SANDIA REPORT

SAND2004-1390
Unlimited Release
Printed July 2004

Simulations of the Pipe Overpack to Compute Constitutive Model Parameters for Use in WIPP Room Closure Calculations

Byoung Yoon Park and Francis D. Hansen

Prepared by
Sandia National Laboratories
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185 and Livermore, California 94550

Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation,
a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy's
National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000.

Approved for public release; further dissemination unlimited.

Sandia National Laboratories

Issued by Sandia National Laboratories, operated for the United States Department of Energy by Sandia Corporation.

NOTICE: This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government, nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, make any warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represent that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government, any agency thereof, or any of their contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, any agency thereof, or any of their contractors.

Printed in the United States of America. This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Telephone: (865)576-8401
Facsimile: (865)576-5728
E-Mail: reports@adonis.osti.gov
Online ordering: <http://www.osti.gov/bridge>

Available to the public from
U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Rd
Springfield, VA 22161

Telephone: (800)553-6847
Facsimile: (703)605-6900
E-Mail: orders@ntis.fedworld.gov
Online order: <http://www.ntis.gov/help/ordermethods.asp?loc=7-4-0#online>

Simulations of the Pipe Overpack to Compute Constitutive Model Parameters for Use in WIPP Room Closure Calculations

Byoung Yoon Park
Performance Assessment and Decision Analysis Department

Francis D. Hansen
Carlsbad Programs Group

Sandia National Laboratories
P.O. Box 5800
Albuquerque, NM 87185-1395

Abstract

The regulatory compliance determination for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant includes the consideration of room closure. Elements of the geomechanical processes include salt creep, gas generation and mechanical deformation of the waste residing in the rooms. The WIPP was certified as complying with regulatory requirements based in part on the implementation of room closure and material models for the waste. Since the WIPP began receiving waste in 1999, waste packages have been identified that are appreciably more robust than the 55-gallon drums characterized for the initial calculations. The pipe overpack comprises one such waste package. This report develops material model parameters for the pipe overpack containers by using axisymmetrical finite element models. Known material properties and structural dimensions allow well constrained models to be completed for uniaxial, triaxial, and hydrostatic compression of the pipe overpack waste package. These analyses show that the pipe overpack waste package is far more rigid than the originally certified drum. The model parameters developed in this report are used subsequently to evaluate the implications to performance assessment calculations.

Intentionally blank

Acknowledgements

Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000.

This research is funded by WIPP programs administered by the U.S. Department of Energy.

The authors are indebted to Douglas Ammerman (SNL, Dept. 6141) for providing material properties and other information regarding the pipe overpack models. The authors also would like to acknowledge the valuable consultation provided by Moo Y. Lee (SNL, Dept. 6117) regarding the actual experimental experience for the test simulations. Tom W. Pfeifle provided technical review and Mario J. Chavez provided a Quality Assurance review. The paper has been improved by these individuals.

Intentionally Blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	13
1.1	Background.....	13
1.2	Objective.....	14
1.3	Analysis Overview.....	14
1.4	Report Organization.....	15
2	ANALYSIS MODEL.....	17
2.1	Configuration.....	17
2.2	Material Properties.....	23
2.3	Waste Constitutive Model.....	24
3	COMPUTER CODES AND FILE NAME CONVENTION.....	27
3.1	Computer Codes.....	27
3.2	File Naming Convention.....	28
4	UNIAXIAL TEST SIMULATION.....	30
4.1	Theoretical Background.....	30
4.2	Mesh Generation and Simulation.....	31
4.3	Simulation Results	34
4.3.1	Deformation pattern.....	34
4.3.2	Young's Modulus (E)	35
4.3.3	Poisson's ratio (ν).....	37
4.3.4	Shear Modulus and Bulk Modulus	38
5	TRIAXIAL TEST SIMULATION	39
5.1	Theoretical Background.....	39
5.2	Mesh Generation and Simulation.....	41
5.3	Simulation Results	44
5.3.1	Deformation pattern.....	44
5.3.2	Yield surface constants	45
6	HYDROSTATIC TEST SIMULATION.....	49
6.1	Theoretical Background.....	49
6.2	Mesh Generation and Simulation.....	50
6.3	Simulation Results	52
6.3.1	Deformation pattern.....	52
6.3.2	Pressure-volumetric strain function data	53
7	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	55
8	REFERENCES	59
	APPENDIX A: CALCULATION SHEET.....	63
	A-1 Shear Modulus and Bulk Modulus	63

A-2 D-P, M-C, and SANTOS input constants	64
APPENDIX B: FASTQ INPUT FILE	72
B-1 12-inch POP Waste Mesh for UTS and TTS	72
B-2 6-inch POP Waste Mesh for UTS and TTS	78
B-3 12-inch POP Waste Mesh for HTS	84
B-4 6-inch POP Waste Mesh for HTS	89
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE SANTOS INPUT FILES FOR TEST SIMULATION	94
C-1 For UTS	94
C-2 For TTS	96
C-3 For HTS	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Material properties for elastic-plastic power law hardening material	23
Table 2. Material properties for elastic plastic material with combined kinematic and isotropic hardening (Ludwigsen et al., 1998)	23
Table 3. File naming convention (* means wild card).....	29
Table 4. The shear modulus and the bulk modulus of POP waste.....	38
Table 5. Axial pressure as a function of confining pressure to attain incipient buckling.	47
Table 6. Friction angle and cohesion of 12-inch and 6-inch POP drum.....	48
Table 7. Drucker-Prager constants and SANTOS input constants	48
Table 8. SANTOS input constants for waste constitutive model	56
Table 9. Pressure-volumetric strain data used in the waste constitutive model.....	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Activity flow diagram for calculating the porosity surface of the disposal room containing the POP waste.	16
Figure 2. Photograph of a pipe and a schematic of pipe overpack configuration.....	18
Figure 3. Drawing of 12-inch POP components (WTS, 2003).....	19
Figure 4. Drawing of 6-inch POP components (WTS, 2003).....	20
Figure 5. Simplified 12-inch POP drawing for mesh generation.....	21
Figure 6. Simplified 6-inch POP drawing for mesh generation.....	22
Figure 7. Pressure-dependent yield surface for the waste material model (Stone, 1997b)26	
Figure 8. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 12-inch POP uniaxial test.	32
Figure 9. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 6-inch POP uniaxial test.	33
Figure 10. Deformation pattern of 12-inch POP from the uniaxial test simulation.....	34
Figure 11. Deformation pattern of 6-inch POP from the uniaxial test simulation.....	35
Figure 12. The axial stress-strain curve of 12-inch POP drum.....	36
Figure 13. The axial stress-strain curve of 6-inch POP drum.....	36
Figure 14: The radial-axial strain curve of 12-inch POP drum	37
Figure 15: The radial-axial strain curve of 6-inch POP drum	38
Figure 16. Deviatoric section of Mohr-Coulomb and Drucker-Prager criteria.	40
Figure 17. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 12-inch POP triaxial test.	42
Figure 18. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 6-inch POP triaxial test.	43
Figure 19. Deformation pattern of 12-inch POP triaxial simulation with 1.5 MPa confining pressure.....	44
Figure 20. Deformation pattern of 6-inch POP triaxial simulation with 1.5 MPa confining pressure.	45
Figure 21. von Mises stress contour for 12-inch POP drum at 11.2 MPa axial pressure .	46
Figure 22. von Mises stress contour for 12-inch POP drum at 11.3 MPa axial pressure .	47
Figure 23. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 12-inch POP hydrostatic test.	50
Figure 24. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 6-inch POP hydrostatic test.	51
Figure 25. 12-inch POP hydrostatic test: Deformation with hydrostatic pressure	52
Figure 26. 6-inch POP hydrostatic test: Deformation with hydrostatic pressure	53
Figure 27. Pressure-volumetric strain curve for the 12-inch POP waste drum.	54
Figure 28. Pressure-volumetric strain curve for the 6-inch POP waste drum.	54
Figure 29. Simulated volumetric strain for POP compared to the standard 55-gal drum. 57	

ACRONYMS

AMWTP	Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project
CCA	Compliance Certification Application
CRA	Compliance Recertification Application
CP	Confining Pressure
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
D-P	Drucker-Prager
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FEM	Finite Element Method
HTS	Hydrostatic Test Simulation
M-C	Mohr-Coulomb
PA	Performance Assessment
POP	Pipe OverPack
PROP	PROPerity
QA	Quality Assurance
SNL	Sandia National Laboratories
TRU	Transuranic Waste
TTS	Triaxial Test Simulation
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WTS	Westinghouse TRU Solutions
WWIS	WIPP Waste Information System
UTS	Uniaxial Test Simulation

Intentionally Blank

1 INTRODUCTION

The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) is an operating deep geological disposal system (repository) for radioactive waste. Additional information can be obtained from a continually updated Internet web page (<http://www.wipp.carlsbad.nm.us>). The facility is located in southeastern New Mexico, near Carlsbad, and situated 655 meters below the surface in a bedded salt formation. The WIPP has been certified as meeting regulatory requirements and has been receiving and disposing waste since the spring of 1999. The WIPP is to be “recertified” at least every five years, as part of the regulatory statutes. This report supports the compliance recertification application (CRA) by evaluating the structural mechanics of waste packages called pipe overpacks. These calculations were performed in lieu of laboratory experiments, such as the compression experiments on standard waste drums, which supported the original certification.

1.1 Background

The compliance certification of WIPP was predicated on many assumptions, including mechanical properties of the waste. As of this writing, the repository has received thousands of waste shipments, of which many contained waste packages significantly different from the basic 55-gallon drum configuration used in the original compliance disposal room calculations. This report examines the mechanical characteristics and response of one such waste package known as the pipe overpack or POP.

The structural response of the underground setting has been modeled many times over the years. The conceptual model for room closure describes salt creep into a disposal room, in which the rock salt impinges on the waste and compresses the waste until stress equilibrium is approached. The models for salt and other lithologies proximal to the rooms are well understood and documented (NRC, 1996). An appropriate model for waste deformation in response to the stresses and strains resulting from salt creep must be determined for a variety of waste packages. The waste constitutive model used in the compliance certification application (CCA) was developed from empirical stress-deformation results obtained from compression tests on surrogate waste in 55-gallon drums (Butcher et al., 1991). Similar test data for the POP waste configurations do not exist; however, the material properties of the elements of the composite POP package are known and parameters can be determined by modeling the POP waste package in compression. This report describes the analyses conducted to determine model parameters for the POP.

The motivation for these calculations derives from ongoing dialogue between the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) concerning the realization that assorted waste packages are being disposed at the WIPP (Gross, 2002). The inventory is recorded in exacting detail, which includes waste packaging. From the WIPP waste information system (WWIS) dated July 29, 2003 there are 39,415 total containers in Panel 1, of which 16,989 are POPs. Another notable example of a possible future waste package includes super-compacted wastes from the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP) (Hansen et al., 2003). Both waste package configurations--POPs and AMWTP--are structurally more rigid than a typical 55-gallon waste drum, and may affect repository processes. The super-compacted AMWTP waste

and the waste in POPs could create stiff columns within the disposal rooms that can influence room closure. It is possible that rigid waste columns would increase overall waste porosity by shielding adjacent standard waste from compaction. This effect would be reflected in the porosity surface look-up table accessed for performance assessment (PA) calculations.

1.2 Objective

This analysis determines model parameters for the POP waste packages. It provides the details of the simulations from which the POP mechanical response can be compared to the constitutive model used in the final disposal room structural response calculations (Stone, 1997a). A subsequent report (Park and Hansen, 2003) will advance this information in concert with structural calculations to develop porosity surfaces for PA. The calculations reported here are required to define the structural response of the underground because the rigidity of the POP has not been determined via mechanical tests in the laboratory. If the POP crushes readily, the resulting porosity surface would replicate the baseline case determined for the 55-gallon drums. If the POP possess sufficient structural integrity that they tend to prop open the room, the resulting porosity surface would depart appreciably from the CCA baseline. Thus, an evaluation of the POP structural response has been approached computationally.

Once the parameters are determined for the volumetric plasticity model used by Stone (1997a), the effects on will be evaluated in a series of scoping calculations. Estimates of room closure will be made for a variety of waste-form columns to ascertain the bounds of closure and porosity surfaces. To implement new or different models for the waste forms, it is necessary to compute parameters for the waste constitutive model such as shear modulus, bulk modulus, deviatoric yield surface constants, and a pressure-volumetric strain function. In this analysis, laboratory tests for uniaxial, triaxial and hydrostatic stress conditions are simulated to compute model parameters for the POP waste configurations.

1.3 Analysis Overview

These analyses are prerequisite to comprehensive assessment of waste homogeneity outlined in Analysis Plan AP-107 (Hansen et al., 2003). Results will be described in three parts. The first quantifies the shear modulus and bulk modulus from the uniaxial test simulation. The second develops the deviatoric yield surface constants from the triaxial test simulation. The third yields the pressure-volumetric strain function from the hydrostatic test simulation. The results from these test simulations are then implemented in creep closure calculation of the disposal room to generate the porosity surface data. Figure 1 illustrates how these calculations feed into the flow diagram for calculating the porosity surface of the disposal room, thus providing input for PA analyses. This report includes the procedure to determine the parameters for the constitutive model of POP waste, as shown in the dotted box in Figure 1. The procedures and results of the creep closure analyses of disposal room using SANTOS will be reported in a subsequent report (Park and Hansen, 2003).

The quasistatic large deformation finite element code SANTOS (Stone, 1997b) version 2.1.7, installed on a Compaq Tru64 UNIX V5.1B, was used for these analyses. SANTOS 2.1.7 was qualified though 21 test cases and documented in accordance with Sandia Quality Assurance requirements in the Verification and Validation Plan/Validation Document for SANTOS 2.1.7 (WIPP PA, 2003).

1.4 Report Organization

Section 2 of this report illustrates the precise detail of the POP containers and reviews the mechanical properties for each of the elemental materials included in the waste package. Section 2 also includes design drawings, material properties, and descriptions of the constitutive models used in the analyses. Section 3 documents the computer codes and file name conventions used for these analyses. The subsequent sections provide the simulations of the uniaxial, triaxial and hydrostatic tests, respectively. Each section includes a figure of the model grid, boundary conditions, loading conditions, deformed shapes, and results. In Section 4, the uniaxial test simulation produces shear, bulk, and Young's moduli and Poisson's Ratio. Section 5 describes the triaxial test simulation, showing that yielding is not pressure sensitive. The hydrostatic test simulation described in Section 6 is used to develop the pressure-volumetric strain function. Section 7 discusses the modeling results, relates how this information is subsequently used in structural calculations of the disposal room, and provides concluding remarks.

Figure 1. Activity flow diagram for calculating the porosity surface of the disposal room containing the POP waste.

2 ANALYSIS MODEL

2.1 Configuration

The pipe-overpack configuration has been used to ship TRU wastes to WIPP. The filled pipe component is surrounded by an impact limiter and placed inside a 55-gallon standard waste drum. Figure 2 includes a photograph of an actual pipe element and a schematic illustrating the assembly. The protective packing (impact limiter) is typically fabricated from polyethylene or a dense fiberboard. The pipe component and impact limiter have three key functions: (1) maintain separation of fissile material to prevent criticality, (2) provide radiation shielding, and (3) immobilize fine particulate waste materials. The POP has been used extensively for wastes from the Rocky Flats site, which comprise approximately half the disposed drums in Panel 1 of the repository.

Two different inner pipe sections are considered in these analyses. One has a 12-inch diameter pipe and the other uses a 6-inch diameter pipe section. Design drawings are shown in Figures 3 and 4, respectively. The actual design dimensions are used to generate the finite element meshes, as shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively.

The standard POP consists of a standard 55-gallon drum outer shell, a heavy plastic liner, impact-limiting material (protective packing) and a stainless steel inner cylinder. The standard 55-gallon drum is approximately 23 inches in diameter by 32 inches in height. The drum is made of mild carbon steel with a nominal wall thickness of 0.055 inches. The plastic liner just inside of the steel drum is included in the design to meet shipping requirements. The impact-limiting material consists of layers of Celotex® glued together. The inner package is either a stainless steel pipe section with a welded end plate or a formed cylinder with a welded flange and a bolted blind flange. The inner package rests on a plywood disc. Leak tightness is achieved with O-ring seals between the flanges (Ludwigsen et al., 1998). The wall thicknesses are minimum 0.219 inches for the 12-inch diameter pipe section and minimum 0.245 inches for the 6-inch diameter.

Figure 2. Photograph of a pipe and a schematic of pipe overpack configuration.

Figure 3. Drawing of 12-inch POP components (WTS, 2003)

Figure 5. Simplified 12-inch POP drawing for mesh generation

Figure 6. Simplified 6-inch POP drawing for mesh generation

2.2 Material Properties

The stainless steel material in the inner pipe was modeled with a realistic analytical material model based on an elastic-plastic power law hardening material (Stone, 1997b) to represent the post-yield plasticity of the material. The upper rigid platen for applying the axial pressure on the drum also was modeled, based on an elastic-plastic power law hardening material. All other materials were modeled with an elastic-plastic material with combined kinematic and isotropic hardening (Stone, 1997b). These materials include the outer steel drum, Celotex® impact limiter, the plywood which contributes little to the behavior of overpack, and the contents. The material properties used in this analysis are shown in Tables 1 and 2. It should be noted that dynamic analyses of the POP have been completed previously by Ludwigsen and co-workers and the material properties used here were excerpted from their report (Ludwigsen et al., 1998).

