# *Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) FY23 Update*

# **Spent Fuel and Waste Disposition**

*Prepared for:* **US Department of Energy Office of Nuclear Energy Office of Spent Fuel and Waste Disposition Office of Spent Fuel and Waste Science and Technology**

#### *Prepared by:*

#### **Sandia National Laboratories**

Kristopher Kuhlman, Melissa Mills, Richard Jayne, Edward Matteo, Courtney Herrick, Martin Nemer, Yongliang Xiong, Charles Choens, Matthew Paul, Christine Downs

#### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

Philip Stauffer, Hakim Boukhalfa, Eric Guiltinan, Thom Rahn, Shawn Otto, Jon Davis, Daniel Eldridge, Aidan Stansberry

**Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory** Jonny Rutqvist, Yuxin Wu, Hafssa Tounsi, Mengsu Hu, Sebastian Uhlemann, Jiannan Wang

**August 2023 • M2SF-23SN010303052 • SAND2023-08820R**

#### **DISCLAIMER**

This information was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the U.S. Government. Neither the U.S. Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness, of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. References herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trade mark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the U.S. Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U.S. Government or any agency thereof.





National Nuclear Security Administration under contract DE-NA0003525.









### <span id="page-2-1"></span>**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<span id="page-2-0"></span>This report summarizes the fiscal year 2023 (FY23) status of the second phase of a series of borehole heater tests in salt at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) funded by the Disposal Research and Development (R&D) program of the Spent Fuel & Waste Science and Technology (SFWST) office at the US Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy's (DOE-NE) Office in the Spent Fuel and Waste Disposition (SFWD) program.

**High-level purpose:** The Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) field test campaign intends to understand brine occurrence (i.e., where, and how much) and migration (i.e., how easily it moves) in salt through the damaged region surrounding excavations. These field tests are the part of a wider systematic multi-year field investigation campaign to improve the post-closure repository safety case for disposal of heat-generating radioactive waste in a generic salt repository. BATS seeks to better understand and ultimately predict how much brine can flow into both ambient and heated excavations (e.g., boreholes or rooms) in salt. This work is helping to train a new generation of repository scientist on both the design and execution of field tests, as well as the modeling and understanding of the coupled processes in salt via the BATS data used as part of DECOVALEX Task E.

Brine availability is important in a salt repository because:

- 1. brine can corrode metallic and glass waste forms or waste packages;
- 2. brine can facilitate transport of radionuclides off-site;
- 3. water is needed for gas generation (e.g., steel corrosion or water radiolysis), which can increase gas pressure, providing a driving force for migration away from the repository;
- 4. chlorine and borate in brine absorb neutrons, thereby reducing in-package nuclear criticality hazards; and
- 5. accumulated brine in an excavation undergoing creep closure provides back-pressure that may resist ultimate creep closure and sealing of a repository excavation.

The ongoing BATS field test activities and data collection are associated with a pair of similar heated and unheated arrays of horizontal boreholes in the underground experimental area at WIPP, southeastern New Mexico. BATS shakedown tests began in 2018 and BATS phase 1 (BATS 1) began in January 2020. BATS 1 included one heater test in January to March 2020 and continued with multiple gas and liquid tracer tests in 2021 (including a heated tracer test). BATS phase 2 (BATS 2) began testing July 2022 and continued into 2023 to examine the effects heating has on the response of the salt under a range of thermal loads.

**FY23 Accomplishments:** The main Disposal Research Salt R&D achievements during this fiscal year include the following two BATS-related activities:

- Executing four three-week heater tests in the BATS 2 array, while monitoring a suite of physical and geophysical response of the salt to different levels of heating (Figure E-1). These four steps were each at a hotter temperature than the previous step (from 90 °C [194 °F]) up to 145 °C [293 °F]), to observe the incremental effects of increasing temperature on brine availability (Section [4](#page-29-0)[\)](#page-29-1)
- Modeling to support interpretation of BATS 2 field data summarized in LANL and LBNL FY23 level-3 reports (Guiltinan et al., 2023; Rutqvist et al., 2023), and international collaborative modeling efforts (e.g., DECOVALEX-2023 task E; see Kuhlman et al., 2023)



#### <span id="page-3-0"></span>**Figure ES-1. Photo of BATS 2 heated array (upper left), power applied in each BATS 2 heater event (lower left), water production in BATS 2 (lower right ), and breakthrough of argon gas at end of BATS 2d heater event (upper right).**

**FY23 Key Finding:** The fundamental observation in BATS 2 is seeing multiple lines of evidence that an accumulation of damage occurs in the salt associated with both heating and cooling. The BATS tests included:

- <span id="page-3-1"></span>• thermal (changes in temperature due to a range of heat setpoints);
- hydrological (water production in HP borehole and gas tracer tests between D and HP boreholes using argon);
- mechanical (closure observations in HP and SL boreholes and damage observations through monitoring acoustic emissions);
- chemical (water isotope observations through time in HP borehole and brine chemistry observations through time in SM borehole); and
- indirect geophysical responses (electrical resistivity tomography and distributed fiber optic strain and temperature measurements).

Each of these responses were characteristic of a system changing through damage and brine migration.

These diverse data support the key finding that heated salt is a complex dynamical system as based on the

- 1) opening and closing of fractures that may be interconnected for flow fluid or not at different times;
- 2) nonlinear and hysteretic two-phase flow of air and brine through discrete fracture networks; and
- 3) evolving water isotopes and fluid chemistry [\(Figure ES-2](#page-4-0)[\) in respon](#page-4-1)se to mechanical damage, fluid migration, and potentially evaporation or other processes.

<span id="page-4-2"></span>

<span id="page-4-1"></span>**Figure ES-2. Changes in Brine Chemistry observed in SM borehole during BATS 2.**

#### <span id="page-4-0"></span>**Next Stages of Work:**

The current three-to-five-year plan for BATS (Kuhlman et al., 2021a) and the longer-term strategy document for testing in salt (Stauffer et al., 2015) list the overall project's longer-term plans. In the next fiscal year plans include:

- Continuing additional BATS 2 heater tests in FY24, with heater events that include:
	- $\circ$  at hotter temperatures with higher N<sub>2</sub> flowrates (to prevent condensation in the flowlines, as was observed in BATS 2d), which will help us to better understand and the response of the salt at elevated temperatures.
	- o ramping up and ramping down temperatures over the course of hours to days (rather than a step change on or off), to explore the association of observed responses and damage accumulation with the time rate of change in heating.
- Continuation of laboratory tests, numerical modeling, and international collaborations in FY24 required to further interpret and explore the data that have already been and continue to be collected as part of BATS.
- Planning the next field-testing phase (BATS 3), including an update the 5-year BATS plan document in FY24. As part of this update, we will give more detail about BATS 3, which is envisioned as a series of smaller, more focused tests in the Salt Disposal Investigation (SDI) experimental area of WIPP. These uncoupled tests will allow more detailed monitoring of individual processes relevant to long-term performance of salt repositories, rather than focusing on coordination (and interference) between many simultaneous geophysical measurements.
- Use BATS 3 to re-start WIPP's role as an internationally relevant underground research laboratory in salt.

#### <span id="page-5-1"></span>**VERSION INFO**

<span id="page-5-3"></span>This report is an annual update of a series of BATS status reports. The FY20 BATS report details the construction of the BATS 1 arrays and the first round of heating (SAND2020–9034R). The FY21 report details further data collection during periods without active heating and results of gas tracer tests conducted between boreholes (SAND2021–10962R). The FY22 report detailed decommissioning of the BATS 1 heated array and construction of the BATS 2 heated array (SAND2022–12142R). This report describes the continued data collection in the new BATS 2 heated array and the original unheated array from BATS 1.



## <span id="page-5-2"></span>**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

<span id="page-5-0"></span>The project is financially supported by the Disposal R&D program of DOE-NE's SFWST office. We acknowledge key assistance from the following groups: the Salado Isolation Mining Contractors (SIMCO, which was formerly the Nuclear Waste Partnership); Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) underground facilities personnel, who provide underground access, power infrastructure, and drilling support; and the DOE Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM) Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO) chief scientist, George Basabilvazo, for whom Shawn Otto and Jon Davis of the WIPP Test Coordination Office (TCO) work for. The authors thank Jason Heath of Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) for providing a detailed technical review of the entire document.

# **CONTENTS**





# <span id="page-8-1"></span>**[LIST OF FIGURES](#page-66-1)**

<span id="page-8-0"></span>

# **BATS FY23 UPDATE**



# **BATS FY23 UPDATE**



# <span id="page-11-0"></span>**[LIST OF TABLES](#page-58-7)**



# <span id="page-12-2"></span><span id="page-12-1"></span>**[ACRONYMS](#page-84-1)**

<span id="page-12-0"></span>

# **BRINE AVAILABILITY TEST IN SALT FY23 UPDATE**

This fiscal year 2023 (FY23) report presents data collected in phase 2 of the Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS 2) in a new heated borehole array. The test is funded by the US Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy (DOE-NE) Spent Fuel and Waste Disposition Program, under the Disposal Research and Development (R&D) program of the Office of Spent Fuel & Waste Science and Technology (SFWST). The test is located underground at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), southeastern New Mexico, which is a DOE Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM) site managed by the Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO).

A high-level test plan by Stauffer et al. (2015) places BATS in the context of a multi-year testing strategy, which involves testing a range of processes at multiple scales, eventually culminating in a drift-scale disposal demonstration. The organization of the current phases of the BATS field test is outlined in *"Project Plan: Salt In-Situ Heater Test"* (SNL et al., 2020), and a three-to-five year plan is presented in *"Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) Extended Plan for Experiments at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)"* (Kuhlman et al., 2021a).

An early conceptual design of the BATS field test was laid out in Kuhlman et al. (2017), which includes appendices with references to historic heated salt field tests. This summary provides context, historical examples, and motivation for the individual test components of BATS. This level-2 milestone report presents data collected with new boreholes drilled in FY22, which constitutes BATS 2. More details on the as-built state of the BATS phase 1 (BATS 1) experiment can be found in the FY20 milestone report "*FY20 Update on Brine Availability Test in Salt"* (Kuhlman et al., 2020). An unheated array of boreholes, which has been monitored during both BATS 1 and 2, is described in the FY20 and FY21 reports and this current FY22 report. The FY21 milestone report "*Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) FY21 Update*" (Kuhlman et al., 2021b) presented a summary of 2020–2021 data, including several gas tracer tests conducted between boreholes. The FY22 milestone report "*Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) FY22 Update*" (Kuhlman et al., 2022) presented a description of the decommissioning activities for the BATS 1 heated array and a description of the construction of the new BATS 2 heated array. This report presents data collected during the first four heating phases in BATS 2 (a-d), and new FY23 data from the unheated array as a comparison to the BATS 2 heated data.

This level-2 milestone report incorporates input from level-3 milestone reports recently completed as part of Salt Disposal Research R&D by Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL; Guiltinan et al., 2023) and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL; Rutqvist et al., 2023). The team preparing, designing, implementing, debugging, and interpreting the BATS results includes members from multiple national laboratories, namely Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), LANL, and LBNL. The tight integration of our DOE-NE Salt R&D team over several years has helped make the ongoing field experiment possible. The work presented here would not be possible without the DOE-EM WIPP Test Coordination Office (TCO), who is onsite and underground at WIPP every week.

#### <span id="page-13-1"></span>**1. Background and Test Overview**

### <span id="page-13-2"></span><span id="page-13-0"></span>**1.1 Motivation for BATS**

The focus of the BATS field test campaign is brine availability in geologic salt. These field tests are the first part of a wider systematic multi-year field investigation campaign to improve the existing long-term repository safety case for disposal of heat-generating radioactive waste in a generic salt repository. BATS seeks to improve current understanding for predictions of how much brine can flow into both ambient and heated excavations (e.g., boreholes or rooms) in salt. Brine availability is important to the long-term repository safety case for radioactive waste disposal in salt (Kuhlman & Sevougian, 2013) because of the following:

1) brine can corrode metallic and glass waste forms or waste packages;

- 2) brine can facilitate transport of radionuclides off-site;
- 3) water is needed for gas generation (e.g., steel corrosion or water radiolysis), which can increase gas pressure, providing a driving force for migration away from the repository;
- 4) chlorine and borate in brine absorb neutrons, thereby reducing in-package nuclear criticality hazards; and
- 5) accumulated brine in an excavation undergoing creep closure provides back-pressure that may resist ultimate creep closure and sealing of a repository excavation.

Future different field tests under the wider field campaign will explore other performance aspects of the long-term repository safety case that are separate from the brine availability focus of the current BATS 2 field test.

In a generic salt repository for "hot" radioactive waste (i.e., above brine boiling temperature at the waste package surface), an area around the waste packages will dry out once water vapor is driven away. Additional water associated with clays and water bound up in hydrous evaporite minerals may become mobile upon heating, and thermal expansion of the solid matrix and intergranular brine located away from the excavation in the host salt leads to thermal pressurization, driving brine towards lower pressure excavations. If conditions are right, a small-scale heat pipe convection process can set up in a highpermeability excavation damaged zone or granular salt regions around waste (Olivella et al., 2011; Jordan et al., 2015). The heat pipe includes salt precipitation near the waste package and salt dissolution where steam condenses as fresh water away from the heat source. The conceptual model is that creep closure eventually reconsolidates any granular salt backfill, closes gaps around waste packages, and heals the Excavation Damaged Zone (EDZ) or Excavated disturbed Zone (EdZ; both EDZ and EdZ are discussed below) associated with access drifts to create a relatively dry, low-porosity, low-permeability zone around the waste packages (Blanco-Martín et al., 2018). Knowledge of brine availability facilitates understanding the following key performance aspects of the repository system: the amount and distribution of brine that flows to an excavation, as well as the long-term behavior of brine around waste packages that affects transport (e.g., brine-radionuclide interactions); and the resistance to creep closure from accumulated brine that does not flow away from the repository excavation. The interplay of brine availability and the complex coupled thermal-hydrological-mechanical-chemical (THMC) processes controls the extent and timing of ultimate drift closure.

In undisturbed geologic salt systems, the ultra-low permeability and porosity of salt (Beauheim & Roberts, 2002) provides the primary natural barrier to contain radioactive waste over performance assessment (PA) relevant time scales ( $10^4$  to  $10^6$  years). However, near-field conditions (e.g., fluid pressures, liquid saturation, and chemical composition) and processes (e.g., brine and gas flow, waste package corrosion, precipitation and dissolution of salt, thermal expansion and contraction of salt and brine, and salt creep) can impact releases in disturbed scenarios (i.e., off-normal scenarios like inadvertent human intrusion) and are the initial conditions for long-term PA simulations. BATS is focused on understanding processes necessary to quantify inflow rates and brine composition in the near-field (i.e., at scales of cm to m from the heat source) with the aim to improve:

- 1) our understanding of coupled THMC processes affecting prediction of near-field conditions;
- 2) conceptual models of near-field behavior that inform the safety case; and
- 3) the numerical models, constitutive relationships, and parameterizations that are implemented in process models and PA models.

