# FINAL DESIGN CALCULATION PACKAGE ON-SITE DISPOSAL FACILITY

## Volume II

**December 20, 2000**
**Revision 0**
**Addendum 2**

**20100-CA-0001**

## United States Department of Energy

**Fernald Environmental Management Project**
**Fernald, Ohio**

*Prepared by*

GeoSyntec Consultants
1100 Lake Hearn Drive, NE, Suite 200
Atlanta, Georgia 30342

*Under*

**Fluor Fernald, Inc.**
Subcontract 95PS005028

GEOSYNTEC CONSULTANTS

1100 Lake Hearn Drive, Suite 200
Atlanta, Georgia 30342-1523 • USA
Tel. (404) 705-9500 • Fax (404) 705-9400

18 December 2000

3423

Mr. Uday Kumthekar
Fluor Fernald, Inc.
MS: 64
7400 Willey Road
Hamilton, Ohio 45013-9402

Subject: Calculations for Re-evaluation of Dumped Rock Fill Size for Biointrusion Barrier
On Site Disposal Facility
Fernald, Ohio

Dear Mr. Kumthekar:

GeoSyntec Consultants (GeoSyntec) was requested by Fluor Fernald, Inc. (Fluor Fernald) to re-evaluate the selection of dumped rock fill size for the biointrusion barrier component of the On-Site Disposal Facility (OSDF) under the Title III Services to Fluor Fernald, Inc. (Fluor Fernald) and in accordance with the scope of services, terms, and conditions described in Fluor Fernald Contract No. 95PS005028. The request was made because additional information is available that was not considered in the original design calculations. Attached to this letter is calculation package prepared as part of the re-evaluation. The re-evaluation was also summarized in a letter dated 6 December 2000. Based on this re-evaluation the following recommendations are made.

- Use Ohio DOT Type D Dumped Rock Fill with a minimum UMTRA rock quality score of 60;
- Material from Liters Quarry, New Point Stone Quarry, Davon Highland Stone Quarry, and Davon Eagle Quarry is expected to meet the above requirement;
- Use Ohio DOT Number 57 for the choke stone; and
- Use Ohio DOT Item 703.06 for the granular filter.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

J. F. Beech, Ph.D., P.E.
Principal

Attachment

GQ1030-14/F0030071

RECYCLED AND RECYCLABLE

# COMPUTATION COVER SHEET

**SUBJECT OF COMPUTATIONS** **BIOINTRUSION BARRIER RE-EVALUATION**

**Computations By:**
(Cognizant Engineer)

Signature _____ Date 16 Dec. 2000

Printed Name and Title: Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, P.E., Assistant Project Engineer

3423

**Assumptions and Procedures Checked By:**
(Checker)

Signature _____ Date 16 Dec 2000

Printed Name and Title: John F. Beech, Ph.D., P.E., Principal

**Computations Checked by:**

Signature _____ Date 16 Dec 2000

Printed Name and Title: John F. Beech, Ph.D., P.E., Principal

**Computations Backchecked by:**
(Cognizant Engineer)

Signature _____ Date 16 Dec 2000

Printed Name and Title: Ganesh Gopalakrishnan, P.E., Assistant Project Engineer

**Approved by:**
(PDP)

Signature _____ Date 16 Dec 2000

Printed Name and Title: John F. Beech, Ph.D., P.E., Principal

**Approved by:**
(DTL and TETL)

Signature _____ Date 16 Dec 2000

Printed Name and Title: _____

**Record of Revision (Number and initial all revisions)**

| Rev. No. | Reason | Date | By | Checked | Approval |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

# RE-EVALUATION OF BIOINTRUSION BARRIER

3423

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this calculation package is to present the calculations for the re-evaluation of the rock requirements for the biointrusion layer for the final cover system of the Onsite Disposal Facility. This calculation presents revisions to Section 11.6 titled "Final Cover System Biointrusion Barrier Design" of the *Final Design Calculation Package for On-Site Disposal Facility, Revision 0, dated May 1997* (hereinafter referred as Revision 0 Final Design Calculations), prepared by GeoSyntec Consultants (GeoSyntec).

This revised calculation is performed because of the reasons outlined below.

- Additional tests to evaluate the quality of rock available from local quarries was recently performed including rock from quarries not previously considered. Rock quality scores for dumped rock fill from 5 local quarries were established from the results of the testing program.

- Additional information from the technical literature on internal friction angle of rock fill is available, which was not considered in the original calculations. This information defines internal friction angles for rock under low confining pressures, which are representative of the confining pressures the biointrusion barrier is subjected.

- An overly conservative interpretation of the UMTRA design approach was used in the original design calculations. This approach oversized the rock based on the ratio of a score of 80 percent to that of the rock quality score of the actual source (e.g., 80/50 or 1.6 for a material with a rock quality of score of 50 percent) instead of the difference (e.g., 80-50, or increasing the diameter by 30 percent or a factor of 1.3)

Based on the revised design of biointrusion barrier, the choke stone is also resized.

## CALCULATIONS

Calculations procedures adopted herein are in general accordance with the methodology adopted in the calculations performed in the Revision 0 Final Design Calculations. The general procedure is described below.