Table 1. Material properties for elastic-plastic power law hardening material

	Stainless Steel Grade 304 (Ludwigsen et al., 1998)	Rigid Upper Platen (WIPP PA, 2003)
Density (kg/m ³)	7908	1
Young's Modulus (Pa)	1.931×10^{11}	30.0×10^{11}
Poisson's Ratio	0.27	0.3
Yield Stress (Pa)	1.931×10^8	1.931×10^9
Hardening Constant (Pa)	1.329×10^9	1.329×10^9
Hardening Exponent	0.74819	0.74819
Luders Strain	0.0	0.0

Table 2. Material properties for elastic plastic material with combined kinematic and isotropic hardening (Ludwigsen et al., 1998)

	Celotex®	Plywood	Contents	Drum Shell
Density (kg/m ³)	256.485	427.476	256.485	7908.0
Young's Modulus (Pa)	6.895×10^7	3.103×10^7	6.895×10^7	1.931×10^{11}
Poisson's Ratio	0.05	0.2	0.2	0.27
Yield Stress (Pa)	3.447×10^5	3.477×10^6	1.724×10^5	2.785×10^8
Hardening Modulus (Pa)	2.413×10^7	6.895×10^4	0.0	6.895×10^7
Beta	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0

The pipe material and the upper platen material described in Table 1 are represented by an elastic-plastic material model with a power law representation of strain hardening. Before yielding stresses are reached, the material is assumed elastic. After the elastic limit of the material is reached, the stress-strain relationship can be represented by the power-law relationship shown in Equation 1 (Stone, 1997b).

$$\bar{\sigma} = \sigma_y + A(\bar{\varepsilon}_p - \varepsilon_L)^n \quad (1)$$

where, $\bar{\sigma}$ = Effective stress state
 $\bar{\varepsilon}_p$ = Equivalent plastic strain
 σ_y = Initial yield stress
 ε_L = Lüders strain or yield plateau strain
 A = Hardening constant
 n = Hardening exponent

The Lüders strain is the flat region of plasticity just after yield, which is common in mild carbon steels. For the stainless steel grade 304 used in the model, the Lüders strain is negligible and has been set to zero.

The elastic-plastic material model used to model the carbon steel drum, Celotex®, Plywood and the contents has an elastic region up to the yield stress limit and a linear hardening region after yield. Unloading would proceed along a line parallel to the elastic portion of the stress strain curve. The beta constant is a kinematic hardening term that becomes significant when load reversals exist. No load reversal is expected in these analyses, so this term has minimal influence on the results, if any.

The steel drum is modeled with typical values for high strength and mild carbon steels. The Celotex® parameters are based upon uniaxial test data of Celotex® samples. The Celotex® has a small initial yield strength followed by a relatively flat and long plasticity region. The waste contents were modeled as a very compliant material with a density similar to wood. To be conservative, the waste inside the pipe was modeled as contributing little to the stiffness of the inner cylinder.

2.3 Waste Constitutive Model

The stress-strain behavior of the waste was represented by a volumetric plasticity model (Stone, 1997a) with a piecewise linear function defining the relationship between the mean stress and the volumetric strain. Compaction experiments on simulated waste were used to develop this relationship in support of the CCA. The deviatoric response of the waste material was not measured in the experiments. It was anticipated that when a drum filled with loosely compacted waste is compressed axially, the drum will not undergo significant lateral expansion until most of the void space inside the drum has been eliminated.

The volumetric plasticity model is implemented exactly as Stone (1997) developed it for the CCA calculations. The yield surface in the principal stress space is a surface of revolution with its axis centered about the hydrostat and the open end pointing into the compression direction (Figure 7). The open end is capped with a plane that is at right angles to the hydrostat. The deviatoric part is elastic-perfectly plastic so the surface of revolution is stationary in the stress space. The volumetric part has variable strain hardening so the end plane moves outward during volumetric yielding. The volumetric hardening is defined by a set of pressure-volumetric strain relations. A flow rule is used such that devia-

toric strains produce no volume change (associated flow). The model is best broken into volumetric and deviatoric parts with the deviatoric part resembling conventional plasticity. The volumetric yield function is a product of two functions, ϕ_{yd} and ϕ_p .

The yield surface assumed is a surface of revolution about the hydrostat in principal stress space as shown in Figure 7. In addition, a planar end cap on the normally open end is assumed. The yield stress is specified as a polynomial in pressure, p (positive in compression) as

$$\phi_{yd} = a_0 + a_1 p + a_2 p^2 \quad (2)$$

where, a_0 , a_1 , a_2 are constants defining the deviatoric yield surface, p is the pressure.

The plasticity theories for the volumetric and deviatoric parts of the material response are completely uncoupled. The volumetric response is computed first. The mean pressure, p , is assumed to be positive in compression, and a yield functions is written for the volumetric responses as

$$\phi_p = p - g(\varepsilon_v) \quad (3)$$

where, ε_v is the volumetric strain. The form of g is defined in this problem by a set of piecewise linear segments relating to the pressure-volumetric strain (Stone, 1997b).

This report describes the procedure to compute the SANTOS input data for the POP configuration. The input data consist of the elastic material parameters derived from the uniaxial test simulation, constants defining the yield surface as shown in Figure 7 through the triaxial test simulation, and the pressure-volumetric strain through the hydrostatic test simulation. The POP waste constitutive model corresponds to the soil and crushable foams model which is discussed in more detail in the SANTOS code description document (Stone, 1997b).

The SANTOS input parameters of the soil and crushable foams model contains the following entries:

- PROP (1) - 2μ
- PROP (2) - K : Bulk Modulus
- PROP (3) - A_0
- PROP (4) - A_1
- PROP (5) - A_2
- PROP (6) – Function ID number: Pressure-volumetric strain curve

Note that the material constants A_0 , A_1 and A_2 are different from a_0 , a_1 and a_2 , as discussed in Section 5.1.

TRI-6348-13-0

Figure 7. Pressure-dependent yield surface for the waste material model (Stone, 1997b)

3 COMPUTER CODES AND FILE NAME CONVENTION

3.1 *Computer Codes*

FASTQ version 3.12 is used for generating the FEM mesh for the POP waste drum. The input file for the FASTQ mesh generation is provided in Appendix B. The FASTQ code is an interactive two-dimensional finite element mesh generation program. It is designed to provide a powerful and efficient tool to both reduce the time required of an analyst to generate a mesh, and to improve the capacity to generate good meshes in arbitrary geometries. It has a number of meshing techniques available. FASTQ has been designed to allow user flexibility and control. The user interface is built on a layered command level structure. Multiple utilities are provided for input, manipulation, and display of the geometric information, as well as for direct control, adjustment, and display of the generated mesh. Enhanced boundary flagging has been incorporated and multiple element types and output formats are supported. FASTQ includes adaptive meshing capabilities with error estimation, deformed and undeformed remeshing according to the error, element variable remapping, and some basic post-processing plotting (Blacker, 1988).

SANTOS version 2.1.7 is used for the solver in this analysis. The quasistatic, large-deformation finite element code SANTOS is capable of representing 2D planar or axis-symmetric solids (Stone, 1997b). The solution strategy, used to obtain the equilibrium states, is based on a self-adaptive, dynamic-relaxation solution scheme incorporating proportional damping. The explicit nature of the code means that no stiffness matrix is formed or factorized which results in a reduction in computer storage necessary for execution. The element used in SANTOS is a uniform-strain, 4-node, quadrilateral element with an hourglass control scheme to minimize the effects of spurious deformation modes. Finite strain constitutive models for many common engineering materials are available within the code. A robust master-slave contact algorithm for modeling arbitrary sliding contact is implemented. SANTOS version 2.1.7 was installed on the Compaq Tru64 with the UNIX V5.1B. All of the verification and qualification test problems were exercised and documented in accordance with QA requirements (WIPP PA, 2003).

BLOTII2 version 1.39 is used as the final post-processor. The deformation of the drum with uniaxial pressure, triaxial pressure, and hydrostatic pressure are plotted using BLOT. BLOT is a graphics program for post-processing of finite element analyses output in the EXODUS database format. It is command driven with free-format input and can drive any graphics device supported by the Sandia Virtual Device Interface. BLOT produces mesh plots with various representations of the analysis output variables. The major mesh plot capabilities are deformed mesh plots, line contours, filled (painted) contours, vector plots of two/three variables (e.g., velocity vectors), and symbol plots of scalar variables (e.g., discrete cracks). Path lines of analysis variables can also be drawn on the mesh. BLOT's features include element selection by material, element birth and death, multiple views for combining several displays on each plot, symmetry mirroring, and node and element numbering. BLOT can also produce X-Y curve plots of the analysis variables. BLOT generates time-versus-variable plots or variable-versus-variable plots. It also generates distance-versus-variable plots at selected time steps where the distance is the accumulated distance between pairs of nodes or element centers (Gilkey and Glick, 1989).

To calculate the volume change of the POP drum with time, NUMBERS version 1.19 is used. NUMBERS is a shell program that reads and stores data from a finite element model described in the EXODUS database format. Within this program are several utility routines that generate information about the finite element model. The utilities currently implemented in NUMBERS allow the analyst to determine information such as: (1) the volume and coordinate limits of each of the materials in the model; (2) the mass properties of the model; (3) the minimum, maximum, and average element volumes for each material; (4) the volume and change in volume of a cavity; (5) the nodes or elements that are within a specified distance from a user-defined point, line, or plane; (6) an estimate of the explicit central-difference time step for each material; (7) the validity of contact surfaces or slide lines, that is, whether two surfaces overlap at any point; and (8) the distance between two surfaces (Sjaardema, 1989).

These pre- and post-processing utilities are considered systems software and not subject to the requirements of NP 19-1 (Chavez, 2003).

3.2 File Naming Convention

The general path for any of these subdirectories is: `/**/waste/`. All of the files related to the analyses for the uniaxial test simulation for the 12-inch POP exist in the subdirectory of `/**/waste/pop/uni/`. Files related to the triaxial test simulation for the 12-inch POP are in the subdirectory of `/**/waste/pop/tri/`. Files related to the hydrostatic simulation for the 12-inch POP are in the subdirectory of `/**/waste/pop/hyd/`.

Similarly, all of the files related to the analyses for the uniaxial test simulation for the 6-inch POP exist in the subdirectory of `/**/waste/pop6/uni/`. Files related to the triaxial test simulation for the 6-inch POP are in the subdirectory of `/**/waste/pop6/tri/`. Files related to the hydrostatic simulation for the 6-inch POP are in the subdirectory of `/**/waste/pop6/hyd/`.

All of the files that remain within each subdirectory are listed and described in Table 3.

The prefix of the files, `d12_` denotes the 12-inch POP and `d06_` denotes the 6-inch POP. In `~/tri/`, the suffix of the files, `0.5mpa`, `1.0mpa`, ..., etc. express the confining pressure in the triaxial test simulation, i.e., `0.5mpa` means the confining pressure is 0.5 MPa.

Table 3. File naming convention (* means wild card)

File Prefix/Suffix	File Definition
*.fsq	The FASTQ input files for the mesh generation
*.g	The FASTQ output files that will be used for the mesh file of SANTOS
*.i	The SANTOS input files
*.e	The SANTOS output files in the EXODUS database format
*.o	The SANTOS output files in the ASCII format
*.num	The NUMBERS output file in the ASCII format to calculate the volume change of the drum with time from the SANTOS output files, *.e
*.run	The batch files for running SANTOS
Pres-Vol strain *.xls	The excel file to calculate the pressure-volume strain data
E-Poisson *.xls	The excel file to calculate the Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio
TwoMu and K *.mcd	The MathCad file to calculate shear and bulk modulus
* A0 N A1*.mcd	The MathCad file to calculate the yield surface constants

4 UNIAXIAL TEST SIMULATION

4.1 Theoretical Background

As discussed in Section 2.3, the input to the soil and crushable foam model in the SANTOS code requires the analyst to provide TWO MU (2μ) and BULK MODULUS (K). The conversion from Young's modulus, E , and Poisson's ratio, ν , to the SANTOS input parameters is given from the following relationships taken from Fung (1965):

$$2\mu = \frac{E}{(1 + \nu)} \quad (4)$$

$$K = \frac{E}{3(1 - 2\nu)} \quad (5)$$

To calculate 2μ and K , Young's modulus, E , and Poisson's ratio, ν , of the POP drum are calculated first. These values can be derived from an experimental uniaxial test of the drum in the laboratory. For this analysis, these values are derived from the numerical simulation of the experimental uniaxial test.

Linear relations between the components of stress and the components of strain are known generally as Hooke's law, where unit deformation of the element up to the proportional limit is given by:

$$\epsilon_x = \frac{\sigma_x}{E} \quad (6)$$

in which E is the modulus of elasticity (Timoshenko and Goodier, 1970). In this uniaxial simulation, the axial strain is derived from the vertical displacement of the upper platen with the axial pressure.

This compression of the element in the x direction is accompanied by lateral strain components, such that:

$$\epsilon_{lateral} = -\nu \cdot \epsilon_{axial} \quad (7)$$

in which the constant of proportionality ν is Poisson's ratio.

In this simulation, the volume and the axial displacement of the drum with the axial pressure will be computed through the uniaxial test simulation. The average cross sectional area of the drum will be calculated from the instantaneous volume divided by the changed height of the drum. The radial strain will be derived from the cross sectional area. The Poisson's ratio is obtained from the lateral strain divided by the axial strain of the drum.

4.2 Mesh Generation and Simulation

Figure 8 shows the mesh discretization and the boundary conditions for the 12-inch POP uniaxial test simulation. Making use of axisymmetry, only half section of the drum is modeled from the drawings illustrated in Figures 5 and 6. The left boundary is the axis of axisymmetry and the right boundary is free. The uniform pressure is applied on the top of the upper platen from 0.0 MPa to 16.0 MPa in 16,000 seconds. The increasing rate of the axial load is 1,000 Pa/s. The model contains 1,767 axisymmetric uniform strain quadrilateral elements and 1,876 nodal points. A zero-displacement boundary condition in the radial direction ($U_x=0.0$) was applied on the left boundary of the model to represent the axisymmetry condition of the drum. A zero displacement boundary condition ($U_y=0.0$) was applied on the lower boundary to react to the applied load. Note that the drum shell element looks like a solid line because it is thin (0.0014 m).

Similarly, Figure 9 shows the discretized FEM mesh and boundary conditions for the 6-inch POP uniaxial test simulation. The 6-inch pipe instead of the 12-inch pipe is contained in the drum and the boundary conditions are the same as those used for the 12-inch POP. The model contains 1,763 axisymmetric uniform strain quadrilateral elements and 1,873 nodal points. The FASTQ input files used to generate the mesh for 12-inch POP and 6-inch POP are provided in Appendix B-1 and B-2 respectively. An example of a SANTOS input file used to simulate the uniaxial test for 12-inch POP is provided in Appendix C-1.

Figure 8. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 12-inch POP uniaxial test.

Figure 9. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 6-inch POP uniaxial test.

4.3 Simulation Results

4.3.1 Deformation pattern

Figure 10 shows the deformation pattern of 12-inch POP model on which the axial pressure is applied from 0.0 MPa to 13 MPa at a rate of 1,000 Pa/s. Owing to large strain, the solution fails to converge before 15 MPa, the lithostatic stress, is reached. This occurs in several simulations, but is not of a serious consequence to the conclusions of this effort, as discussed in Section 7. The buckling pattern of the drum shell and the pipe is similar to dynamic experimental test results obtained by Hoffman and Ammerman (1995). They carried out a series of tests investigating the dynamic pulse buckling of a cylindrical shell under axial impact and compared experimental to numerical simulations. They attribute the buckling pattern to load eccentricity relative to the shell wall caused by mid-length expansion of the shell, resulting in a bending moment being applied to shell wall. As the buckles form, a hardening moment develops (due to differential stress states through the wall thickness) which resists further curvature increases. Instability occurs when the applied bending moment is greater than the hardening moment, causing the larger of the two buckles to become unstable. These simulation results are felt to replicate these experimental deformation patterns reasonably well.

Figure 10. Deformation pattern of 12-inch POP from the uniaxial test simulation

Similarly, Figure 11 shows the deformation pattern of 6-inch POP from the uniaxial test simulation. The pattern is similar to the 12-inch POP's except the vertical displacement

of the 6-inch POP is slightly larger than 12-inch POP's. This result is reasonable because the cross sectional area of 6-inch stainless steel pipe is smaller and less rigid.

Figure 11. Deformation pattern of 6-inch POP from the uniaxial test simulation

4.3.2 Young's Modulus (E)

The axial stress-strain curve of 12-inch POP drum is plotted in Figure 12 and the axial stress-strain curve of 6-inch POP drum is plotted in Figure 13. The linear portions of the displacement are denoted as point A and point B on the plots, respectively. The slope of the line connected from zero to point A or point B is Young's Modulus. Young's Modulus of 12-inch POP drum is 1.874 GPa and is 1.804 GPa for the 6-inch POP. Obviously, the elastic response is a minor contributor to the overall deformation of these waste configurations.

Figure 12. The axial stress-strain curve of 12-inch POP drum

Figure 13. The axial stress-strain curve of 6-inch POP drum

4.3.3 Poisson's ratio (ν)

Poisson's ratio was determined over a larger region of strain than the elastic modulus because POP waste packages are composite materials. The radial strain-axial strain curve of 12-inch POP drum is plotted in Figure 14 and a similar plot for the 6-inch POP drum is plotted in Figure 15. The volume of the drum with the axial pressure is calculated first, because the radial strain along the drum wall is not uniform. The average cross sectional area of the drum is calculated from the changed volume divided by the changed height of the drum. The radial strain is derived from the changed cross section area. Poisson's ratio is obtained from the lateral strain divided by the axial strain of the drum. The regression line of the radial-axial strain curve is Poisson's ratio, which is 0.30 and 0.32 for the 12-inch POP and 6-inch POP, respectively.