Brine availability in a salt repository depends on both the distribution of water in the host salt geologic formation and the flow and transport properties of the EDZ or EdZ surrounding an excavation (Kuhlman & Malama, 2013; Kuhlman, 2019). Note that we may use the generic term "water" to refer to the aqueous liquid that may range in total dissolved solids from fresh water to brine, as heating processes and

condensation may alter the salinity of the aqueous liquid, and we may also use "water" to refer to the molecule itself—the specific context should make the usage clear. The EDZ is a region surrounding excavations where the salt is damaged, and both its material properties (i.e., porosity and permeability) and state or potential energy (i.e., pressure, stress, or temperature) have changed—note that the EDZ is often equivalently called the disturbed rock zone (DRZ). The EdZ is a larger region surrounding the EDZ, where only the state variables are disturbed from their far-field values, while rock material properties are unchanged (Davies & Bernier, 2005). The distribution of water in the system includes the following: bound water that is both liquid or structural in the salt formation (i.e., brine in clay, intragranular brine, intergranular brine, and hydrous minerals; Roedder, 1984); and water in both the liquid and gas phases before and during emplacement of heat-generating radioactive waste, which is affected by heating processes, evaporation, and condensation. The primary EDZ property of interest for the BATS field test is the distribution and evolution of mechanical damage and coupled hydrologic properties (i.e., porosity, permeability, and the nature of induced fractures) around the access drift and test boreholes, which provides the primary path for flow around the access drifts and test boreholes.

#### <span id="page-15-1"></span><span id="page-15-0"></span>**1.2 BATS Phases**

The preliminary BATS "shakedown" test location was in WIPP drift E-140 [\(Figure 1](#page-15-2)[\), utili](#page-15-4)zing existing boreholes. Referred to as BATS 1s, it was performed June 2018 through April 2019 (Boukhalfa et al., 2019; Guiltinan et al., 2020).



<span id="page-15-4"></span><span id="page-15-3"></span><span id="page-15-2"></span>**Figure 1. WIPP underground map. BATS phases 1 and 2 location indicated with red circle. BATS 1s shakedown test location indicated with blue star.**

BATS phase 1a began with two nearly identical new horizontal borehole arrays (heated and unheated) drilled in the Salt Disposal Investigation (SDI) area of WIPP (on the south side of N-940 west of E-540; see [Figure 2\)](#page-16-0). [BATS](#page-16-2) phase 1a refers to testing that occurred from January to March 2020 and involved data collection from both the heated and unheated arrays. BATS phase 1b was conducted from January to June 2021 and involved addition of gas tracers to the D boreholes in both the heated and unheated arrays. BATS phase 1c was conducted July to August 2021 and involved adding liquid tracers in the same heated and unheated D boreholes (Kuhlman et al., 2021b). Here, the references to the "BATS 1" boreholes mean the boreholes used in phases 1a through 1c, not the 1s shakedown test boreholes in drift E-140.



<span id="page-16-2"></span><span id="page-16-1"></span><span id="page-16-0"></span>**Figure 2. Layout of borehole arrays and in-drift equipment in N-940 showing relation between BATS 1 and BATS 2. Boreholes are on the south side of drift; the unheated array is east of the heated arrays. Upper panel shows orientation of boreholes.**

BATS 2 boreholes were drilled October 2021 and January through February 2022 in the N-940 drift at WIPP, approximately 20 feet [6.1 m] west of the BATS 1 heated arrays. Four heater testing events have occurred so far in BATS 2 (July 2022 through March 2023) named BATS 2a, 2b, 2c, and 2d, with followon heater tests planned to continue in 2023 and possibly into 2024. The BATS 2 heater tests are being

conducted in a newly constructed (October 2021 through February 2022) heated borehole array, while reusing the BATS 1 unheated array (constructed in 2019).

## <span id="page-17-1"></span><span id="page-17-0"></span>**1.3 BATS Field Test Components**

The western test array of BATS 2 is heated by the heater in the central HP borehole, and the eastern array is the unheated array from BATS 1 (see Kuhlman et al., 2020, for detailed info on the unheated array). [Figure 2](#page-16-0) [shows t](#page-16-2)he location of the adjacent BATS 1 and BATS 2 arrays in the N-940 drift. [Table A-1](#page-66-2) [lists](#page-66-4) [th](#page-66-4)e sequence boreholes drilled as part of BATS 1 decommissioning and BATS 2 setup. Appendix A includes several lists of tabular data important for documentation of BATS 2, such as the sequence of BATS 2 borehole drilling and coring, as-built coordinates of BATS 2 boreholes, various measurement or sensor names and locations, and other similar information. The HP boreholes in the two BATS 1 arrays were 6.9 m apart horizontally and at the same level vertically, while the BATS 2 heated array is 13 m west and 1 m lower vertically than the unheated array (distance between HP boreholes).

The heated BATS 2 array is configured with several types of instruments in the central HP borehole and surrounding satellite boreholes. Se[e Table 1](#page-17-2) [for a](#page-17-4) listing of information on the various boreholes, [Figure 3](#page-18-2) [for bor](#page-18-4)ehole locations projected on an image of the drift, and [Figure 4](#page-19-4) [for vie](#page-19-6)ws of the boreholes and temperature sensor locations from three different viewpoints. [Table A-2](#page-67-0) [lists th](#page-67-2)e planned and as-built coordinates for the boreholes, and [Table A-3](#page-68-0) [lists th](#page-68-2)e locations of temperature measures, both of which were used to plot [Figure 4.](#page-19-4) [There](#page-19-6) are some minor differences apparent between as-built and planned locations in [Figure 3](#page-18-2) [and](#page-18-4) [Figure 4](#page-19-4)[, mostly](#page-19-6) visible in the boreholes furthest from the center. This is likely due to image warping issues with the application used to creat[e Figure 3](#page-18-2)[;](#page-18-4) [Figure 4](#page-19-4) [is more](#page-19-6) accurate, and is based on survey data.

Compared to BATS 1 (including the unheated array, which is still partially monitored), there are additional AE and E boreholes (four in BATS 2 heated array compared to three in each array for BATS 1a), and the SL, AE, and E boreholes are all longer. The narrowest boreholes in BATS 1 were 1.75 inches [4.4 cm] diameter, while the narrowest boreholes in BATS 2 are 2.1 inches [5.3 cm] diameter. Temperature distribution, strain, and brine movement are monitored with thermocouples, fiber-optic distributed strain sensing (DSS) and temperature sensing (DTS), acoustic emissions (AE) monitoring, and electrical resistivity tomography (ERT).

<span id="page-17-2"></span>

#### <span id="page-17-4"></span><span id="page-17-3"></span>**Table 1. Summary of BATS 2 heated array boreholes.**

\* The given number or size is different between BATS 1 and BATS 2

Inflatable packers are used in the HP and D boreholes to isolate the region behind the packer from the drift air [\(Table 1](#page-17-2)[\). This](#page-17-4) is to prevent dry-out of the salt, loss of moisture, and contamination of samples. The rubber bladder is inflated to approximately 80 psi [5 bars] pressure above atmospheric pressure. The HP borehole packer has multiple pass-through tubes or pipes, to allow sensors and power to reach the isolated part of the borehole. These pass-throughs are sealed with wire compression nuts, made by Conax Technologies. The D borehole packer has a port for application of gas pressure behind the inflated packer but does not have wire pass-throughs. Mechanical packers are also used in the SM and SL boreholes to isolate the rear part of the borehole from the drift environment. The mechanical packers use mechanical compression of a rubber sleeve by tightening nuts on a threaded rod to isolate the rear of the borehole. The wires to the sensors behind the packer are sealed against the inside of the threaded pipe with plumber's putty.

### <span id="page-18-0"></span>**2. Test Design Details**

The following testing methods relate to the setup and initial monitoring of the BATS 2 heated array. For the as-built details of the BATS unheated array boreholes and more information on BATS 1 in general, see previous milestone reports by Kuhlman et al. (2020; 2021b).

<span id="page-18-1"></span>

<span id="page-18-4"></span><span id="page-18-3"></span><span id="page-18-2"></span>**Figure 3. Planned (overlay) and as-drilled (image) locations of boreholes in BATS 2 array. Borehole lengths given in feet.**





<span id="page-19-6"></span><span id="page-19-5"></span><span id="page-19-4"></span>**Figure 4. Drift, side, and top views of BATS 2 boreholes. Drift view shows proposed (gray dashed) and as-built (green) borehole positions in drift; red line is axis of boreholes with "×" labeling end of boreholes. Side and top views show thermocouple and resistance temperature detector (RTD) locations (blue dots), AE sensor locations (green stars), HP heater (filled red box), and HP packer (filled gray box). Gray contours indicate distance from center of heated interval.**

#### <span id="page-19-2"></span><span id="page-19-0"></span>**2.1 BATS 2 Testing Phases**

To date, four heater tests have been conducted in BATS 2, each for three weeks of heating. The tests have consisted of a three-week heating phase, followed by at least two weeks of cool down period. The fourth heater test (BATS 2d) was initially aborted after approximately one day, due to an error configuring the heater controller. After removing the packer and troubleshooting all the components of the system, the controller was re-programmed. The BATS 2d was eventually run in March 2023, after some delays due to instrumentation being repaired or replaced (i.e., for the Picarro cavity ringdown spectrometer and Standard Research Systems (SRS) gas analyzer).

The full-length heater test periods are referred to as BATS 2a, BATS 2b, BATS 2c, and BATS 2d. The setpoints, achieved power, and temperatures observed are discussed in detail in Section [4.1.6.](#page-41-0)

### <span id="page-19-3"></span><span id="page-19-1"></span>**3. [Con](#page-41-1)figurations of BATS 2 Boreholes and Measurements**

The following subsections describe the arrangement of boreholes and measurement equipment in the new BATS 2 heated array. The boreholes in the unheated array were completed as part of BATS 1, and they are described in Kuhlman et al. (2020).

#### <span id="page-20-0"></span>**3.1 HP (Heater and Packer) Borehole**

There is one central 12.54-ft [3.82 m] long and 4.8-inch [12.2 cm] diameter HP borehole. The 1250-watt quartz lamp heater (BATS 1 used a 750 W heater of the same physical size) and centralized boreholeclosure gauge are mounted behind the 4.5-inch [11.4 cm] diameter 4.2-ft [1.3 m] long inflatable packer, which is built around a 0.5-inch [12.5 mm] stainless steel pipe. The HP borehole in BATS 2 is like the configuration used in BATS 1, but a longer packer is employed to provide better isolation of the heated interval [\(Figure 5](#page-20-2)[\).](#page-20-4)

[The](#page-20-4) BATS 2 packer was manufactured by Inflatable Packers International (IPI) and is 4.49 inches [11.4 cm] maximum outer diameter and  $4.27 \text{ ft}$  [1.3 m] long (from shoulder to shoulder), with the inflatable portion (i.e., the black nitrile rubber portion) of the packer being  $3.25 \text{ ft}$  [1 m] long. The BATS 2 heater was placed at the same depth into the borehole as the BATS 1 heater to improve comparison between tests, but the BATS 2 packer covers a longer interval than the BATS 1 packer [\(Figure 5](#page-20-2)[\).](#page-20-4)

<span id="page-20-1"></span>

#### <span id="page-20-4"></span><span id="page-20-3"></span><span id="page-20-2"></span>**[Fig](#page-20-4)ure 5. Comparison of BATS 1 Aardvark HP packer after removal (right, in pipe) with BATS 2 IPI packer before installation (left, in box).**

The heater/packer assembly is placed almost to the back of the borehole [\(Table 2](#page-21-2)[\), with](#page-21-4) only a 6.49-inch 16.5-cm [6.49-inch] gap behind the back of the heater/packer assembly (because the borehole ended up being 16.5 cm longer than initially planned). Approximately 69 cm of heater/packer assembly extends out of the borehole into the drift. The packer sealing element is inflated with  $N_2$  to approximately 80 psi [5.5] bar] gauge pressure (i.e., above atmospheric pressure) to isolate the heater and gas circulation from the drift. The packer inflation is valved off from the  $N_2$  bottle after filling, and the inflation pressure is monitored.

There are two 0.25-inch [6.4 mm] pass-through tubes allowing gas flow to and from the interval behind the packer: one tube is connected to ultra-high purity (UHP  $> 99.999\%$ ) bottled N<sub>2</sub> (inflow) and the other is connected to the downstream gas instrumentation (outflow). The inflow gas tube extends to the rear of the heater/packer assembly (near the back of the borehole; [Figure 8](#page-23-3)[\), while](#page-23-6) the gas outflow tube ends at the back of the packer (the front of the isolated interval, closer to the drift). The thermocouples exit the borehole through two 0.38-inch [9.5 mm] pass-through tubes and are sealed with Conax Technologies fittings near the drift side of the packer (which are inside the borehole when the packer is installed). The heater power and a linear variable differential transform (LVDT) data cable pass through the 0.5-inch [12.7 mm] pipe, which is sealed with Conax Technologies fittings at the end of the 0.5-inch pipe, visible in the drift.

<span id="page-21-2"></span>

<span id="page-21-4"></span><span id="page-21-3"></span>

#### <span id="page-21-1"></span><span id="page-21-0"></span>**3.1.1 Routing and analysis of gas streams**

Upstream of the HP borehole, a bottle of UHP  $N_2$  gas flows at a constant mass flowrate maintained via a programmable Omega flow controller (FMA-2605A-V2). BATS 2 is mostly run at a constant flowrate, 75 std mL/min (i.e., mass flowrate at standard temperature and pressure), while the unheated array is mostly maintained at 25 std mL/min. When the gas flow was first turned on (25 April 2022), both the heated and unheated arrays were set at a higher flowrate to more quickly remove any standing brine in the boreholes (Section [4.1.1](#page-29-4)[\). W](#page-29-7)e wish to prevent standing water in the borehole (for water isotopes), but there is also a concern regarding having too much dry air circulating through the borehole, which might dry out the salt surrounding the borehole (changing the flow regime from single to two-phase around the borehole).

Later in BATS 2d the gas flowrate was also increased in the heated array because there was evidence of condensation in the tubing. The flowrate of  $N_2$  is otherwise set to maintain a minimum humidity of the gas stream, based on the calibration range ( $> 10,000$  ppm by volume of H<sub>2</sub>O) for the Picarro cavity ringdown spectrometer (CRDS). Omega (FMA6708-12V) multiparameter flowmeters (MPFM) are located downstream of the packers to monitor the air temperature, pressure, and flowrate, with data recorded on a Campbell Scientific datalogger.

The Picarro CRDS and the SRS QMS-200 gas analyzer are shared between the heated and unheated arrays. The gas plumbing changes which branch the Picarro/SRS are on periodically (2 hours on unheated array, 10 hours on heated array, repeating twice daily) via solenoid-actuated three-way valves [\(Figure 6](#page-22-2)[\).](#page-22-4) [The P](#page-22-4)icarro analyzer reports the concentration of water isotopologues in the gas stream (three stable oxygen and two stable hydrogen isotopes). The system is designed to keep the water as a vapor, to prevent condensation and evaporation in the tubing, which could lead to fractionation of isotopes. A dedicated LI-COR analyzer on each branch of the plumbing (upstream of the switching) measures mmol  $H_2O$  and  $\mu$ mol CO<sub>2</sub> per mol gas. On 6 September 2022, the LI-COR systems were switched out because the systems were not properly calibrated (data reported for the LI-COR systems in Kuhlman et al., 2022 were not accurate). The analog outputs from the LI-COR are connected to a Campbell Scientific CR1000X datalogger, while the Picarro and SRS gas analyzers each have their own logging computers.

The SRS QMS-200 gas analyzer is a quadrupole mass spectrometer operating in a vacuum chamber evacuated with a turbomolecular pump. The unit splits the sample, directing most of it to the backing vacuum pump, which permits the unit to directly sample gases at atmospheric pressure.

The output streams from the gas analyzers go through another pair of plumbing tees and three-way solenoid-actuated valves before passing through a pair of air temperature and relative humidity (RH) probes (labeled as TRH probes in [Figure 6](#page-22-2)[\) and a p](#page-22-4)air of canisters of desiccant, with subsequent TRH probes at the outflow. The TRH probes before and after the desiccant are used to confirm the RH of the gas stream, and to confirm the desiccant is removing all the moisture from the gas stream. These final set of switching valves ensures that one set of desiccant canisters is associated with the heated array and the other associated with the unheated array, even though the intervening gas analyzers are switching between arrays.