- **Step 1:** Laboratory testing results for rock quality from five potential local quarries were obtained. Attachment 1 provides the summary of testing results.

All these stones meet the Ohio DOT Type D dumped rock fill with a $D_{50}$ = 6 inches. The following properties from these tables are utilized in the calculations.

- Split Tensile Strength;
- Bulk Specific Gravity; and
- Overall Weighted Score.

3423

Calculations are performed for rock from two quarries namely LITERS QUARRY and MELVIN STONE QUARRY because they had the lowest rock quality score of the five quarries tested. The other quarries will be acceptable if one or both of these quarries are acceptable.

- **Step 2:** Manning's Roughness Coefficient of Riprap with $D_{50}$ = 6 inches is computed using the procedure described in Attachment 2.

- **Step 3:** The maximum flow per unit width in the center of the erosion gully is calculated as shown in Attachment 3. The peak discharge (Q) was calculated earlier based on hydrology procedures in Revision 0 Final Design Calculations. Q=4.33 cfs calculated earlier is utilized. The depth of flow is calculated using an iterative solution procedure for Manning's equation on a computer spreadsheet. Based on this calculation, the Maximum flow per unit width for the 2000-year storm in the erosion gully ($q_{all}$) is 2.50 cfs/ft.

- **Step 4**: Attachment 4 provides the calculation for friction angle of the rocks from the above two quarries, based on Split Tensile Strength and Effective Normal Stress. The calculated friction angles are:
  - $\phi_{LITERS}$ = 48 degrees
  - $\phi_{MELVIN}$ = 45 degrees

- **Step 5:** Attachment 5 provides the calculation of "Required $D_{50}$" based on the Stephenson Method. The maximum flow per unit width calculated in Step 3, and friction angle calculated in Step 4 is utilized for this calculation.

- **Step 6:** Attachment 6 provides the calculation of "Required Oversized $D_{50}$" based on the "Overall Weighted Score" for the rocks and the UMTRA procedure. Based on the these calculations:
  - Required Oversized $D_{50}$ for LITERS QUARRY = 5.64 inches; and
  - Required Oversized $D_{50}$ for MELVIN STONE QUARRY = 6.83 inches

Since, it was assumed that Ohio DOT Type D dumped rock fill with a $D_{50}$ = 6 inches will be used, MELVIN STONE QUARRY stones will <u>not</u> meet the oversizing requirement. Therefore, further calculations are performed for the LITERS QUARRY stone.

- **Step 7:** Attachment 7 provides the calculations to verify whether riprap with $D_{50} = 6$ inches meets the erosion criteria based on the Hartung and Scheuerlein Method. The "allowable flow per unit width" for riprap with $D_{50} = 6$ inches calculated using the Hartung and Scheuerlein Method is less than the "expected maximum flow per unit width" calculated in Step 3. Therefore, based on this method, riprap with $D_{50} = 6$ inches is acceptable for the biointrusion barrier.

- **Step 8:** Attachment 8 provides the calculations for evaluating the choke stone layer considering the revised biointrusion barrier stone. Based on the calculations performed, the Ohio DOT Number 57 stone is acceptable as a choke stone layer.

- **Step 9:** Attachment 9 provides a list of references.

## CONCLUSIONS

- Ohio DOT Type D Dumped Rock Fill can be used as a biointrusion barrier if it scores a minimum rock quality of 60 based on UMTRA technical approach.

- Ohio DOT Type D Dumped Rock Fill will meet the erosion resistance requirements for the final cover system.

- Ohio No. 57 Stone can be used for the choke stone if Ohio DOT Type D dumped rock fill is used for the biointrusion barrier.

- Granular filter material remains Ohio DOT Item 703.06

# ATTACHMENT 1

3423 5/36

| Source | Test | # Results | Average Results | Weighing Factor | Weighted Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Liters Quarry | Bulk specific gravity (ASTM C295) (1) | 2 | 2.63 | 12 | 76 |
| | Absorption (ASTM C127) (1) | 2 | 1.9 | 13 | 32 |
| | Sulfate soundness (ASTM C88) (1) | 2 | 6 | 4 | 74.1 |
| | Schmidt Rebound Hammer (2) | 20 | 53.24 | 11 | 68.9 |
| | Los Angeles Abrasion (ASTM C131 or C535) (1) | 2 | 26 | 1 | 0 |
| | Splitting tensile (Brazilian disk) (ASTM D3967) (3) | | 1259.60 | 6 | 93.0 |
| | Overall Weighted Score | | | | 62.6 |
| New Point Stone Quarry | Bulk specific gravity (ASTM C295) (1) | 4 | 2.669 | 12 | 83.8 |
| | Absorption (ASTM C127) (1) | 4 | 1.54 | 13 | 39.2 |
| | Sulfate soundness (ASTM C88) (2) | 1 | 4.8 | 4 | 81.0 |
| | Schmidt Rebound Hammer (2) | 50 | 59.96 | 11 | 79.9 |
| | Los Angeles Abrasion (ASTM C131 or C535) (1) | 3 | 27.4 | 1 | 0 |
| | Splitting tensile (Brazilian disk) (ASTM D3967) (3) | | 1261.75 | 6 | 93.1 |
| | Overall Weighted Score | | | | 69.7 |
| Melvin Stone Quarry | Bulk specific gravity (ASTM C295) (1) | 11 | 2.59 | 12 | 68 |
| | Absorption (ASTM C127) (1) | 5 | 2.16 | 13 | 26.8 |
| | Sulfate soundness (ASTM C88) (1) | 5 | 1.5 | 4 | 97.5 |
| | Schmidt Rebound Hammer (2) | 40 | 43.87 | 11 | 55.5 |
| | Los Angeles Abrasion (ASTM C131 or C535) (1) | 5 | 34.08 | 1 | 0 |
| | Splitting tensile (Brazilian disk) (ASTM D3967) (3) | | 1094.58 | 6 | 84.7 |
| | Overall Weighted Score | | | | 56.9 |

