

RAS 5566 72-22-ISFSI - State Exhibit 106 - Rec'd 6/17/02

2.6.4.11 Techniques to Improve Subsurface Conditions

Soil Cement

Discussions presented in Section 2.6.1.12, above, indicate that the soils underlying the eolian silt layer at the surface of the PFSF site are suitable for support of the proposed structures; therefore, no special construction techniques are required for improving the subsurface conditions below the eolian silt. The eolian silt, in its *in situ* loose state, is not suitable for founding the structures at the site. The basemat of the Canister Transfer Building will be founded on the silty clay/clayey silt layer beneath the eolian silt. It was originally intended that the cask storage pads also would be founded on the silty clay/clayey silt layer. However, instead of excavating the eolian silt from the pad emplacement area and replacing it with suitable structural fill, it will be mixed with sufficient portland cement and water and compacted to form a strong soil-cement subgrade to support the cask storage pads. Soil cement will also be utilized around the Canister Transfer Building. The required characteristics of the soil cement will be engineered during detailed design and constructed to meet the necessary strength requirements.

During construction of the storage pads, all of the eolian silt in the quadrant under construction will be excavated. The eolian silt will be mixed with sufficient cement and water and compacted to produce soil cement across the pad area, up to the design elevations of the bottoms of the storage pads. The layer of soil cement beneath the storage pads will have a minimum thickness of 12 inches and a maximum thickness of 24 inches. In the event that the eolian silt layer extends to a depth greater than 2 ft below the elevations of the bottoms of the storage pads, compacted clayey soils will be used to raise the elevation of the subgrade that will support the soil cement layer to an elevation of 2 ft or less below the design elevations of the bottoms of the pads. This will ensure that the layer of soil cement does not exceed a thickness of 2 ft. This is the

DOCKETED
USNRC



2003 JAN 29 PM 3: 10

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket No. 72-22 Official Exh. No. 106
in the matter of PFS
Staff IDENTIFIED ✓
Applicant RECEIVED ✓
Intervenor ✓ REJECTED
Other WITHDRAWN
DATE 6-17-02 Witness
Clerk pmp

maximum permissible thickness of the soil cement layer, since the storage cask hypothetical tipover and drop analyses were performed assuming a 2.0-ft thick layer of soil cement underlying the storage pads.

Strength of Soil Cement and Minimum/Maximum Thickness Requirements

The soil cement underlying the pads shall have a minimum unconfined compressive strength of 40 psi to ensure that there is an adequate factor of safety against sliding of an entire column of pads (S&W Calculation 05996.02-G(B)-4, SWEC, 2001b). This layer of soil cement is required to be no greater than 2-ft thick and have a static modulus of elasticity less than or equal to 75,000 psi to ensure that the decelerations from a hypothetical storage cask tipover event or vertical end drop accident do not exceed HI-STORM design criteria (Section 3.2.11.3).

Following construction of the storage pads on top of this layer of soil cement, additional soil cement will be placed around and between the cask storage pads, extending from the bottoms of the pads to a level that is 28 inches above the bottoms of the storage pads. The remaining 8 inches, from the top of the soil cement up to grade, will be filled with coarse aggregate, placed and compacted to be flush with the tops of the pads to permit easy access by the cask transporter. The soil cement placed around the sides of the storage pads is expected to have a minimum unconfined compressive strength of at least 250 psi to satisfy durability requirements within the depth of frost penetration (based on S&W Calculation 05996.02-G(B)-4 (SWEC, 2001b), as discussed in Section 2.6.1.12.1).

The Canister Transfer Building basemat will be founded on the silty clay/clayey silt layer that is below the eolian silt. The design calls for soil cement to be placed around the Canister Transfer Building base mat to make the free-field soil profile for the building consistent with that for the storage pad emplacement area and to help resist sliding forces due to the higher design basis ground motions. Soil cement will surround the

foundation mat and will extend outward from the mat to a distance equal to the associated mat dimension; i.e., approximately 240 ft out from the mat in the east and west directions and approximately 280 ft out in the north and south directions. Existing soils (eolian silt and silty clay/clayey silt) will be excavated to a depth of approximately 5 ft 8 inches below grade, mixed with cement, and placed and compacted around the foundation mat.