<span id="page-22-4"></span><span id="page-22-2"></span>**Research System (SRS), and LI-COR gas analyzers to exhaust (left). Green lines are 0.25-inch [6.4 mm] polyethylene tubing, purple lines are 0.25-inch stainless steel tubing, red items are only for the heated array, and blue items are only for the unheated array, gray items switch between the heated and unheated arrays. TRH means temperature and relative humidity.**

#### <span id="page-22-3"></span><span id="page-22-1"></span><span id="page-22-0"></span>**3.1.2 Applied heater power**

The 1250-watt, 208-volt Tempco Gemini Medium Wave quartz twin-bore infrared heater is mounted on a 1-inch [2.5 cm] steel pipe with perpendicular disc-shaped reflectors (4-inch [10.2 cm] outer diameter) installed on either end of the heater to confine the radiative energy to an approximately 28-inch [71 cm] long interval of the borehole wall. Four thermocouples are installed to measure the temperature of the borehole wall (extending radially from stainless steel guide tubes) between the two reflectors [\(Figure 7](#page-23-2)[\).](#page-23-7) 



<span id="page-23-7"></span><span id="page-23-4"></span><span id="page-23-2"></span>**[Fi](#page-23-7)gure 7. Borehole closure gauge (left), heater, thermocouples, rear centralizer, and gas inlet tubing (right) for heater HP packer assembly in BATS 2.**

The heater is controlled to maintain the setpoint thermocouple at constant temperature (which is pressed against the borehole wall), while a second thermocouple pressed against the wall is used as an emergency over-limit check, shutting down heater power in case a malfunction with the primary controlling thermocouple leads to overheating. In the aborted BATS 2d test, the limit thermocouple functioned as designed (the issue was it was set too low at 145 ºC) and shut the test down. The Watlow F4T controller output (applied power, current, voltage, resistance, and duty through time—along with several other system diagnostics) is transmitted to a Campbell Scientific CR1000X datalogger. The hot and neutral power wires for the heater pass through the packer via the 0.5-inch [12.7 mm] pipe and are sealed via a Conax Technologies fitting at the drift, while the 0.5-inch pass-through pipe is used for grounding.

On the heater side of the packer, the 0.5-inch [12.7 mm] pipe goes through a union (to allow breaking and easier transport of the assembled packer), a reducer (to convert between 1 and 0.5 inch pipe), and a plumbing "T" (to let the thermocouples and LVDT wires out of the tube before reaching the heated interval) before the borehole closure gauge [\(Figure 8](#page-23-3) [and](#page-23-6) [Figure 9](#page-24-2)[\).](#page-24-4)



<span id="page-23-6"></span><span id="page-23-5"></span><span id="page-23-3"></span>**[Fig](#page-24-4)ure 8. Packer (right), borehole closure gauge and LVDT, heater (covered with black foam), 0.25 inch [6.4 mm] gas line to back of borehole, and rear centralizer (left) used in BATS 2 during assembly. Measuring tape (in feet and inches) zeroed at end of packer assembly.**

#### <span id="page-23-1"></span><span id="page-23-0"></span>**3.1.3 Borehole closure**

The borehole closure gauge is made of a four-arm spring steel centralizer fixed to the 1-inch [2.5 cm] pipe on one end, with the other end connected to a polyether ether ketone (PEEK) bushing, which slides on a key over the 1-inch pipe [\(Figure 9](#page-24-2)[\). The b](#page-24-4)ushing connects to an axial LVDT, which measures displacement of the bushing. The axial measurement was found to be more robust than a radial LVDT measurement with the gauge pressed against the borehole wall. Displacement can be related linearly to borehole circumference. The response of the LVDT at different borehole radii was calibrated against

standard-diameter calibration rings. The LVDT is equipped with an in-line signal conditioner and is connected to a Campbell Scientific CR1000X datalogger.



#### <span id="page-24-4"></span><span id="page-24-3"></span><span id="page-24-2"></span>**Figure 9. Closeup of borehole closure gauge (heater to left, packer to right – out of photo); distance from far end of packer/heater assembly indicated (in inches and feet) with measuring tape. LVDT (connected to orange wire, held to pipe with hose clamp) is not visible behind central pipe.**

### <span id="page-24-1"></span><span id="page-24-0"></span>**3.2 AE (Acoustic Emission) Boreholes**

There are four 11-ft [3.35 m] long (2.1-inch [5.3 cm] diameter) AE boreholes with multiple piezoelectric sensors, namely Physical Acoustics Nano30 AE sensors, in each borehole. The AE boreholes are not grouted. There are two Mistras Micro-II Express data acquisition systems (one for each array) used to listen passively to piezoelectric sensors (8 channels unheated array, 16 channels heated array). The unheated array is monitored to measure AE associated with the unheated boreholes (i.e., background effects), while the heated array is used to monitor AE generated during heat-up and cool-down. Eight more channels are used in the heated array than in the unheated array, to better characterize the distribution of AE events spatially around the heater. There are also three thermocouples in each AE borehole (12 total in BATS 2 heated array) between the decentralized piezoelectric sensors [\(Table A-3](#page-68-0)[\).](#page-68-2) [The fo](#page-68-2)ur AE boreholes are arranged in a rough square surrounding the heated borehole [\(Figure 3](#page-18-2)[\).](#page-18-4)

[The](#page-18-4) same sensor type and mounting method as BATS 1 were used for the BATS 2 installation. AE boreholes were moved to a further radial distance out from the central borehole. Four AE Boreholes were also drilled to a greater depth than previously, that is, to 3.05 m as opposed to 2.75 m, to have a larger interrogation volume of rock and get closer to the heater. Four sensors are mounted in each borehole for a total of 16 sensors, with two extra sensors installed as spares, to allow switching out damaged or noisy sensors. Small form factor inline preamps were used on the deepest sensor in each borehole, but were eventually abandoned due to unacceptable noise levels, otherwise the 2/4/6 preamps from BATS 1 were reused to amplify the millivolt signals coming from the sensors at a gain value of 40 dB. The Mistras system from the previous system was redeployed for BATS 2, and acquisition parameters were set to a 28 dB threshold and a 100 to 700 kHz bandpass filter. The sensors from BATS 1 were reused in BATS 2 after disassembly, cleaning, testing, and re-assembly on new longer hollow-tube conveyance pipes.



#### <span id="page-25-4"></span><span id="page-25-3"></span><span id="page-25-2"></span>**Figure 10. AE sensors and inside of centralizers (left); sensors and hemisphere waveguides installed on 0.75-inch [19.1 mm] stainless-steel conveyance rod with centralizers.**

The AE sensors are installed through the arms of kwik-ZIP centralizers (made of polyoxymethylene thermoplastic) mounted on the outside of a 0.75-inch [19.1 mm] stainless-steel hollow-tube conveyance pipes [\(Figure 10](#page-25-2)[\). One en](#page-25-4)d of each centralizer is screwed to the stainless-steel tube to fix a given sensor's position, while the other is fastened around the conveyance, but is free to slide along the tube. The flat circular faces of the piezoelectric transducers have 304 stainless steel hemispheres epoxied to them. The hemispheres act as wave guides to improve contact between the flat face of the transducers and the curved borehole walls. The piezoelectric transducers are all located on the sides of the AE boreholes that are closest to the HP borehole to optimize detection of the first arrival (i.e., P-wave) of acoustic emissions from the heated borehole (see sensor [Figure 10](#page-25-2)[\). The Mi](#page-25-4)stras system automatically picks AE events based on a magnitude threshold to record events and waveforms.

The piezoelectric sensors have 9.8-ft [3 m] leads, which are connected to an in-line signal preamplifier box at the drift face, which prevents them being installed more deeply into the boreholes. The cable from the preamplifier to the Mistras control computer does not have the same cable-length constraints. The Mistras logging systems with either eight or 16 channels are computers with internal data acquisition boards connected to a keyboard and mouse, which are rack-mounted inside an enclosure.

Electrical interference from the ERT system has been problematic for the heated array AE measurements, especially the channels associated with the inline preamps. To address this, a front-end filter was placed on the incoming signals where the Mistras systems automatically discards any hit that has a duration less than 10 counts. This solution works well for the channels using the 2/4/6 preamps, but channels on the inline preamps still show excessive electrical noise from the ERT system. These channels were disabled to allow heater tests to proceed. Existing data was filtered to this duration minimum and channel arrangement.

The unheated array from BATS 1 was left in place and is still active for the current and future phases of testing. Eight sensors are installed into three AE boreholes.

### <span id="page-25-1"></span><span id="page-25-0"></span>**3.3 T (Thermocouple) Boreholes**

There are two 19-ft [5.5 m] long (2.1-inch [5.3 cm] diameter) T boreholes [\(Figure 3](#page-18-2)[\) with 1](#page-18-4)8 thermocouples in each (grouted outside 0.75-inch [19.1 mm] polyvinyl chloride (PVC) conveyance pipe; [Table A-3](#page-68-0)[\). One of](#page-68-2) the boreholes is at 2-ft [61 cm] radial distance away from the edge of the heated borehole (T2), and the other at 3-ft [91 cm] radial distance (T1). Thermocouples are also located in other measurement boreholes to increase the density of observations and help correct other observations for local temperatures [\(Figure 4](#page-19-4)[\). The 1](#page-19-6)0-minute averages of thermocouple temperatures are read on

Campbell Scientific CR1000X loggers through Campbell Scientific AM25T thermocouple multiplexers. The T1 and T2 boreholes in the BATS 2 array are in the same relative configuration to the central HP borehole as the BATS 1 array.

## <span id="page-26-2"></span><span id="page-26-0"></span>**3.4 E (Electrical Resistivity Tomography) Boreholes**

There are four 18-ft [5.79 m] (2.1-inch [5.3 cm] diameter) E boreholes with 16 ERT electrodes on the outside of each 0.75-inch [19.1 mm] PVC conveyance pipe (12-inch [30 cm] spacing between adjacent electrodes, starting from the far end of the borehole), with grout installed in the space inside and outside the PVC. Like the AE boreholes, the BATS 2 ERT electrodes are spread across four boreholes (compared to three boreholes in BATS 1), which are now 1 ft [30.5 cm] deeper and approximately 1 ft [30.5 cm] radially further from the HP borehole to increase the volume of interrogated rock. The electrodes are 1 inch [2.5 cm] wide copper foil rings installed on the outside of the conveyance pipes with jacketed wires running down the inside of the pipes. The electrodes are driven by Multi-Phase Technologies ERT controller (MPT DAS-1), located in an enclosure in the drift. In the heated array, the four ERT boreholes have a total of 64 electrodes. The ERT electrodes in the unheated array are no longer monitored.

The thermocouples used in the BATS 1 ERT boreholes were replaced in BATS 2 with RTDs [\(Table A-3\)](#page-68-0) [as an a](#page-68-2)ttempt to combat the anomalous non-physical temperatures that were measured in BATS 1 during ERT surveys (i.e., when applying current to ERT electrodes, from approximately 1:00 AM to 6:00 AM daily). The RTDs still record some anomalous readings during ERT surveys, but the RTD data are much less noisy than thermocouple data were in BATS 1. A complete ERT survey takes approximately one hour to perform at each frequency. A suite of ERT tests was scheduled to run at several frequencies nightly (9 PM to midnight each night, during BATS 2) to estimate the temporal evolution of the apparent resistivity distribution.

## <span id="page-26-3"></span><span id="page-26-1"></span>**3.5 F (Fiber Optic Distributed Sensing) Boreholes**

There is one  $18$ -ft  $[5.5 \text{ m}](2.1$ -inch  $[5.3 \text{ cm}]$  diameter) F1 borehole and a second  $30$ -ft  $[9.1 \text{ m}]$  F2 borehole [\(Figure 3](#page-18-2)[, same d](#page-18-4)iameter), both with grouted distributed fiber-optic sensors. The F1 and F2 boreholes in BATS 2 have the same relative orientation and distance to the HP borehole as in BATS 1. Each F borehole has four fibers: one for DTS and three others for DSS. Both types of fibers are protected with a braided steel sheath and polymer coatings to improve their durability during the experiment. The DTS fibers are inside a gel-filled tube to reduce sensitivity to strains. All fibers are attached to the outside of a 0.75-inch [19.1 mm] PVC conveyance pipe and grouted into the borehole. Efforts were made to arrange the strain fibers at 0-, 90-, and 180-degree circumferential positions clockwise from vertically up [\(Figure 11\)](#page-27-6). [Additi](#page-27-8)onal thermocouples (four in borehole F1 and eight in F2) were grouted in with the fibers for calibration and verification of DTS data [\(Table A-3](#page-68-0)[\). After](#page-68-2) grouting, the fiber optic sensors were well-coupled with the salt formation. The straight DSS fiber measures longitudinal strain along its length. The DTS measurements can be validated or calibrated against thermocouple observations in the same borehole. The fibers are connected to an eight-channel Luna fiber interrogator (ODiSi 6108) that reads the fibers hourly, located in an enclosure in the drift. The thermocouples are read at 10-minute averages using a Campbell Scientific CR1000X datalogger.



<span id="page-27-8"></span><span id="page-27-7"></span><span id="page-27-6"></span><span id="page-27-3"></span>**Figure 11. Fiber installation details in F1 and F2 boreholes of BATS 2 heated array. Green circles are DSS fibers; red circles are DTS fibers (Rutqvist et al., 2023).**

## <span id="page-27-0"></span>**3.6 D (Tracer Source) Borehole**

There is one 15-ft  $[4.6 \text{ m}]$  (2.1-inch [5.3 cm] diameter) D borehole [\(Figure 3](#page-18-2)[\) with a](#page-18-4) 2.1-foot  $[64 \text{ cm}]$  long 1.9-inch [4.8 cm] diameter IPI packer inflated in the borehole (with the back of the packer set at 1.53 m depth). The packer sealing element is inflated to 80 psi [5.5 bar] above atmospheric pressure when in use. The BATS 2 D borehole has the same relative orientation and distance to the central HP borehole as in BATS 1. The BATS 2 D tracer borehole has been used for permeability testing to date, using UHP argon to pressurize behind the borehole. Gas tracer tests with other tracers are planned during later phases of BATS 2.

## <span id="page-27-4"></span><span id="page-27-1"></span>**3.7 SM (Liquid Sample) Borehole**

A 15-ft [4.6 m] long and 2.1-inch [5.3 cm] diameter liquid sampling borehole (SM; see [Figure 3](#page-18-2)[\) is](#page-18-4) [plu](#page-18-4)gged with a mechanical packer beyond major fractures near the drift wall (the back of the packer is set at 1.35 m depth). The mechanical packer has a Campbell Scientific EE181-L air temperature and RH probe (TRH) behind it to confirm equilibrium of the air in the borehole with formation brine behind the plug. An RH in the range 70% to 75% indicates there is not significant mine ventilation (typically <50% RH) reaching the interval behind the packer, which would remove liquid water and impact the brine composition and water isotopes. The TRH probes are logged using a Campbell Scientific CR1000X datalogger.

Through the pass-through in the plug, a 0.25-inch [6.4 mm] stainless steel tube extends to the back of the borehole, which is the lowest elevation point in the borehole. The tube is sealed into the plug passthrough with plumber's putty. When not being sampled, the sampling tube is valved off at the drift face.