3423

6/36

| Source | Test | # Results | Average Results | Weighing Factor | Weighted Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Davon Highland Stone Quarry | Bulk specific gravity (ASTM C295) (1) | 2 | 2.68 | 12 | 86 |
| | Absorption (ASTM C127) (1) | 1 | 1.1 | 13 | 48 |
| | Sulfate soundness (ASTM C88) (1) | 1 | 1.77 | 4 | 96.15 |
| | Schmidt Rebound Hammer (2) | 20 | 58.10 | 11 | 76.8 |
| | Los Angeles Abrasion (ASTM C131 or C535) (1) | 1 | 26.5 | 1 | 0 |
| | Splitting tensile (Brazilian disk) (ASTM D3967) (3) | | 1284.51 | 6 | 94.2 |
| | Overall Weighted Score | | | | 73.4 |
| Davon Eagle Quarry | Bulk specific gravity (ASTM C295) (1) | 2 | 2.66 | 12 | 82 |
| | Absorption (ASTM C127) (1) | 1 | 1.3 | 13 | 44 |
| | Sulfate soundness (ASTM C88) (1) | 1 | 1.83 | 4 | 95.85 |
| | Schmidt Rebound Hammer (2) | 20 | 57.18 | 11 | 75.3 |
| | Los Angeles Abrasion (ASTM C131 or C535) (1) | 1 | 22.2 | 1 | 15.6 |
| | Splitting tensile (Brazilian disk) (ASTM D3967) (3) | | 1344.70 | 6 | 97.2 |
| | Overall Weighted Score | | | | 71.6 |

(1) Data provided by quarries (Appendix ).
(2) Testing performed by UC.
(3) Data extrapolated (Section ).

# ATTACHMENT 2

Written by: _____ Date: ___/___/___ (YY MM DD) Reviewed by: _____ Date: 00/12/15 (YY MM DD)

Client: _____ Project: _____ Project/Proposal No.: _____ Task No.: _____

# CALCULATION OF MANNING'S N FOR RIPRAP

Manning's "n" value for riprap is estimated using the following equation [HRB, 1970]:

$$n = 0.0395 d_{50}^{\frac{1}{6}}$$

where: $n$ = Manning's roughness coefficient; and
$d_{50}$ = Median riprap diameter (ft).

$d_{50} = 6'' = 0.5$ ft

$$n = (0.0395)(d_{50})^{1/6}$$
$$= (0.0395)(0.5)^{1/6} = \underline{0.035}$$

HRB. 1970. *National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 108: Tentative Design Procedure for Riprap-Lined Channels.* Washington, D.C.: Highway Research Board.

Written by: Ganesh Gopalakrishnan (GG) Date: 12/16/00 Reviewed by: John F. Beech (JFB) Date: 13 Dec 00

Client: Fluor Fernald Project: Re-evaluation - Biointrusion Barrier Project/Proposal No.: GQ1030 Task No.: 14

# ATTACHMENT 3

Design/Check: Trapezoidal/Triangular Channel
Methodology: Manning's Equation
Project: FLUOR FERNALD
Task: **Bio-intrusion Barrier Re-evaluation**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Peak Discharge, $Q_{max}$ = | 4.33 | cfs |
| Bottom Width, B = | 1.00 | ft |
| Left Side Slope, $Z_1$ = | 2.00 | horizontal :1 vertical |
| Right Side Slope, $Z_2$ = | 2.00 | horizontal :1 vertical |
| Manning's Roughness Coeff., n = | 0.035 | |
| Longitudinal Channel Slope, $S_o$ = | 0.1670 | ft/ft |