Figure 14: The radial-axial strain curve of 12-inch POP drum

Figure 15: The radial-axial strain curve of 6-inch POP drum

4.3.4 Shear Modulus and Bulk Modulus

From the foregoing results, shear and bulk moduli are calculated as mentioned in Section 4.1. Substitution of the value E and ν into Equations (4) and (5) results in the shear modulus, G , and the bulk modulus, K , listed in Table 4. The calculation sheet to compute the above values is provided in Appendix A-1.

Table 4. The shear modulus and the bulk modulus of POP waste

	12-inch POP	6-inch POP
G (Two Mu) [Pa]	1.442×10^9	1.364×10^9
K [Pa]	1.561×10^9	1.690×10^9

5 TRIAXIAL TEST SIMULATION

5.1 Theoretical Background

In Butcher and Holmes (1995), the inelastic deviatoric response of the TRU waste is characterized by a constitutive equation of the form

$$J_2 = a_0 + a_1 p + a_2 p^2 \quad (8)$$

where J_2 is the second deviatoric stress invariant, p is the pressure (positive in compression), and a_0 , a_1 and a_2 are material constants. Their material constants are defined for this particular form of deviatoric response. In SANTOS, the model for the waste is written in a different functional form

$$\bar{\sigma} = A_0 + A_1 p + A_2 p^2 \quad (9)$$

where $\bar{\sigma}$ is the von Mises equivalent stress and p is the pressure (positive in compression). The material constants A_0 , A_1 and A_2 are different from a_0 , a_1 and a_2 .

The POP waste is considered isotropic and elastic until yield occurs. The yield function is assumed to be governed by the Drucker-Prager (D-P) criterion as follows:

$$\sqrt{J_2} = C - \alpha I_1 \quad (10)$$

where, I_1 = the first stress invariant

J_2 = the second deviatoric stress invariant

The constants α and C can be defined from conventional triaxial geotechnical tests. Later in this report, modeling results are presented using conventional Mohr-Coulomb (M-C) diagrams, so the relationship between D-P and M-C is highlighted here along with discussion of the yield function. Pressure sensitivity to failure is also commonly represented by the M-C criterion in two-dimensional stress space defined by two-constants cohesion, c , and friction angle, ϕ , in the following form

$$\tau = c + \sigma \tan \phi \quad (11)$$

The D-P criterion (10) is more commonly used in numerical analyses, whereas the M-C is convenient to illustrate the lack of pressure effects on the yield surface. This discussion is intended to set up the following discussion of the Mohr's circles for yield in Section 5.3.2. Figure 16 compares the D-P and M-C criteria and shows how the D-P inner circle coincides with the M-C polygon in extension and the D-P outer circle coincides with the M-C polygon in compression.

Figure 16. Deviatoric section of Mohr-Coulomb and Drucker-Prager criteria.

For the plane strain model, the relationships between D-P and M-C parameters derived by Zimmermann et al. (2001) are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= \sin \frac{\phi}{3} \\ C &= c \cos \phi\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

The soil and foam model used in SANTOS was selected to represent the POP. Using Equation (12), D-P constants α and C are obtained from c and ϕ which are computed from the triaxial test simulation. SANTOS requires the input to the material model which describes the nonlinear response to be given in terms of effective stress, $\bar{\sigma} = \sqrt{3J_2}$, and pressure, $p = \frac{I_1}{3}$ (Butcher, 1997).

Rewriting Equation (9) in terms of $\bar{\sigma}$ and p , the following relationship is obtained:

$$\bar{\sigma} = \sqrt{3}C - 3\sqrt{3}\alpha p\tag{13}$$

Thus, the SANTOS input constant A_0 , A_1 and A_2 are:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0 &= \sqrt{3}C \\
A_1 &= -3\sqrt{3}\alpha \\
A_2 &= 0
\end{aligned}
\tag{14}$$

Note that the value of input parameter A_1 in SANTOS is required to be positive value (i.e., $3\sqrt{3}\alpha$ instead of $-3\sqrt{3}\alpha$).

5.2 *Mesh Generation and Simulation*

Figures 17 and 18 show the meshes and boundary conditions for the 12-inch and 6-inch POP triaxial test simulations, respectively. The uniform axial pressure is applied on the upper platen from 0.0 MPa to 16.0 MPa in 16,000 seconds at a rate identical to the uniaxial simulation. Four levels of confining pressure are applied on the drum wall boundary, as shown. The uniaxial test simulation is the case of zero confining pressure.

The FASTQ input file used to generate the meshes is the same as the one for uniaxial simulation. An example of the SANTOS input file for the triaxial test at 1.5 MPa confining pressure applied to a 12-inch POP is provided in Appendix C-2.

Figure 17. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 12-inch POP triaxial test.

Figure 18. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 6-inch POP triaxial test.

5.3 Simulation Results

5.3.1 Deformation pattern

Figure 19 is an example exhibiting deformation patterns of the 12-inch POP at various levels of axial pressures and a confining pressure of 1.5 MPa. Figure 20 illustrates the deformation pattern of the 6-inch POP for a similar range of axial pressures and a confining pressure of 1.5 MPa. In both cases, the axial strain in confined conditions is less than experienced when the POP is unconfined. The deformation of the 6-inch POP is slightly greater than the 12-inch POP. Because the 12-inch POP is slightly more rigid, its placement in the underground at WIPP will provide slightly more resistance to closure.

Figure 19. Deformation pattern of 12-inch POP triaxial simulation with 1.5 MPa confining pressure.

Figure 20. Deformation pattern of 6-inch POP triaxial simulation with 1.5 MPa confining pressure.

5.3.2 Yield surface constants

As discussed in Section 5.1, the SANTOS input constants A_0 , A_1 and A_2 are derived from the Drucker-Prager parameters α and C . The parameters α and C are obtained from c and ϕ which are obtained from the triaxial test simulations. Determination of c and ϕ typically requires ascertainment of a “failure” condition. These simulations did not fail the composite material in the sense of loss of load bearing capacity. A subjective evaluation involving yield of the inner stainless steel pipe is used here to quantify the stress conditions at incipient buckling. This process involves engineering judgment and, as explained subsequently, allows determination of D-P parameters. The POP waste drum is a composite material, and the yield behavior of the inner drum is complex. The overriding purpose of these simulations is to describe mechanical response of the POP sufficiently to allow the assemblages to be represented reasonably well in models of the closure of disposal rooms at WIPP.

Figures 21 and 22 are used to illustrate how the yield or incipient buckling stress is determined. Figure 21 shows the von Mises stress contour at 11,200 seconds (11.2 MPa). The symbol $\oplus$ indicates the location of the minimum von Mises stress and the symbol $\ast$ indicates the location of the maximum von Mises stress. The location of the maximum value is the bottom corner of the pipe in Figure 21. Figure 22 shows these same reference symbols at the next load increment equaling 11.3 MPa. At this loading stage, the maximum von Mises stress appears along the pipe wall, approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ of the length downward from the top. We have assumed that when the maximal stress migrates from the

corner to the wall of the inner pipe, buckling is incipient and defines the yield stress condition. Thus, in this example, 11.3 MPa defines the yield stress in a conservative manner.

Figure 21. von Mises stress contour for 12-inch POP drum at 11.2 MPa axial pressure

Figure 22. von Mises stress contour for 12-inch POP drum at 11.3 MPa axial pressure

Table 5 summarizes the axial pressure at incipient buckling as a function of confining pressure. These results show that the buckling phenomenon is essentially independent of confining pressure. The nominally zero values for friction angle are listed in Table 6.

Table 5. Axial pressure as a function of confining pressure to attain incipient buckling

(Units in MPa)

12-inch POP drum		6-inch POP drum	
Confining Pressure ($\sigma_2 = \sigma_3$)	Axial Pressure at Yield (σ_1)	Confining Pressure ($\sigma_2 = \sigma_3$)	Axial Pressure at Yield (σ_1)
0.0	9.6	0.1	7.9
0.5	10.2	0.5	8.3
1.0	10.8	0.8	8.6
1.5	11.3	1.5	9.2

The friction angle calculated from the numerical simulation of the 12-inch POP on the triaxial stress condition was 3.66 degrees. This small friction angle was deemed to be insignificant and probably falls within the range of numerical errors. Therefore, the friction angle of 12-inch POP is considered zero. The friction angle for 6-inch POP was calculated to be -1.592 degrees. This small negative friction angle was also deemed to be insignificant. Similarly to 12-inch POP, the friction angle of 6-inch POP is considered zero.

Then, the cohesions for 12-inch POP and 6-inch POP are calculated to be 4.89 MPa and 3.88 MPa respectively. The calculation sheet to compute these values is provided in Appendix A-2.

Table 6. Friction angle and cohesion of 12-inch and 6-inch POP drum

	12-inch POP	6-inch POP
ϕ (degrees)	0	0
c (MPa)	4.892	3.875

Substitution of the values in Table 6 into Equation (12) in Section 5.1 results in the Drucker-Prager constants, α and C . Then the SANTOS input constants A_0 , A_1 and A_2 are determined by Equation (14) as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Drucker-Prager constants and SANTOS input constants

	12-inch POP	6-inch POP
C (MPa)	4.892	3.875
α	0.0	0.0
A_0 (MPa)	8.473	6.712
A_1	0.0	0.0
A_2	0.0	0.0

6 HYDROSTATIC TEST SIMULATION

6.1 Theoretical Background

In this section, the pressure-volumetric strain curve corresponding to the function $g(\varepsilon_v)$ of Equation 3 in Section 2.3 will be derived from the hydrostatic test simulation. Volumetric strain for POP drum is:

$$\varepsilon_v = \frac{V_0 - V}{V_0} \quad (15)$$

where, V_0 = initial volume of the POP drum, and V = instantaneous volume of the POP drum as hydrostatic pressure is applied. The simulation allows determination of a stress-porosity function consistent with the procedure used in the CCA. Data have been converted into pressure-volumetric strain curves for use in mechanical simulations. The conversion from porosity to (natural log of) volume strain is follows (Butcher, 1997):

$$\varepsilon_v = \ln((1 - e)\rho_s / \rho_0) \quad (16)$$

where, ε_v = Volumetric strain

e = Porosity of the waste

ρ_s = Solid density of the waste

ρ_0 = Initial density of the waste

The data points determined from the hydrostatic test simulation define the volumetric plasticity model as a piece-wise linear volumetric yield function.

6.2 Mesh Generation and Simulation

Figures 23 and 24 show the meshes and boundary conditions for the 12-inch and 6-inch POP hydrostatic test simulations, respectively. A uniform pressure is applied to the top, the bottom and the wall of the drum from 0.0 MPa to 16.0 MPa for 16,000 seconds (4.44 hours). The loading rate is 1,000 Pa/s.

The FASTQ input file to generate the mesh for 12-inch POP and 6-inch POP is provided in Appendix B-3 and B-4 respectively. Also, the SANTOS input file to simulate the hydrostatic test for 12-inch POP is provided in Appendix C-3.

Figure 23. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 12-inch POP hydrostatic test.

Figure 24. The finite element mesh and boundary conditions for the 6-inch POP hydrostatic test.

6.3 Simulation Results

6.3.1 Deformation pattern

Figure 25 shows the deformation patterns of the 12-inch POP at hydrostatic loading of 0 MPa, 4 MPa, 8 MPa and 13 MPa, and Figure 26 shows the deformation patterns of the 6-inch POP. The overall deformation of the 6-inch POP is slightly larger than the 12-inch POP's and the patterns are slightly different because of the size differences in the stainless steel pipes. The 6-inch POP is slightly more compressible than the 12-inch POP.

Figure 25. 12-inch POP hydrostatic test: Deformation with hydrostatic pressure

Figure 26. 6-inch POP hydrostatic test: Deformation with hydrostatic pressure

6.3.2 Pressure-volumetric strain function data

To obtain data points for the volumetric plasticity model, the volume change of the POP drum with hydrostatic pressure is calculated using Equation 15. The hydrostatic pressure-volumetric strain curve of the 12-inch POP drum is plotted in Figure 27 and similar data for the 6-inch POP drum are plotted in Figure 28. Coordinates are selected from these curves for pressure-volumetric strain data to facilitate comparison between POP and standard, 55-gallon drum deformation. This comparison and implementation as a waste constitutive model in SANTOS is the essential output of these analyses.

Figure 27. Pressure-volumetric strain curve for the 12-inch POP waste drum.

Figure 28. Pressure-volumetric strain curve for the 6-inch POP waste drum.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The calculations discussed in this report were executed to ascertain the mechanical properties of a WIPP waste package known as the pipe overpack or POP. The transuranic waste is packaged in a stainless steel pipe, which is placed inside a standard 55-gal drum. The interior pipe is further protected by a concentric, hollow cylinder of fiberboard. The composite package appears substantially more rigid and therefore, less compressible, than the standard waste residing in 55-gal drums. In addition, approximately half of the inventory placed in Panel 1 consists of POP waste packages. Rigid waste could affect room closure, which is a first-order input to performance assessment calculations in terms of a porosity surface. To determine porosity surfaces from room closure calculations, a material model for the constituents residing in the rooms is needed.

The material model for wastes implemented in the initial compliance certification calculations was based on laboratory testing of 55-gal drums containing surrogate wastes. Similar laboratory tests have not been conducted on the POP, but the composite material properties and geometries are known accurately, thus allowing deformational characteristics to be modeled readily using finite elements. This report presents the details of the several specific analyses used to develop model parameters for the POP.

The finite element code called SANTOS was used for these calculations. Documentation details are included in the main text and in the Appendices. SANTOS was used because it has been qualified and certified to requirements of the WIPP Quality Assurance Program. It should be noted that SANTOS results are corroborated in separate calculations for which a well-known code, JAS3D, was used. The JAS3D code allows three-dimensional calculations, whereas the SANTOS calculations utilize two-dimensional axisymmetry. The JAS3D code is not under WIPP QA configuration control and the calculations derived thereby are used only to corroborate the SANTOS results.

The SANTOS analyses allowed determination of shear modulus, bulk modulus, deviatoric yield surface constants, and a pressure-volumetric strain function. Simulations were run for 6-inch and 12-inch interior pipes and included uniaxial, triaxial, and hydrostatic stress applications.

Uniaxial Test Simulation The input to the soil and crushable foam model in the SANTOS code requires a shear modulus (2μ) and the bulk modulus, K . These values are derived from Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio of the POP drum simulations. Shear moduli are calculated as 1.44×10^9 Pa, 1.36×10^9 Pa for 12-inch POP and 6-inch POP respectively. Bulk moduli are calculated as 1.56×10^9 Pa, 1.69×10^9 Pa for 12-inch POP and 6-inch POP respectively.

Triaxial Test Simulation The POP waste package is considered isotropic and elastic until yield occurs. Yield is assumed to be governed by the Drucker-Prager criterion. SANTOS input constants for the deviatoric yield surface, A_0 , A_1 and A_2 , are listed in Table 8.

Hydrostatic Test Simulation To express the volumetric hardening of the POP, the data points defining the volumetric plasticity model are determined from calculating the volume change of POP drum with hydrostatic pressure. The pressure-volumetric strain curves show the 12-inch POP is slightly more rigid than the 6-inch POP.

These analyses examined the mechanical response of the pipe-overpack waste package under possible stresses in the WIPP disposal room. It is important to assess just how different the mechanical properties of the POP are from the mechanical properties used previously to describe the waste in the initial compliance certification calculations. **The pipe-overpack waste package is more rigid, much stronger, and far less collapsible than the 55-gal drums as characterized for the CCA.** These statements will be expounded upon in the tables and figures that follow. In Table 8, for example, the elastic parameters and the SANTOS input yield stress parameters are five to ten times greater for the POPs than for the 55-gal drums of the CCA.

From the simulations, the pressure-volumetric strain curve can be plotted and compared to the data used for standard waste in the CCA. Table 9 contains point-by-point comparisons between the overpack simulations and experimental data from Stone (1997a). Note that Table 9 is compiled in terms of stress-strain data from experiments on standard waste and from a series of stress levels, subjectively selected to describe the response adequately. Generally, the volumetric strain of the POP is an order-of-magnitude less than the standard waste. A plot of all the available volumetric strain versus pressure data is made in Figure 29.

Table 8. SANTOS input constants for waste constitutive model

	12-inch POP	6-inch POP	Standard (CCA)
G (Two Mu) [MPa]	1442.0	1364.0	333.3
K [MPa]	1561.0	1690.0	222.3
A_0 [MPa]	8.473	6.712	1.0
A_1	0.0	0.0	3.0
A_2	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 9. Pressure-volumetric strain data used in the waste constitutive model

Pressure [MPa]	Volumetric Strain		
	12-in POP	6-in POP	Standard
0.00	0.000	0.000	
1.00	0.005	0.006	
1.53			0.510
1.60	0.008	0.010	
1.80	0.010	0.012	
1.90	0.011	0.013	
2.00	0.012	0.015	
2.03			0.631
2.53			0.719
3.00	0.031	0.038	
3.03			0.786
3.53			0.838
4.00	0.051	0.065	
4.03			0.881
4.93			0.942
5.00	0.070	0.090	
7.00	0.109	0.140	
10.00	0.164	0.211	
12.00			1.140
13.00	0.217	0.275	
15.00		0.314	

Pressure - Volumetric Strain Curve

Figure 29. Simulated volumetric strain for POP compared to the standard 55-gal drum.