Approximately weekly, the valve on the 0.25-inch [6.4 mm] stainless-steel tube is opened to attempt to collect a liquid-phase sample from the tube that extends to the back of the borehole. A Nalgene polypropylene fluid-transfer closure is used to connect a portable vacuum pump to the permanent 0.25 inch stainless steel tube. The closure is connected to a larger (1 L) Nalgene sample collection bottle. This larger sample collection bottle is used to fill smaller sample bottles for delivery to the SNL and LANL geochemistry labs for analysis. The total volume of brine collected is estimated via graduated cylinder and recorded.

### <span id="page-27-5"></span><span id="page-27-2"></span>**3.8 SL (Seal) Borehole**

The 11.5-ft [3.5 m] deep SL borehole has a pair of composite lab-constructed cement seals emplaced and sealed behind a mechanical packer (the back of the packer is set at 1.05 m depth). The BATS 2 heated SL borehole is deeper than the SL borehole was in BATS 1, but it is at the same position and distance relative to the central HP borehole as was in BATS 1. The borehole was deepened from a length of 8 ft [2.44 m]

in BATS 1, to get the seal emplaced closer to the heater. The composite seal was constructed in a single cylindrical cardboard tube mold of 4.6-inch [11.7 cm] diameter in the laboratory. First the salt concrete seal was constructed at the bottom of the mold, with the sorel cement seal emplaced on top of it after the salt concrete had cured for 28 days [\(Figure 12](#page-28-0)[\). Salt c](#page-28-2)oncrete and sorel cement seals were emplaced, with plans to eventually over-core and remove them for comparison of the two seals' relative reactions to hot brine exposure and mechanical loading due to creep closure.



#### <span id="page-28-2"></span><span id="page-28-1"></span><span id="page-28-0"></span>**Figure 12. BATS 2 lab-constructed composite seal emplaced in SL borehole. Salt concrete (left) and sorel cement (right) were constructed in a single mold. Thermocouple (red) and strain gauge (gray) wires are visible coming out of the drift-side of the plug on the right. Ruler marked in inches.**

The sorel cement used a slightly different recipe than in BATS 1 (less salt aggregate and different MgO; Kuhlman et al., 2022), mostly because of a change in MgO source material. The salt concrete recipe used was the same as in BATS 1. The order of the two seals in the borehole was also switched (salt concrete in back, sorel cement in front) relative to the order in BATS 1 because of delays associated with procuring MgO.

The cement seals each have a Vishay Precision Group (VPG) concrete embedment (EGP-5-12 or "waffle") gauge estimating strain [\(Figure 13](#page-29-8)[\) with th](#page-29-10)ermocouples embedded in the cement near the strain gauges. These sensors were embedded into the cement seals in the laboratory, and the seal was installed in the SL borehole to respond when the salt eventually closes in around it. The laboratory-made seals fit in the horizontal SL boreholes with a 0.25-inch [6.4 mm] or smaller gap. The seals were pushed back into the borehole to make contact with the back of the seal borehole, and a 4-foot [1.2 m] mechanical packer with a pass-through for wires was used to seal the borehole near the drift from mine ventilation. A TRH probe (Campbell Scientific EE181-L) was installed behind the mechanical packer to monitor the RH and air temperature between the packer and seal, confirming the isolation of the interval from mine ventilation (i.e., maintenance of near 75% RH). The sensor wires pass through the mechanical packer and the remaining gap between the wires was sealed with plumber's putty.

The strain gauges in the cement plugs serve two purposes. First, they should provide an indication of when the borehole creeps closed around the cement plug, causing the cement plug to deform. Secondly, once the salt has made contact and loaded with the plug, the strain in the cement plug provides some information on the stress state in the rock (i.e., the stress-strain behavior of the cement plug is assumed to be relatively well-known). The strain gauges, thermocouples, and hygrometer are monitored with a Campbell Scientific CR1000X datalogger.



#### <span id="page-29-10"></span><span id="page-29-9"></span><span id="page-29-8"></span>**Figure 13. Cross-sectional of BATS 2 SL borehole showing relative positions of plugs, strain gauges (green), thermocouples (red), TRH probe (black), and mechanical packer.**

### <span id="page-29-5"></span><span id="page-29-2"></span>**3.9 In-Drift Observations**

Ambient drift air pressure, air temperature, ventilation (i.e., "wind") speed, and RH are monitored in the drift between the BATS 1 unheated and BATS 2 heated arrays. Temperature is also monitored on the drift wall to provide information on how the heat from the tests interacts with the ambient drift air. Barometric pressure fluctuations can impact migration of gases during permeability and tracer tests. The weather station and drift thermocouples are monitored by a Campbell Scientific CR1000X datalogger.

#### <span id="page-29-1"></span><span id="page-29-0"></span>**4. BATS 2 Borehole Observations**

Previous BATS 1 reports (Kuhlman et al., 2020; 2021b) focused on data collected January 2020 to August 2021, which include several heater tests and tracer tests. In this section, we mostly present BATS 2 data from the BATS 2a heating period (July to August 2022) until summer 2023. Additional BATS 1 and 2 data will be presented in subsequent reports and journal manuscripts after analyses are complete.

#### <span id="page-29-6"></span><span id="page-29-3"></span>**4.1 Data from Central Heater/Packer Boreholes**

Dry UHP  $N_2$  gas is circulated through the interval isolated behind the HP packer. The gas inflow location is at the back of the borehole (i.e., the inlet gas is directed to the area behind both heater reflectors through a 0.25-inch [6.4 mm] stainless steel tube), and the gas outflow location is on the back of the packer [\(Table 2](#page-21-2)[\). The](#page-21-4) mass flowrate of gas into the interval behind the packer is controlled by an Omega flow controller between the N<sub>2</sub> gas bottle regulator (set to approximately 20 psi [1,379 mbar] gauge pressure) and the packer. The flowrate of gas out of the packer-isolated interval is measured immediately downstream of the packer with an Omega MPFM, which measures mass flowrate, temperature, and pressure.

#### <span id="page-29-7"></span><span id="page-29-4"></span>**4.1.1 HP: Gas stream pressure and flowrate time series**

[Figure 14](#page-31-0) [shows th](#page-31-2)e time series of gas stream mass flowrate (the active flow controller upstream and the passive mass flowmeter downstream of the packer for both heated and unheated arrays) averaged every 10 minutes by Campbell CR1000X dataloggers. The legends and titles in [Figure 14](#page-31-0) [and subs](#page-31-2)equent figures use the naming convention of variables in the data spreadsheets used by the WIPP TCO. In these variables, heated or unheated array are indicated by a starting letter "H" or "U". The next letters relate to the borehole (in this case "HP"), and "GQUp" and "GQDown" refer to gas "G" flowrate "Q" up and downstream of the HP packer (see [Figure 14](#page-31-0)[\).](#page-31-2)

[In th](#page-31-2)e time series plots, the minor tick-marks indicate weeks (each Monday). The colored dots indicate individual 10-minute average values, while lines of the same color are used to connect dots but may not be representative of the value between averages. The colored vertical stripes are common across all timeseriesfigures and are associated with key testing events listed in

[Table](#page-31-3) [3. The pin](#page-32-4)k bar indicates when gas flow started (at a higher flowrate to remove excess water, "Q"), the blue bar indicates a planned WIPP power maintenance activity (all data collection and gas flow stopped, "W"). The gray bar is the BATS 2a (first) heating event, "a", the magenta bar is the BATS 2b (second) heating event, "b", the dark blue bar is the BATS 2c (third) heating event, "c", and the yellow bar is the BATS 2d (fourth) heating event, "d". The lighter gray bar is the period when the HP packer was out of the borehole, "p". These events are labeled with letters in [Figure 14](#page-31-0) [for clar](#page-31-2)ity of explanation but are not labeled with letters on subsequent figures.



<span id="page-31-2"></span><span id="page-31-1"></span><span id="page-31-0"></span>**Figure 14. Gas stream mass flowrates (GQ) up- and down-stream of HP packer for heated (H) and unheated (U) arrays.**

In [Figure 14](#page-31-0) [the mass](#page-31-2) flowrates of gas upstream and downstream of the packers are close to the same (red vs. green for unheated and black vs. blue for heated) during most of the data record. Before the BATS 2a heating event ("a") the downstream flowrate (black) is slightly higher than the upstream rate (blue) in the heated array, for unknown reasons. During BATS 2d the downstream gas flowrate in the heated array is erroneously low (~0.02 std L/min), likely due to water condensation on the MPFM instrument caused by the high water-production rate during the hottest heater test event. After BATS 2d the downstream flowrate is slightly lower than the upstream flowrate in the unheated array, which is not as expected (the unheated array should not be impacted by the heater test in the adjacent array).

<span id="page-31-3"></span>Differences can be observed between the upstream and downstream mass flowrate (standard liters per minute, with standard temperature for Omega equipment being 21 °C) and a non-zero flowrate was reported when gas was not being flowed (before 25 April 2022). Values at or below ~0.01 std L/min likely correspond to zero flow.

<span id="page-32-0"></span>

Event	Color	Begin	End
Higher gas flowrate to initially dry out HP boreholes	<b>Pink</b>	25 Apr 2022 12:30	16 May 2022 09:00
WIPP power maintenance	<b>Blue</b>	27 Jun 2022 08:30	05 Jul 2022 10:15
BATS 2a heater test (90 °C)	<b>Black</b>	20 Jul 2022 08:29	10 Aug 2022 07:38
Aborted BATS 2b heater test (<1 hour)	Cyan	24 Aug 2022 07:53	24 Aug 2022 08:45
BATS 2b heater test (115 °C setpoint)	Magenta	07 Sep 2022 14:52	28 Sep 2022 08:02
BATS 2c heater test (130 °C setpoint)	Dark Blue	12 Oct 2022 10:01	02 Nov 2022 11:43
Aborted BATS 2d heater test (~1.5 days)	Maroon	16 Nov 2022 07:30	17 Nov 2022 17:02
HP Packer out of borehole	Gray	22 Nov 2022 09:45	30 Nov 2022 08:05
BATS 2d heater test (140 °C setpoint)	Yellow	8 Mar 2023 09:20	29 Mar 2023 09:36

<span id="page-32-4"></span><span id="page-32-2"></span>**Table 3. BATS 2 events associated with colored bars in timeseries figures.**

[Figure 15](#page-32-1) [shows th](#page-32-5)e time series of air pressure in the tubing between the packer and the switching solenoids for the heated and unheated arrays measured at the MPFM and averaged every 10 minutes on the Campbell dataloggers. [Figure 16](#page-33-2) [shows th](#page-33-4)e time series of air temperature in the tubing upstream and downstream of the HP borehole packer (upstream of the switching solenoids), measured at the MPFM and averaged every 10 minutes on the Campbell dataloggers. Gas pressure rose above nominal levels when the gas flowrate was highest at the beginning of gas flow (late April into early May 2022) and during BATS 2d. Gas stream temperatures show effect of changes in ambient temperature, with few additional fluctuations visible.



<span id="page-32-5"></span><span id="page-32-3"></span><span id="page-32-1"></span>**Figure 15. Gas stream pressure downstream of HP packers; "FlowLn" indicates flowline.**



<span id="page-33-4"></span><span id="page-33-3"></span><span id="page-33-2"></span>**Figure 16. Gas temperature up- (red) and down-stream (green) of HP packers (unheated array top, heated array bottom).**

#### <span id="page-33-1"></span><span id="page-33-0"></span>**4.1.2 HP: Water content time series**

Water content is measured at multiple locations downstream of the HP packers. The gas flowing into the packer-isolated interval is assumed dry (UHP  $N_2$ ). The flowrate of water recovered from behind the packer is determined using a combination of the gas mass flowrate and the concentration of water in the gas measured by two LI-COR 850 instruments (both heated and unheated) recording data at 10-minute averages [\(Figure 17](#page-34-0) [and](#page-34-4) [Figure 18](#page-34-1)[\). The co](#page-34-5)ncentration of water is also measured by the Picarro CRDS (data at approximately 2-minute intervals), depending on the state of the three-way solenoidal switching valves [\(Figure 21\)](#page-38-0). [Finally](#page-38-2), both branches of the gas system have Campbell EE181-L TRH probes measuring in-line air temperature and RH at 10-minute average [\(Figure 19](#page-35-0)[\) before](#page-35-2) and after pairs of heated stream and unheated stream desiccant canisters on each branch, which are weighed once or twice weekly [\(Figure 20](#page-36-2)[\) as an i](#page-36-4)ndependent check on the calculation of the total mass of water leaving the borehole system from the high-frequency flowrate data.



<span id="page-34-0"></span>**Figure 17. LI-COR water concentrations. Red is unheated array green is heated array. No initial capital letter is heated array, leading "U" is unheated.**

<span id="page-34-4"></span><span id="page-34-2"></span>

<span id="page-34-5"></span><span id="page-34-3"></span><span id="page-34-1"></span>**Figure 18. LI-COR CO2 concentrations. Red is unheated array green is heated array. No initial capital letter is heated array, leading "U" is unheated.**

The LI-COR data reported in the FY22 report (Kuhlman et al., 2022) were erroneous (until 6 September 2022) and are left out [Figure 17](#page-34-0) and [Figure 18](#page-34-1)[. The ins](#page-34-5)truments were far out of calibration and required servicing by the manufacturer.

The water concentrations reported by the LI-COR [\(Figure 17](#page-34-0)[\) show in](#page-34-4)creasing water concentration during the BATS 2b through BATS 2d heater tests. The LI-COR shows a spike in water concentration at the beginning of the BATS 2b heater test, with declining concentration during the remaining 3 weeks of the heater test. During BATS 2c and BATS 2d, the water concentration was consistently higher during the entire heating event.

During BATS 2d, the LI-COR on the unheated array showed a brief spike in water concentrations up to those experienced in the heated array. This spike corresponded to the replacement of a MPFM on the

unheated array, opening the array to the drift air briefly. The drop in water concentration after BATS 2d is partially due to the increase in gas flowrate used to dry out the system after water had apparently condensed in the tubing, leading to erroneous MPFM pressure readings. The LI-COR reported lower water concentrations during the period the packer was out of the heated HP borehole, which is consistent with the relative humidity of the drift air.

The spikes in the LI-COR output in May and June 2023 are due to power outages in the experimental area underground at WIPP. During extended outages, the gas flow stops since the flow controllers are electrically powered, and they default to the off position (no flow) when they are not supplied power.

The LI-COR also measures  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  concentrations [\(Figure 18](#page-34-1)[\), which](#page-34-5) were at approximately atmospheric levels while the heated HP packer was out of the borehole (400 ppm), as expected. During BATS 2b, there was a minimal change in the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  concentration, but there was a small spike and subsequent decay at the beginning of the third heating event, and a larger spike and decay at the beginning of BATS 2d. These spikes and decays likely are caused by  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  desorbing from the borehole wall or exsolving from brine at elevated temperatures.



<span id="page-35-2"></span><span id="page-35-1"></span><span id="page-35-0"></span>**Figure 19. RH up- (red) and down-stream (green) of the unheated array (top) and heated array (bottom) desiccant.**

Relative humidity (RH) time series are measured both upstream and downstream of the Drierite desiccant canisters [\(Figure 19](#page-35-0)[\). These](#page-35-2) RH sensors are downstream of the second set of solenoid valves [\(Figure 6](#page-22-2)[\).](#page-22-4)
[The u](#page-22-1)pstream RH in the unheated array was elevated at the end of BATS 2d (and to a lesser degree during BATS 2c), which supports the spike reported by the LI-COR. The upstream RH measurements are in the portion of the gas plumbing that switches between heated and unheated (gray lines in [Figure 6](#page-22-0)[\), and t](#page-22-1)hey show more significant cross-contamination than the LI-COR, which is upstream of the switching. The downstream RH is mostly  $\leq 1\%$  (green curves), except when the gas is not flowing (before 25 April) and briefly after the power outage in June to July 2022 or May to June 2023, especially for the unheated array.