| Depth of Flow Y ft | Area of Flow A $ft^2$ | Wetted Perimeter P ft | Hydraulic Radius R=A/P ft | Average Velocity V ft/s | Discharge (Flow Rate) Q=AV $ft^3/s$ | Avg. Tractive Stress $\tau_o$ $lb/ft^2$ | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.01 | 0.01 | 1.04 | 0.01 | 0.79 | 0.01 | 0.10 | |
| 0.20 | 0.27 | 1.88 | 0.15 | 4.82 | 1.32 | 1.52 | |
| 0.38 | 0.68 | 2.71 | 0.25 | 6.89 | 4.67 | 2.60 | |
| 0.57 | 1.22 | 3.55 | 0.34 | 8.53 | 10.41 | 3.58 | |
| 0.76 | 1.90 | 4.38 | 0.43 | 9.97 | 18.95 | 4.52 | |
| 0.94 | 2.72 | 5.22 | 0.52 | 11.27 | 30.70 | 5.44 | |
| 1.13 | 3.68 | 6.05 | 0.61 | 12.49 | 46.01 | 6.34 | |
| 1.32 | 4.78 | 6.89 | 0.69 | 13.64 | 65.26 | 7.24 | |
| 1.50 | 6.02 | 7.72 | 0.78 | 14.74 | 88.78 | 8.13 | |
| 1.69 | 7.40 | 8.56 | 0.86 | 15.79 | 116.90 | 9.01 | |
| 1.88 | 8.92 | 9.39 | 0.95 | 16.81 | 149.94 | 9.90 | |
| 2.06 | 10.58 | 10.23 | 1.03 | 17.79 | 188.21 | 10.78 | |
| 2.25 | 12.38 | 11.06 | 1.12 | 18.75 | 232.01 | 11.66 | |
| 0.37 | 0.64 | 2.65 | 0.24 | 6.76 | 4.35 | 2.53 | DESIGN Q |

PEAK DISCHARGE IN GULLY (2000-YEAR) = 4.33 CFS
(ESTABLISHED FROM HYDROLOGY PROCEDURES)

ASSUMED GULLY CROSS-SECTION




AREA OF FLOW = 0.64 $FT^2$ = A

CONCENTRATED AREA OF FLOW = AREA(ABCD) = $A_c$ = ✓
= (0.37)(1) = 0.37 $FT^2$

MAXIMUM FLOW PER UNIT WIDTH IN CENTER OF CHANNEL = $\left(\frac{A_c}{A}\right) Q = \left(\frac{0.37}{0.64}\right)(4.33) = 2.50$ CFS/FT ✓

Written by: Ganesh Gopalakrishnan (GG) Date: 12/16/00 Reviewed by: John F. Beech (JFB) Date: 12/16/00

Client: Fluor Fernald Project: Re-evaluation - Biointrusion Barrier Project/Proposal No.: GQ1030 Task No.: 14

# ATTACHMENT 4

Written by: GG Date: 00/12/15 (YY/MM/DD) Reviewed by: _____ Date: 00/12/15 (YY/MM/DD)

Client: _____ Project: _____ Project/Proposal No.: _____ Task No.: _____

CALCULATION FOR FRICTION ANGLE OF MELVIN STONE

1. LOWEST TENSILE STRENGTH FOR STONE = 1,094 psi
2. BASED ON JAEGER AND COOK [1969] FOR ROCKS,

$$\frac{\text{UNCONFINED COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH } (q_u)}{\text{TENSILE STRENGTH } (q_t)} \sim 10$$

THEREFORE, $q_u = (10)(1{,}094) = \underline{10{,}940}$ psi

$= \underline{75}$ MPa

3. BASED ON TABLE PROVIDED IN TABLE 19.3 [TERZAGHI, ~~1966~~ 1996], FOR $q_u = 75$ MPa ROCKFILL GRADE = E

4. NORMAL STRESS IN THE BIO-INTRUSION BARRIER;

MINIMUM DEPTH = 2.75'

MAXIMUM DEPTH = 5.75'

DENSITY = 125 pcf

$\sigma_n$ (max) = (2.75)(125) = 343.75 psf = 16.46 kPa

$\sigma_n$ (min) = (5.75)(125) = 718.75 psf = 34.42 kPa

5. BASED ON FIGURE PROVIDED IN FIGURE 19.3 [TERZAGHI, ~~1966~~ 1996]

MAXIMUM VALUE OF $\phi$ FOR GRADE 'E' IS CHOSEN (INSTEAD OF EXTRAPOLATING OUTSIDE THE LIMIT FOR $\sigma$ = 34.4 kPa OR 16.5 kPa)

$\phi = 45°$

Written by: GG Date: 00/12/15 Reviewed by: Date: 00/12/15

Client: Project: Project/Proposal No.: Task No.:

CALCULATION FOR FRICTION ANGLE OF LITERS STONE

1. LOWEST TENSILE STRENGTH FOR STONE = 1260 psi
2. BASED ON JAEGER AND COOK [1969] FOR ROCKS,

$$\frac{\text{UNCONFINED COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH } (q_u)}{\text{TENSILE STRENGTH } (q_t)} \sim 10$$

THEREFORE, $q_u = (10)(1{,}094) = 12{,}600$ psi

$= 87$ MPa

3. BASED ON TABLE PROVIDED IN TABLE 19.3 [TERZAGHI, ~~1966~~ 1996], FOR $q_u = 87$ MPa ROCKFILL GRADE = D

4. NORMAL STRESS IN THE BIO-INTRUSION BARRIER;

MINIMUM DEPTH = 2.75'

MAXIMUM DEPTH = 5.75'

