.S. Geological Survey. ACC: NNA.19870406.0056.

8.2 CODES, STANDARDS, REGULATIONS, AND PROCEDURES

AP-3.10Q, Rev. 2, ICN 4. *Analyses and Models*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. ACC: MOL.20010405.0009.

AP-3.15Q, Rev. 2, ICN 1. *Managing Technical Product Inputs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. ACC: MOL.20010405.0011

AP-SI.1Q, Rev. 2, ICN 4. *Software Management*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. ACC: MOL.20000223.0508.

AP-SIII.3Q, Rev. 0, ICN 3. *Submittal and Incorporation of Data to the Technical Data Management System*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. ACC: MOL.19990831.0078.

AP-SV.1Q, REV 0 ICN 1. *Control of the Electronic Management of Data*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. ACC: MOL.20000412.0785.

QAP-2-0, Rev. 5, ICN 1. *Conduct of Activities*. Las Vegas, Nevada: CRWMS M&O. ACC: MOL.19991109.0221.

8.3 SOURCE DATA, LISTED BY DATA TRACKING NUMBERS

MO0012FLOW25C3.001. Flow Meter Survey Data From Borehole UE-25 C#3 For Use On the Yucca Mountain Project. Submittal date: 12/15/00.

MO0007FDIP25C3.000. Fracture DIP Data from Flowing Intervals for Borehole UE-25C#3. Submittal date: 07/20/2000. Submit to RPC URN-0535

MO0007FLWDEPG4.000. Flowing Interval Depth Data from Borehole USW G-4 Flow Meter Survey. Submittal date: 07/20/2000. Submit to RPC URN-0536

MO0007FLWINTC1.000. Fracture Dip Data and Flowing Interval Depth Data from Borehole UE-25c#1 Flow Meter Survey. Submittal date: 07/20/2000. Submit to RPC URN-0542

MO0007FLWINTC2.000. Fracture Dip Data and Flowing Interval Depth Data from Borehole UE-25c#2 Flow Meter Survey. Submittal date: 07/20/2000. Submit to RPC URN-0540

MO0007FLWINTH1.000. Fracture Dip and Flowing Interval Depth Data from Borehole USW H-1 Flow Meter Survey. Submittal date: 07/20/2000. Submit to RPC URN-0539

MO0007FLWINTH3.000. Fracture Dip and Flowing Interval Depth Data from Borehole USW H-3 Flow Meter Survey. Submittal date: 07/20/2000. Submit to RPC URN-0538

MO0007FLWINTH4.000. Fracture Dip Data and Flowing Interval Depth Data from Borehole USW H-4 Flow Meter Survey. Submittal date: 07/20/2000. Submit to RPC URN-0537

MO0007FLWINTP1.000. Fracture Dip and Flowing Interval Depth Data from Borehole UE-25P#1 Flow Meter Survey. Submittal date: 07/20/2000. Submit to RPC URN-0543

8.4 SOFTWARE

Golder Associates 1999. *Software Code: RIP*. 5.19.01. 30055 V5.19.01.

9. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment I	Figures	9 pages
Attachment II	Tables	3 pages
Attachment III	List of directories for reference and reproducibility	2 pages

Attachment I




Figure 2. Flow Chart of Software Used in This Analysis.




Figure 3. Histogram of the Flowing Interval Spacing Raw Data. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 4. Histogram of the Flowing Interval Spacing Dip Raw Data. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 5. CDF for Flowing Interval Spacing Used as Input to LHS Module in RIP.
DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 6. CDF for Flowing Interval Spacing Dip Used as Input to LHS Module in RIP.
DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 7. Probability Distribution of Corrected Flowing Interval Spacing. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 8. Histogram of the Raw Fracture Spacing Data. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 9. Histogram of the Raw Fracture Spacing Dip Data DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 10. CDF for Fracture Spacing Used as Input to RIP for LHS. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 11. CDF for Fracture Spacing Dips Used as Input to RIP for LHS. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 12. Comparison of the Probability Distributions of the Log of Corrected Flowing Interval Spacing and Corrected Fracture Spacing. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001




Figure 13. Percentage of Flow in Each Flowing Interval per Hydrogeologic Unit.
DTN: SN9907T0571599.001





Figure 14. Box and Whisker Plot of Flowing Interval Spacing Data Points and the Number of Data Points Within Each Unit.

Note some data points span adjoining hydrogeologic units. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001



* Top of second survey. Two surveys were conducted in this borehole
 ** Note 28% of flow moved past lowest measurable station

Figure 15. Comparison of the Flow Meter Survey Borehole Information Used in this Analysis.
 Note: The shaded areas indicate flowing Intervals and the number within the flowing interval represents the percentage of total flow within that interval. DTN: SN9907T0571599.001

Table 2. Input to LHS in RIP for Flowing Interval Spacing

Probability (Number of raw data points = 32)	Flowing Interval Spacing (m)
0	11.5
0.13	21.34
0.34	30.48
0.44	39.01
0.56	47.5
0.66	58.67
0.75	79.1
0.81	96.32
0.94	172.5
1	468.5

Table 3. Input to LHS in RIP for Flowing Interval Spacing Dips

Probability (Number of raw data points = 165)	Flowing Interval Spacing Dips (Degree)
0	0
0.036	23
0.127	29
0.19	38
0.31	55
0.678	72
0.848	78
0.93	81
0.99	85
1	87