Figure 29 contains four relationships: the standard waste 55-gal drum, the 12-in and 6-in POPs from SANTOS runs and a corroborative calculation of the 12-in POP from JAS3D (Rath, 2003). The effect of the POP on closure might be appreciable because the volumetric collapse is very limited, especially when compared to the standard waste drums. The material characteristics and parameters determined in these studies will comprise the waste material models for the POP, which will be incorporated into structural room calculations in a companion report (Park and Hansen, 2003).

It is clear that the POP waste is much stiffer than the standard waste and the calculations presented here provide reasonable material parameters to facilitate room closure calculations. The purpose of these calculations is to characterize mechanical deformation of the POP sufficiently to bound closure of a WIPP waste room containing a large proportion of POP drums. The pipe overpacks could create stiff columns within the disposal rooms and influence room closure. It is possible that rigid waste columns would increase overall waste porosity by shielding adjacent standard waste from compaction. This effect would be reflected in the porosity surface look-up table accessed in PA. In order to evaluate the effect of these pillars on the repository performance, calculations will be made using SANTOS for bounding cases to determine the effect of these stiffer columns on the waste porosity.

8 REFERENCES

- Blacker, T.D. 1988. *FASTQ Users Manual, Version 2.1*. SAND88-1326. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Butcher, B.M. 1995. "Pre- and Post Processing of SANTOS code results." Memo from B.M. Butcher to J.J. Loukota, dated October 26, 1995. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. (Copy on file in the Sandia WIPP Records Center [SWRC] as ERMS# 227538).
- Butcher, B.M. 1997. *A Summary of the Sources of Input Parameter Values for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Final Porosity Surface Calculations*. SAND97-0796. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Butcher, B.M., and J.T. Holmes. 1995. "Completion of Milestone DR015, Definition of Closure Analysis Input Parameters, Due March 31, 1995." Memo to Les Shephard and Martin Tierney, dated March 31, 1995. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. (Copy on file in the SWRC as ERMS# 220876).
- Butcher, B.M., and D.J. Morin. 1996. "Exceptions from Documentation Requirements for the SANTOS QA Package." Memo from B.M. Butcher and D.J. Morin to S.Y. Pickering, dated March 13, 1996. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. (Copy on file in the SWRCs as ERMS# 237416).
- Butcher, B.M., T.W. Thompson, R.G. VanBuskirk, and N.C. Patti. 1991. *Mechanical Compaction of Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Simulated Waste*. SAND90-1206. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Chavez, M.J. 2003. "Software Requirements." NP 19-1, Revision 10. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. (Copy on file in the SWRC as ERMS# 529692).
- Fung, Y.C. 1965. *Foundations of Solid Mechanics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gilkey, A.P., and J.H. Glick. 1989. *BLOT - a Mesh and Curve Plot Program for the Output of a Finite Element Analysis*. SAND88-1432. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Gross, M.B. 2002. *Assessment of Impacts on Long-Term Performance from Supercompacted Wastes Produced by the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project*. Carlsbad, NM: U.S. Department of Energy, Carlsbad Field Office, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. (Copy on file in the SWRC as ERMS# 533388).
- Hansen, C.W., L.H. Brush, F.D. Hansen, and J.S. Stein. 2003. "Analysis Plan for Evaluating Assumptions of Waste Homogeneity in WIPP Performance Assessment." AP-107, Revision 1. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. (Copy on file in the SWRC as ERMS# 531067).

- Hoffman, E.L., and D.J. Ammerman. 1995. *Dynamic Pulse Buckling of Cylindrical Shells under Axial Impact: A Comparison of 2D and 3D Finite Element Calculations with Experimental Data*. SAND93-0350. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Ludwigsen, J.S., D.J. Ammerman, and H.D. Radloff. 1998. *Analysis in Support of Storage of Residues in the Pipe Overpack Container*. SAND98-1003. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- NRC (National Research Council). 1996. *The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant: a Potential Solution for the Disposal of Transuranic Waste*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Park, B.Y., and F.D. Hansen. 2003. "Analysis Report for Determination of the Porosity Surfaces of the Disposal Room Containing Various Waste Inventories for WIPP PA." Revision 0. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. (Copy on file in the SWRC as ERMS# 533126).
- Rath, J.S. 2003. "JAS3D Calculations in Support of FY2003 WIPP – AMWTP Waste Pipe Overpack Drum Analyses." Memo to F.D. Hansen and B.Y. Park, dated October 20, 2003. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. (Copy on file in the SWRC as ERMS# 53317).
- Sjaardema, G.D. 1989. *NUMBERS: a Collection of Utilities for Pre- and Post-processing Two- and Three-Dimensional EXODUS Finite Element Models*. SAND88-0737. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Stone, C.M. 1997a. *Final Disposal Room Structural Response Calculations*. SAND97-0795. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Stone, C.M., 1997b. *SANTOS - a Two-Dimensional Finite Element Program for the Quasistatic, Large Deformation, Inelastic Response of Solids*. SAND90-0543. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Timoshenko, S.P., and J.N. Goodier. 1970. *Theory of Elasticity*. Third Edition, International Student Edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- WIPP PA (Performance Assessment). 2003. *Verification and Validation Plan, Validation Document for SANTOS, Version 2.1.7*. Document Version 1.20BOC. Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. (Copy on file in the SWRC as ERMS# 530421).
- WTS (Westinghouse TRU Solutions). 2003. "TRUPACT-II Authorized Methods for Payload Control (TRAMPAC)." Revision 19c, April 2003. Carlsbad, NM: Westinghouse TRU Solutions, LLC. [Online version, 3/9/04, at <http://www.wipp.ws/t2sar/Trampac/TRAMPAC.PDF>]

Zimmermann, Th., A. Truty, A. Urbanski, S. Commend, and K. Podles. 2001. *ZSOIL.PC: a Unified Approach to Stability, Bearing Capacity, Consolidation, Creep and Flow for Two and Three-Dimensional Simulations in Geotechnical Practice.1*. Lausanne, Switzerland: Zace Services Ltd. [Online version, 3/9/04, at Zace homepage, http://www.zace.com/white_p/zswp30.htm]

Intentionally Blank

APPENDIX A: CALCULATION SHEET

A-1 Shear Modulus and Bulk Modulus

12"-POP

$$E_{12} := 1.874 \cdot 10^9 \cdot \text{Pa}$$

$$\nu_{12} := 0.2999$$

$$\text{Two}\mu_{12} := \frac{E_{12}}{(1 + \nu_{12})} \quad \text{Two}\mu_{12} = 1.442 \times 10^9 \text{ Pa}$$

$$K_{12} := \frac{E_{12}}{3 \cdot (1 - 2 \cdot \nu_{12})} \quad K_{12} = 1.561 \times 10^9 \text{ Pa}$$

6"-POP

$$E_6 := 1.804 \cdot 10^9 \cdot \text{Pa}$$

$$\nu_6 := 0.3221$$

$$\text{Two}\mu_6 := \frac{E_6}{(1 + \nu_6)} \quad \text{Two}\mu_6 = 1.364 \times 10^9 \text{ Pa}$$

$$K_6 := \frac{E_6}{3 \cdot (1 - 2 \cdot \nu_6)} \quad K_6 = 1.69 \times 10^9 \text{ Pa}$$

A-2 D-P, M-C, and SANTOS input constants

[12-inch POP drum]

$$i := 1..4$$

$$\sigma_{3_i} :=$$

0.0 MPa
0.5 MPa
1.0 MPa
1.5 MPa

$$\sigma_{1_i} :=$$

9.6 MPa
10.2 MPa
10.8 MPa
11.3 MPa

$$\text{MPa} \equiv 10^6 \cdot \text{Pa}$$

$$\sin(\theta) = \frac{r_2 - r_1}{x_2 - x_1} \quad h = \frac{r_2}{\cos(\theta)}$$

Thus,

Slope of the line contacting with both circles:

$$\theta = \arcsin\left(\frac{r_2 - r_1}{x_2 - x_1}\right)$$

Intercept of the line contacting with both circles:

$$c = \frac{r_2}{\cos(\theta)} - \tan(\theta) \cdot x_2$$

To show the stress term:

$$x_i := \frac{\sigma_{1_i} + \sigma_{3_i}}{2}$$

$$r_i := \frac{\sigma_{1_i} - \sigma_{3_i}}{2}$$

$$\frac{x_i}{\text{MPa}} =$$

4.8
5.35
5.9
6.4

$$\frac{r_i}{\text{MPa}} =$$

4.8
4.85
4.9
4.9

k := 1..3

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(k) and the Mohr circle of Test(k+1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_k := \text{asin}\left(\frac{r_{k+1} - r_k}{x_{k+1} - x_k}\right) \quad \text{Intercept: } c_k := \frac{r_{k+1}}{\cos(\phi_k)} - \tan(\phi_k) \cdot x_{k+1}$$

$$\frac{\phi_k}{\text{deg}} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 5.216 \\ \hline 5.216 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \frac{c_k}{\text{MPa}} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 4.382 \\ \hline 4.382 \\ \hline 4.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(4) and the Mohr circle of Test(1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_4 := \text{asin}\left(\frac{r_4 - r_1}{x_4 - x_1}\right) \quad \text{Intercept: } c_4 := \frac{r_4}{\cos(\phi_4)} - \tan(\phi_4) \cdot x_4$$

$$\frac{\phi_4}{\text{deg}} = 3.583 \quad c_4 = 4.509 \text{MPa}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(3) and the Mohr circle of Test(1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_5 := \text{asin}\left(\frac{r_3 - r_1}{x_3 - x_1}\right) \quad \text{Intercept: } c_5 := \frac{r_3}{\cos(\phi_5)} - \tan(\phi_5) \cdot x_3$$

$$\frac{\phi_5}{\text{deg}} = 5.216 \quad c_5 = 4.382 \text{MPa}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(4) and the Mohr circle of Test(2):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_6 := \text{asin}\left(\frac{r_4 - r_2}{x_4 - x_2}\right) \quad \text{Intercept: } c_6 := \frac{r_4}{\cos(\phi_6)} - \tan(\phi_6) \cdot x_4$$

$$\frac{\phi_6}{\text{deg}} = 2.729 \quad c_6 = 4.6 \text{MPa}$$

j := 1..6

Thus,

Average Internal
Friction Angle:

$$\phi_m := \frac{\sum \phi_j}{6} \quad \phi_m = 3.66 \text{deg}$$

=====

This small friction angle was deemed to be insignificant and probably falls within the range of numerical errors. Therefore, the friction angle of 12-inch POP is considered zero.

$$\phi_m := 0 \cdot \text{deg}$$

$$k := 1..3$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(k) and the Mohr circle of Test(k+1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_k := 0 \quad \text{Intercept: } c_k := \frac{r_{k+1}}{\cos(\phi_k)} - \tan(\phi_k) \cdot x_{k+1}$$

$\frac{\phi_k}{\text{deg}}$	$\frac{c_k}{\text{MPa}}$
0	4.85
0	4.9
0	4.9

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(4) and the Mohr circle of Test(1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_4 := 0 \quad \text{Intercept: } c_4 := \frac{r_4}{\cos(\phi_4)} - \tan(\phi_4) \cdot x_4 \quad c_4 = 4.9 \text{ MPa}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(3) and the Mohr circle of Test(1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_5 := 0 \quad \text{Intercept: } c_5 := \frac{r_3}{\cos(\phi_5)} - \tan(\phi_5) \cdot x_3 \quad c_5 = 4.9 \text{ MPa}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(4) and the Mohr circle of Test(2):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_6 := 0 \quad \text{Intercept: } c_6 := \frac{r_4}{\cos(\phi_6)} - \tan(\phi_6) \cdot x_4 \quad c_6 = 4.9 \text{ MPa}$$

$$j := 1..6$$

Average Shear Strength
Intercept:

$$c_m := \frac{\sum_j c_j}{6} \quad c_m = 4.892 \text{ MPa}$$

=====

According to "Zimmermann, Th., A. Truty, A. Urbanski, S. Commend and K. Podles, 2001, *ZSOIL.PC: A Unified Approach to Stability, Bearing Capacity, Consolidation, Creep and Flow for Two and Three-Dimensional Simulations in Geotechnical Practice.1*, Zace Services Ltd."

$$C := c_m \cdot \cos(\phi_m) \quad C = 4.892 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa}$$

$$\alpha := \frac{\sin(\phi_m)}{3} \quad \alpha = 0$$

$$A_0 := \sqrt{3} \cdot C \quad A_0 = 8.473 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa}$$

$$A_1 := 3 \cdot \sqrt{3} \cdot \alpha \quad A_1 = 0$$

[6-inch POP drum]

$$i := 1..4$$

$$\sigma_{3_i} :=$$

$$\sigma_{1_i} :=$$

$$\text{MPa} \equiv 10^6 \cdot \text{Pa}$$

0.1-MPa
0.5-MPa
0.8-MPa
1.5-MPa

7.9-MPa
8.3-MPa
8.6-MPa
9.2-MPa

$$\sin(\theta) = \frac{r_2 - r_1}{x_2 - x_1} \quad h = \frac{r_2}{\cos(\theta)}$$

Thus,

Slope of the line contacting with both circles:

$$\theta = \arcsin\left(\frac{r_2 - r_1}{x_2 - x_1}\right)$$

Intercept of the line contacting with both circles:

$$c = \frac{r_2}{\cos(\theta)} - \tan(\theta) \cdot x_2$$

To show the stress term:

$$x_i := \frac{\sigma_{1_i} + \sigma_{3_i}}{2}$$

$$r_i := \frac{\sigma_{1_i} - \sigma_{3_i}}{2}$$

$\frac{x_i}{\text{MPa}} =$
4
4.4
4.7
5.35

$\frac{r_i}{\text{MPa}} =$
3.9
3.9
3.9
3.85

$$k := 1..3$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(k) and the Mohr circle of Test(k+1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_k := \text{asin} \left(\frac{r_{k+1} - r_k}{x_{k+1} - x_k} \right) \quad \text{Intercept: } c_k := \frac{r_{k+1}}{\cos(\phi_k)} - \tan(\phi_k) \cdot x_{k+1}$$

$$\frac{\phi_k}{\text{deg}} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 6.67 \cdot 10^{-14} \\ \hline -8.893 \cdot 10^{-14} \\ \hline -4.412 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \frac{c_k}{\text{MPa}} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 3.9 \\ \hline 3.9 \\ \hline 4.274 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(4) and the Mohr circle of Test(1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_4 := \text{asin} \left(\frac{r_4 - r_1}{x_4 - x_1} \right) \quad \text{Intercept: } c_4 := \frac{r_4}{\cos(\phi_4)} - \tan(\phi_4) \cdot x_4$$

$$\frac{\phi_4}{\text{deg}} = -2.123 \quad c_4 = 4.051 \text{MPa}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(3) and the Mohr circle of Test(1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_5 := \text{asin} \left(\frac{r_3 - r_1}{x_3 - x_1} \right) \quad \text{Intercept: } c_5 := \frac{r_3}{\cos(\phi_5)} - \tan(\phi_5) \cdot x_3$$

$$\frac{\phi_5}{\text{deg}} = 0 \quad c_5 = 3.9 \text{MPa}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(4) and the Mohr circle of Test(2):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_6 := \text{asin} \left(\frac{r_4 - r_2}{x_4 - x_2} \right) \quad \text{Intercept: } c_6 := \frac{r_4}{\cos(\phi_6)} - \tan(\phi_6) \cdot x_4$$

$$\frac{\phi_6}{\text{deg}} = -3.017 \quad c_6 = 4.137 \text{MPa}$$

$$j := 1..6$$

Thus,

Average Internal
Friction Angle:

$$\phi_m := \frac{\sum \phi_j}{6}$$

$$\phi_m = -1.592 \text{deg}$$

=====

This small negative friction angle was deemed to be insignificant and probably falls within the range of numerical errors. Therefore, the friction angle of 6-inch POP is considered zero.

$$\phi_m := 0 \text{ deg}$$

$$k := 1..3$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(k) and the Mohr circle of Test(k+1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_k := 0 \quad \text{Intercept: } c_k := \frac{r_{k+1}}{\cos(\phi_k)} - \tan(\phi_k) \cdot x_{k+1}$$

$\frac{\phi_k}{\text{deg}} =$	$\frac{c_k}{\text{MPa}} =$
0	3.9
0	3.9
0	3.85

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(4) and the Mohr circle of Test(1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_4 := 0 \quad \text{Intercept: } c_4 := \frac{r_4}{\cos(\phi_4)} - \tan(\phi_4) \cdot x_4 \quad c_4 = 3.85 \text{ MPa}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(3) and the Mohr circle of Test(1):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_5 := 0 \quad \text{Intercept: } c_5 := \frac{r_3}{\cos(\phi_5)} - \tan(\phi_5) \cdot x_3 \quad c_5 = 3.9 \text{ MPa}$$

For the line contacting with both the Mohr circle of Test(4) and the Mohr circle of Test(2):

$$\text{Slope: } \phi_6 := 0 \quad \text{Intercept: } c_6 := \frac{r_4}{\cos(\phi_6)} - \tan(\phi_6) \cdot x_4 \quad c_6 = 3.85 \text{ MPa}$$

$$j := 1..6$$

Average Shear Strength

Intercept:

$$c_m := \frac{\sum_j c_j}{6} \quad c_m = 3.875 \text{ MPa}$$

=====

According to "Zimmermann, Th., A. Truty, A. Urbanski, S. Commend and K. Podles, 2001, *ZSOIL.PC: A Unified Approach to Stability, Bearing Capacity, Consolidation, Creep and Flow for Two and Three-Dimensional Simulations in Geotechnical Practice.1*, Zace Services Ltd."