DENSITY = 125 pcf

$\sigma_n$ (max) = (2.75)(125) = 343.75 psf = 16.46 kPa

$\sigma_n$ (min) = (5.75)(125) = 718.75 psf = 34.42 kPa

5. BASED ON FIGURE PROVIDED IN FIGURE 19.4 [TERZAGHI, ~~1966~~ 1996]

MAXIMUM VALUE OF $\phi$ FOR GRADE 'D' IS CHOSEN (INSTEAD OF EXTRAPOLATING OUTSIDE THE LIMIT FOR $\sigma = 34.4$ kPa OR 16.5 kPa)

$\phi = 48°$

Written by: GG Date: 00 / 12 / 15 (YY MM DD) Reviewed by: _____ Date: 02 / 12 / 15 (YY MM DD)

Client: _____ Project: _____ Project/Proposal No.: _____ Task No.: _____

3423




**Figure 19.4** Values of secant friction angle for granular soils.

**Table 19.3 Unconfined Compressive Strength of Particles for Rockfill Grades in Fig. 19.4**

| Rockfill Grade | Particle $q_u$ (MPa) |
|---|---|
| A | ≥220 |
| B | 165–220 |
| C | 125–165 |
| D | 85–125 |
| E | ≤85 |

Terzaghi, K., Peck, R.B., Mesri, G., "Soil Mechanics in Engineering Practice" 3rd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1996, 549p.

3423

# ATTACHMENT 5

Written by: GG Date: 00/12/15 (YY/MM/DD) Reviewed by: _____ Date: 00/12/16 (YY/MM/DD)

Client: _____ Project: _____ Project/Proposal No.: _____ Task No.: _____

3423

## 8. STEPEHENSON METHOD

The Stephenson Method [Abt et al., 1988] is used to evaluate the resistance of the biointrusion barrier against gully advancement, should a gully erode through the overlying topsoil, vegetative support, and gravel choke layers. This method is based on work by Olivier [1967] who studied flow over riprap on slopes, for the purpose of designing rockfill dams to be overtopped. This method is recommended by NRC [1990] for evaluating the erosion resistance of slopes greater than 10%.

The acceptable riprap mean particle diameter ($D_{50}$) to survive the design flow is calculated with the following equation [Abt et al., 1988]:

$$D_{50} = \left[ \frac{q(\tan\theta)^{7/6} n_p^{1/6}}{C g^{1/2}\left[(1-n_p)(G_s-1)\cos\theta(\tan\phi-\tan\theta)\right]^{5/3}} \right]^{2/3}$$

Where:
- q = design flow per unit width
- θ = slope = 0.167 ft/ft (Section 5.)
- $n_p$ = porosity of riprap
- C = empirical factor
- g = acceleration of gravity (32.2 ft/s$^2$)
- $G_s$ = specific gravity of riprap
- ϕ = angle of repose of riprap

Riprap with a $D_{50}$ calculated by the above equation will be on the threshold of movement at the flow value (q) used. The riprap layer will completely collapse at a flow varying from 120% (gravel) to 180% (crushed granite) of q [Stephenson, 1979].

### 8.1 Design Flow Per Unit Width (q)

$q = q_{max}$ See Section 7

### 8.2 Porosity of Riprap ($n_p$)

Porosities for different soil textures are shown in Table 3, where it can be seen that porosity decreases with increasing particle size, and for the coarsest soil listed (gravel), $n_p$ = 0.397.

### 8.3 Empirical Factor (C)

C varies from 0.22 for gravel to 0.27 for crushed granite [Stephenson, 1979]. Using a low value of C (0.22) is conservative

### 8.4 Specific Gravity of Riprap, $G_s$

(BASED ON TEST RESULTS FROM QUARRIES)

### 8.5 Angle of Repose of Riprap (ϕ)

(FRICTION ANGLE 45° and 48° CALCULATED)

Written by: GPG Date: 00/12/15 Reviewed by: Date: 00/12/15

Client: Project: Project/Proposal No.: Task No.:

3423

COMPUTATION OF $D_{50}$ REQUIRED USING STEPHENSON METHOD

INPUT PARAMETERS

FOR LITERS STONE ($\phi = 48°$)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Flow Rate per unit Width | q | 2.5 | cfs/ft |
| Slope Angle | Theta | 9.46 | degrees |
| Porosity of Rock | np | 0.397 | |
| Empirical Constant | C | 0.22 | |
| Acceleration Due to Gravity | g | 32.2 | ft/sec2 |
| Specific Gravity of Rock | Gs | 2.63 | |
| Angle of Repose of Rock | Phi | 48 | degrees |

FOR MELVIN STONE ($\phi = 45°$)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Flow Rate per unit Width | q | 2.5 | cfs/ft |
| Slope Angle | Theta | 9.46 | degrees |
| Porosity of Rock | np | 0.397 | |
| Empirical Constant | C | 0.22 | |
| Acceleration Due to Gravity | g | 32.2 | ft/sec2 |
| Specific Gravity of Rock | Gs | 2.59 | |
| Angle of Repose of Rock | Phi | 45 | degrees |

CALCULATION (STEPHENSON METHOD - EQUATION)

$$D_{50} = \left[ \frac{(2.5)(\tan 9.46°)^{7/6}(0.397)^{1/6}}{0.22\,(32.2)^{1/2}\left[(1-0.397)(2.63-1)\cos 9.46\,(\tan 48° - \tan 9.46°)\right]^{5/3}} \right]^{2/3}$$