The desiccant water production data is listed in [Table A-10](#page-81-0) [\(heated](#page-81-1) array) and [Table A-11](#page-84-0) [\(unheated](#page-84-1) array) and presented graphically in [Figure 20.](#page-36-0) [After t](#page-36-1)he early high flowrate period (pink shaded area) and before BATS 2b (magenta shaded area), the unheated array produced similar amounts of brine to the heated array. At early times the newly drilled BATS 2 heated array was producing more brine because the borehole was fresh. After BATS 2b (and even more between BATS 2c and 2d) brine production likely increased due to induced damage from heating and cooling cycles.

Both arrays show a spike in water production after the power outage in June to July 2022 and May to June 2023, when gas flow stopped. This is likely due to an accumulation of a small amount of standing water in the boreholes during the stoppage of gas flow. The unheated array showed a spike in water production during BATS 2d, which is like the data seen in the RH sensors and LI-COR during this period. This supports the hypothesis that some of the large amount of water produced during this test went into the unheated array tubing. Water concentration in the unheated array rose to levels in the heated array  $(-0.025 \text{ g H}_2\text{O/L air})$  near the end of the heating period.

Notably, there was not a significant inflow of brine observed in the heated array after the shutdown of the heater during the BATS 2 heater tests.



<span id="page-36-1"></span><span id="page-36-0"></span>**Figure 20. Desiccant water production concentration (top) and cumulative water mass (bottom) data.**

### **4.1.3 HP: Water isotopic composition time series**

The Picarro CRDS measures concentration of different isotopes of water vapor in the  $N_2$  stream (i.e., oxygen and hydrogen isotopes) at approximately two-minute intervals. The raw Picarro time series

[\(Figure 21\)](#page-38-0) [shows s](#page-38-1)imilar trends as the LI-COR 850 data [\(Figure 17\)](#page-34-0). [More de](#page-34-1)tailed analysis of fieldcollected brine samples, fluid inclusions, and field water isotope data can be found in the 2023 LANL M3 report (Guiltinan et al., 2023).

[Figure 21](#page-38-0) [clearly s](#page-38-1)hows the change in reported isotopes with changing Picarro CRDS instruments. At the end of BATS 2dt, the water concentration values measured by the Picarro were well above the calibration range; therefore, the gas flowrate was increased to dilute the water vapor with dry  $N_2$ . By the time this was observed, there was likely already water condensed in the tubing. In future tests, the gas flow rate will be increased before testing at high temperatures to help prevent condensation from happening.



<span id="page-38-1"></span><span id="page-38-0"></span>**Figure 21. Picarro CRDS raw data on water concentration (top), oxygen isotopes (middle), and hydrogen isotopes (bottom). Data included from both heated and unheated arrays (data stream switches 2× per day). Data before September from original Picarro instrument, data after November 2022 from new Picarro instrument.**

Using laboratory measurements of water isotopes in fluid inclusions taken from BATS core (discussed in detail in Guiltinan et al., 2023), some estimates were made of the fraction of the brine flowing into the BATS 2 heated HP borehole, based upon the isotopic signature [\(Figure 22](#page-39-0)[\). Less t](#page-39-1)han 30% of the total brine could be attributed to fluid inclusions, using the mixing model illustrated in [Figure 22](#page-39-0)[a. Some](#page-39-1) [e](#page-39-1)vaporation models were used to predict that amount of evaporation needed to explain the observed isotopic data from BATS 2 [\(Figure 22](#page-39-0)[b\), showin](#page-39-1)g the data could be explained by physically realistic evaporation models.



<span id="page-39-1"></span><span id="page-39-0"></span>**Figure 22. Isotopic variation of water composition in BATS 2 brines related to (a) fraction of fluid inclusion contribution and (b) evaporation models (Guiltinan et al., 2023). In this figure, "Phase 4" corresponds to the aborted BATS 4d heating event (Nov 2022), and "Phase 5" corresponds to full BATS 4d heating event (Mar 2023).**

#### **4.1.4 HP: Gas composition time series**

The gas stream from the Picarro CRDS flows into an SRS QMS-200 Gas Analyzer, which analyzed the gas stream for compositional changes with time. The gas analyzer is operating in "P vs. T" mode, which monitors the partial pressure of several gases, using an electron multiplier. [Figure 23](#page-40-0) [shows th](#page-40-2)e relative reported ion current for three key gases, normalized by the ion current reported for  $N_2$  (to adjust for differences in pressure of the input gas stream).

The gas analyzer was sent back to the manufacturer for repairs from December 2022 through January 2023. The dynamic range of the instrument was expanded significantly after replacing the electron multiplier and the ionizer. Significant breakthrough of argon was observed at the end of BATS 2d (using the repaired gas analyzer, [Figure 24\)](#page-40-1). [No sig](#page-40-3)nificant breakthrough of argon was observed associated with the other heating events, but the dynamic range of the SRS gas analyzer was significantly lower. No significant release of helium associated with BATS 2d was seen (none was seen in the other heating events, but similarly the instrument did not have the expected dynamic range, either during the first three heating events – BATS 2a-c). Most of the observed spikes and decays in  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  data are likely representative of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  sorbing to metal inside the instrument vacuum chamber, rather than  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  being released from the salt (i.e., compare to LI-COR  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  values, [Figure 18\)](#page-34-2). [The st](#page-34-3)ep increase in  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ concentration reported at the beginning of BATS 2d may correspond to the step observed using the LI-COR, while other spikes and decays can be related to restarts of the instrument and its turbomolecular pump after a power outage.



<span id="page-40-2"></span><span id="page-40-0"></span>**Figure 23. SRS Gas Analyzer observations from HP gas stream. Plot clearly shows difference in data before (2022) and after (2023) repairs. Only heated array data shown.**



<span id="page-40-3"></span><span id="page-40-1"></span>**Figure 24. SRS gas analyzer data since February 2023 (after repairs). Heated array data shown.**

#### **4.1.5 HP: Borehole closure gauge time series**

A linear variable differential transformer (LVDT) was used to measure the diameter of both heated and unheated HP boreholes through time. [Figure 25](#page-41-0) [shows th](#page-41-1)e change in borehole diameter since the beginning of BATS 2. The unheated array shows steady borehole closure (green), while borehole closure gauge in the heated array (red) shows small step changes and change associated with heating and cooling during the BATS 2a heating event. The LVDT on the unheated array stopped working in December 2022.

The jumps in the heated LVDT data may be due to the PEEK bushing sticking against the 1-inch [2.54 cm] steel pipe, when the pipe heats up and expands. This sticking effect was also observed in BATS 1. Some effort was made during BATS 2 construction to lubricate the bushing with high-temperature grease and increase the clearance between these elements to reduce sticking, but this effort was apparently not successful.

When the packer was removed from the heated HP borehole (light gray bar in November 2022), a 0.5 mm reduction in borehole diameter occurred, possibly representing borehole closure occurring once the

inflated packer was removed. The packer (inflated to 80 psi gauge, only 45 cm from the borehole closure instrument; see [Table 2](#page-21-0)[\) likely](#page-21-1) slows down the closure of the borehole compared to an open borehole.



<span id="page-41-1"></span>**Figure 25. Change in diameter of HP boreholes measured by LVDT.**

#### <span id="page-41-0"></span>**4.1.6 HP: Heater power and temperature time series**

The heater controller reports applied current and voltage, apparent heater resistance, and power for the heater, which are critical to characterizing the applied thermal boundary condition [\(Figure 26](#page-42-0)[\). The](#page-42-1) [co](#page-42-1)ntroller also reports the temperature at thermocouples inside the borehole used to control and provide a high temperature safety limit for the heater. In the upper-left panel 4TC\_C\_SP\_Max (green) gives the temperature observed on the setpoint thermocouple, while 4TC\_C\_SP (red) gives the setpoint; they only differ when the borehole is hotter than the heater (i.e., during cooling). These data are used in thermalhydrological-mechanical models to drive the thermal response of the entire system. Only the heated array HP borehole is collecting this time series.

The power measured by the heater controller can be confirmed by using either  $P = VI$  (power from potential and current) or  $P = I^2 R$  (power from current and resistance). Both checks give similar values to those reported directly by the controller, providing some confidence in the internal consistency of the measurements. The heater element resistance increases slightly (33.5 to 34.75 ohm) with each heater test episode, which is a sign the heating element is healthy but aging. Most of the heater controller parameters (aside from thermocouples) are only reported or make sense when the heater is on.

The BATS 1a heater test, which had a setpoint of 120 °C, had an average power of approximately 520 W (after applying a correction to the reported power). [Table 4](#page-43-0) [lists](#page-43-2) the setpoint and controller limit temperatures, steady-state applied power, and temperature in the nearest observation to the heater that is not in the HP borehole (19.3 cm from the center of the heater or 13.2 cm from the HP borehole wall, [Table A-4](#page-70-0)[\), for ea](#page-70-1)ch of the four tests comprising BATS 2 so far.

BATS 2a only applied approximately 200 W to the salt, while BATS 2b applied approximately double that. BATS 2c was similar power levels BATS 1a, at approximately 500 W. BATS 2d applied approximately 700 W to the salt. Some of the data in [Table 4](#page-43-0) [are pl](#page-43-2)otted in [Figure 27.](#page-43-1) [This pl](#page-43-3)ot shows BATS 2d appears to be slightly different from the previous three heating events (between the setpoint thermocouple and the applied power or limit thermocouple temperatures).



<span id="page-42-1"></span>**Figure 26. Heater controller parameters.**

<span id="page-42-0"></span>This difference may be from removing the heated HP packer from the borehole between BATS 2c and BATS 2d, which may have changed how the thermocouple contacts the borehole wall. During the removal and replacement of the heater in November 2022, the controller setpoint and limit thermocouples (see them in [Figure 7](#page-23-0)[\) may ha](#page-23-1)ve cause a change in their contact with the salt, or whether the heater lamp shines on them directly.

<span id="page-43-0"></span>

<span id="page-43-2"></span>**Table 4. Summary of BATS 2 heating events.**

\*At end of each heating event (aborted D heating event was 1.5 days, others were ~3 weeks)



<span id="page-43-3"></span><span id="page-43-1"></span>**Figure 27. Comparison of setpoint to applied power and limit thermocouple reading. Day-long aborted BATS 2d test is indicated with a star.**

### **4.2 D: Continuous Pressure Testing**

The interval behind the inflatable IPI packer in the D borehole was pressurized to 20 psi [1.4 bar] above atmospheric pressure and closed in (i.e., disconnected from the inflation tank). The packer inflation pressure (roughly 80 psi [5.5 bar] above atmospheric) and the pressure of gas in the interval behind the packer are both monitored. [Figure 28](#page-44-0) [shows th](#page-44-1)e gas pressure behind the packer in the D borehole through time.

Initially the interval was pressurized with UHP  $N_2$  (May and July 2022). The drop in pressure just before BATS 2a heater test (20 July) is when N<sub>2</sub>-filled interval was depressurized and re-pressurized with UHP Ar to the same pressure. Argon was used to get tracer travel information from the gas permeability tests, when the argon was observed breaking through by the gas analyzer in the HP borehole.

The slow decrease in pressure behind the D borehole between heating events [\(Figure 28](#page-44-0)[\) can be](#page-44-1) used to constrain the interval relative gas permeability, which appears to increase (i.e., steeper declines) after each successive test. Interpretation of these data is more complex than interpreting single-phase pressure decline since this is movement of gas through a variably brine-saturated fracture system. Gas pressure decline is sensitive to the gas relative permeability of the interval. The relative permeability might change due to fractures opening and closing (i.e., changes in absolute permeability) or due to changes in brine content in fractures (i.e., changes in relative permeability).

The rise in pressure during the BATS 2 a, b, and c heater tests (Figure 28; dark gray, magenta, and dark blue stripes) can be explained by the pressure rise expected due to heating a closed container (i.e., permeability is low enough to prevent significant gas leakage).



<span id="page-44-1"></span>**Figure 28. Interval gas pressure (above atmospheric) for heated D borehole.**

<span id="page-44-0"></span>Adding the atmospheric pressure measured in the drift (red line in [Figure 28](#page-44-0)[\) to the](#page-44-1) gauge gas pressure measurement behind the packer in the heated D borehole (blue line in [Figure 28](#page-44-0)[\) produce](#page-44-1)s the absolute pressure [\(Figure 29](#page-44-2)[\), where](#page-44-3) most of the high-frequency daily fluctuations are now canceled out. Fluctuations of the same magnitude and opposite direction occur in the atmospheric pressure data and the heated D borehole pressure data.



<span id="page-44-3"></span><span id="page-44-2"></span>**Figure 29. Interval gas pressure (absolute) for heated D borehole.**

The pressure response in the heated D borehole between December 2022 and February 2023 had an atypical "concave down" curvature. A pressure decay through a non-deforming, single-phase porous medium should be a concave-up exponential. LANL has recently investigated this response using twophase flow models [\(Figure 30\)](#page-45-0) [to try](#page-45-1) to re-create this atypical response. This figure illustrates the different curvature the data have (blue line), compared to a range of simulations with different material properties and starting liquid saturations (many orange curves). This difference indicates the effective gas permeability of the medium must be changing with time, driven by some process other than gas pressure in the D borehole. Either the solid part of the medium is changing (e.g., fractures opening or closing) and/or brine that was initially blocking gas flow is moving out of the way as flow continues. Additional modeling of this response with discrete fracture networks is also underway (Guiltinan et al., 2023).



<span id="page-45-1"></span><span id="page-45-0"></span>**Figure 30. LANL modeling study to investigate "concave down" pressure response in the heated D borehole December 2022 through February 2023 (Guiltinan et al., 2023).**

Argon was used to pressurize the heated D borehole since the start of the BATS 2a heater test, but no significant Ar was observed breaking through to the heated HP borehole until the BATS 2d heating event in 2023 (but also the dynamic range of the SRS gas analyzer has improved in 2023). Zooming in on BATS 2d, [Figure 31](#page-46-0) [shows th](#page-46-1)e D borehole pressure and the Ar response in the heated HP borehole. The yellow shaded interval is the period the heater was at the 140 ºC setpoint. An hour before turning on the heater, the D packer interval was depressurized, then repressurized to 20 psi gauge [1,379 mbar] pressure  $(-2,350$  mbar absolute pressure) with UHP Ar. The pressure in the heated D interval declined initially as the salt heated up. After approximately three days, the pressure leveled off in the heated D interval, and it held steady until the end of the heating period (with a very slight rise likely due to thermal expansion of the gas as the now-sealed borehole continued to heat).

Immediately after turning off the heater, the gas pressure in the heated D interval fell to a similar pressure it was before the BATS 2d heater test  $(\sim 1.2$  bar absolute pressure), and the normalized Ar-40 signal on the SRS gas analyzer in the heated HP borehole rose 100× above background (despite the 5× increase in  $N_2$  flowrate in the heated HP borehole to remove water, which further dilutes the Ar signal), clearly showing Ar was flowing from the D borehole to the HP borehole in the heated array in response to shutting off the heater. This change may reflect a change in aperture of fractures and effective permeability due to thermal expansion and contraction of the salt.