$$C := c_m \cdot \cos(\phi_m) \quad C = 3.875 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa}$$

$$\alpha := \frac{\sin(\phi_m)}{3} \quad \alpha = 0$$

$$A_0 := \sqrt{3} \cdot C \quad A_0 = 6.712 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa}$$

$$A_1 := 3 \cdot \sqrt{3} \cdot \alpha \quad A_1 = 0$$

APPENDIX B: FASTQ INPUT FILE

B-1 12-inch POP Waste Mesh for UTS and TTS

TITLE

Assembled POP with platen - 12 INCH PIPE (07/10/03-B.Y.PARK)

\$

\$Define Point

\$

\$ Lower Impact Limiter

POINT	101	.0	-1.397E-3
POINT	102	.1569974	-1.397E-3
POINT	103	.16256	-1.397E-3
POINT	104	.20701	-1.397E-3
POINT	105	.27305	-1.397E-3
POINT	106	.274447	-1.397E-3

\$

POINT	1	.0	.0
POINT	2	.1569974	.0
POINT	3	.16256	.0
POINT	4	.20701	.0
POINT	5	.27305	.0
POINT	6	.274447	.0

\$

POINT	11	.0	.04
POINT	12	.1569974	.04
POINT	13	.16256	.04
POINT	14	.20701	.04
POINT	15	.27305	.04
POINT	16	.274447	.04

\$

POINT	21	.0	.05334
POINT	22	.1569974	.05334
POINT	23	.16256	.05334
POINT	24	.20701	.05334
POINT	25	.27305	.05334
POINT	26	.274447	.05334

\$

POINT	31	.0	.05969
POINT	32	.1569974	.05969
POINT	33	.16256	.05969
POINT	34	.20701	.05969
POINT	35	.27305	.05969
POINT	36	.274447	.05969

\$

POINT	41	.0	.64516
POINT	42	.1569974	.64516
POINT	43	.16256	.64516
POINT	44	.20701	.64516
POINT	45	.27305	.64516
POINT	46	.274447	.64516

\$

POINT	51	.0	.68326
POINT	52	.1569974	.68326
POINT	53	.1665224	.68326
POINT	54	.20701	.68326
POINT	55	.27305	.68326
POINT	56	.274447	.68326

\$

POINT	61	.0	.70612
POINT	62	.1569974	.70612
POINT	63	.1665224	.70612

POINT	64	.20701	.70612
POINT	65	.27305	.70612
POINT	66	.274447	.70612
\$			
POINT	71	.0	.72898
POINT	72	.1569974	.72898
POINT	73	.1665224	.72898
POINT	74	.20701	.72898
POINT	75	.27305	.72898
POINT	76	.274447	.72898
\$			
POINT	81	.0	.79502
POINT	82	.1569974	.79502
POINT	83	.1665224	.79502
POINT	84	.20701	.79502
POINT	85	.27305	.79502
POINT	86	.274447	.79502
\$			
POINT	91	.0	.796417
POINT	92	.1569974	.796417
POINT	93	.1665224	.796417
POINT	94	.20701	.796417
POINT	95	.27305	.796417
POINT	96	.274447	.796417
\$ Upper Platen			
POINT	97	.3	.796417
POINT	191	.0	1.
POINT	192	.1569974	1.
POINT	193	.1665224	1.
POINT	194	.20701	1.
POINT	195	.27305	1.
POINT	196	.274447	1.
POINT	197	.3	1.
\$			
\$Define line			
\$			
LINE	101	STR 101 102	0 12 1.0
LINE	102	STR 102 103	0 2 1.0
LINE	103	STR 103 104	0 3 1.0
LINE	104	STR 104 105	0 5 1.0
LINE	105	STR 105 106	0 1 1.0
LINE	106	STR 101 1	0 1 1.0
LINE	107	STR 102 2	0 1 1.0
LINE	108	STR 103 3	0 1 1.0
LINE	109	STR 104 4	0 1 1.0
LINE	110	STR 105 5	0 1 1.0
LINE	111	STR 106 6	0 1 1.0
\$			
LINE	1	STR 1 2	0 12 1.0
LINE	2	STR 2 3	0 2 1.0
LINE	3	STR 3 4	0 3 1.0
LINE	4	STR 4 5	0 5 1.0
LINE	116	STR 5 6	0 1 1.0
LINE	5	STR 1 11	0 3 1.0
LINE	6	STR 2 12	0 3 1.0
LINE	7	STR 3 13	0 3 1.0
LINE	8	STR 4 14	0 3 1.0
LINE	9	STR 5 15	0 3 1.0
LINE	10	STR 6 16	0 3 1.0
\$			
LINE	11	STR 11 12	0 12 1.0
LINE	12	STR 12 13	0 2 1.0
LINE	13	STR 13 14	0 3 1.0

LINE	14	STR	14	15	0	5	1.0
LINE	115	STR	15	16	0	1	1.0
LINE	15	STR	11	21	0	2	1.0
LINE	16	STR	12	22	0	2	1.0
LINE	17	STR	13	23	0	2	1.0
LINE	18	STR	14	24	0	2	1.0
LINE	19	STR	15	25	0	2	1.0
LINE	20	STR	16	26	0	2	1.0
\$							
LINE	21	STR	21	22	0	12	1.0
LINE	22	STR	22	23	0	2	1.0
LINE	23	STR	23	24	0	3	1.0
LINE	24	STR	24	25	0	5	1.0
LINE	125	STR	25	26	0	1	1.0
LINE	25	STR	21	31	0	2	1.0
LINE	26	STR	22	32	0	2	1.0
LINE	27	STR	23	33	0	2	1.0
LINE	28	STR	24	34	0	2	1.0
LINE	29	STR	25	35	0	2	1.0
LINE	30	STR	26	36	0	2	1.0
\$							
LINE	31	STR	31	32	0	12	1.0
LINE	32	STR	32	33	0	2	1.0
LINE	33	STR	33	34	0	3	1.0
LINE	34	STR	34	35	0	5	1.0
LINE	135	STR	35	36	0	1	1.0
LINE	35	STR	31	41	0	48	1.0
LINE	36	STR	32	42	0	48	1.0
LINE	37	STR	33	43	0	48	1.0
LINE	38	STR	34	44	0	48	1.0
LINE	39	STR	35	45	0	48	1.0
LINE	40	STR	36	46	0	48	1.0
\$							
LINE	41	STR	41	42	0	12	1.0
LINE	42	STR	42	43	0	2	1.0
LINE	43	STR	43	44	0	3	1.0
LINE	44	STR	44	45	0	5	1.0
LINE	145	STR	45	46	0	1	1.0
LINE	45	STR	41	51	0	4	1.0
LINE	46	STR	42	52	0	4	1.0
LINE	47	STR	43	53	0	4	1.0
LINE	48	STR	44	54	0	4	1.0
LINE	49	STR	45	55	0	4	1.0
LINE	50	STR	46	56	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	51	STR	51	52	0	12	1.0
LINE	52	STR	52	53	0	2	1.0
LINE	53	STR	53	54	0	3	1.0
LINE	54	STR	54	55	0	5	1.0
LINE	155	STR	55	56	0	1	1.0
LINE	55	STR	51	61	0	4	1.0
LINE	56	STR	52	62	0	4	1.0
LINE	57	STR	53	63	0	4	1.0
LINE	58	STR	54	64	0	4	1.0
LINE	59	STR	55	65	0	4	1.0
LINE	60	STR	56	66	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	61	STR	61	62	0	12	1.0
LINE	62	STR	62	63	0	2	1.0
LINE	63	STR	63	64	0	3	1.0
LINE	64	STR	64	65	0	5	1.0
LINE	165	STR	65	66	0	1	1.0
LINE	65	STR	61	71	0	4	1.0

LINE	66	STR	62	72	0	4	1.0
LINE	67	STR	63	73	0	4	1.0
LINE	68	STR	64	74	0	4	1.0
LINE	69	STR	65	75	0	4	1.0
LINE	70	STR	66	76	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	71	STR	71	72	0	12	1.0
LINE	72	STR	72	73	0	2	1.0
LINE	73	STR	73	74	0	3	1.0
LINE	74	STR	74	75	0	5	1.0
LINE	175	STR	75	76	0	1	1.0
LINE	75	STR	71	81	0	4	1.0
LINE	76	STR	72	82	0	4	1.0
LINE	77	STR	73	83	0	4	1.0
LINE	78	STR	74	84	0	4	1.0
LINE	79	STR	75	85	0	4	1.0
LINE	80	STR	76	86	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	81	STR	81	82	0	12	1.0
LINE	82	STR	82	83	0	2	1.0
LINE	83	STR	83	84	0	3	1.0
LINE	84	STR	84	85	0	5	1.0
LINE	185	STR	85	86	0	1	1.0
LINE	85	STR	81	91	0	1	1.0
LINE	86	STR	82	92	0	1	1.0
LINE	87	STR	83	93	0	1	1.0
LINE	88	STR	84	94	0	1	1.0
LINE	89	STR	85	95	0	1	1.0
LINE	90	STR	86	96	0	1	1.0
\$							
LINE	91	STR	91	92	0	12	1.0
LINE	92	STR	92	93	0	2	1.0
LINE	93	STR	93	94	0	3	1.0
LINE	94	STR	94	95	0	5	1.0
LINE	195	STR	95	96	0	1	1.0
LINE	196	STR	96	97	0	2	1.0
LINE	95	STR	91	191	0	4	1.0
LINE	96	STR	92	192	0	4	1.0
LINE	97	STR	93	193	0	4	1.0
LINE	98	STR	94	194	0	4	1.0
LINE	99	STR	95	195	0	4	1.0
LINE	100	STR	96	196	0	4	1.0
LINE	197	STR	97	197	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	201	STR	191	192	0	12	1.0
LINE	202	STR	192	193	0	2	1.0
LINE	203	STR	193	194	0	3	1.0
LINE	204	STR	194	195	0	5	1.0
LINE	205	STR	195	196	0	1	1.0
LINE	206	STR	196	197	0	2	1.0
\$							
\$ NODEBC CARDS							
\$							
NODEBC	1	106	5	15	25	35	45 55 65 75 85 95 \$ Axis of Model
NODEBC	2	101	102	103	104	105	\$ Bottom of Model
\$							
\$ SIDEBC CARDS							
\$							
SIDEBC	100	101	102	103	104	105	\$ Bot of Drum
SIDEBC	200	106	5	15	25	35 45	55 65 75 85 95 \$ Axis of Model
SIDEBC	300	111	10	20	30	40 50	60 70 80 90 \$ R-Side of Drum
SIDEBC	400	91	92	93	94	195	\$ Top of Drum
SIDEBC	401	201	202	203	204	205 206	\$ Top of Platen

SIDIBC	500	101	102	103	104	105	111	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	91	92	93	94	195
SIDIBC	501	101	102	103	104	105	111	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	196	197	206	205	
	204	203	202	201																	
SIDIBC	643	43																			
SIDIBC	648	48																			
SIDIBC	653	53																			
SIDIBC	647	47																			
\$																					
\$																					
\$																					
REGION	1	1	-1	-6	-11	-5															
REGION	2	1	-2	-7	-12	-6															
REGION	3	1	-3	-8	-13	-7															
REGION	4	1	-4	-9	-14	-8															
\$																					
REGION	11	3	-11	-16	-21	-15															
REGION	12	3	-12	-17	-22	-16															
REGION	13	3	-13	-18	-23	-17															
REGION	14	3	-14	-19	-24	-18															
\$																					
\$																					
REGION	21	2	-21	-26	-31	-25															
REGION	22	2	-22	-27	-32	-26															
REGION	23	1	-23	-28	-33	-27															
REGION	24	1	-24	-29	-34	-28															
\$																					
REGION	31	4	-31	-36	-41	-35															
REGION	32	2	-32	-37	-42	-36															
REGION	33	1	-33	-38	-43	-37															
REGION	34	1	-34	-39	-44	-38															
\$																					
REGION	41	4	-41	-46	-51	-45															
REGION	42	2	-42	-47	-52	-46															
\$REGION	43	2	-43	-48	-53	-47															
REGION	44	1	-44	-49	-54	-48															
\$																					
REGION	51	4	-51	-56	-61	-55															
REGION	52	2	-52	-57	-62	-56															
REGION	53	2	-53	-58	-63	-57															
REGION	54	1	-54	-59	-64	-58															
\$																					
REGION	61	2	-61	-66	-71	-65															
REGION	62	2	-62	-67	-72	-66															
REGION	63	2	-63	-68	-73	-67															
REGION	64	1	-64	-69	-74	-68															
\$																					
REGION	71	1	-71	-76	-81	-75															
REGION	72	1	-72	-77	-82	-76															
REGION	73	1	-73	-78	-83	-77															
REGION	74	1	-74	-79	-84	-78															
\$ Drum																					
REGION	81	5	-81	-86	-91	-85															
REGION	82	5	-82	-87	-92	-86															
REGION	83	5	-83	-88	-93	-87															
REGION	84	5	-84	-89	-94	-88															
\$ Platen																					
REGION	91	6	-91	-96	-201	-95															
REGION	92	6	-92	-97	-202	-96															
REGION	93	6	-93	-98	-203	-97															
REGION	94	6	-94	-99	-204	-98															
REGION	95	6	-195	-100	-205	-99															
REGION	96	6	-196	-197	-206	-100															
\$ Drum																					

REGION 101	5	-101	-107	-1	-106
REGION 102	5	-102	-108	-2	-107
REGION 103	5	-103	-109	-3	-108
REGION 104	5	-104	-110	-4	-109
REGION 105	5	-105	-111	-116	-110
\$ Drum					
REGION 106	5	-116	-10	-115	-9
REGION 115	5	-115	-20	-125	-19
REGION 125	5	-125	-30	-135	-29
REGION 135	5	-135	-40	-145	-39
REGION 145	5	-145	-50	-155	-49
REGION 155	5	-155	-60	-165	-59
REGION 165	5	-165	-70	-175	-69
REGION 175	5	-175	-80	-185	-79
REGION 185	5	-185	-90	-195	-89
\$					
SCHEME	0	M			
EXIT					

B-2 6-inch POP Waste Mesh for UTS and TTS

TITLE

Assembled POP pressed with platen - 6" Pipe (07/13/03-B.Y.PARK)

\$

\$Define Point

\$

\$ Lower Impact Limiter

POINT	101	.0	-1.397E-3
POINT	102	.07887	-1.397E-3
POINT	103	.08509	-1.397E-3
POINT	104	.13970	-1.397E-3
POINT	105	.27305	-1.397E-3
POINT	106	.274447	-1.397E-3

\$

POINT	1	.0	.0
POINT	2	.07887	.0
POINT	3	.08509	.0
POINT	4	.13970	.0
POINT	5	.27305	.0
POINT	6	.274447	.0

\$

POINT	11	.0	.04
POINT	12	.07887	.04
POINT	13	.08509	.04
POINT	14	.13970	.04
POINT	15	.27305	.04
POINT	16	.274447	.04

\$

POINT	21	.0	.05334
POINT	22	.07887	.05334
POINT	23	.08509	.05334
POINT	24	.13970	.05334
POINT	25	.27305	.05334
POINT	26	.274447	.05334

\$

POINT	31	.0	.05969
POINT	32	.07887	.05969
POINT	33	.08509	.05969
POINT	34	.13970	.05969
POINT	35	.27305	.05969
POINT	36	.274447	.05969

\$

POINT	41	.0	.64516
POINT	42	.07887	.64516
POINT	43	.08509	.64516
POINT	44	.13970	.64516
POINT	45	.27305	.64516
POINT	46	.274447	.64516

\$

POINT	51	.0	.69088
POINT	52	.07887	.69088
POINT	53	.08905	.69088
POINT	54	.13970	.69088
POINT	55	.27305	.69088
POINT	56	.274447	.69088

\$

POINT	61	.0	.71374
POINT	62	.07887	.71374
POINT	63	.08905	.71374
POINT	64	.13970	.71374
POINT	65	.27305	.71374
POINT	66	.274447	.71374

```

$
POINT 71 .0 .73660
POINT 72 .07887 .73660
POINT 73 .08905 .73660
POINT 74 .13970 .73660
POINT 75 .27305 .73660
POINT 76 .274447 .73660
$
POINT 81 .0 .79502
POINT 82 .07887 .79502
POINT 83 .08905 .79502
POINT 84 .13970 .79502
POINT 85 .27305 .79502
POINT 86 .274447 .79502
$
POINT 91 .0 .796417
POINT 92 .07887 .796417
POINT 93 .08905 .796417
POINT 94 .13970 .796417
POINT 95 .27305 .796417
POINT 96 .274447 .796417
$ Upper Platen
POINT 97 .3 .796417
POINT 191 .0 1.
POINT 192 .07887 1.
POINT 193 .08905 1.
POINT 194 .13970 1.
POINT 195 .27305 1.
POINT 196 .274447 1.
POINT 197 .3 1.
$
$Define line
$
LINE 101 STR 101 102 0 6 1.0
LINE 102 STR 102 103 0 2 1.0
LINE 103 STR 103 104 0 4 1.0
LINE 104 STR 104 105 0 10 1.0
LINE 105 STR 105 106 0 1 1.0
LINE 106 STR 101 1 0 1 1.0
LINE 107 STR 102 2 0 1 1.0
LINE 108 STR 103 3 0 1 1.0
LINE 109 STR 104 4 0 1 1.0
LINE 110 STR 105 5 0 1 1.0
LINE 111 STR 106 6 0 1 1.0
$
LINE 1 STR 1 2 0 6 1.0
LINE 2 STR 2 3 0 2 1.0
LINE 3 STR 3 4 0 4 1.0
LINE 4 STR 4 5 0 10 1.0
LINE 116 STR 5 6 0 1 1.0
LINE 5 STR 1 11 0 3 1.0
LINE 6 STR 2 12 0 3 1.0
LINE 7 STR 3 13 0 3 1.0
LINE 8 STR 4 14 0 3 1.0
LINE 9 STR 5 15 0 3 1.0
LINE 10 STR 6 16 0 3 1.0
$
LINE 11 STR 11 12 0 6 1.0
LINE 12 STR 12 13 0 2 1.0
LINE 13 STR 13 14 0 4 1.0
LINE 14 STR 14 15 0 10 1.0
LINE 115 STR 15 16 0 1 1.0
LINE 15 STR 11 21 0 2 1.0