$= 0.39$ FEET $= \underline{4.71}$ inches

$D_{50} = 0.46$ FEET $= \underline{5.56}$ inches

3423

# ATTACHMENT 6

Written by: GG Date: 00/12/15 Reviewed by: Date: 00/12/15

Client: Project: Project/Proposal No.: Task No.:

3423

OVERSIZING $D_{50}$ BASED ON OVERALL WEIGHTED SCORE

LITERS QUARRY

$\phi = 48°$, $D_{50}$ (CALCULATED) = 4.71 inches

Overall weighted Score = 60

BASED ON UMTRA Procedure

$$\text{Oversizing factor} = 1 + \left[\frac{80-60}{100}\right] = 1.20$$

$$\text{Oversized } D_{50} = (4.71)(1.20)$$

$$= \underline{5.64 \text{ inches}}$$

MELVIN QUARRY

$\phi = 45°$, $D_{50}$ (calculated) = 5.56 inches

Overall weighted Score = 56.9 ~ 57

BASED ON UMTRA PROCEDURE,

$$\text{oversizing factor} = 1 + \left[\frac{80-57}{100}\right] = 1.23$$

$$\text{Oversized } D_{50} = (5.56)(1.23)$$

$$= \underline{6.83 \text{ inches}}$$

CONCLUSION

SINCE $D_{50}$ FOR OHIO DOT CLASS D RIPRAP IS 6 INCHES, ONLY THE LITERS QUARRY WILL BE CONSIDERED FURTHER

3423

# ATTACHMENT 7

## 9. HARTUNG AND SCHEUERLEIN METHOD

The Hartung and Scheuerlein Method (H&S Method) [Hartung and Scheuerlein, 1970] is used to evaluate the resistance of the biointrusion barrier against gully advancement, should a gully erode through the overlying topsoil, vegetative support, and gravel choke layers. Hartung and Scheuerlein studied flow over riprap on steep slopes (10H:1V to 1.5H:1V), and developed their method for the purpose of designing rockfill dams to be overtopped. Knauss [1979] compared the H&S Method to Olivier's Method (the Stepehenson Method is based on Olivier's Method). Knauss found both to be in general agreement for slopes flatter than 5H:1V, but found the H&S Method to be reasonable and Olivier's Method over-conservative for steeper slopes. Based on this, Knauss recommended using the H&S Method on slopes of 5H:1V or steeper. Though the steepest slope on the OSDF final cover is 6H:1V (within the range Knauss found both methods to agree), the Hartung and Scheuerlein Method is used for comparison with the results of the Stephenson Method.

The steps for the Hartung and Scheuerlein Method are presented below:

### 9.1 Maximum Flow Depth in Gully, D

The maximum flow depth is an iterated variable. D is selected until the average flow velocity ($v_{avg}$) equals the critical velocity ($v_{crit}$). Both velocities are calculated in the steps that follow.

### 9.2 Aeration Factor ($\sigma$)

The aeration factor is calculated from the equation shown below[Hartung and Scheuerlein, 1970]:

$$\sigma = 1 - 1.3\sin\varphi + 0.08\frac{y_m}{\theta_m} \leq 1$$

Where: $\varphi$ = slope (6H:1V, Section 1.3)
$y_m$ = mean flow depth
$\theta_m$ = mean roughness height

If $\sigma$ = 1, there is no aeration in the flow and flow can be calculated with Manning's equation. Otherwise, Manning's equation is not valid [Hartung and Scheuerlein, 1970].

#### 9.1.1 Mean flow depth ($y_m$)

See Figure 16

#### 9.1.2 Mean roughness height ($\theta_m$)

$\theta_m \sim D_{50}/3$ [Hartung and Scheuerlein, 1970] Where: $D_{50}$ = mean diameter of riprap (= 0.305 m)

### 9.2 Flow Coefficient, c

$c = \sigma(1.7 + 8.1\Phi\sin\varphi)$ Where: $\Phi$ = packing factor

#### 9.2.1 Packing factor ($\Phi$)

The packing factor varies from 0.625 for "dumped" or "natural" packing to 1.125 for "manual" packing "with flat stones placed on edge" [Knauss, 1979]

### 9.3 Resistance Factor ($\lambda$)

The equation for the resistance factor is [Hartung and Scheuerlein, 1970]:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} = -3.2\log\left(c\frac{\theta_m}{4y_m}\right)$$

Written by: GEO Date: 00/12/15 (YY MM DD) Reviewed by: _____ Date: 00/14/15 (YY MM DD)

Client: _____ Project: _____ Project/Proposal No.: _____ Task No.: _____

3423

### 9.4 Average Velocity ($v_{avg}$)

The equation for average flow velocity is [Hartung and Scheuerlein, 1970]:

$$v_{avg} = \sqrt{\frac{8g}{\lambda}}\sqrt{y_m \sin\varphi}$$

Where: g = acceleration of gravity (9.81 m/s$^2$)

### 9.5 Critical Velocity ($v_{crit}$)

The equation for critical velocity (the velocity at which riprap stones will begin to move) is [Hartung and Scheuerlein, 1970]:

$$v_{crit} = 1.2\sqrt{\frac{2g(G_s - 1)\gamma_w}{\sigma\gamma_w}}\sqrt{d_s \cos\varphi}$$