<span id="page-46-1"></span><span id="page-46-0"></span>**Figure 31. Absolute pressure in heated D borehole (blue) shown with normalized Ar response in HP borehole measured with SRS gas analyzer (red).**

### **4.3 AE Data from BATS 2 AE Boreholes**

This section discusses cumulative AE data recorded in the heated BATS 2 array from July 2022 to June 2023. Orange intervals in the figures indicate the extent of heater tests. AE activity increases at the onset of heating, and further increases after heated intervals when the borehole intervals started cooling. Increase in AE activity outside of heated or cooling intervals are believed to be associated with mine activity, like drilling boreholes, vehicles using the N940 drift, and blasting the new utility shaft. Broader responses in energy and frequency are observed during times of increased AE activity. The breaks in the data collection (due to power outages or issues with data due to noisy sensors producing extremely large data files) can also be seen in [Figure 32.](#page-46-2)



<span id="page-46-3"></span><span id="page-46-2"></span>**[Figur](#page-46-3)e 32. Cumulative AE hits over time for BATS 2 heating events. Heated periods marked in orange and labeled. Breaks indicate missing data.**



<span id="page-47-2"></span><span id="page-47-0"></span>**Figure 33. Daily AE hit rate for BATS 2 heating events. Heated periods marked in orange and labeled. Gaps in data more apparent in other AE figures.**

Most of the days with large hit counts are seen to line up with the beginning or ending of heating periods [\(Figure 33](#page-47-0)[\). There](#page-47-2) is an elevated background level since approximately November 2022. The reason for this elevated background level is not fully understood, but it appears to be some type of interference or noise on the sensors.



<span id="page-47-3"></span><span id="page-47-1"></span>**Figure 34. AE energy (μvolt-sec/count) for BATS 2 heating events. Heated periods marked in orange and labeled. Gaps indicate missing data.**

The plot of energy through time [\(Figure 34](#page-47-1)[\) shows mo](#page-47-3)st periods with higher energy ( $10^4$  to  $10^5$  uvoltsec/count) correspond to beginning or ending of heating periods. Low-energy hits were screened out of



<span id="page-48-1"></span><span id="page-48-0"></span>**Figure 35. AE frequency for BATS 2 heating events. Heated periods marked in orange and labeled. Gaps indicate missing data.** 

[Figure 35](#page-48-0) [shows mo](#page-48-1)st events have frequencies in the range 100 to 200 kHz, with excursions up to 300 kHz during events associated with the beginning of heating and cooling. The very high frequencies >400 kHz may be noise.

Located events from the BATS 2a heater test show that activity is concentrated in the array, and most located events are within the receiver borehole array. Timing of events are associated with the heater intervals. There is an initial surge of activity when a heating event starts, which falls to a lower level for the duration of the heater test. Events surge again after the heater is turned off and the borehole intervals begins to cool.





**Figure 36. Located events from the BATS 2a heating event. Depth into the drift is increasing on the y axis. Black triangles are the locations of the receivers, and circles are the locations of identified events. Color scale on the events show the occurrence date.**

### **4.4 T: Temperature Time Series**

Thirty-six sealed Type-K thermocouples are grouted into the two T boreholes, and more thermocouples are co-located with other observations in other boreholes (e.g., AE, F, and SL). RTDs are used in place of thermocouples in the ERT boreholes (E1 through E4). Temperature measurement locations are tabulated in [Table A-3.](#page-68-0)

[The un](#page-68-1)heated array [\(Figure 37](#page-50-0)[\) now sho](#page-50-1)ws regional fluctuations of temperature in the salt, as ERT testing is no longer being conducted in the unheated array. Most of the thermocouples in the ERT boreholes in the unheated array have failed since they were installed in 2019. The BATS 2 heated array is further away from the BATS 1 unheated array than the BATS 1 heated array was [\(Figure 2](#page-16-0)[\), so th](#page-16-1)e effects of the BATS 2 heating events are not observed in the unheated array, as they were in BATS 1. The unheated T1 borehole shows the variation of ambient temperature with depth varies with seasons (an unexplained shift appears to impact the deepest two thermocouples in the UT2 borehole). In the summer, the drift air is warmer than the salt and in the winter the salt is warmer than the drift air. A maximum of 1 ºC difference is observed between TC1 and TC16 in the summer, and approximately 0.75 ºC difference is observed between these thermocouples in the winter. The annual variation in the shallowest thermocouple is approximately 2 °C, and the annual variation in the deepest thermocouple is only 0.7 °C.

An average "deep" salt temperature of 27.88 °C [82.18 °F] is inferred from the average UT1TC16 temperature over a twelve-month period. This is consistent with what has been observed previously at WIPP, but it is clearer in the unheated array data now than it was previously (fewer man-made impacts).



<span id="page-50-1"></span>**Figure 37. Thermocouple data from unheated array.**

<span id="page-50-0"></span>[Figure 38](#page-51-0) [shows te](#page-51-1)mperature data observed in the BATS 2 heated array. Each panel in the plot is a different borehole; curves within each panel show data from different thermocouples. In each borehole thermocouple "TC1" is closest to the drift, "TC2" is deeper in the borehole, etc. Thermocouple and RTD data collected during ERT surveys are not deleted from the BATS 2 dataset (some noise is still observed in the data during ERT surveys each night), as was done in BATS 1.

RTD5 in the BATS 2 heated array AE3 borehole is quite noisy since BATS 2a began, so it was plotted without lines connecting the dots.

The temperature rise observed in TC2 of the heated F1 borehole is the largest temperature rise observed outside the heated HP borehole (approximately 53 ºC rise). This thermocouple is 19.3 cm from the center of the HP heater (13.2 cm from the HP borehole wall).



<span id="page-51-1"></span><span id="page-51-0"></span>**Figure 38. Background temperature data from heated array. Each subplot shows the thermocouples or RTDs from a single borehole.**

## **4.5 E: Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT) Data**

Rutqvist et al. (2023) provide a detailed summary of data collection, inversion, and preliminary analysis of BATS 2 ERT data. Primarily, improvements were made to the model used to invert the data, and there are more electrodes across more boreholes in BATS 2 as compared to BATS 1.

ERT surveys were nominally conducted nightly, but they were not conducted during power outages or periods when there were equipment issues (see surveys on days with asterisks in [Figure 39](#page-52-0)[\). Only](#page-52-2) [p](#page-52-2)resenting the days that have ERT surveys, the raw resistance and the percent change in resistance are shown against time in [Figure 40.](#page-52-1)

[In the](#page-52-3) raw resistance data [\(Figure 40](#page-52-1)[c\), the in](#page-52-3)tra-borehole measurements  $(100$  ohm) are clearly delineated from the inter-borehole measurements (>100 ohm).



<span id="page-52-2"></span><span id="page-52-0"></span>**Figure 39. Time-series of temperatures and average resistance during BATS 2. (a) Temperatures in the HP borehole. (b) Average measured resistance, with ERT survey dates indicated using asterisks (Rutqvist et al., 2023).**



<span id="page-52-3"></span><span id="page-52-1"></span>**Figure 40. Resistance and temperature across all ERT surveys. (a) Temperature, (b) change in resistivity, and (c) raw resistance (Rutqvist et al., 2023).**

#### **BATS FY23 UPDATE** August 2023 **41**



#### <span id="page-53-1"></span><span id="page-53-0"></span>**Figure 41. Baseline resistivity (top) and resistivity changes during or after heating phases. (a) BATS 2a, (b) BATS 2b, (c) BATS 2c, and (d) BATS 2d (Rutqvist et al., 2023).**

[Figure 41](#page-53-0) [shows th](#page-53-1)e results of inversion differenced to illustrate the changes in resistivity associated with heating and subsequent cooling during each of the four heating phases. This figure illustrates the baseline resistivity (top row) and resistivity changes (lower rows) during the four primary BATS 2 heating events (each heating event is a column). To highlight the specific changes in each heating event, the resistivity model before each heating phase is shown as a baseline. Even though the four heating events were quite different in magnitude of temperature change, the results in [Figure 41](#page-53-0) [show simi](#page-53-1)larities, suggesting that it may not have a significant impact on subsequent processes. The four heating events display similar resistivity trend features. The resistivity decreases in the central part, particularly in the area close to the heater  $(\sim3.5\,\text{m})$ , while the resistivity increases in the edge areas. Resistivity is known to change with temperature and brine content. To determine the leading cause of this change in resistivity will require additional analysis.

Additional data, background, and analysis of the ERT data are presented in Rutqvist et al. (2023).

### **4.6 Fiber Optic (F) Data**

A near-continuous data recording was maintained over the course of nine months during the BATS 2 test. The raw data collected are plotted [Figure 42](#page-54-0)[. The poi](#page-54-1)nt where the fiber first meets grout in the wall of the drift is located at approximately 2 meters along the fiber (large strain anomaly), while the heater location is at about 4.5 to 5 meters along the fiber (large temperature anomaly associated with heating events). The variation in entrance location can be attributed to the differing lengths of optical fiber outside the borehole.

The raw temperature and strain measurements obtained by the distributed fiber optic sensing shows a correlation between the deeper strain anomaly (the shallow anomaly being near the drift face where strain associated with room closure is maximum) and the location of increased temperature. Both the strain and

temperature data indicate deformation when the heater was operated three times—in September 2022 (BATS 2b), October 2022 (BATS 2c), and May 2023 (BATS 2d). The simultaneous occurrences of maximum strain and maximum temperature changes at the depth associated with the heater suggest that maximum deformation is due to heating, rather than creep closure of the drift.



<span id="page-54-1"></span><span id="page-54-0"></span>**Figure 42. Raw fiber optic strain (DSS, microstrain) and temperature (DTS, ºC) data (Rutqvist et al., 2023).**

More analysis, including adjusted and calibrated fiber optic data, are presented in Rutqvist et al. (2023).

## **4.7 Liquid Sample Borehole (SM) Data**

### **4.7.1 SM: Air temperature and RH time series**

[Figure 43](#page-55-0) [shows th](#page-55-1)e temperature and RH associated with the behind-the packer interval in the SM and SL boreholes. The right panel shows the air temperature behind the packer rising during the heating portion of the test (red and green curves), while the left panel shows the RH rising during heating in the heated SL borehole (but initially not the heated SM borehole). RH near 75% is indicative of equilibrium between moist air and halite.

The rise in RH behind the packer during heating is likely due to liquid brine being present in the seal borehole, but not the sample borehole (because of repeated removal of any standing brine for geochemical sampling). The upward spikes  $(\sim 1\%)$  in the RH data are in response to power outages. The RH sensor requires a warm-up time each time after the power is disconnected. The downward spikes (1-2%) in the RH data in the SM borehole are associated with sampling attempts. A vacuum pump is connected to the 0.635 cm [0.25 in] tubing to extract any brine standing at the back of the borehole. When air and water are removed from the borehole for sampling, less humid drift air must flow in to replace it.



<span id="page-55-1"></span>**Figure 43. Relative humidity (left) and air temperature (right) for SM and SL boreholes.**

#### <span id="page-55-0"></span>**4.7.2 SM: Liquid brine samples**

Volumes of brine sampled during BATS 2 are listed [Table A-7](#page-76-0) [for all](#page-76-1) boreholes. Brine production volumes through time for the heated SM borehole are plotted in [Figure 44](#page-55-2) [\(see RH](#page-55-3) and air temperature in this borehole as red lines in [Figure 43](#page-55-0)[\). Geoche](#page-55-1)mical data associated with SM samples are listed in [Table](#page-80-0)  [A-9](#page-80-0) [and plot](#page-80-1)ted in [Figure 45](#page-56-0) [and](#page-56-1) [Figure 46.](#page-57-0) [The hea](#page-57-1)ted SM borehole was drilled 9 February 2022 [\(Table](#page-66-0)  [A-1\)](#page-66-0), [and th](#page-66-1)e mechanical packer (as opposed to sewer plug) was installed 13 April 2022 [\(Table A-6,](#page-73-0) [marked b](#page-73-1)y vertical dashed line in SM brine figures).



<span id="page-55-3"></span>**Figure 44. Brine production in heated SM borehole through time.**

<span id="page-55-2"></span>The highest averaged rate of brine production in the SM borehole was observed during heating event BATS 2a. The second highest rate of brine production was just after installing the permanent inflatable packer. The third highest rate of brine production was during heating event BATS 2b.



<span id="page-56-1"></span><span id="page-56-0"></span>**Figure 45. Brine chemistry data through time in heated SM borehole. (top) observed concentrations, (middle) change in concentrations, and (bottom) relative change in concentration.**

[Figure 45](#page-56-0) [shows th](#page-56-1)e wide range of dissolved species tracked in BATS brine samples. The top panel shows over three orders of magnitude between lithium and chloride. The middle panel shows differences in species through time (compared to the median of the first 5 samples), which is mostly dominated by the higher-concentration species (i.e., sodium and chloride), which start deviating before the BATS 2a heater test. The bottom panel shows the relative changes in concentrations (divided by the median of the first 5 samples), which is mostly dominated by changes in more minor species (i.e., calcium), which change most after the BATS 2d heater test. Sulphate appears significant in both the middle and bottom panels. Kuhlman et al. (2018) performed laboratory evaporation experiments and numerical modeling to understand evaporation in a closed system, but the borehole is an open system – more brine flows into the borehole during the tests, while the brine concentrates due to heating.

[Figure 46](#page-57-0) [shows ra](#page-57-1)tios of Na/Cl and K/Mg ion concentrations through time at the SM borehole (see [Table](#page-80-0)  [A-9](#page-80-0) [for data](#page-80-1) in g/L). Molar ratios (computed from value converted from g/L to moles/L through the molar weight) are plotted because they are less sensitive to dilution issues during sample collection (i.e., contamination by a small amount of clean rinse water between sampling events) or during laboratory processing (i.e., during dilution of samples to 100 or 1,000 times, based on requirements of the analytical instrument).

The Na/Cl data show a steady increase with time (the third sample in May 2022 is suspect for crosscontamination during sampling). The K/Mg data show a dip after BATS 2c, followed by an increase to higher than the initial level.



<span id="page-57-1"></span>**Figure 46. Ratios of ions in heated SM borehole brine samples through time.**

<span id="page-57-0"></span>To place these values and changes in context, these SM sample data are plotted in [Figure 47](#page-58-0) [against](#page-58-1) other BATS 1 and BATS 2 samples collected, as well as historical Map Unit 0 (MU-0, where BATS 2 is completed), Marker Bed 139 (MB-139, approximately 1 to 2 m below where BATS 2 is completed), and fluid inclusion data. See Roberts et al. (1999) for a detailed description of WIPP in-repository stratigraphy.

The two samples that show the lowest K/Mg ratio (early 2023) appear more like the BATS 1 data collected previously (see two red dots in [Figure 47](#page-58-0) [that are](#page-58-1) located inside the pink "BATS 1" box). This change in brine chemistry also occurs within a few months after the marked increase in gas permeability (faster declines in argon gas pressure behind the packer, reported in [Figure 29](#page-44-2)[\) observe](#page-44-3)d in the heated D borehole. One possible explanation is that fractures created during heating and cooling during the BATS 2c and aborted BATS 2d test in November 2022 created pathways that connected to the horizon associated with BATS 1 (i.e., MU-3), which then allowed brine to drain down towards the heated D and SM boreholes over the course of the following months (although the rate of brine production in the SM borehole did not change significantly during this time, [Figure 44](#page-55-2)[\). This m](#page-55-3)igration of brine might have reduced the permeability of newly opened fractures to gas (possibly even contributing to the "concave down" behavior observed in the heated D borehole pressure response; see [Figure 30](#page-45-0)[\) and cou](#page-45-1)ld have changed the brine chemistry observed in the heated SM borehole. Another possible explanation for the changes in brine chemistry could be the changes in temperature, related to the temperature-dependent solubility of the salt.



<span id="page-58-1"></span><span id="page-58-0"></span>**Figure 47. BATS SM brine chemistry timeseries (red circles) plotted with historic fluid inclusions, BATS 1, and WIPP historic brine MU-0, MB-139, and MB-140 (Krumhansl et al., 1990). Sample data converted from g/L in Appendix to moles/L before computing ratios.**

### **4.8 Seal Borehole Data**

The new BATS 2 seals were emplaced as part of the BATS 2 construction, while the unheated seals from BATS 1 are still in place and will remain in place longer, with over-coring of both sets of seals occurring at a future date (possibly during preparations for BATS 3).