```

LINE	16	STR	12	22	0	2	1.0
LINE	17	STR	13	23	0	2	1.0
LINE	18	STR	14	24	0	2	1.0
LINE	19	STR	15	25	0	2	1.0
LINE	20	STR	16	26	0	2	1.0
\$							
LINE	21	STR	21	22	0	6	1.0
LINE	22	STR	22	23	0	2	1.0
LINE	23	STR	23	24	0	4	1.0
LINE	24	STR	24	25	0	10	1.0
LINE	125	STR	25	26	0	1	1.0
LINE	25	STR	21	31	0	2	1.0
LINE	26	STR	22	32	0	2	1.0
LINE	27	STR	23	33	0	2	1.0
LINE	28	STR	24	34	0	2	1.0
LINE	29	STR	25	35	0	2	1.0
LINE	30	STR	26	36	0	2	1.0
\$							
LINE	31	STR	31	32	0	6	1.0
LINE	32	STR	32	33	0	2	1.0
LINE	33	STR	33	34	0	4	1.0
LINE	34	STR	34	35	0	10	1.0
LINE	135	STR	35	36	0	1	1.0
LINE	35	STR	31	41	0	48	1.0
LINE	36	STR	32	42	0	48	1.0
LINE	37	STR	33	43	0	48	1.0
LINE	38	STR	34	44	0	48	1.0
LINE	39	STR	35	45	0	48	1.0
LINE	40	STR	36	46	0	48	1.0
\$							
LINE	41	STR	41	42	0	6	1.0
LINE	42	STR	42	43	0	2	1.0
LINE	43	STR	43	44	0	4	1.0
LINE	44	STR	44	45	0	10	1.0
LINE	145	STR	45	46	0	1	1.0
LINE	45	STR	41	51	0	4	1.0
LINE	46	STR	42	52	0	4	1.0
LINE	47	STR	43	53	0	4	1.0
LINE	48	STR	44	54	0	4	1.0
LINE	49	STR	45	55	0	4	1.0
LINE	50	STR	46	56	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	51	STR	51	52	0	6	1.0
LINE	52	STR	52	53	0	2	1.0
LINE	53	STR	53	54	0	4	1.0
LINE	54	STR	54	55	0	10	1.0
LINE	155	STR	55	56	0	1	1.0
LINE	55	STR	51	61	0	4	1.0
LINE	56	STR	52	62	0	4	1.0
LINE	57	STR	53	63	0	4	1.0
LINE	58	STR	54	64	0	4	1.0
LINE	59	STR	55	65	0	4	1.0
LINE	60	STR	56	66	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	61	STR	61	62	0	6	1.0
LINE	62	STR	62	63	0	2	1.0
LINE	63	STR	63	64	0	4	1.0
LINE	64	STR	64	65	0	10	1.0
LINE	165	STR	65	66	0	1	1.0
LINE	65	STR	61	71	0	4	1.0
LINE	66	STR	62	72	0	4	1.0
LINE	67	STR	63	73	0	4	1.0
LINE	68	STR	64	74	0	4	1.0

LINE	69	STR	65	75	0	4	1.0
LINE	70	STR	66	76	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	71	STR	71	72	0	6	1.0
LINE	72	STR	72	73	0	2	1.0
LINE	73	STR	73	74	0	4	1.0
LINE	74	STR	74	75	0	10	1.0
LINE	175	STR	75	76	0	1	1.0
LINE	75	STR	71	81	0	4	1.0
LINE	76	STR	72	82	0	4	1.0
LINE	77	STR	73	83	0	4	1.0
LINE	78	STR	74	84	0	4	1.0
LINE	79	STR	75	85	0	4	1.0
LINE	80	STR	76	86	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	81	STR	81	82	0	6	1.0
LINE	82	STR	82	83	0	2	1.0
LINE	83	STR	83	84	0	4	1.0
LINE	84	STR	84	85	0	10	1.0
LINE	185	STR	85	86	0	1	1.0
LINE	85	STR	81	91	0	1	1.0
LINE	86	STR	82	92	0	1	1.0
LINE	87	STR	83	93	0	1	1.0
LINE	88	STR	84	94	0	1	1.0
LINE	89	STR	85	95	0	1	1.0
LINE	90	STR	86	96	0	1	1.0
\$							
LINE	91	STR	91	92	0	6	1.0
LINE	92	STR	92	93	0	2	1.0
LINE	93	STR	93	94	0	4	1.0
LINE	94	STR	94	95	0	10	1.0
LINE	195	STR	95	96	0	1	1.0
LINE	196	STR	96	97	0	2	1.0
LINE	95	STR	91	191	0	4	1.0
LINE	96	STR	92	192	0	4	1.0
LINE	97	STR	93	193	0	4	1.0
LINE	98	STR	94	194	0	4	1.0
LINE	99	STR	95	195	0	4	1.0
LINE	100	STR	96	196	0	4	1.0
LINE	197	STR	97	197	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	201	STR	191	192	0	6	1.0
LINE	202	STR	192	193	0	2	1.0
LINE	203	STR	193	194	0	4	1.0
LINE	204	STR	194	195	0	10	1.0
LINE	205	STR	195	196	0	1	1.0
LINE	206	STR	196	197	0	2	1.0
\$							
\$ NODEBC CARDS							
\$							
NODEBC	1	106	5	15	25	35	45 55 65 75 85 95 \$ Axis of Model
NODEBC	2	101	102	103	104	105	\$ Bottom of Model
\$							
\$ SIDEBC CARDS							
\$							
SIDEBC	100	101	102	103	104	105	\$ Bot of Drum
SIDEBC	200	106	5	15	25	35 45 55 65 75 85 95	\$ Axis of Model
SIDEBC	300	111	10	20	30	40 50 60 70 80 90	\$ R-Side of Drum
SIDEBC	400	91	92	93	94	195	\$ Top of Drum
SIDEBC	401	201	202	203	204	205 206	\$ Top of Platen
SIDEBC	500	101	102	103	104	105 111 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 195 94 93 92 91	
SIDEBC	501	101	102	103	104	105 111 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 196 197 206 205	
204 203 202 201							

SIDIBC	643	43				\$ Floor of Space
SIDIBC	648	48				\$ Right wall of Space
SIDIBC	653	53				\$ Roof of Space
SIDIBC	647	47				\$ Left wall of Space
\$						
\$ REGION CARDS						
\$						
REGION	1	1	-1	-6	-11	-5
REGION	2	1	-2	-7	-12	-6
REGION	3	1	-3	-8	-13	-7
REGION	4	1	-4	-9	-14	-8
\$						
REGION	11	3	-11	-16	-21	-15
REGION	12	3	-12	-17	-22	-16
REGION	13	3	-13	-18	-23	-17
REGION	14	3	-14	-19	-24	-18
\$						
\$						
REGION	21	2	-21	-26	-31	-25
REGION	22	2	-22	-27	-32	-26
REGION	23	1	-23	-28	-33	-27
REGION	24	1	-24	-29	-34	-28
\$						
REGION	31	4	-31	-36	-41	-35
REGION	32	2	-32	-37	-42	-36
REGION	33	1	-33	-38	-43	-37
REGION	34	1	-34	-39	-44	-38
\$						
REGION	41	4	-41	-46	-51	-45
REGION	42	2	-42	-47	-52	-46
\$REGION	43	2	-43	-48	-53	-47
REGION	44	1	-44	-49	-54	-48
\$						
REGION	51	4	-51	-56	-61	-55
REGION	52	2	-52	-57	-62	-56
REGION	53	2	-53	-58	-63	-57
REGION	54	1	-54	-59	-64	-58
\$						
REGION	61	2	-61	-66	-71	-65
REGION	62	2	-62	-67	-72	-66
REGION	63	2	-63	-68	-73	-67
REGION	64	1	-64	-69	-74	-68
\$						
REGION	71	1	-71	-76	-81	-75
REGION	72	1	-72	-77	-82	-76
REGION	73	1	-73	-78	-83	-77
REGION	74	1	-74	-79	-84	-78
\$ Drum						
REGION	81	5	-81	-86	-91	-85
REGION	82	5	-82	-87	-92	-86
REGION	83	5	-83	-88	-93	-87
REGION	84	5	-84	-89	-94	-88
\$ Platen						
REGION	91	6	-91	-96	-201	-95
REGION	92	6	-92	-97	-202	-96
REGION	93	6	-93	-98	-203	-97
REGION	94	6	-94	-99	-204	-98
REGION	95	6	-195	-100	-205	-99
REGION	96	6	-196	-197	-206	-100
\$ Drum						
REGION	101	5	-101	-107	-1	-106
REGION	102	5	-102	-108	-2	-107
REGION	103	5	-103	-109	-3	-108

REGION 104	5	-104	-110	-4	-109
REGION 105	5	-105	-111	-116	-110
\$ Drum					
REGION 106	5	-116	-10	-115	-9
REGION 115	5	-115	-20	-125	-19
REGION 125	5	-125	-30	-135	-29
REGION 135	5	-135	-40	-145	-39
REGION 145	5	-145	-50	-155	-49
REGION 155	5	-155	-60	-165	-59
REGION 165	5	-165	-70	-175	-69
REGION 175	5	-175	-80	-185	-79
REGION 185	5	-185	-90	-195	-89
\$					
SCHEME	0	M			
EXIT					

B-3 12-inch POP Waste Mesh for HTS

TITLE

Assembled POP - 12 INCH PIPE (07/10/03-B.Y.PARK)

\$

\$Define Point

\$

\$ Lower Impact Limiter

POINT	101	.0	-1.397E-3
POINT	102	.1569974	-1.397E-3
POINT	103	.16256	-1.397E-3
POINT	104	.20701	-1.397E-3
POINT	105	.27305	-1.397E-3
POINT	106	.274447	-1.397E-3

\$

POINT	1	.0	.0
POINT	2	.1569974	.0
POINT	3	.16256	.0
POINT	4	.20701	.0
POINT	5	.27305	.0
POINT	6	.274447	.0

\$

POINT	11	.0	.04
POINT	12	.1569974	.04
POINT	13	.16256	.04
POINT	14	.20701	.04
POINT	15	.27305	.04
POINT	16	.274447	.04

\$

POINT	21	.0	.05334
POINT	22	.1569974	.05334
POINT	23	.16256	.05334
POINT	24	.20701	.05334
POINT	25	.27305	.05334
POINT	26	.274447	.05334

\$

POINT	31	.0	.05969
POINT	32	.1569974	.05969
POINT	33	.16256	.05969
POINT	34	.20701	.05969
POINT	35	.27305	.05969
POINT	36	.274447	.05969

\$

POINT	41	.0	.64516
POINT	42	.1569974	.64516
POINT	43	.16256	.64516
POINT	44	.20701	.64516
POINT	45	.27305	.64516
POINT	46	.274447	.64516

\$

POINT	51	.0	.68326
POINT	52	.1569974	.68326
POINT	53	.1665224	.68326
POINT	54	.20701	.68326
POINT	55	.27305	.68326
POINT	56	.274447	.68326

\$

POINT	61	.0	.70612
POINT	62	.1569974	.70612
POINT	63	.1665224	.70612
POINT	64	.20701	.70612
POINT	65	.27305	.70612
POINT	66	.274447	.70612

```

$
POINT 71 .0 .72898
POINT 72 .1569974 .72898
POINT 73 .1665224 .72898
POINT 74 .20701 .72898
POINT 75 .27305 .72898
POINT 76 .274447 .72898
$
POINT 81 .0 .79502
POINT 82 .1569974 .79502
POINT 83 .1665224 .79502
POINT 84 .20701 .79502
POINT 85 .27305 .79502
POINT 86 .274447 .79502
$
POINT 91 .0 .796417
POINT 92 .1569974 .796417
POINT 93 .1665224 .796417
POINT 94 .20701 .796417
POINT 95 .27305 .796417
POINT 96 .274447 .796417
$
$Define line
$
LINE 101 STR 101 102 0 12 1.0
LINE 102 STR 102 103 0 2 1.0
LINE 103 STR 103 104 0 3 1.0
LINE 104 STR 104 105 0 5 1.0
LINE 105 STR 105 106 0 1 1.0
LINE 106 STR 101 1 0 1 1.0
LINE 107 STR 102 2 0 1 1.0
LINE 108 STR 103 3 0 1 1.0
LINE 109 STR 104 4 0 1 1.0
LINE 110 STR 105 5 0 1 1.0
LINE 111 STR 106 6 0 1 1.0
$
LINE 1 STR 1 2 0 12 1.0
LINE 2 STR 2 3 0 2 1.0
LINE 3 STR 3 4 0 3 1.0
LINE 4 STR 4 5 0 5 1.0
LINE 116 STR 5 6 0 1 1.0
LINE 5 STR 1 11 0 3 1.0
LINE 6 STR 2 12 0 3 1.0
LINE 7 STR 3 13 0 3 1.0
LINE 8 STR 4 14 0 3 1.0
LINE 9 STR 5 15 0 3 1.0
LINE 10 STR 6 16 0 3 1.0
$
LINE 11 STR 11 12 0 12 1.0
LINE 12 STR 12 13 0 2 1.0
LINE 13 STR 13 14 0 3 1.0
LINE 14 STR 14 15 0 5 1.0
LINE 115 STR 15 16 0 1 1.0
LINE 15 STR 11 21 0 2 1.0
LINE 16 STR 12 22 0 2 1.0
LINE 17 STR 13 23 0 2 1.0
LINE 18 STR 14 24 0 2 1.0
LINE 19 STR 15 25 0 2 1.0
LINE 20 STR 16 26 0 2 1.0
$
LINE 21 STR 21 22 0 12 1.0
LINE 22 STR 22 23 0 2 1.0
LINE 23 STR 23 24 0 3 1.0

