

G O R L E B E N -

" the endless story "

***(Insights from site characterization of a proposed high-level
waste repository at Gorleben, Federal Republic of Germany)***

***Klaus Kühn
GSF - Institut für Tieflagerung
Braunschweig
Germany***

ELECTRICITY GENERATION IN GERMANY

Total in 1992: 460.8 billion kWh

Nuclear power	34.2 %
Lignite	30.7 %
Coal	24.2 %
Natural gas	4.4 %
Water	4.1 %
Oil	1.6 %
Others	0.8 %
	<hr/>
	100.0 %

NUCLEAR POWER IN GERMANY

20 Nuclear Power Plants in operation with a total installed capacity of	22.5 MWe
- 13 Pressurized Water Reactors with	15.3 MWe
- 7 Boiling Water Reactors with	7.2 MWe

**(Projects for High Temperature Gas Cooled Reactor
and Fast Breeder Reactor have been given up)**

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE (1/2)

- **Interim Storage Facilities for spent nuclear fuel in operation at**
 - **Gorleben (Lower Saxony) 1,500 t HM**
 - **Ahaus (Northrhine-Westphalia) 1,500 t HM**
 - **Greifswald (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) 740 t HM**

- **Reprocessing contracts with**
 - **Cogéma, France, at La Hague 4,653 t HM**
(Option) (1,645 t HM)
 - **BNFL, United Kingdom, at Sellafield 885 t HM**
(Option) (1,365 t HM)

- **Return of vitrified high-level waste from**
 - **Cogéma 2,800 canisters**
(Option) (1,150 canisters)
 - **BNFL 700 canisters**
(Option) (1,100 canisters)

First vitrified HLW will arrive in Germany in November 1994

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE (2/2)

- **Direct disposal of spent fuel from HTRs already legally possible**
- **Direct disposal of spent fuel from LWRs under legislation**
- **Pilot conditioning plant for spent fuel under construction at Gorleben**
- **Repositories for radioactive waste:**
 - **Morsleben (Sachsen-Anhalt) for low- and intermediate-level waste: in operation since 1981**
 - **Konrad (Lower Saxony) for non-heat generating waste: under licensing**
 - **Gorleben (Lower Saxony) for all types of radioactive waste, with emphasis on heat generating waste (vitrified HLW + spent fuel): site under exploration**

GORLEBEN SITE SELECTION

- Nuclear Fuel Cycle Center with reprocessing plant, waste treatment facilities, and repository was planned in the early 70's
- Three proposed sites with salt domes in the State of Lower Saxony:
 - Wahn
 - Weesen-Lutterloh
 - Lichtenhorst
- Not accepted by the State Government
- Proposal by the State Government in February 1977: G O R L E B E N
- Proposal accepted by the Federal Government in June 1977
- Gorleben Hearing in March 1979
- Decision by the State Government in May 1979:
 - Reprocessing Plant rejected (with the fatal statement of then acting Prime Minister Ernst Albrecht: "Can be realized from a safety point of view, but cannot be carried through politically")
 - Site exploration of salt dome accepted
- Start of first exploratory drilling in May 1979

GORLEBEN SITE

EXPLORATION PROGRAM (1/3)

- **Hydrogeology (1979 - 1985):**
 - **145** exploration boreholes
 - **322** wells for groundwater monitoring
 - **4** wells for long-time pumping tests

- **Seismic investigations (1984)**
 - **16** profiles with a total length of **150 km** were shot and the data were processed and evaluated

- **Cap rock and salt dome surface (1979 - 1985):**
 - **44** exploration boreholes until about **30 m** into the salt
 - **1** exploration borehole until **230 m** into the salt

- **Deep exploration boreholes (1980 - 1981):**
 - **4** deep exploration boreholes were drilled into the flanks of the salt dome, each fully cored borehole about **2000 m** deep

GORLEBEN SITE

EXPLORATION PROGRAM (2/3)