### **4.8.1 SL: Air temperature and RH time series**

[Figure 43](#page-55-0) [shows th](#page-55-1)e air temperature and relative humidity data associated with the SL boreholes. Unlike the SM boreholes, the relative humidity behind the packer rises in the SL borehole in response to heating. This could likely be due to standing brine in the borehole being removed from the SM borehole by vacuum pump, while brine in the SL borehole would remain, and would tend to saturate parts the emplaced seals with time.

### **4.8.2 SL: Strain and temperature time series**

The lab-constructed seals were instrumented with embedded strain gauges to observe strain in the salt once the borehole has closed in and made contact on the laboratory-fabricated cement plugs. The vibrating-wire GEOKON strain gauges installed in seals as part of BATS 1 in the unheated seal have failed and are no longer reporting valid values. The VPG strain gauges in the unheated seal are still working (blue line in [Figure 48\)](#page-59-0), [and th](#page-59-1)e data show a change in slope in December 2022. This is interpreted to mean the borehole has crept shut against the unheated seal, so now the sample is showing a higher strain rate under the now-increase stress in the seal. This strain gauge was installed as part of

BATS 1 in 2019 and is embedded in the salt concrete portion (see detailed description in Kuhlman et al., 2020) of the unheated SL composite seal. It has taken roughly three years for the borehole to close in on the salt concrete seal. Similar VPG strain gauges in the sorel and salt concrete seals in the heated SL boreholes (red and green lines in [Figure 48](#page-59-0)[\) show cl](#page-59-1)ear straining in response to heating events. In May 2023, after BATS 2d, the VPG gauge in the heated sorel cement seal saw a similar increase in strain rate, followed by another jump at the end of June 2023. It has taken roughly one year for the borehole to close in on the BATS 2 heated sorel seal.



<span id="page-59-1"></span>**Figure 48. Strain (top) and temperature (bottom) inside cement plugs in SL borehole.**

<span id="page-59-0"></span>In heater event BATS 2d, the Sorel plug experienced a change in temperature of approximately 22 ºC (green curve in bottom of [Figure 48](#page-59-0)[\), and a](#page-59-1) change in strain of approximately 425 microstrains (red curve in top of [Figure 48](#page-59-0)[\). This t](#page-59-1)ranslates to a coefficient of volume expansion of 19 microstrains/ºC, or a coefficient of linear expansion of 6.4 microstrains/ºC, which agrees reasonably with the value of 5.18 microstrains/ºC in the literature for 5-1-8 Sorel cement below 180 ºC (Pavlíkov et al., 2020). The coefficient of thermal expansion of halite is approximately twice as high, at 13 microstrains/ºC (Wang & Reeber, 1996).

## **4.9 In-Drift Time Series**

Weather station measurements were made in the N-940 drift. [Figure 49](#page-60-0) [shows](#page-60-1) 10-minute average air temperature, RH, barometric pressure, and air speed near the datalogger enclosures. Drift air temperature increased during the observation period, associated with summer weather. The RH generally rises from spring into summer, associated with changing seasons on the surface, since air from the surface is

ventilated through the mine. Large changes in ventilation air speeds are likely due to changes in routing of ventilation in the WIPP underground, which are due to ventilation needs and proximity of other activities in WIPP (e.g., mining or rock bolting). Lower ventilation air speeds occur at night when fewer personnel are underground at WIPP. Barometric pressure fluctuations generally stay between 960 and 970 mbar, with higher-amplitude fluctuations in winter and spring.

The air temperature in the drift fluctuated approximately 3.5 °C through a 12-month period, but there are spikes of higher temperatures observed when the mine ventilation is low, possibly due to heat generated by the instrumentation and computers in the N-940 drift at BATS.



<span id="page-60-1"></span><span id="page-60-0"></span>**Figure 49. In-drift barometric pressure (top left), air speed (top right), air temperature (bottom left), and RH (bottom right) during BATS 2.**

### **5. Summary**

This report presents the observations from the Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) field test in the underground at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). We presented the motivation and technical background for creating coupled process field experiments in salt, along with summarizing data collected from the first four heating phases of BATS 2 (heating events a-d). Brine is important to radioactive waste disposal safety as brine leads to corrosion of waste packages and waste forms, is the primary offsite transport vector, can resist final elimination of excavation porosity by creep closure, and presents a high chlorine concentration environment enabling reduced risk of in-package nuclear criticality. The main goals of the BATS field test are to collect data that lead to better understanding and possible confirmation of model predictions related to brine availability in bedded salt and to train a new generation of scientists and technicians on the use of underground research labs in the US for radioactive waste disposal.

The report describes the first four heating events of BATS 2. Eight of the boreholes have instrumentation grouted into them (T1, T2, E1, E2, E3, E4, F1 and F2), while four of the remaining boreholes are isolated with inflatable or mechanical packers (HP, D, SM, SL). The four AE boreholes are not grouted or sealed with packers. BATS 2a was conducted in July and August of 2022, with BATS 2b and BATS 2c following short cool-down periods in September and October 2022. Some equipment related delays (related to the gas analyzer, ERT, and Picarro) pushed BATS 2d to March 2023.

In each array, electrical resistivity electrodes in the four E boreholes are used to interrogate changes in apparent resistivity through time due to brine migration and temperature variation. The ERT system has shown a sensitivity to the migration and distribution of brine during and after heating. The four AE boreholes contain decentralized piezoelectric transducers for monitoring the timing and locating the source of AE in the salt. The two T boreholes, along with temperature measurements in most of the other boreholes, are used to monitoring the spatial and temporal variability of temperature around the heater. Aside from a few interactions between the ERT system and the thermocouples (which led to premature failure of most of the thermocouples in the unheated ERT boreholes), the sealed Type-K thermocouples being used have proven to be generally robust in the salt environment. The ERT boreholes in BATS 2 use RTDs to reduce the noise previously observed during ERT testing each night, but the RTDs still experience some noise. The SL borehole includes a laboratory-created composite seal (salt concrete and sorel cement), instrumented with strain gauges behind a mechanical packer. The D borehole is pressurized with argon, which is used to test the changing gas permeability of the system (i.e., pressure decay), and monitor breakthrough of gas to the gas analyzer in the HP borehole after BATS 2d. The central HP borehole contains a 1250-Watt heater used to heat a 71-cm interval of the borehole, while moisture is removed with flowing dry nitrogen for in-drift analyses of gas and water isotope composition.

The AE system saw significant activity at the beginning and end of each heating cycle. The ERT system showed systematic changes in resistivity around the heater associated with each heating event. The Picarro CRDS showed changes in water isotopes, possibly related to the change in the relative contribution of fluid inclusions to the overall brine. Both the unheated and heated seals showed evidence for creep closure of the salt and loading of the plug with increased stress. By BATS 2c, the gas permeability had markedly increased, as monitored by gas pressure decline rates in the heated D borehole. A "concave down" pressure response was observed in late 2022, and changes in brine chemistry were observed in the SM borehole. The data are presented in this report with some analyses, but it will take some time to fully understand the coupled thermal, hydrological, mechanical, and chemical processes going on in the BATS 2 array.

The overall theme in BATS 2 is seeing multiple lines of evidence that an accumulation of damage occurs in the salt associated with both heating and cooling to different temperatures. The BATS tests included:

• thermal (changes in temperature due to a range of heat setpoints; ranging from lower to higher temperatures than the BATS 1 test in early 2020);

- hydrological (water production associated with heating and cooling in the HP borehole and gas tracer tests between D and HP boreholes using argon);
- mechanical (closure observations in HP and change in strain rate in the SL boreholes, supplemented by observations of the timing and location of damage through acoustic emissions);
- chemical (water isotope observations through time in HP borehole gas stream and brine chemistry observations through samples made across time in the SM borehole); and
- indirect geophysical responses (electrical resistivity tomography changes due to heating and distributed fiber optic strain and temperature measurements showing effects of both heating and drift closure).

Each of these responses were characteristic of a system changing through damage and brine migration. The focus of BATS is "brine availability", which is related to the occurrence of brine, and the evolution of the flow networks that bring gas and brine to boreholes and excavations.

The large response of brine inflow after the end of the BATS 1 test (Jan-Mar 2020) was notably not observed to the same degree in BATS 2a through BATS 2d. The difference in the response of the system between these tests is a point which will be investigated further in future work.

### **6. Next Stages**

Additional heater tests are planned for the remainder of 2023 and into 2024, building on some of the lessons learned during FY23. To alleviate problems associated with overwhelming the water vapor collection system, we have purchased a new nitrogen regulator that allows multiple bottles of UHP  $N_2$  gas to be connected to the inflow system in parallel. This will allow higher flowrates of gas to be set at the beginning of a heated period, while minimizing the risk of running out of gas over a weekend. We intend to re-run a test like BATS 2d at higher gas flowrates. We also intend to run a test with more gradually increasing start-up and decreasing shut-down heating rates. Current heater tests are essentially a step change on or off. We also want to run a cyclic heater test (this was intended at the end of BATS 1, but there were issues with the heater controller used in that test that didn't allow it to be programmed this way). The new heater controller should allow arbitrary heater power profiles, including gradual ramping up or down over hours or days, or even a smooth sinusoidal heating distribution.

Any future heater tests will continue to use gas permeability tests conducted in the heated D borehole to confirm when changes in apparent gas permeability occur, associated with damage imparted from heating or changes in brine saturation due.

In FY24, we intend to update the BATS 5-year plan (Kuhlman et al., 2021a), which includes plans for BATS 3. This next phase which will involve a series of smaller tests that are not centered around a single borehole. Hopefully this approach will reduce scheduling issues and test interference issues. We hope to continue to develop and test hypotheses associated with brine availability and migration in the excavation damaged zone salt.

BATS 1 provided some key information about the changes in permeability with temperature and damage associated with heating the salt. BATS 2 has further explored the evolution of damage in salt with new instrumentation at a at range of heater temperatures. The BATS series of tests aim to further illuminate the key mechanisms and couplings that govern thermal-hydrological-mechanical-chemical processes and how they relate to key fluid and solid changes (e.g., boiling point of brine or the dewatering point of certain minerals) that would be driven by the emplacement of heat-generating waste into a salt repository.

### **7. References**

- Beauheim, R.L. & R.M. Roberts, 2002. Hydrology and hydraulic properties of a bedded evaporite formation, *Journal of Hydrology, 259*(1–4):66–68.
- Boukhalfa, H., E. Guiltinan, T. Rahn, D. Weaver, B. Dozier, S. Otto, P.H. Stauffer, M. Mills, K. Kuhlman, E. Matteo, C. Herrick, M. Nemer, J. Heath, Y. Xiong, C. Lopez, J. Rutqvist, Y. Wu & M. Hu, 2019. *2019 LANL Experiments and Simulations in Support of Salt R&D*, (34 p.) M3SF-19LA010303014, LA-UR-19–29830, Los Alamos, NM: Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- Davies, C. & F. Bernier [Eds.], 2005. *Impact of the Excavation Disturbed or Damaged Zone (EDZ) on the Performance of Radioactive Waste Geological Repositories*, (359 p.) EUR 21028 EN, Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- Guiltinan, E.J., K.L. Kuhlman, J. Rutqvist, M. Hu, H. Boukhalfa, M. Mills, S. Otto, D.J. Weaver, B. Dozier & P.H. Stauffer, 2020. Temperature response and brine availability to heated boreholes in bedded salt, *Vadose Zone Journal, 19*(1):e20019.
- Guiltinan, E., H. Boukhalfa, C. Campe, J. Davis, D. Eldridge, O. Marina, H. Miller, S. Otto, T. Rahn, A. Stansberry, P.H. Stauffer, K.L. Kuhlman, M. Mills, R. Jayne, E. Matteo, C. Herrick, M. Nemer, J. Heath, Y. Xiong, C. Choens, M. Paul, J. Rutqvist, Y. Wu, H. Tounsi& M. Hu, 2023. *2023 LANL Contributions to the BATS Test in WIPP*, (67 p.) LA-UR-23–29483. Los Alamos, NM: Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- Jordan, A.B., H. Boukhalfa, F.A. Caporuscio; B.A. Robinson & P.H. Stauffer, 2015. Hydrous mineral dehydration around heat-generating nuclear waste in bedded salt formations, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 5:1–13.
- Kuhlman, K.L., 2019. *Processes in Salt Repositories*, (41 p.) SAND19–6441R, Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1559569>
- Kuhlman, K.L. & B. Malama, 2013. *Brine Flow in Heated Geologic Salt*, (128 p.) SAND2013–1944, Carlsbad, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1095129>
- Kuhlman, K.L. & S.D. Sevougian, 2013. *Establishing the Technical Basis for Disposal of Heat-Generating Waste in Salt*, (100 p.) SAND2013–6212P, FCRD-UFD-2013–000233. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Kuhlman, K.L., M.M. Mills & E.N. Matteo, 2017. *Consensus on Intermediate Scale Salt Field Test Design*, (95 p.) SAND2017–3179R, Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1365470>
- Kuhlman, K.L., C.M. Lopez, M.M. Mills, J.M. Rimsza & D.C. Sassani, 2018. *Evaluation of Spent Nuclear Fuel Disposition in Salt (FY18)*, (83 p.) M2SF-18SN010303031, SAND2018–11355R, Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1481605>
- Kuhlman, K., M. Mills, R. Jayne, E. Matteo, C. Herrick, M. Nemer, J. Heath, Y. Xiong, C. Choens, P. Stauffer, H. Boukhalfa, E. Guiltinan, T. Rahn, D. Weaver, B. Dozier, S. Otto, J. Rutqvist, Y. Wu, M. Hu, S. Uhlemann & J. Wang, 2020*. FY20 Update on Brine Availability Test in Salt*, (107 p.) SAND2020–9034R. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1657890>
- Kuhlman, K.L., S. Otto, P. Stauffer & Y. Wu, 2021a. *Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) Extended Plan for Experiments at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)*, (25 p.) SAND2021–3497R. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.<https://doi.org/10.2172/1773028>
- Kuhlman, K., M. Mills, R. Jayne, E. Matteo, C. Herrick, M. Nemer, J. Heath, Y. Xiong, C. Choens, M. Paul, P. Stauffer, H. Boukhalfa, E. Guiltinan, T. Rahn, D. Weaver, S. Otto, J. Davis, J. Rutqvist,

Y. Wu, M. Hu, S. Uhlemann & J. Wang, 2021b*. Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) FY21 Update*, (64 p.) SAND2021–10962R. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories. <https://doi.org/10.2172/1821547>

- Kuhlman, K., M. Mills, R. Jayne, E. Matteo, C. Herrick, M. Nemer, Y. Xiong, C. Choens, M. Paul, C. Downs, D. Fontes, B. Kernen, P. Stauffer, H. Boukhalfa, E. Guiltinan, T. Rahn, S. Otto, J. Davis, M. Carrasco Jr., J. Mata, J. Rutqvist, Y. Wu, H. Tounsi, M. Hu, S. Uhlemann & J. Wang, 2022*. Brine Availability Test in Salt (BATS) FY22 Update*, (82 p.) SAND2022–12142R. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Kuhlman, K., E.N. Matteo, M.M. Mills, R.S. Jayne, J.B. Coulibaly, B. Reedlunn & J. Bean, 2023. *Salt International Collaborations FY23 Update*, (22 p.) SAND2023-07447R. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Olivella, S., S. Castagna, E.E. Alonso & A. Lloret, 2011. Porosity variation in saline media induced by temperature gradients: experimental evidences and modelling. *Transport in Porous Media, 90*:763–777.
- Pavlíková, M., A. Pivák & Z. Pavlík, 2020. "High temperature dilatometric measurements of MOC" in *Thermophysics 25th International Meeting*, Smolenice, Slovokía, 7-9 September 2020.
- Roberts, R.M., R.L. Beauhiem & P.S. Domski, 1999. *Hydraulic Testing of Salado Formation Evaporites at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Site: Final Report,* (288 p.) SAND98–2537, Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Roedder, E., 1984. The fluids in salt. *American Mineralogist, 69*(5–6):413–439.
- Rutqvist, J., M. Hu, H. Tounsi, Y. Wu, C. Steefel, S. Uhlemann, J. Wang, H. Chen & B. Gilbert, 2023. *Salt Coupled THMC Processes Research Activities at LBNL: FY23 Progress* (146 p.) M3SF-23LB010303032, Berkeley, CA: Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.
- Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) & Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), 2020. *Project Plan: Salt in situ Heater Test*, (20 p.) SAND2020– 1251R.
- Stauffer, P.H., A.B. Jordan, D.J. Weaver, F.A. Caporuscio, J.A. Ten Cate, H. Boukhalfa, B.A. Robinson, D.C. Sassani, K.L. Kuhlman, E.L. Hardin, S.D. Sevougian, R.J. MacKinnon, Y. Wu, T.A. Daley, B.M. Freifeld, P.J. Cook, J. Rutqvist & J.T. Birkholzer, 2015. *Test Proposal Document for Phased Field Thermal Testing in Salt,* (104 p.) LA-UR-15–23154, FCRD-UFD-2015–000077. Los Alamos, NM: Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- Wang, K. & R.R. Reeber, 1996. Thermal expansion of alkali halides at high pressure: NaCl as an example. *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals, 23*:354–360.