Where: $G_s$ = specific gravity of riprap (assume $G_S$ = 2.65 per USDOE [1989])
$\gamma_w$ = unit weight of water = 1 g/cm$^3$

If $v_{crit} \geq v_{avg}$, the riprap should not erode (gullies should not penetrate the biointrusion barrier)

### 9.6 Allowable Flow Per Unit Width ($q_{all}$)

The equation for allowable flow per unit width is [Hartung and Scheuerlein, 1970]:

$$q_{all} = \sigma y_m v_{crit}$$

If $q_{all} \geq q_{max}$, the riprap should not erode (gullies should not penetrate the biointrusion barrier).
$q_{max}$ is calculated in Section 7.




$W = 1ft + 2D(2) \longrightarrow W - 1 = 4D$

$A_c = D \qquad A_s = \frac{1}{2}[(W-1)D] = 2D^2$

$$y_m = \frac{D A_c + \frac{D}{2} A_s}{A_c + A_s} = \frac{D^2 + D^3}{D + 2D^2} = \frac{D + D^2}{1 + 2D}$$

$y_m$ = MEAN FLOW DEPTH

*Figure 16 - Procedure For Calculating Mean Flow Depth, $y_m$, in a Trapezoidal Channel With a 1-foot Wide Base*

# HARTUNG AND SCHEUERLEIN METHOD
## (EVALUATION OF STONE FROM LITERS QUARRY)

3423

ITERATIVELY SOLVE FOD D

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Riprap D50 = | 6 | inches = | 0.1524 | meters |
| Assumed D = | 0.615 | feet = | 0.187452 | meters |

**AERATION FACTOR**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean Flow Depth | $Y_m$ = | 0.45 | feet = | 0.135756 | meters |
| Mean Roughness Height | $\theta_m$ = | 0.05 | meters | | |
| Slope Angle | $\varphi$ = | 9.46 | degrees = | 0.17 | radians |
| Aeration Factor | $\sigma$ = | 1.00 | | | |
| Maximum Value of Aeration Factor | $\sigma$ = | 1.00 | | | |

**FLOW COEFFICIENT**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Packing Factor | $\Phi$ = | 0.63 | | | |
| Slope Angle | $\varphi$ = | 9.46 | degrees = | 0.17 | radians |
| Aeration Factor | $\sigma$ = | 1.00 | | | |
| Flow Coefficient | C = | 2.53 | | | |

**RESISTANCE FACTOR**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Flow Coefficient | C = | 2.53 | |
| Mean Roughness Height | $\theta_m$ = | 0.05 | meters |
| Mean Flow Depth | $Y_m$ = | 0.14 | meters |
| Resistance Factor | $1/(\lambda)^{0.5}$ = | 2.00 | |
| | $\lambda$ = | 0.25 | |

**AVERAGE VELOCITY**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $\lambda$ = | 0.25 | | | |
| Mean Flow Depth | $Y_m$ = | 0.14 | meters | | |
| Slope Angle | $\varphi$ = | 9.46 | degrees = | 0.17 | radians |
| Acc. Due to gravity | g = | 9.81 | m/sec2 | | |
| Average Velocity | $V_{avg}$ = | 2.649 | m/s | | |

$V_{avg} = V_{crit}$

**CRITICAL VELOCITY**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Specific Gravity of Stone | Gs = | 2.65 | | | |
| Unit Weight of Water | $\gamma_w$ = | 1.00 | g/cm$^3$ | | |
| D50 of Riprap | ds = | 0.15 | m | | |
| Slope Angle | $\varphi$ = | 9.46 | degrees = | 0.17 | radians |
| Aeration Factor | $\sigma$ = | 1.00 | | | |
| Acc. Due to gravity | g = | 9.81 | m/sec2 | | |
| Crictical Velocity | $V_{crit}$ = | 2.647 | m/s | | |

**ALLOWABLE FLOW PER UNIT WIDTH**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Crictical Velocity | $V_{crit}$ = | 2.647 | m/s | | |
| Mean Flow Depth | $Y_m$ = | 0.14 | meters | | |
| Aeration Factor | $\sigma$ = | 1.00 | | | |
| Allowable flow per unit width | $q_{all}$ = | 0.359 | m$^3$/s per m = | 3.868 | ft$^3$/s per ft |

**MAXIMUM FLOW PER UNIT WIDTH** (2000-YEAR) ✓

$q_{max}$ = 2.50 CFS/FT < $q_{all}$ = 3.87 CFS/FT ✓

Hence, $D_{50}$ = 6" is acceptable based on this method.

3423

# ATTACHMENT 8

Written by: LMG Date: 00 / 11 / 29 (YY MM DD) Reviewed by: Date: / / (YY MM DD)

Client: FLUOR FERNALD Project: Project/Proposal No.: Task No.:

3423

- BIOINTRUSION BARRIER

CHOKE STONE

BIOINTRUSION BARRIER

- ASSUME.