```

LINE	24	STR	24	25	0	5	1.0
LINE	125	STR	25	26	0	1	1.0
LINE	25	STR	21	31	0	2	1.0
LINE	26	STR	22	32	0	2	1.0
LINE	27	STR	23	33	0	2	1.0
LINE	28	STR	24	34	0	2	1.0
LINE	29	STR	25	35	0	2	1.0
LINE	30	STR	26	36	0	2	1.0
\$							
LINE	31	STR	31	32	0	12	1.0
LINE	32	STR	32	33	0	2	1.0
LINE	33	STR	33	34	0	3	1.0
LINE	34	STR	34	35	0	5	1.0
LINE	135	STR	35	36	0	1	1.0
LINE	35	STR	31	41	0	48	1.0
LINE	36	STR	32	42	0	48	1.0
LINE	37	STR	33	43	0	48	1.0
LINE	38	STR	34	44	0	48	1.0
LINE	39	STR	35	45	0	48	1.0
LINE	40	STR	36	46	0	48	1.0
\$							
LINE	41	STR	41	42	0	12	1.0
LINE	42	STR	42	43	0	2	1.0
LINE	43	STR	43	44	0	3	1.0
LINE	44	STR	44	45	0	5	1.0
LINE	145	STR	45	46	0	1	1.0
LINE	45	STR	41	51	0	4	1.0
LINE	46	STR	42	52	0	4	1.0
LINE	47	STR	43	53	0	4	1.0
LINE	48	STR	44	54	0	4	1.0
LINE	49	STR	45	55	0	4	1.0
LINE	50	STR	46	56	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	51	STR	51	52	0	12	1.0
LINE	52	STR	52	53	0	2	1.0
LINE	53	STR	53	54	0	3	1.0
LINE	54	STR	54	55	0	5	1.0
LINE	155	STR	55	56	0	1	1.0
LINE	55	STR	51	61	0	4	1.0
LINE	56	STR	52	62	0	4	1.0
LINE	57	STR	53	63	0	4	1.0
LINE	58	STR	54	64	0	4	1.0
LINE	59	STR	55	65	0	4	1.0
LINE	60	STR	56	66	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	61	STR	61	62	0	12	1.0
LINE	62	STR	62	63	0	2	1.0
LINE	63	STR	63	64	0	3	1.0
LINE	64	STR	64	65	0	5	1.0
LINE	165	STR	65	66	0	1	1.0
LINE	65	STR	61	71	0	4	1.0
LINE	66	STR	62	72	0	4	1.0
LINE	67	STR	63	73	0	4	1.0
LINE	68	STR	64	74	0	4	1.0
LINE	69	STR	65	75	0	4	1.0
LINE	70	STR	66	76	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	71	STR	71	72	0	12	1.0
LINE	72	STR	72	73	0	2	1.0
LINE	73	STR	73	74	0	3	1.0
LINE	74	STR	74	75	0	5	1.0
LINE	175	STR	75	76	0	1	1.0
LINE	75	STR	71	81	0	4	1.0


```

LINE 76 STR 72 82 0 4 1.0
LINE 77 STR 73 83 0 4 1.0
LINE 78 STR 74 84 0 4 1.0
LINE 79 STR 75 85 0 4 1.0
LINE 80 STR 76 86 0 4 1.0
$
LINE 81 STR 81 82 0 12 1.0
LINE 82 STR 82 83 0 2 1.0
LINE 83 STR 83 84 0 3 1.0
LINE 84 STR 84 85 0 5 1.0
LINE 185 STR 85 86 0 1 1.0
LINE 85 STR 81 91 0 1 1.0
LINE 86 STR 82 92 0 1 1.0
LINE 87 STR 83 93 0 1 1.0
LINE 88 STR 84 94 0 1 1.0
LINE 89 STR 85 95 0 1 1.0
LINE 90 STR 86 96 0 1 1.0
$
LINE 91 STR 91 92 0 12 1.0
LINE 92 STR 92 93 0 2 1.0
LINE 93 STR 93 94 0 3 1.0
LINE 94 STR 94 95 0 5 1.0
LINE 195 STR 95 96 0 1 1.0
$
$ NODEBC CARDS
$
NODEBC 1 106 5 15 25 35 45 55 65 75 85 $ Axis of Model
NODEBC 2 101 102 103 104 105 $ Bottom of Model
$
$ SIDEBC CARDS
$
SIDEBC 100 101 102 103 104 105 $ Bot of Drum
SIDEBC 200 106 5 15 25 35 45 55 65 75 85 $ Axis of Model
SIDEBC 300 111 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 $ R-Side of Drum
SIDEBC 400 91 92 93 94 195 $ Top of Top Im-
pact Limiter
SIDEBC 500 101 102 103 104 105 111 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 91 92 93 94 195
$ Vol of Drum
SIDEBC 643 43 $ Floor of Space
SIDEBC 648 48 $ Right wall of Space
SIDEBC 653 53 $ Roof of Space
SIDEBC 647 47 $ Left wall of Space
$
$ REGION CARDS
$
REGION 1 1 -1 -6 -11 -5
REGION 2 1 -2 -7 -12 -6
REGION 3 1 -3 -8 -13 -7
REGION 4 1 -4 -9 -14 -8
$
REGION 11 3 -11 -16 -21 -15
REGION 12 3 -12 -17 -22 -16
REGION 13 3 -13 -18 -23 -17
REGION 14 3 -14 -19 -24 -18
$
$
REGION 21 2 -21 -26 -31 -25
REGION 22 2 -22 -27 -32 -26
REGION 23 1 -23 -28 -33 -27
REGION 24 1 -24 -29 -34 -28
$
REGION 31 4 -31 -36 -41 -35
REGION 32 2 -32 -37 -42 -36

```

REGION	33	1	-33	-38	-43	-37
REGION	34	1	-34	-39	-44	-38
\$						
REGION	41	4	-41	-46	-51	-45
REGION	42	2	-42	-47	-52	-46
\$REGION	43	2	-43	-48	-53	-47
REGION	44	1	-44	-49	-54	-48
\$						
REGION	51	4	-51	-56	-61	-55
REGION	52	2	-52	-57	-62	-56
REGION	53	2	-53	-58	-63	-57
REGION	54	1	-54	-59	-64	-58
\$						
REGION	61	2	-61	-66	-71	-65
REGION	62	2	-62	-67	-72	-66
REGION	63	2	-63	-68	-73	-67
REGION	64	1	-64	-69	-74	-68
\$						
REGION	71	1	-71	-76	-81	-75
REGION	72	1	-72	-77	-82	-76
REGION	73	1	-73	-78	-83	-77
REGION	74	1	-74	-79	-84	-78
\$						
REGION	81	5	-81	-86	-91	-85
REGION	82	5	-82	-87	-92	-86
REGION	83	5	-83	-88	-93	-87
REGION	84	5	-84	-89	-94	-88
\$						
\$						
REGION	101	5	-101	-107	-1	-106
REGION	102	5	-102	-108	-2	-107
REGION	103	5	-103	-109	-3	-108
REGION	104	5	-104	-110	-4	-109
REGION	105	5	-105	-111	-116	-110
\$						
REGION	106	5	-116	-10	-115	-9
REGION	115	5	-115	-20	-125	-19
REGION	125	5	-125	-30	-135	-29
REGION	135	5	-135	-40	-145	-39
REGION	145	5	-145	-50	-155	-49
REGION	155	5	-155	-60	-165	-59
REGION	165	5	-165	-70	-175	-69
REGION	175	5	-175	-80	-185	-79
REGION	185	5	-185	-90	-195	-89
\$						
SCHEME	0	M				
EXIT						

B-4 6-inch POP Waste Mesh for HTS

TITLE

POP Waste for Hydrostatic Test Simulation - 6" Pipe (07/13/03-B.Y.PARK)

\$

\$Define Point

\$

\$ Lower Impact Limiter

POINT	101	.0	-1.397E-3
POINT	102	.07887	-1.397E-3
POINT	103	.08509	-1.397E-3
POINT	104	.13970	-1.397E-3
POINT	105	.27305	-1.397E-3
POINT	106	.274447	-1.397E-3

\$

POINT	1	.0	.0
POINT	2	.07887	.0
POINT	3	.08509	.0
POINT	4	.13970	.0
POINT	5	.27305	.0
POINT	6	.274447	.0

\$

POINT	11	.0	.04
POINT	12	.07887	.04
POINT	13	.08509	.04
POINT	14	.13970	.04
POINT	15	.27305	.04
POINT	16	.274447	.04

\$

POINT	21	.0	.05334
POINT	22	.07887	.05334
POINT	23	.08509	.05334
POINT	24	.13970	.05334
POINT	25	.27305	.05334
POINT	26	.274447	.05334

\$

POINT	31	.0	.05969
POINT	32	.07887	.05969
POINT	33	.08509	.05969
POINT	34	.13970	.05969
POINT	35	.27305	.05969
POINT	36	.274447	.05969

\$

POINT	41	.0	.64516
POINT	42	.07887	.64516
POINT	43	.08509	.64516
POINT	44	.13970	.64516
POINT	45	.27305	.64516
POINT	46	.274447	.64516

\$

POINT	51	.0	.69088
POINT	52	.07887	.69088
POINT	53	.089905	.69088
POINT	54	.13970	.69088
POINT	55	.27305	.69088
POINT	56	.274447	.69088

\$

POINT	61	.0	.71374
POINT	62	.07887	.71374
POINT	63	.089905	.71374
POINT	64	.13970	.71374
POINT	65	.27305	.71374
POINT	66	.274447	.71374

```

$
POINT 71 .0 .73660
POINT 72 .07887 .73660
POINT 73 .089905 .73660
POINT 74 .13970 .73660
POINT 75 .27305 .73660
POINT 76 .274447 .73660
$
POINT 81 .0 .79502
POINT 82 .07887 .79502
POINT 83 .089905 .79502
POINT 84 .13970 .79502
POINT 85 .27305 .79502
POINT 86 .274447 .79502
$
POINT 91 .0 .796417
POINT 92 .07887 .796417
POINT 93 .089905 .796417
POINT 94 .13970 .796417
POINT 95 .27305 .796417
POINT 96 .274447 .796417
$
$Define line
$
LINE 101 STR 101 102 0 6 1.0
LINE 102 STR 102 103 0 2 1.0
LINE 103 STR 103 104 0 4 1.0
LINE 104 STR 104 105 0 10 1.0
LINE 105 STR 105 106 0 1 1.0
LINE 106 STR 101 1 0 1 1.0
LINE 107 STR 102 2 0 1 1.0
LINE 108 STR 103 3 0 1 1.0
LINE 109 STR 104 4 0 1 1.0
LINE 110 STR 105 5 0 1 1.0
LINE 111 STR 106 6 0 1 1.0
$
LINE 1 STR 1 2 0 6 1.0
LINE 2 STR 2 3 0 2 1.0
LINE 3 STR 3 4 0 4 1.0
LINE 4 STR 4 5 0 10 1.0
LINE 116 STR 5 6 0 1 1.0
LINE 5 STR 1 11 0 3 1.0
LINE 6 STR 2 12 0 3 1.0
LINE 7 STR 3 13 0 3 1.0
LINE 8 STR 4 14 0 3 1.0
LINE 9 STR 5 15 0 3 1.0
LINE 10 STR 6 16 0 3 1.0
$
LINE 11 STR 11 12 0 6 1.0
LINE 12 STR 12 13 0 2 1.0
LINE 13 STR 13 14 0 4 1.0
LINE 14 STR 14 15 0 10 1.0
LINE 115 STR 15 16 0 1 1.0
LINE 15 STR 11 21 0 2 1.0
LINE 16 STR 12 22 0 2 1.0
LINE 17 STR 13 23 0 2 1.0
LINE 18 STR 14 24 0 2 1.0
LINE 19 STR 15 25 0 2 1.0
LINE 20 STR 16 26 0 2 1.0
$
LINE 21 STR 21 22 0 6 1.0
LINE 22 STR 22 23 0 2 1.0
LINE 23 STR 23 24 0 4 1.0

```

LINE	24	STR	24	25	0	10	1.0
LINE	125	STR	25	26	0	1	1.0
LINE	25	STR	21	31	0	2	1.0
LINE	26	STR	22	32	0	2	1.0
LINE	27	STR	23	33	0	2	1.0
LINE	28	STR	24	34	0	2	1.0
LINE	29	STR	25	35	0	2	1.0
LINE	30	STR	26	36	0	2	1.0
\$							
LINE	31	STR	31	32	0	6	1.0
LINE	32	STR	32	33	0	2	1.0
LINE	33	STR	33	34	0	4	1.0
LINE	34	STR	34	35	0	10	1.0
LINE	135	STR	35	36	0	1	1.0
LINE	35	STR	31	41	0	48	1.0
LINE	36	STR	32	42	0	48	1.0
LINE	37	STR	33	43	0	48	1.0
LINE	38	STR	34	44	0	48	1.0
LINE	39	STR	35	45	0	48	1.0
LINE	40	STR	36	46	0	48	1.0
\$							
LINE	41	STR	41	42	0	6	1.0
LINE	42	STR	42	43	0	2	1.0
LINE	43	STR	43	44	0	4	1.0
LINE	44	STR	44	45	0	10	1.0
LINE	145	STR	45	46	0	1	1.0
LINE	45	STR	41	51	0	4	1.0
LINE	46	STR	42	52	0	4	1.0
LINE	47	STR	43	53	0	4	1.0
LINE	48	STR	44	54	0	4	1.0
LINE	49	STR	45	55	0	4	1.0
LINE	50	STR	46	56	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	51	STR	51	52	0	6	1.0
LINE	52	STR	52	53	0	2	1.0
LINE	53	STR	53	54	0	4	1.0
LINE	54	STR	54	55	0	10	1.0
LINE	155	STR	55	56	0	1	1.0
LINE	55	STR	51	61	0	4	1.0
LINE	56	STR	52	62	0	4	1.0
LINE	57	STR	53	63	0	4	1.0
LINE	58	STR	54	64	0	4	1.0
LINE	59	STR	55	65	0	4	1.0
LINE	60	STR	56	66	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	61	STR	61	62	0	6	1.0
LINE	62	STR	62	63	0	2	1.0
LINE	63	STR	63	64	0	4	1.0
LINE	64	STR	64	65	0	10	1.0
LINE	165	STR	65	66	0	1	1.0
LINE	65	STR	61	71	0	4	1.0
LINE	66	STR	62	72	0	4	1.0
LINE	67	STR	63	73	0	4	1.0
LINE	68	STR	64	74	0	4	1.0
LINE	69	STR	65	75	0	4	1.0
LINE	70	STR	66	76	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	71	STR	71	72	0	6	1.0
LINE	72	STR	72	73	0	2	1.0
LINE	73	STR	73	74	0	4	1.0
LINE	74	STR	74	75	0	10	1.0
LINE	175	STR	75	76	0	1	1.0
LINE	75	STR	71	81	0	4	1.0

LINE	76	STR	72	82	0	4	1.0
LINE	77	STR	73	83	0	4	1.0
LINE	78	STR	74	84	0	4	1.0
LINE	79	STR	75	85	0	4	1.0
LINE	80	STR	76	86	0	4	1.0
\$							
LINE	81	STR	81	82	0	6	1.0
LINE	82	STR	82	83	0	2	1.0
LINE	83	STR	83	84	0	4	1.0
LINE	84	STR	84	85	0	10	1.0
LINE	185	STR	85	86	0	1	1.0
LINE	85	STR	81	91	0	1	1.0
LINE	86	STR	82	92	0	1	1.0
LINE	87	STR	83	93	0	1	1.0
LINE	88	STR	84	94	0	1	1.0
LINE	89	STR	85	95	0	1	1.0
LINE	90	STR	86	96	0	1	1.0
\$							
LINE	91	STR	91	92	0	6	1.0
LINE	92	STR	92	93	0	2	1.0
LINE	93	STR	93	94	0	4	1.0
LINE	94	STR	94	95	0	10	1.0
LINE	195	STR	95	96	0	1	1.0
\$							
\$ NODEBC CARDS							
\$							
NODEBC	1	106	5	15	25	35	45 55 65 75 85 \$ Axis of Model
NODEBC	2	101	102	103	104	105	\$ Bottom of Model
\$							
\$ SIDEBC CARDS							
\$							
SIDEBC	100	101	102	103	104	105	\$ Bot of Drum
SIDEBC	200	106	5	15	25	35	45 55 65 75 85 \$ Axis of Model
SIDEBC	300	111	10	20	30	40	50 60 70 80 90 \$ R-Side of Drum
SIDEBC	400	91	92	93	94	195	\$ Top of Top Impact
Limiter							
SIDEBC	500	101	102	103	104	105	111 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 91 92 93 94 195
\$ Vol of Drum							
SIDEBC	643	43	\$ Floor of Space				
SIDEBC	648	48	\$ Right wall of Space				
SIDEBC	653	53	\$ Roof of Space				
SIDEBC	647	47	\$ Left wall of Space				
\$							
\$ REGION CARDS							
\$							
REGION	1	1	-1	-6	-11	-5	
REGION	2	1	-2	-7	-12	-6	
REGION	3	1	-3	-8	-13	-7	
REGION	4	1	-4	-9	-14	-8	
\$							
REGION	11	3	-11	-16	-21	-15	
REGION	12	3	-12	-17	-22	-16	
REGION	13	3	-13	-18	-23	-17	
REGION	14	3	-14	-19	-24	-18	
\$							
\$							
REGION	21	2	-21	-26	-31	-25	
REGION	22	2	-22	-27	-32	-26	
REGION	23	1	-23	-28	-33	-27	
REGION	24	1	-24	-29	-34	-28	
\$							
REGION	31	4	-31	-36	-41	-35	
REGION	32	2	-32	-37	-42	-36	

REGION	33	1	-33	-38	-43	-37
REGION	34	1	-34	-39	-44	-38
\$						
REGION	41	4	-41	-46	-51	-45
REGION	42	2	-42	-47	-52	-46
\$REGION	43	2	-43	-48	-53	-47
REGION	44	1	-44	-49	-54	-48
\$						
REGION	51	4	-51	-56	-61	-55
REGION	52	2	-52	-57	-62	-56
REGION	53	2	-53	-58	-63	-57
REGION	54	1	-54	-59	-64	-58
\$						
REGION	61	2	-61	-66	-71	-65
REGION	62	2	-62	-67	-72	-66
REGION	63	2	-63	-68	-73	-67
REGION	64	1	-64	-69	-74	-68
\$						
REGION	71	1	-71	-76	-81	-75
REGION	72	1	-72	-77	-82	-76
REGION	73	1	-73	-78	-83	-77
REGION	74	1	-74	-79	-84	-78
\$						
REGION	81	5	-81	-86	-91	-85
REGION	82	5	-82	-87	-92	-86
REGION	83	5	-83	-88	-93	-87
REGION	84	5	-84	-89	-94	-88
\$						
\$						
REGION	101	5	-101	-107	-1	-106
REGION	102	5	-102	-108	-2	-107
REGION	103	5	-103	-109	-3	-108
REGION	104	5	-104	-110	-4	-109
REGION	105	5	-105	-111	-116	-110
\$						
REGION	106	5	-116	-10	-115	-9
REGION	115	5	-115	-20	-125	-19
REGION	125	5	-125	-30	-135	-29
REGION	135	5	-135	-40	-145	-39
REGION	145	5	-145	-50	-155	-49
REGION	155	5	-155	-60	-165	-59
REGION	165	5	-165	-70	-175	-69
REGION	175	5	-175	-80	-185	-79
REGION	185	5	-185	-90	-195	-89
\$						
SCHEME	0	M				
EXIT						

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE SANTOS INPUT FILES FOR TEST SIMULATION