# **A-1. Appendix: Tabular Data**

Additional data, summarized or exemplified in figures in the main text, are presented here in tabular form.

<span id="page-66-1"></span><span id="page-66-0"></span>



#### **Table A-2. Proposed and as-built coordinates for BATS 2 boreholes. Center of HP borehole at drift face is (0,0,0) of both planned and as-built coordinate systems. +X is west along N-940, +Y is south into the wall, and +Z is vertically up.**

Borehole ID Name Depth [m] Instrument

Borehole ID	Name	Depth [m]	Instrument	F <sub>2</sub>	HF2TC2	2.51	Type K TC
				F <sub>2</sub>	HF2TC3	2.97	Type K TC
E <sub>1</sub>	HE1RTD1	1.52	<b>RTD</b>	F <sub>2</sub>	HF2TC4	3.43	Type K TC
E1	HE1RTD2	2.51	<b>RTD</b>	F <sub>2</sub>	HF2TC5	4.57	Type K TC
E1	HE1RTD3	2.97	<b>RTD</b>	F <sub>2</sub>	HF2TC6	6.86	Type K TC
E <sub>1</sub>	HE1RTD4	3.43	<b>RTD</b>	F <sub>2</sub>	HF2TC7	9.14	Type K TC
E1	HE1RTD5	5.79	<b>RTD</b>	<b>HP</b>	HHPTC1	2.47	Type K TC
E <sub>2</sub>	HE2RTD1	1.52	<b>RTD</b>	HP	HHPTC2	2.81	Type K TC
E <sub>2</sub>	HE2RTD2	2.51	<b>RTD</b>	<b>HP</b>	HHPTC3	2.81	Type K TC
E <sub>2</sub>	HE2RTD3	2.97	<b>RTD</b>	HP	HHPTC4	3.12	Type K TC
E <sub>2</sub>	HE2RTD4	3.43	<b>RTD</b>	<b>HP</b>	HHPTC5	3.12	Type K TC
E <sub>2</sub>	HE2RTD5	5.79	<b>RTD</b>	<b>HP</b>	HHPTC6	3.48	Type K TC
E <sub>3</sub>	HE3RTD1	1.52	<b>RTD</b>	<b>SL</b>	<b>HSL Salt Conc</b>	3.25	Type K TC
E <sub>3</sub>	HE3RTD2	2.51	<b>RTD</b>	<b>SL</b>	<b>HSL Sorel</b>	3.25	Type K TC
E <sub>3</sub>	HE3RTD3	2.97	<b>RTD</b>	T1	T <sub>1</sub> TC <sub>1</sub>	0.30	Type K TC
E <sub>3</sub>	HE3RTD4	3.43	<b>RTD</b>	T1	T <sub>1</sub> T <sub>C2</sub>	0.61	Type K TC
E <sub>3</sub>	HE3RTD5	5.79	<b>RTD</b>	T1	T <sub>1</sub> TC <sub>3</sub>	0.91	Type K TC
E <sub>4</sub>	HE4RTD1	1.52	<b>RTD</b>	T1	T1TC4	1.22	Type K TC
E <sub>4</sub>	HE4RTD2	2.51	<b>RTD</b>	T1	T <sub>1</sub> TC <sub>5</sub>	1.52	Type K TC
E <sub>4</sub>	HE4RTD3	2.97	<b>RTD</b>	T1	T <sub>1</sub> TC <sub>6</sub>	1.83	Type K TC
E <sub>4</sub>	HE4RTD4	3.43	<b>RTD</b>	T1	T <sub>1</sub> TC <sub>7</sub>	2.13	Type K TC
E <sub>4</sub>	HE4RTD5	5.79	<b>RTD</b>	T1	T <sub>1</sub> TC <sub>8</sub>	2.51	Type K TC
<b>SL</b>	<b>HSLTY</b>	1.20	<b>TRH Probe</b>	T1	T <sub>1</sub> TC <sub>9</sub>	2.74	Type K TC
SM	<b>HSMTY</b>	1.50	<b>TRH Probe</b>	T1	T1TC10	2.97	Type K TC
AE1	HAE1TC1	2.44	Type K TC	T1	<b>T1TC11</b>	3.43	Type K TC
AE1	HAE1TC2	2.97	Type K TC	T1	<b>T1TC12</b>	3.66	Type K TC
AE1	HAE1TC3	3.35	Type K TC	T1	<b>T1TC13</b>	3.96	Type K TC
AE2	HAE2TC1	2.44	Type K TC	T1	<b>T1TC14</b>	4.27	Type K TC
AE2	HAE2TC2	2.97	Type K TC	T1	<b>T1TC15</b>	4.57	Type K TC
AE <sub>2</sub>	HAE2TC3	3.35	Type K TC	T1	T1TC16	4.88	Type K TC
AE3	HAE3TC1	2.44	Type K TC	T1	<b>T1TC17</b>	5.18	Type K TC
AE3	HAE3TC2	2.97	Type K TC	T1	T1TC18	5.49	Type K TC
AE3	HAE3TC3	3.35	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> TC <sub>1</sub>	0.30	Type K TC
AE4	HAE4TC1	2.44	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> T <sub>C<sub>2</sub></sub>	0.61	Type K TC
AE4	HAE4TC2	2.97	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> TC <sub>3</sub>	0.91	Type K TC
AE4	HAE4TC3	3.35	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> T <sub>C4</sub>	1.22	Type K TC
F1	HF1TC1	2.51	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> T <sub>C5</sub>	1.52	Type K TC
F <sub>1</sub>	HF1TC2	2.97	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> T <sub>C6</sub>	1.83	Type K TC
F <sub>1</sub>	HF1TC3	3.43	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> TC <sub>7</sub>	2.13	Type K TC
F <sub>1</sub>	HF1TC4	4.57	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> T <sub>C</sub> 8	2.51	Type K TC
F <sub>2</sub>	HF2TC1	1.52	Type K TC	T <sub>2</sub>	T <sub>2</sub> T <sub>C9</sub>	2.74	Type K TC

<span id="page-68-1"></span><span id="page-68-0"></span>**Table A-3. Temperature measurement names and locations.**

#### **BATS FY23 UPDATE** August 2023 57





<u> Termin de la propincia de la</u>

<span id="page-70-1"></span>

<span id="page-70-0"></span>**Table A-4. As-built thermocouple and RTD coordinates. +X is west along N-940; +Y is south into the drift wall; +Z is up. Origin is center of HP borehole at drift face. Assumes sensors in center of a**   $\frac{1}{2}$  $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 

#### **BATS FY23 UPDATE** August 2023 59








### **Table A-6. TCO BATS2 major events (SN is serial number).**



# **BATS FY23 UPDATE**







#### **BATS FY23 UPDATE** August 2023 65



Volumes from sponge collection are estimated without graduated cylinder.

### **Table A-8. BATS 2 brine ionic species composition data, values in g/L. Blue samples collected with vacuum pump; orange samples collected with sponge. SM samples after 2/22/22 in next table.**





### **BATS FY23 UPDATE** August 2023 67



Borehole Species 11/01/21 11/01/21 02/02/22			02/24/22	03/08/22	03/22/22
	Br			3.292	
	SO <sub>4</sub>			21.983	

**Table A-9. BATS 2 brine ionic species composition data for heated SM borehole, values in g/L.**





**Table A-10. Desiccant water production data for heated array.**



# **BATS FY23 UPDATE**



Table A-II. Desiccant water production data for unheated array.									
Date Time Start	Date Time End	$\Delta$ Time	$\Delta H_2O$ mass	Rate of change $H2O$ mass	Upstream gas mass flow rate				
		[day]	[g]	[q/day]	[std mL/min]				
4/25/22 13:18	4/26/22 12:46	0.9778	11.07	11.3216	500				
4/26/22 12:46	4/27/22 10:00	0.8847	9.7	10.9639	500				
4/27/22 10:10	5/2/22 08:30	4.9306	14.61	2.9632	500				
5/2/22 08:30	5/3/22 12:04	1.1486	0.57	0.4963	50				
5/3/22 12:04	5/4/22 07:53	0.8257	0.44	0.5329	50				
5/4/22 07:53	5/5/22 07:43	0.9931	0.68	0.6848	50				
5/5/22 07:43	5/9/22 08:10	4.0188	2.44	0.6072	50				
5/10/22 07:55	5/11/22 09:22	1.0604	0.6	0.5658	50				
5/11/22 09:22	5/16/22 08:30	4.9639	2.67	0.5379	50				
5/16/22 08:36	5/18/22 09:52	2.0528	0.83	0.4043	50				
5/18/22 09:52	5/23/22 08:15	4.9326	1.93	0.3913	50				
5/23/22 08:15	5/24/22 13:51	1.2333	0.58	0.4703	50				
5/24/22 13:51	5/25/22 07:48	0.7479	0.31	0.4145	50				
5/25/22 07:48	5/31/22 08:04	6.0111	1.89	0.3144	25				
5/31/22 08:04	6/2/22 09:08	2.0444	0.78	0.3815	25				
6/2/22 09:08	6/6/22 08:00	3.9528	1.25	0.3162	25				
6/6/22 08:00	6/9/22 08:33	3.0229	1.2	0.397	25				
6/9/22 08:33	6/13/22 08:00	3.9771	1.36	0.342	25				
6/13/22 08:00	6/15/22 07:55	1.9965	0.66	0.3306	25				
6/15/22 07:55	6/22/22 08:30	7.0243	2.58	0.3673	25				
6/22/22 08:30	6/27/22 08:00	4.9792	1.75	0.3515	25				
7/5/22 09:45	7/7/22 08:30	1.9479	1.1	0.5647	25				
7/7/22 08:30	7/11/22 07:55	3.9757	1.79	0.4502	25				
7/11/22 07:55	7/18/22 08:18	7.016	2.74	0.3905	25				
7/18/22 08:18	7/20/22 07:58	1.9861	0.81	0.4078	25				
7/20/22 07:58	7/25/22 08:09	5.0076	2.21	0.4413	25				
7/25/22 08:09	7/26/22 11:32	1.141	0.45	0.3944	25				
7/26/22 11:32	8/1/22 07:55	5.8493	2.46	0.4206	25				
8/1/22 07:55	8/4/22 10:34	3.1104	1.29	0.4147	25				
8/4/22 10:34	8/8/22 08:15	3.9035	1.62	0.42	25				
8/8/22 08:15	8/10/22 07:47	1.9806	0.9	0.45	25				
8/10/22 07:47	8/15/22 07:45	4.9986	2.07	0.41	25				
8/15/22 07:45	8/16/22 10:42	1.1229	0.49	0.44	25				
8/16/22 10:42	8/17/22 07:34	0.8694	0.41	0.4716	25				
8/17/22 07:34	8/22/22 07:40		4.48		25				
		5.0042		0.8953					
8/22/22 07:40	8/24/22 07:28	1.9917	0.81	0.4067	25				
8/24/22 07:28	8/29/22 07:28	5	2.02	0.404	25				
8/29/22 07:28	9/6/22 08:45	8.0535	3.3	0.4098	25				
9/6/22 08:45	9/7/22 14:55	1.2569	0.66	0.5251	25				
9/7/22 14:55	9/12/22 08:40	4.7396	2.2	0.4642	25				
9/12/22 08:40	9/19/22 08:30	6.9931	3.12	0.4462	25				
9/19/22 08:30	9/22/22 09:27	3.0396	1.19	0.3915	25				
9/22/22 09:27	9/26/22 07:30	3.9187	1.7	0.4338	25				
9/26/22 07:30	9/28/22 08:20	2.0347	0.94	0.462	25				
9/28/22 08:20	10/3/22 07:48	4.9778	1.99	0.3998	25				
10/3/22 07:48	10/5/22 08:05	2.0118	0.39	0.1939	25				
10/5/22 08:05	10/12/22 09:54	7.0757	3.6	0.5088	25				
10/12/22 09:54	10/17/22 07:31	4.9007	1.99	0.4061	25				
10/17/22 07:31	10/19/22 07:58	2.0187	0.68	0.3368	25				
10/19/22 07:58	10/24/22 07:33	4.9826	2.48	0.4977	25				
10/24/22 07:33	11/1/22 08:40	8.0465	3.75	0.4660	25				
11/1/22 08:40	11/2/22 11:46	1.1292	0.57	0.5048	25				
11/2/22 11:46	11/3/22 07:54	0.8389	0.09	0.1073	25				
11/3/22 07:54	11/7/22 07:50	3.9972	1.95	0.4878	25				

Table A-11. Designed water production data for unheated





#### **APPENDIX E**

## **NFCSC DOCUMENT COVER SHEET<sup>1</sup>**



**NOTE 1:** *Appendix E should be filled out and submitted with the deliverable. Or, if the PICS:NE system permits, completely enter all applicable information in the PICS:NE Deliverable Form. The requirement is to ensure that all applicable information is entered either in the PICS:NE system or by using the NFCSC Document Cover Sheet.* 

 $\overline{a}$ 

 *In some cases there may be a milestone where an item is being fabricated, maintenance is being performed on a facility, or a document is being issued through a formal document control process where it specifically calls out a formal review of the document. In these cases, documentation (e.g., inspection report, maintenance request, work planning package documentation or the documented review of the issued document through the document control process) of the completion of the activity, along with the Document Cover Sheet, is sufficient to demonstrate achieving the milestone.* 

**NOTE 2**: *If QRL 1, 2, or 3 is not assigned, then the QRL 4 box must be checked, and the work is understood to be performed using laboratory QA requirements. This includes any deliverable developed in conformance with the respective National Laboratory / Participant, DOE or NNSA-approved QA Program.* 

**NOTE 3:** *If the lab has an NQA-1 program and the work to be conducted requires an NQA-1 program, then the QRL-1 box must be checked in the work Package and on the Appendix E cover sheet and the work must be performed in accordance with the Lab's NQA-1 program. The QRL-4 box should not be checked.*