The soil cement placed around the Canister Transfer Building foundation mat will be 5 ft thick and have a minimum unconfined compressive strength of 250 psi to ensure that there is an adequate factor of safety against sliding of the Canister Transfer Building (based on Calculation 05996.02-G(B)-13 (SWEC, 2001c), as discussed in Section 2.6.1.12.2). The top 8 inches will be filled with compacted coarse aggregate, similar to that used in the pad emplacement area.

PFS is developing the soil-cement mix design using standard industry practice. This effort includes performing laboratory testing of soils obtained from the site. This on-going laboratory testing is being performed in accordance with the requirements of Engineering Services Scope of Work (ESSOW) for Laboratory Testing of Soil-Cement Mixes, ESSOW 05996.02-G010 (SWEC, 2001e). This program includes measuring gradations and Atterberg limits of samples of the near-surface soils obtained from the site. It includes testing of mixtures of these soils with varying amounts of cement and the testing of compacted specimens of soil-cement to determine moisture-density relationships, freeze/thaw and wet/dry characteristics, compressive and tensile strengths, and permeability of compacted soil-cement specimens. The entire laboratory testing program is being conducted in full compliance with the Quality Assurance (QA) Category I requirements of the ESSOW.

As part of this effort, PFS is performing so-called durability testing. These tests are performed in accordance with ASTM D559 and D560 to measure the durability of soil cement specimens exposed to 12 cycles of wet/dry and freeze/thaw conditions. As indicated on p. 16 of PFS Calculation 05996.02-G(B)-4 (SWEC, 2001b):

"The unconfined compressive strength of the soil cement adjacent to the pads needs to be at least 50 psi to provide an adequate subbase for support of the cask transporter, in lieu of placing and compacting structural fill, but it likely will be at least 250 psi to satisfy the durability requirements associated with environmental considerations (i.e., freeze/thaw and wet/dry cycles) within the frost zone (30 in. from the ground surface)."

PFS is performing these tests to determine the amounts of cement and water that must be added to the site soils and to determine the compaction requirements to ensure that the soil cement will be durable and will withstand exposure to the elements. As indicated on p. 8 of Portland Cement Association (1971):

"The freeze-thaw and wet-dry tests were designed to determine whether the soil-cement would stay hard or whether expansion and contraction on alternate freezing-and-thawing and moisture changes would cause the soil-cement to soften."

And on p. 32:

"The principle requirement of a hardened soil-cement mixture is that it withstand exposure to the elements. Thus the primary basis of comparison of soil-cement mixtures is the cement content required to produce a mixture that will withstand the stresses induced by the wet-dry and freeze-thaw tests. The service record of projects in use proves the reliability both of the results based on these tests and of the criteria given below.

The following criteria are based on considerable laboratory test data, on the performance of many projects in service, and on information obtained from the outdoor exposure of several thousand specimens. The use of these criteria will provide the minimum cement content required to produce hard, durable soil-cement, suitable for base-course construction of the highest quality.

1. *Soil-cement losses during 12 cycles of either the wet-dry test or freeze-thaw test shall conform to the following limits:*

Soil Groups A-1, A-2-4, A-2-5, and A-3, not over 14 percent;

Soil Groups A-2-6, A-2-7, A-4, and A-5, not over 10 percent;

Soil Groups A-6 and A-7, not over 7 percent.

2. *Compressive strengths should increase both with age and with increases in cement content in the ranges of cement content producing results that meet requirement 1."*

The on-going laboratory testing program will also include additional tests to confirm that the bond at the interfaces between concrete and soil-cement, soil-cement and soil-cement, and soil-cement and the site soils will exceed the strength of the in situ clayey soils. These tests will include direct shear tests, performed on specimens prepared from the site soils at various cement and moisture contents, in a manner similar to that used by DeGroot in his testing of bond along soil-cement interfaces.