- **Shaft exploration boreholes (1982):**
 - **2 exploratory boreholes were drilled to a depth of 900 m for detailed information to locate the two planned shafts**

- **Summary report of all results in May 1983 by BfS formed the basis for the decision to continue with underground site exploration**

- **Shaft sinking started in September 1986**

- **Updated summary report by BfS in April 1990 confirmed "expected site suitability"**

- **Target depth for the two shafts is about 840 m**

- **Detailed underground site investigation is absolutely necessary**

- **A coordinated program for underground exploration with drifts, boreholes, and geophysical investigations has been set up**

GORLEBEN SITE

EXPLORATION PROGRAM (3/3)

- **Main target is to get a complete detailed picture of geology**
- **Rock-mechanical and thermo-mechanical data of salt were previously elaborated. Therefore, only on site-confirmation is necessary**
- **Possible presence of brines (e. g. brine pockets or brine inclusions) is not expected to cause problems**

L I C E N S I N G ^(1/3)

- **German Atomic Act of 1957 delegates licensing authorization for all nuclear installations to the Federal States with supervision by the Federal Government (presently BMU)**

- **Political impacts by State Governments on their licensing authorities, especially by Red or Red/Green Governments who want to phase out nuclear energy**

- **Continuous discussions and differences between Federal and State Governments**

- **Directions by the Federal Government according to Article 85 (3) of the German Constitution**

- **Licensing of the Gorleben exploration mine according to:**
 - **German Atomic Act**
 - **German Mining Law**

L I C E N S I N G _(2/3)

- **Consequences of using the Mining Law:**
 - **Mining Law does not provide for participation of the public**
 - **Mining Authorities are State Authorities**
 - **No directions by the Federal Government possible**
 - **Mineral rights of salt belong to the land owner**
 - **No expropriation possibility for an exploration mine**
 - **Continuous and numerous law suits**

- **Specific licensing procedure (Planfeststellungsverfahren) according to § 9 b of the German Atomic Act for construction and operation of a repository:**
 - **Partial licenses not possible**
 - **Concentration of all other relevant laws (e. g. construction, water, nature protection)**
 - **New licensing procedure necessary if substantial changes occur**

L I C E N S I N G (3/3)

- **Prescribes public layout of planning documents and public hearing with intervenors**

***UNEXPECTED TECHNICAL
PROBLEMS -
SHAFT SINKING ^(1/4)***

- Freezing technology has to be used for sinking the two shafts "Gorleben 1" and "Gorleben 2" because of the specific geological and hydrogeological situation above a salt dome
- Shaft "Kolenfeld" for the potash mine "Sigmundshall" near Hannover was sunk with the same technology within 4 years (1965 - 1969) to a total depth of 940 m (freezing section to 243 m)
- Sinking of shaft "Gorleben 1" started on September 16, 1986, after completion of freezing
- Unexpected inhomogeneous stress distribution occurred within frozen Tertiary clays at a depth of 234 m which endangered the preliminary precast concrete-block shaft lining

***UNEXPECTED TECHNICAL
PROBLEMS -
SHAFT SINKING (2/4)***

- Supporting steel rings were installed within the endangered zone. One of those steel rings was not properly welded, broke, fell down and caused an accident

- Shaft accident occurred on May 12, 1987, which killed one miner and injured five

- Sinking was stopped and a new concept for the outer preliminary shaft lining was developed

- Shaft sinking could only be resumed on January 23, 1989, after 20 months' interruption with a new preliminary lining system

- Shaft "Gorleben 1" reached a depth of 312 m in December 1991. Sinking was interrupted because of brine detection in pre-drillholes within the fracture zone caused by contraction of the salt through freezing

- Tightening of this fracture zone by drilling and injection was performed between December 1991 and June 1992