Table 4. Input to LHS in RIP for Fracture Spacing in SZ

Probability (Number of raw data points = 1119)	Fracture Spacing in SZ (m)
0	0.1
0.0598	0.16
0.227	0.19
0.3955	0.28
0.659	0.52
0.9205	3.08
0.95	7.09
0.979	18.5
0.99	34.5
1.0	77.1

Table 5. Input to LHS in RIP for Fracture Spacing Dips

Probability (Number of raw data points = 943)	Fracture Spacing Dips (Degree)
0	0.001
0.13	25
0.27	41
0.33	45
0.49	56
0.58	64
0.73	72
0.79	75
0.87	77
1	87

Table 6. Comparison of Statistics of the Logs of the Corrected Flowing Interval Spacing and the Logs of the Corrected Fracture Spacing (Output from STATISTICA)

Variable	Valid N	Mean (m)	Min. (m)	Max. (m)	Std.Dev. (m)
Log of corrected flowing interval spacing	1000	1.29385	0.25428	2.571806	0.433811
Log of corrected fracture spacing in the SZ	1000	-0.59449	-1.94979	1.728895	0.628003

Table 7. Statistical Test Results From Kruskal-Wallis Rank Test

Statistical Nonparametric Statistics	Kruskal-Wallis Anova by Ranks	Kruskal-Wallis test: H (4, N=41) = 3.23 p=0.5185	-
Dependant:newvar17	Code	Valid N	Sum of Ranks
Lithic	100	3	69.5
Tram	101	14	268.0
Bullfrog	102	14	330.5
Bull-Prow-Pass	103	1	3.5
Prow-Pass	104	9	189.5

Table 8. Comparison of Frequency of Flowing Intervals with Rock Type

Rock Type	% of Rock Type	Total Length (m)	Number of Flowing Intervals	Frequency of Flowing Intervals(1/m)
Paritally Welded	77.0	2525.6	25	0.0099
Welded	7.9	259.1	1	0.0039
Non-welded	9.7	318.7	3	0.0094
Bedded	5.4	176.6	1	0.0057

Table 9. Comparison of Flowing Interval Spacing with Hydrogeologic Units

Unit	Total Length of Unit (m)	Number of Flowing Intervals per Unit	Flowing Interval Spacing (m)
Calico Hills	6.7	1	6.7
Prow-Pass	175.9	9	19.5
Bullfrog	278.4	13	21.4
Tram	314.6	15	21.0
Lithic	197.7	2	98.8

List of Directories

AP3.10Q/FIS/EXCEL/

Fracture_dips2.xls

- Sheet: FIS** data from USGS reports used to calculate raw flowing interval spacing data. **spreadsheet 6.1 (Figure 3).**
- Sheet: FIS_CDF** flowing interval data used to generate CDF for input to RIP, **spreadsheet 6.2 (Figure 5).**
- Sheet: FIS_dip** flowing interval dip data from USGS reports and data used to generate CDF for input to RIP, **spreadsheet 6.3 (Figures 4 and 6).**
- Sheet: fspsz&cdf** raw fracture spacing data from USGS reports and CDF for input to RIP, **spreadsheet 6.4 (Figures 8 and 10).**
- Sheet: dipsz&cdf** raw fracture spacing dip data from USGS reports and CDF for input to RIP, **spreadsheet 6.5 (Figures 9 and 11).**

resul_fis2.xls calculation of corrected flowing interval spacing from 1000 LHS realizations (excel spreadsheet).

resul_fpsz2.xls calculation of corrected fracture spacing from 1000 LHS realizations (excel spreadsheet).

AP3.10Q/FIS/RIP/

FIS1.dat Input file for RIP LHS runs for flowing interval spacing and flowing interval spacing dips

Res_fis2.txt Rip output file for flowing interval spacing and flowing interval spacing dips

Fracture.dat Input file for RIP LHS runs for fracture spacing in the SZ and fracture spacing dips

Re_419.txt Rip output file for fracture spacing and fracture spacing dips

Rip.exe Rip executable

AP3.10Q/FIS/GRAPHER

Workheet2.dat Data file for Figures 3,4, 7-9

Plot4b.grf Graph file for Figure 3

Plot5b.grf Graph file for Figure 4

Corr_fis.grf Graph file for Figure 7

Plot6.grf Graph file for Figure 8

Attachment3.doc

AP3.10Q/FIS/STATISTICA

Data 3.10Q.sta	Data file for Figure 12
Bothcorrcurves3.stg	Graph file for Figure 12
Correlation_units1.sta	Data input file for Figure 12 (columns “unit” and “%flow”). (Data for this spreadsheet is located in stat_unit.xls)
%_unit2.stg	Graph file for Figure 13
Correlation_units.sta	Data input file for Figure 14. (Data for this spreadsheet comes from Fractures_dips2.xls)
Box_plot4.stg	Graph file for Figure 14

AP3.10Q/FIS/WORD/

S0030_rev00_ICN_1_9_13.doc	Text write-up for AP3.10Q document
Figures4_ICN1_9_13.doc	Attachment I, Figures
Attachment2_ICN1_9_13.doc	Attachment II, Tables
Attachment3_ICN1_9_13.doc	Attachment III, List of Directories

AP3.10Q/FIS/PVWAVE/

Bh_gv.eps	Graph file for Figure 15
borehole_flow.pro	PVWAVE code to generate Figure 15
fracsp_eleva3.xls	Excel spreadsheet to calculate the elevations used to produce Figure 15