Based on the above, PFS has adequately defined the measures that will be followed in the design and construction of the soil cement to assure that the assumed bonds can be sustained through the period of interest. PFS has committed to performing site-specific testing to confirm that the required interface strengths are available to resist sliding forces due to an earthquake. As indicated above, this testing will include direct shear tests to be performed in the laboratory in the near-term (pre-construction) during the soil-cement mix development to demonstrate that the required interface strengths can be achieved and during construction to demonstrate that the required interface strengths are achieved. In addition, PFS has committed to augmenting this field testing program by performing additional site-specific testing of the strengths achieved at the interface between the bottom of the soil cement and the underlying soils.

The most recent analyses of the PFSF design basis ground motions assumed the incorporation of a 5 ft thick soil cement layer over the entire pad emplacement area and also surrounding the Canister Transfer Building. The 5 ft soil cement layer around the Canister Transfer Building extends to the free field boundary from the edge of the building basemat. This soil cement layer is assumed to have a minimum shear wave velocity greater than 1,500 fps (Geomatrix 2001a and 2001b). As indicated in Section 2.6.1.2.2, soil cement around the Canister Transfer Building should have a minimum unconfined compressive strength of 250 psi to ensure a factor of safety greater than 1.1 for seismic sliding stability. The design requirements for the 5 ft thick soil cement layer

around the Canister Transfer Building will be based on the results of laboratory and field testing to be conducted during the final design stage.

The surficial layer of eolian silt, existing across the entire site as shown in the pad emplacement area foundation profiles (Figure 2.6-5, Sheets 1 through 14), is a major factor in the earthwork required for construction of the facility. This layer consists of a nonplastic to slightly plastic silt, and it has an average thickness of approximately 2 feet across the pad emplacement area. This layer was expected to be removed prior to construction of the storage pads. However, based on evaluation of the earthwork associated with site grading requirements for flood protection and the environmental impacts of truck trips required to import fill to replace this material, PFS will stabilize this soil with cement and use it as base material beneath the storage pads and adjacent driveways.

Section 2.6.1.12 indicates that there is ample margin in the factor of safety against a bearing capacity failure of the silty clay/clayey silt underlying the site and that the settlements are acceptable for these structures. They indicate that the critical design factor with respect to stability of these structures is the resistance to sliding due to loadings from the design basis ground motion. As discussed in that section, the silty clay/clayey silt layer has sufficient strength to resist these dynamic loadings; therefore, adequate sliding resistance can be provided by constructing the structures directly on the silty clay/clayey silt layer. The soil cement around the storage pads and Canister Transfer Building will be designed and constructed to have a minimum unconfined compressive strength of 250 psi and quality assurance testing will be performed during construction to demonstrate that this minimum strength is achieved. The soil cement directly beneath the storage pads will be designed and constructed to have an unconfined compressive strength of at least 40 psi with static elastic modulus of less than ~75,000 psi. Therefore, the resistance to sliding due to loadings from the design

basis ground motion will be enhanced by constructing the cask storage pads on a properly designed and constructed soil-cement subgrade. See the section titled "Sliding Stability of the Cask Storage Pads Founded on and Within Soil Cement" in 2.6.1.12.1 for additional details.

Using soil cement to stabilize the eolian silt will reduce the amount of spoil materials generated, create a stable and level base for pad construction, and substantially improve the sliding resistance of the storage pads. The soil cement will be placed above the *in situ* silty clay/clayey silt layer and will be designed to improve the strength of the eolian silt so that it will be stronger than the clayey soils that were originally intended for use as the founding medium for the pads. The soil cement will also be used to replace the compacted structural fill that the original plan included between the rows of pads. This continuous layer of soil cement, existing under and between the pads, will spread the loads from the pads beyond the footprint of the pads, resulting in decreased total and differential settlements of the pads. The layer of soil cement above the base of the pads and the bond and friction of the pad foundation with the underlying soil-cement layer will greatly increase the sliding resistance of the pad.