***UNEXPECTED TECHNICAL
PROBLEMS -
SHAFT SINKING*** ^(3/4)

- After resuming shaft sinking, the shaft reached its interim target depth at 350 m in November 1992
- Foundation for the final inner lining was installed between November 1992 and March 1993
- Subsequently, the final inner lining was mounted until August 1993
- Shaft "Gorleben 2" met the same fate:
 - Surface of salt dome was reached at 258 m in June 1992
 - Drilling and injection of contraction zone between June and October 1992
 - Interim target depth of 357 m reached in June 1993
 - Foundation installed from July until December 1993
 - Final inner lining subsequently mounted until March 1994

***UNEXPECTED TECHNICAL
PROBLEMS -
SHAFT SINKING (4/4)***

◦ **Present situation of shaft "Gorleben 1":**

- **Upper part penetrating the overburden is completed with final lining in place since August 1993**
- **Freezing pumps were shut off on August 12, 1993, having been in operation since October 24, 1985**
- **Standstill since September 15, 1993, because of lacking license for continuation of sinking**

◦ **Present situation of shaft "Gorleben 2":**

- **Upper part penetrating the overburden ist completed with final lining in place since March 1994**
- **Freezing pumps were shut off on March 24, 1994, having been in operation since April 2, 1986**
- **Standstill beginning end of April 1994 because of lacking license for continuation of sinking**

***UNEXPECTED GEOLOGICAL
RESULTS -
THE GORLEBEN GROOVE (1/3)***

- **Multiple barrier system is internationally accepted**
- **Host rock "salt" is the most important barrier**
- **Geological overburden above the salt dome is one further barrier**
- **Generic information about overburden and caprock on top of a salt dome was available**
- **Tertiary and Quarternary clay layers were expected to form aquicludes above the Gorleben salt dome**
- **By extensive drilling exploration the "G o r l e b e n g r o o v e" was detected**
- **This groove was cut into the overburden and partially into the caprock by a glacier during the Elster glaciation period in Quarternary (500,000 to 350,000 years before now)**

***UNEXPECTED GEOLOGICAL
RESULTS -
THE GORLEBEN GROOVE (2/3)***

- The Gorleben groove is partially filled with Quarternary loose sediments
- The overburden above the salt dome is a complicated system of aquicludes, aquitards, and aquifers
- Hydrogeological investigations proved that the deeper part of the Gorleben groove is filled with saturated salt solutions
- Groundwater flow velocity was determined to be between 1.4 and 8.8 m/a in the aquifers
- There is, however, no flow within the saturated salt solution. Radionuclide transportation could only occur by diffusion
- Groundwater travel modelling was performed in the mid 80's using fresh water data
- At present, there is no fast computer program available which can include saturated salt solution

***UNEXPECTED GEOLOGICAL
RESULTS -
THE GORLEBEN GROOVE (3/3)***

- **A program was initiated to develop such a computer code**
- **The political critics of the Gorleben project, supported by so-called "critical scientists", claim that the plain existence of the Gorleben groove is a "k.o.-criterion" for the site**
- **The overburden above the salt dome is only one barrier in the total system**
- **It can be proved - in spite of the existence of the Gorleben groove - that the total system of the Gorleben repository is able to meet the safety goals**

C R I T E R I A (1/2)

- **The German Reactor Safety Commission elaborated "Safety Criteria for Disposal of Radioactive Wastes in a Repository" in 1982**
- **These criteria were enacted in January 1983 by the then responsible Bundesminister des Innern (BMI) through publishing in the Federal Register**
- **The criteria define the overall safety goal according to the German Radiation Protection Ordinance:**

Maximum dose of an individual

shall be less than 0.3 mSv/a

(has to be proved for about 10,000 years)

- **This has to be achieved by a site specific safety analysis**
- **The criteria make use of the system's approach and the multiple barrier system:**
 - **Waste form**
 - **Waste packages**
 - **Backfill and sealing**
 - **Host rock formation**
 - **Overburden and adjacent rock formations**
 - **Biosphere**

C R I T E R I A (2/2)