C-1 For UTS

```
TITLE $ Card 1
Uni-axial Test Simulation, 12"-Dia. POP Waste: B.Y.Park (7/14/03)
$ Card 3
AXISYMMETRIC $ Drum shape
$ Card 12 $ Default = 0.5 (%)
RESIDUAL TOLERANCE = 1.0
$ Card 13 (Default=2*num of nodes)
MAXIMUM ITERATIONS = 10000000
$
STEP CONTROL
10000, 1.E-3
100, 1.
100, 1.E3
150, 16.E3
END
PLOT TIME
1000, 1.E-3
10, 1.
10, 1.E3
1, 16.E3
END
OUTPUT TIME
1000, 1.E-3
10, 1.
10, 1.E3
1, 16.E3
END
$ Card 8
PLOT NODAL, DISPLACEMENT, RESIDUAL
$ Card 9
PLOT ELEMENT, STRESS, STRAIN, VONMISES, PRESSURE
$ Card 10
PLOT STATE, EQCS, EV
$ Card 32
FUNCTION,1 $ Axial Pressure: 0 to 16 MPa
0. 0.
1.E-3 1.
1. 1.E3
1.E3 1.E6
16.E3 16.E6
END
$ Card 33
NO DISPLACEMENT X 1 $ Axis of Model
NO DISPLACEMENT Y 2 $ Bottom of Model
$ Card 37
PRESSURE 401 1 1.0 $ Applying the pressure on the top of Upper Rigid Platen
$ Card 39: Coarser mesh should be designated as the master surface.
$ master,slave, mu, dis, tenrel
CONTACT SURFACE, 643, 647, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn floor and LW of space
CONTACT SURFACE, 653, 648, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn roof and RW of space
CONTACT SURFACE, 643, 648, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn floor and RW of space
$ Card 41
$Impact Limiter based on SAND98-1003 Table 2
MATERIAL, 1, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 256.485
YOUNGS MODULUS 6.895E7
POISSONS RATIO 0.05
YIELD STRESS 3.447E5
HARDENING MODULUS 2.413E7
```

```

BETA                0.5
END
$ Stainless Steel Grade 304 based on SAND98-1003 Table 1
MATERIAL, 2, EP POWER HARD, 7908.
YOUNGS MODULUS      1.931E11
POISSONS RATIO      0.27
YIELD STRESS        1.931E8
HARDENING CONSTANT  1.329E9
HARDENING EXPONENT  0.748190
LUDERS STRAIN       0.0
END
$ Plywood based on SAND98-1003 Table 2
MATERIAL, 3, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 427.476
YOUNGS MODULUS      3.103E7
POISSONS RATIO      0.2
YIELD STRESS        3.477E6
HARDENING MODULUS   6.895E4
BETA                0.5
END
$ Contents based on SAND98-1003 (Table 2)
MATERIAL, 4, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 256.485
YOUNGS MODULUS      6.895E7
POISSONS RATIO      0.2
YIELD STRESS        1.724E5
HARDENING MODULUS   0.0
BETA                0.0
END
$ Drum wall based on SAND98-1003 (Table 2)
MATERIAL, 5, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 7908.
YOUNGS MODULUS      1.931E11
POISSONS RATIO      0.27
YIELD STRESS        2.785E8
HARDENING MODULUS   6.895E7
BETA                0.0
END
$ Rigid Platen based on SANTOS V&Q Problem 8
$ MATERIAL, 6, ELASTIC, 1.
MATERIAL, 6, EP POWER HARD, 1.
YOUNGS MODULUS      30.E11
POISSONS RATIO      0.3
YIELD STRESS        1.931E9
HARDENING CONSTANT  1.329E9
HARDENING EXPONENT  0.748190
LUDERS STRAIN       0.0
END
$ Card 31
EXIT

```

C-2 For TTS

```
TITLE $ Card 1
Tri-axial Test Simulation, 1.5MPa CP, 12"-Dia. POP Waste: B.Y.Park (7/17/03)
$ Card 3
AXISYMMETRIC $ Drum shape
$ Card 12 $ Default = 0.5 (%)
RESIDUAL TOLERANCE = 1.0
$ Card 13 (Default=2*num of nodes)
MAXIMUM ITERATIONS = 10000000
$
STEP CONTROL
1000, 1.E-3
100, 1.5
100, 1.5E3
145, 16.E3
END
PLOT TIME
1000, 1.E-3
10, 1.5
10, 1.5E3
1, 16.E3
END
OUTPUT TIME
1000, 1.E-3
10, 1.5
10, 1.5E3
1, 16.E3
END
$ Card 8
PLOT NODAL, DISPLACEMENT, RESIDUAL
$ Card 9
PLOT ELEMENT, STRESS, STRAIN, VONMISES, PRESSURE
$ Card 10
PLOT STATE, EQCS, EV
$ Card 32
FUNCTION,1 $ Axial Pressure: 0 to 16 MPa
0. 0.
1.E-3 1.
1.5 1.5E3
1.5E3 1.5E6
16.E3 16.E6
END
FUNCTION,2 $ Confining Pressure: 1.5 MPa
0. 0.0
1.E-3 1.0
1.5 1.5E3
1.5E3 1.5E6
16.E3 1.5E6
END
$ Card 33
NO DISPLACEMENT X 1 $ Axis of Model
NO DISPLACEMENT Y 2 $ Bottom of Model
$ Card 37
PRESSURE 300 2 1.0 $ Applying the confining pressure on the drum wall
PRESSURE 401 1 1.0 $ Applying the pressure on the top of Upper Rigid Platen
$ Card 39: Coarser mesh should be designated as the master surface.
$ master,slave, mu, dis, tenrel
CONTACT SURFACE, 643, 647, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn floor and LW of space
CONTACT SURFACE, 653, 648, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn roof and RW of space
CONTACT SURFACE, 643, 648, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn floor and RW of space
$ Card 41
$Impact Limiter based on SAND98-1003 Table 2
```

MATERIAL, 1, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 256.485
 YOUNGS MODULUS 6.895E7
 POISSONS RATIO 0.05
 YIELD STRESS 3.447E5
 HARDENING MODULUS 2.413E7
 BETA 0.5
 END
 \$ Stainless Steel Grade 304 based on SAND98-1003 Table 1
 MATERIAL, 2, EP POWER HARD, 7908.
 YOUNGS MODULUS 1.931E11
 POISSONS RATIO 0.27
 YIELD STRESS 1.931E8
 HARDENING CONSTANT 1.329E9
 HARDENING EXPONENT 0.748190
 LUDERS STRAIN 0.0
 END
 \$ Plywood based on SAND98-1003 Table 2
 MATERIAL, 3, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 427.476
 YOUNGS MODULUS 3.103E7
 POISSONS RATIO 0.2
 YIELD STRESS 3.477E6
 HARDENING MODULUS 6.895E4
 BETA 0.5
 END
 \$ Contents based on SAND98-1003 (Table 2)
 MATERIAL, 4, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 256.485
 YOUNGS MODULUS 6.895E7
 POISSONS RATIO 0.2
 YIELD STRESS 1.724E5
 HARDENING MODULUS 0.0
 BETA 0.0
 END
 \$ Drum wall based on SAND98-1003 (Table 2)
 MATERIAL, 5, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 7908.
 YOUNGS MODULUS 1.931E11
 POISSONS RATIO 0.27
 YIELD STRESS 2.785E8
 HARDENING MODULUS 6.895E7
 BETA 0.0
 END
 \$ Rigid Platen based on SANTOS V&Q Problem 8
 \$ MATERIAL, 6, ELASTIC, 1.
 MATERIAL, 6, EP POWER HARD, 1.
 YOUNGS MODULUS 30.E11
 POISSONS RATIO 0.3
 YIELD STRESS 1.931E9
 HARDENING CONSTANT 1.329E9
 HARDENING EXPONENT 0.748190
 LUDERS STRAIN 0.0
 END
 \$ Card 31
 EXIT

C-3 For HTS

```
TITLE $ Card 1
Hydrostatic Test Simulation, 12"-Dia. POP Waste : B.Y.Park (7/14/03)
$ Card 3
AXISYMMETRIC $ Drum shape
$ Card 12 $ Default = 0.5 (%)
RESIDUAL TOLERANCE = 0.5
$ Card 13 (Default=2*num of nodes)
MAXIMUM ITERATIONS = 10000000
$
STEP CONTROL
10000, 1.0E-3
100, 1.0
100, 1.0E3
150, 16.E3
END
PLOT TIME
1000, 1.0E-3
10, 1.0
10, 1.0E3
1, 16.E3
END
OUTPUT TIME
1000, 1.0E-3
10, 1.0
10, 1.0E3
1, 16.E3
END
$ Card 8
PLOT NODAL, DISPLACEMENT, RESIDUAL
$ Card 9
PLOT ELEMENT, STRESS, STRAIN, VONMISES, PRESSURE
$ Card 10
PLOT STATE, EQCS, EV
$ Card 32
FUNCTION,1 $ Hydraulic Pressure
0. 0.
1.0E-3 1.
1.0 1.0E3
1.0E3 1.0E6
16.E3 16.E6
END
$ Card 33
NO DISPLACEMENT X 1 $ Axis of Model
$ Card 37
PRESSURE 100 1 1.0 $ Applying the pressure on the bottom of drum
PRESSURE 300 1 1.0 $ Applying the pressure on the drum wall
PRESSURE 400 1 1.0 $ Applying the pressure on the top of drum lid
$ Card 39: Coarser mesh should be designated as the master surface.
$ master,slave, mu, dis, tenrel
CONTACT SURFACE, 643, 647, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn floor and LW of space
CONTACT SURFACE, 653, 648, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn roof and RW of space
CONTACT SURFACE, 643, 648, 0.0, 1.E-4, 1.E4 $ btwn floor and RW of space
$Impact Limiter based on SAND98-1003 Table 2
MATERIAL, 1, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 256.485
YOUNGS MODULUS 6.895E7
POISSONS RATIO 0.05
YIELD STRESS 3.447E5
HARDENING MODULUS 2.413E7
BETA 0.5
END
$ Stainless Steel Grade 304 based on SAND98-1003 Table 1
```

MATERIAL, 2, EP POWER HARD, 7908.
 YOUNGS MODULUS 1.931E11
 POISSONS RATIO 0.27
 YIELD STRESS 1.931E8
 HARDENING CONSTANT 1.329E9
 HARDENING EXPONENT 0.748190
 LUDERS STRAIN 0.0
 END
 \$Plywood based on SAND98-1003 Table 2
 MATERIAL, 3, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 427.476
 YOUNGS MODULUS 3.103E7
 POISSONS RATIO 0.2
 YIELD STRESS 3.477E6
 HARDENING MODULUS 6.895E4
 BETA 0.5
 END
 \$ Contents based on SAND98-1003 (Table 2)
 MATERIAL, 4, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 256.485
 YOUNGS MODULUS 6.895E7
 POISSONS RATIO 0.2
 YIELD STRESS 1.724E5
 HARDENING MODULUS 0.0
 BETA 0.0
 END
 \$ Drum wall based on SAND98-1003 (Table 2)
 MATERIAL, 5, ELASTIC PLASTIC, 7908.
 YOUNGS MODULUS 1.931E11
 POISSONS RATIO 0.27
 YIELD STRESS 2.785E8
 HARDENING MODULUS 6.895E7
 BETA 0.0
 END
 \$ Card 31
 EXIT

Intentionally Blank

DISTRIBUTION:

Federal Agencies

- 1 US Department of Energy
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Mgmt.
Attn: Deputy Director, RW-2
Forrestal Building
Washington, DC 20585
- 8 US Department of Energy
Carlsbad Field Office
Attn: P. Detwiler
C. Wu
G. Basabilvazo
S. Casey
D. Mercer
R. Nelson
R. Patterson
Mailroom
P.O. Box 3090
Carlsbad, NM 88221-3090
- 1 US Department of Energy
Office of Environmental Restoration and
Waste Management
Attn: P. Bubar, EM-20
Forrestal Building
Washington, DC 20585-0002
- 1 US Department of Energy
Office of Environmental Restoration and
Waste Management
Attn: Mary Bisesi/Lynne Smith, EM-23
Washington, DC 20585-0002
- 1 US Environmental Protection Agency
Radiation Protection Programs
Attn: B. Forinash
ANR-460
Washington, DC 20460

Boards

- 1 Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
Attn: D. Winters
625 Indiana Ave. NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004

State Agencies

- 1 Attorney General of New Mexico
P.O. Drawer 1508
Santa Fe, NM 87504-1508
- 2 Environmental Evaluation Group
Attn: Library
7007 Wyoming NE
Suite F-2
Albuquerque, NM 87109
- 1 NMED Hazardous Waste Bureau
WIPP Project Leader
2905 Rodeo Park Dr E., Bldg 1
Santa Fe, NM 87505-6303
- 1 NM Bureau of Geology & Mineral Resources
801 Leroy Place
Socorro, NM 87801

Laboratories/Corporations

- 1 Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories
Battelle Blvd.
Richland, WA 99352
- 1 Los Alamos National Laboratory
Attn: B. Erdal, INC-12
P.O. Box 1663
Los Alamos, NM 87544
- 3 Washington TRU Solutions
Attn: Library, GSA-214
P.O. Box 2078
Carlsbad, NM 88221

National Academy of Sciences WIPP Panel

- 1 National Academies
Attn: Barbara Pastina
Committee on WIPP
Board on Radioactive Waste Management
500 Fifth Ave NW; Keck 634
Washington, DC 20001

Universities

- 1 University of New Mexico
Geology Department
Attn: Library
141 Northrop Hall
Albuquerque, NM 87131
- 1 North Carolina State University
Department of Nuclear Engineering
Attn: Man-Sung Yim
Box 7909
Raleigh, NC 27695-7909

Libraries

- 1 Government Information Department
Zimmerman Library
University of New Mexico
MSC05 3020
Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001
- 1 New Mexico Junior College
Pannell Library
Attn: Earl Dye
5317 Lovington Highway
Hobbs, NM 88240
- 1 New Mexico State Library
Attn: L. Canepa
1209 Camino Carlos Rey
Santa Fe, NM 87507
- 1 New Mexico Tech
Joseph R. Skeen Library
801 Leroy Place
Socorro, NM 87801

Foreign Addresses

- 2 OECD Nuclear Energy Agency
Attn: OECD NEA Library
Le Seine Saint-Germain
12, boulevard des Îles
F-92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux
FRANCE
- 2 Francois Chenevier
ANDRA
Parc de la Croix Blanche
1-7 rue Jean Monnet
92298 Chatenay-Malabry Cedex
FRANCE

- 1 Commissariat a L'Energie Atomique
Attn: D. Alexandre
Centre d'Etudes de Cadarache
13108 Saint Paul Lez Durance Cedex
FRANCE
- 1 Bundesanstalt fur Geowissenschaften und
Rohstoffe
Attn: M. Wallner
Postfach 510 153
D-30631 Hannover
GERMANY
- 1 Bundesministerium fur Forschung und Technologie
Postfach 200 706
5300 Bonn 2
GERMANY
- 1 Gesellschaft fur Anlagen und Reaktorsicherheit
(GRS)
Attn: B. Baltes
Schwertnergasse 1
D-50667 Cologne
GERMANY
- 1 Dr.-Ing. Klaus Kuhn
TU Clausthal Institut fur Bergbau
Erzstr. 20
D-38678 Clausthal-Zellerfeld
GERMANY
- 1 Dr. Chung-Won Cho
Ministry of Science & Technology
Government Complex-Gwacheon Gwacheon City,
Gyeonggi-Do 427-715,
Republic of KOREA
- 1 Dr. Myung-Jae Song
Nuclear Environment Technology Institute
Korea Hydro & Nuclear Power Co., Ltd (KHNP)
150 Duckjin-dong, Yusong-ku, Taejon, 305-600,
Republic of KOREA
- 10 Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute
Attn: Overseas Attachment Section
Library (6)
Dr. In-Soon Chang
Dr. Hyun-Soo Park
Dr. Pil-Soo Hahn
150 Duckjin-dong, Yusong-ku, Taejon, 305-600,
Republic of KOREA

1	Prof. Chang Sun Kang Seoul National University Department of Nuclear Engineering Shillim-dong, Kwanak-gu, Seoul, 151-742 Republic of KOREA	<u>Internal</u>		
			<u>MS</u>	<u>Org.</u>
		1	0701	6100 P. B. Davies
1	Prof. Chung In Lee Seoul National University School of Civil, Urban and Geosystem Engineering Shillim-dong, Kwanak-gu, Seoul, 151-742 Republic of KOREA	2	0731	6800 823 Library
		1	0751	6117 L. S. Costin
		1	0751	6117 M. Lee
		1	0751	6117 T. W. Pfeifle
		1	0771	6800 D. Berry
		10	0771	6820 F. D. Hansen
		1	0776	6852 M. K. Knowles
		1	0776	6852 J. S. Stein
		1	0847	9127 J. Jung
		1	0847	9127 J. F. Holland
2	Japan Nuclear Cycle Development Institute Attn: Dr. Massao Shiotsuki Takashi Toshikawa 4-49, Muramatsu, Tokai-Mura Naka-Gun, Ibaraki, 319-1184 JAPAN	1	1395	6820 P. E. Shoemaker
		1	1395	6821 D. Kessel
		1	1395	6821 C. W. Hansen
		1	1395	6820 M. J. Chavez
		10	1395	6821 B. Y. Park
		8	1395	6820 WIPP Library
		1	9018	8940-2 Central Technical Files
1	Dr. Susumu Muraoka Nuclear Material Control Center Tokai-Mura, Ibaraki-Ken, 319-11 JAPAN	2	0899	9616 Technical Library
2	Nationale Genossenschaft fur die Lagerung Radioaktiver Abfalle Attn: NAGRA Library Hardstrasse 73 CH-5430 Wettingen SWITZERLAND			
2	AEA Technology Attn: J. H. Rees Lee J. Hartley 424-4 Harwell Didcot, Oxfordshire OX11 0QJ UNITED KINGDOM			