Soil cement has been used extensively in the United States and around the world since the 1940's. It was first used in the United States in 1915 for constructing roads. It also has been used at nuclear power plants in the United States and in South Africa. The largest soil-cement project worldwide involved construction of soil-cement slope protection for a 7,000-acre cooling-water reservoir at the South Texas Nuclear Power Plant near Houston, TX. Soil cement also was used to replace an ~18-ft thick layer of potentially liquefiable sandy soils under the foundations of two 900-MW nuclear power plants in Koeberg, South Africa (Dupas and Pecker, 1979). The strength of soils can be improved markedly by the addition of cement. The eolian silt at the site is similar to the soils identified as Soil A-4 in Nussbaum and Colley (1971), Soils 7 and 8 in Balmer

(1958), and Soil 4 in Felt and Abrams (1957). As indicated for Soil A-4 in Table 5 of Nussbaum and Colley (1971), the addition of just 2.5% cement by weight to the silt increased the cohesion from 5 psi (720 psf) to 30 psi (4,320 psf). The cohesion for Soils 7 and 8 also were increased significantly by the addition of low percentages of cement, as shown on Tables VI and VII of Balmer (1958). Figure 10 in Felt and Abrams (1957) illustrates the continued strength increase over time for these soil-cement mixtures. Other examples of soil-cement strength increases over time are presented in Figure 4.3 of ACI (1998), Table 6 of Nussbaum and Colley (1971), and Figures 6 and 7 of Dupas and Pecker (1979). Therefore, the soil cement will be much stronger than the underlying silty clay/clayey silt and the strength will increase with time, providing an improved foundation material. This will provide additional margin against sliding compared to the original plan to construct the pads directly on the silty clay/clayey silt layer.

As shown in the section titled "Sliding Stability of the Cask Storage Pads Founded on and Within Soil Cement" in Section 2.6.1.12.1 above, the shear resistance required at the base of the pads can be provided easily by the passive resistance of the soil cement acting against the vertical side of the foundation and by bond between the pad foundation and soil-cement contact and the cohesive strength of the soil cement. Shear resistance will be transferred through the approximately 2-ft thick soil-cement layer and into the underlying silty clay/clayey silt subgrade. Additional resistance will be provided by the continuous layer of soil cement under and between the pads; therefore, shear resistance requirements within the silty clay/clayey silt layer will be less with the soil-cement layer compared to the original plan to construct the pads directly on the silty clay/clayey silt without the proposed soil-cement layer.

DeGroot (1976) indicates that this bond strength can be easily obtained between layers of soil cement. He performed nearly 300 laboratory direct shear tests to determine the

effect of numerous variables on the bond between layers of soil cement. These variables included the length of time between placement of successive layers of soil cement, the frequency of watering while curing soil cement, the surface moisture condition prior to construction of the next lift, the surface texture prior to construction of the next lift, and various surface treatments and additives.

His results demonstrated that, with the exception of treating the surface of the lifts with asphalt emulsion, asphalt cutback, and chlorinated rubber compounds, the bond strength always exceeded 6.6 psi, the minimum required value of cohesion if the passive resistance acting on the sides of the pads is ignored. The minimum bond strength he reports, other than for the asphalt and chlorinated rubber surface treatments identified above, is 8.7 psi. This value applied for two tests that were performed on samples that had time delays of 24 hours and did not have a cement surface treatment along the lift line. He reports that nearly all of the specimens that used a cement surface treatment broke along planes other than along the lift lines, indicating that the bond between the layers of soil cement was stronger than the remainder of the specimens. Excluding the specimens that had 24-hr delays between lift placements and which did not use the cement surface treatment, the minimum bond strength was 10.7 psi and there were only two others that had bond strengths that were less than 20 psi. Even these minimum values for the group of specimens that did not use a cement surface treatment exceeded the cohesive strength (6.6 psi) required to obtain an adequate factor of safety against sliding without including the passive resistance acting on the sides of the pads, and all of the rest were much greater, generally more than an order of magnitude greater.

DeGroot reached the following conclusions:

1. Increasing the time delay between lifts decreases bond.
2. High frequency of watering the lift line decreases the bond.

3. Moist curing conditions between lift placements increases the bond.
4. Removing the smooth compaction plane increases the bond.
5. Set retardants decreased the bond at 4-hr time delay.
6. Asphalt and chlorinated rubber curing compounds decreased the bond.
7. Small amounts of cement placed on the lift line bonded the layers together, such that failure occurred along planes other than the lift line, indicating that the bond exceeded the shear strength of the soil cement.