- **Criteria cover the normal expected behaviour of the repository system as well as the consequences of accident scenarios**
- **Criteria take into account "the general geological situation which cannot be standardized"**
- **Consequently, the criteria do not specify figures or numbers, but establish deliberately some "margins of discretion"**
- **The licensing procedure for the repository shall be performed within these margins of discretion "according to the level of science and technology" taking into account the site specific situation**
- **Consequently,**

**it is not necessary to find
the best site for the repository**

but a site which is able to meet the safety goal within the system's approach

SITE EVALUATION (1/2)

- **The Gorleben salt dome is investigated with**
 - **an exploration program from the surface**
 - **an underground exploration program**

- **Exploration program from the surface was performed from 1979 until 1985**

- **Results achieved formed the basis to continue with underground site exploration ("expected site suitability")**

- **Underground site exploration of the Gorleben salt dome is absolutely necessary to get a detailed picture of the internal geological structure of the salt dome**

- **Two approaches for site evaluation:**
 - **Site evaluation can be done straight forward by application of the present state of knowledge in geological exploration and of mining experience**

 - **Site evaluation can only be done by a complete performance assessment (a safety or risk analysis) for the planned repository with a perfect set of site specific data**

SITE EVALUATION (2/2)

- **Yardsticks for site evaluation:**
 - **Legal requirements**
 - **Technical requirements**
 - **Performance assessment methodology**
 - **Multiple barrier system**
 - **Experience from prospecting and mining**
 - **Underground research laboratories**

- **Concurrence on site suitability is necessary between applicant and licensing authority**

LESSONS LEARNED (1/3)

- **Consensus on nuclear energy is desirable**
- **Understanding for the need of a repository must be established in spite of the NIMBY- and NIMEP-syndroms**
- **In a Federal System, basic understanding between the Federal Government and the State and Local Governments is required for siting a repository**
- **Legal situation should be clarified in advance as detailed as possible**
- **Clear licensing requirements and responsibilities are indispensable**
- **Criteria for site selection and site evaluation should make allowances for the system's approach and should not be too specified**
- **Positive basic understanding between licensing authority and applicant is necessary**

LESSONS LEARNED (2/3)

- **Certain flexibility within the licensing procedure is recommended**
- **Time schedules for site investigation and repository construction should be as realistic as possible, but must continuously be adjusted**
- **Quantities and qualities of radioactive wastes to be disposed of in the repository must be kept "à jour"**
- **Unexpected geological results and technical problems will occur**
- **Procedure for site evaluation and acceptance should be established**
- **Experiences (positive and negative) in geological exploration and mining should be used as much as possible**
- **Costs are not to be completely neglected**
- **Positive interaction with the public should be strived for without the possibility that public opinion prevents the project**

LESSONS LEARNED (3/3)

- **International Commission on Nuclear Waste Disposal (ICND) should be established with reference to ICRP**
- **Discussions on international repositories should not be a taboo any longer**

INTERACTION WITH THE PUBLIC

(1/2)

- **Gorleben Hearing on the planned Nuclear Fuel Cycle Center in March 1979
(Chairman: Prof. Carl-Friedrich von Weizsäcker)**

- **Public Hearing by the then responsible Committee of Interior of the Deutscher Bundestag (German Parliament) on Gorleben in 1984**

- **Public Hearing by the State Government of Lower Saxony in June 1987**

- **Second Public Hearing by the Committee for Environment, Nature Conservation and Reactor Safety of the Deutscher Bundestag after the shaft accident in April 1988**

- **Government changed in the State of Lower Saxony to a Red/Green-Coalition in May 1990:
Installation of a committee with the objective "to consult the State Government for its target to phase out nuclear energy"**

- **"Braunschweig-Hearing on Radioactive Waste Disposal" by the State Government in September 1993**

INTERACTION WITH THE PUBLIC

(2/2)

- **Continuous information of the public about all technical and scientific results of the Gorleben project**
- **Public hearing with the intervenors is prescribed in the licensing procedure**
- **Public hearings and discussions were not interested in solving the problem of siting and constructing a repository, but in fighting "a religious or ideological war against nuclear power"**