DeGroot (1976) noted that increasing the time delay between placement of subsequent lifts decreases the bond strength. The nature of construction of soil cement is such that there will be occasions when the time delay will be greater than the time required for the soil cement to set. This will clearly be the case for construction of the concrete storage pads on top of the soil-cement surface, because it will take some period of time to form the pad, build the steel reinforcement, and pour the concrete. He noted that several techniques can be used to enhance the bond between these lifts to overcome this decrease in bond due to time delay. In these cases, more than sufficient bond can be obtained between layers of soil cement and between the set soil-cement surface and the underside of the cask storage pads by simply using a cement surface treatment.

DeGroot's direct shear test results demonstrate that the specimens having a cement surface treatment all had bond strengths that ranged from 47.7 psi to 198.5 psi, with the average bond strength of 132.5 psi. Even the minimum value of this range is nearly an order of magnitude greater than the cohesion (6.6 psi) required to obtain a factor of safety against sliding of 1.1, conservatively ignoring the passive resistance available on the sides of the pads. Therefore, when required due to unavoidable time delays, the techniques DeGroot describes for enhancing bond strength will be used between the top of the soil cement and succeeding lifts or the concrete cask storage pads, to assure that the bond at the interfaces are greater than the minimum required value. These

techniques will include roughening and cleaning the surface of the underlying soil cement, proper moisture conditioning, and using a cement surface treatment.

A fundamental assumption in the PFS approach is that sufficient bonding and shear transfer between clay and soil cement interfaces can be achieved using various construction techniques. As indicated above, DeGroot has demonstrated that techniques are available that will enhance the bond between lifts of soil cement. These techniques should be equally effective when applied to the soils at the PFSF site. PFS has committed to perform direct shear tests of the interface strengths during the design phase of the soil cement to demonstrate that the required interface strength can be achieved, as well as during construction, to demonstrate that they are achieved.

PFS has discussed the change to use soil cement beneath the storage pads with the project consultants who have analyses in-place that are based on the storage pads resting on the silty clay/clayey silt. The consultants contacted were Geomatrix (development of seismic criteria and soil dynamic properties), Holtec International (cask stability analysis), and International Civil engineering Consultants (pad design). Each has indicated their analyses would not be adversely affected by this proposed change.

The design, placement, testing, and performance of soil cement is a well-established technology. The "State-of-the-Art Report on Soil Cement" (ACI, 1998) provides information about soil cement, including applications, materials, properties, mix proportioning, design, construction, and quality-control inspection and testing techniques. PFS will develop site-specific procedures to implement the recommendations presented in ACI (1998) regarding mix proportioning, testing, construction, and quality control. The following describes the processes that will be used to develop a proper soil-cement mix design and establish adequate sliding resistance at each material interface in the storage pad and soil system:

- Soil-Cement Mix and Procedure Development – The sliding forces due to the design basis ground motion will be resisted by bond between the base and sides of the foundation and the soil cement and by passive resistance of the soil cement acting against the vertical side of the foundation. The soil-cement mix will be designed and constructed to exceed the minimum shear resistance requirements. During the soil-cement design phase, direct shear testing will be conducted along manufactured soil-cement lift contacts and concrete contacts that represent anticipated field conditions. The direct shear testing, along with other standard soil-cement testing, will be used to confirm that adequate shear resistance and other strength requirements will be provided by the final soil-cement mix design. Procedures required for placement and treatment of the soil cement, lift surfaces, and foundation contact will be established in accordance with the recommendations of ACI (1998) during the mix design and testing process. Specific construction techniques and field quality control requirements will be identified in the construction specifications developed by PFS during this detailed design phase of the project.
- Soil-Cement Lift and Concrete Interface – The soil cement will be constructed in lifts approximately 6-in. thick (compacted thickness) as described in ACI (1998). Construction techniques will be used to ensure that the interface between the soil-cement layers will be adequately bonded to transmit shear stresses. As described in Section 6.2.2.5 of ACI (1998), these techniques will include, but will not be limited to: minimizing the time between placement of successive layers of soil cement, moisture conditioning required for proper curing of the soil cement, producing a roughened surface on the soil cement prior to placement of additional lifts or concrete foundations, and using a dry cement or cement slurry to enhance the bonding of concrete or new soil cement layers to underlying layers that have already set. In addition to conventional quality control testing performed for soil-cement

projects, direct shear testing will be performed on representative samples obtained from placed lift contacts to confirm design requirements are obtained. Sacrificial soil-cement lifts may be used to protect the soil-cement subgrade in the pad foundation areas.

- Soil Cement and *In Situ* Clay Interface – The soil cement and *in situ* clay interface will be constructed such that a good bond will be established between the two materials. Construction techniques will be utilized that will ensure that the integrity of the upper surface of the clay is maintained and that a good interface bond between the two materials is obtained. Specific construction techniques and field quality control requirements will be identified in the construction specifications developed by PFS during the detailed design phase of the project.

An additional benefit of incorporating the soil cement into the design is that it will minimize the environmental impacts of constructing the facility. Using on-site materials to construct the soil cement, rather than excavating and spoiling those materials, will reduce environmental impacts of the project. In addition, replacement of some of the structural fill layer between the rows of pads with soil cement, as shown in Figure 4.2-7, will result in reduced trucking requirements associated with transporting those materials to the site.

Adequacy of the Soil Cement Design

The adequacy of the design of the soil cement surrounding and underlying the pads to ensure the sliding stability of the pads under seismic conditions is demonstrated by S&W Calculation 05996.02-G(B)-04 (SWEC, 2001b). This calculation determined that there is sufficient shear strength at the interfaces between the concrete pad and the underlying soil cement and between that soil cement layer and the underlying clayey soils that the factor of safety against sliding exceeds the minimum required value, with

no credit for the soil cement placed between storage pads above the bottom of the pads. The underlying layer of soil cement is also required to have a static modulus of elasticity less than or equal to 75,000 psi to ensure that decelerations of a cask resulting from a hypothetical storage cask tipover event or vertical end drop accident do not exceed design criteria (Sections 4.2.1.5.1.E and 8.2.6).

The large extent of soil cement in the storage pad emplacement area allows the soil cement layer to be considered as part of the free field soil profile for the site response analyses. The properties of the soil cement, higher shear wave velocity and higher density than the existing soils in the area, help to minimize the response at the surface of the site caused by the design basis ground motions. Soil cement was added around the Canister Transfer Building foundation mat to make the free field soil profile for the building consistent with that for the storage pad emplacement area (as discussed in Section 2.6.4.11), and to help resist sliding forces, in conjunction with the building's perimeter key, due to the revised design basis ground motions. The adequacy of this design feature is demonstrated in Calculation No. 05996.02-G(B)-13 (SWEC, 2001c), which determined that the design of the soil cement surrounding the Canister Transfer Building (in conjunction with the building's perimeter key) is adequate to ensure the stability of the Canister Transfer Building under seismic conditions.

2.6.4.12 Criteria and Design Methods

The allowable bearing capacity of footings is limited by shear failure of the underlying soil and by footing settlement. The minimum factor of safety against a bearing capacity failure from static loads (dead load plus maximum live loads) is 3.0 and from static loads plus loads due to extreme environmental conditions, such as design basis ground motion, is 1.1. Allowable settlements are determined based on Table 14.1, "Allowable Settlement," of Lambe & Whitman (1969) and assume that the differential settlement will be 3/4 of the maximum settlement. Section 2.6.1.12 provides more details.

In order to comply with the requirements of NUREG-75/087, Section 3.8.5, "Foundations," Section II.5, "Structural Acceptance Criteria," the recommended minimum factor of safety against overturning or sliding failure from static loads (dead load plus maximum live loads) is 1.5 and from static loads plus loads due to extreme environmental conditions, such as design basis ground motion, is 1.1. Where the factor of safety against sliding is less than 1 due to the design basis ground motion, the displacements the structure may experience are calculated using the method proposed by Newmark (1965) for estimating displacements of dams and embankments during earthquakes. The magnitude of these displacements are evaluated to assess the impact on the performance of the structure. See Section 2.6.1.12 for details about these analyses.

2.6.5 Slope Stability

There are no slopes close enough to the proposed Important to Safety facilities that their failure could adversely affect the operation of these facilities.