BIOINTRUSION BARRIER → ROCKFILL TYPE D

CHOKE STONE → OHIO DOT #57 STONE

- FILTER REQUIREMENT

$$\frac{d_{15\,\text{BIOINTRUSION}}}{d_{85\,\text{CHOKE STONE}}} \leq 5$$

- GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION CURVE

FIGURE 1. BIOINTRUSION BARRIER

$d_{15} = 75$ mm

$d_{85} = 300$ mm

FIGURE 2. CHOKE STONE

$d_{15} = 6$ to $10$ mm

$d_{85} = 16$ to $20$ mm

MAO 96/2/19

Written by: PJP Date: 96 / 02 / 17 Reviewed by: PJS Date: 96 / 2 / 17 (26/36)

Client: FERMCO Project: FERNALD OSDF Project/Proposal No.: GE3900 Task No.: 8.8

FIGURE 1.

3423

ROCKFILL TYPE D has the following approximate grain-size curve:




This gives a $d_{15}$ = 75 mm ✓ and a $d_{85}$ = 300 mm ✓

MAO 96/2/19

Written by: PJP Date: 96 / 02 / 17 Reviewed by: PJS Date: 96 / 27/36 / 17
YY MM DD YY MM DD

Client: FERMCO Project: FERNALD OSDF Project/Proposal No.: GE3900 Task No.: 8.8

FIGURE 2. **3423**

Ohio DOT #57 stone has the following approximate grain-size curve:




This gives a $d_{15}$ = 6 TO 10 MM and a $d_{85}$ = 16 TO 20 MM

CHOKE STONE REQUIREMENT

$$\frac{d_{15\,\text{BIOINTRUSION}}}{d_{85\,\text{CHOKE STONE}}} \leq 5$$

USE. $d_{15\,\text{BIOINTRUSION}}$ = 75 mm

$d_{85\,\text{CHOKE STONE}}$ = 16 MM

$$\frac{d_{15\,\text{BIOINTRUSION}}}{d_{85\,\text{CHOKE STONE}}} = \frac{75\text{ mm}}{16\text{ mm}} = 4.7 < 5 \quad \text{OK}$$

Written by: LMG Date: 00 / 11 / 29 (YY MM DD) Reviewed by: Date: / / (YY MM DD)

Client: FLUOR FERNALD Project: Project/Proposal No.: Task No.:

3423

□ GRANULAR FILTER

CASE I:

| | |
|---|---|
| VEGETATIVE SOIL LAYER | → FINE-GRAINED GRAY TILL |
| GRANULAR FILTER | → ODOT ITEM 703.06 |
| COVER DRAINAGE LAYER | → AASHTO M43 No.78 |

CASE II.

| | |
|---|---|
| GRANULAR FILTER | → ODOT ITEM 703.06 |
| CHOKE STONE | → AASHTO M43 No.57 |
| BIOINTRUSION BARRIER | → ROCKFILL TYPE D |

CASE I:

VEGETATIVE SOIL LAYER TO GRANULAR FILTER:

$$\frac{d_{15}\text{ (GRANULAR FILTER)}}{d_{85}\text{ (VEGETATIVE SOIL LAYER)}} \leq 15$$

GRANULAR FILTER TO COVER DRAINAGE LAYER:

$$\frac{d_{15}\text{ (COVER DRAINAGE LAYER)}}{d_{85}\text{ (GRANULAR FILTER)}} \leq 5 \checkmark$$

CASE II:

GRANULAR FILTER TO CHOKE STONE:

$$\frac{d_{15}\text{ (CHOKE STONE)}}{d_{85}\text{ (GRANULAR FILTER)}} \leq 5 \checkmark$$

□ GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION CURVE

FIGURE 3. VEGETATIVE SOIL LAYER

$d_{15}$ = < 0.001 to 0.0028 mm

$d_{85}$ = 0.032 to 3.8 mm ✓

Written by: LMG Date: / / (YY MM DD) Reviewed by: Date: / / (YY MM DD)

Client: FLUOR FERNALD Project: Project/Proposal No.: Task No.:

3423

FIGURE 4. GRANULAR FILTER

$d_{15}$ = 0.12 to 0.48 mm

$d_{85}$ = 1.9 to 4 mm

FIGURE 5. COVER DRAINAGE LAYER

$d_{15}$ = 2.6 to 5.8 mm

$d_{85}$ = 10 to 12 mm

CASE I:

VSL TO GF → $\frac{d_{15(GF)}}{d_{85(VSL)}} \leq 15$

$\frac{0.48}{0.032} = 15$ OK ✓

GF TO CDL → $\frac{d_{15(CDL)}}{d_{85(GF)}} \leq 5$

$\frac{5.8\ mm}{1.9\ mm} = 3.1 < 5$ OK ✓

CASE II:

GF TO CS → $\frac{d_{15(CS)}}{d_{85(GF)}} \leq 5$

$\frac{10\ mm}{1.9\ mm} = 5$ OK ✓




| ASTM D 2487 (USCS) | COBBLES | GRAVEL | | SAND | | | SILT OR CLAY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | COARSE | FINE | COARSE | MEDIUM | FINE | |

Range of 27 fine-grained brown till CL samples (excludes outliers)

Mode from visual inspection

Outlier (1 total)

Range of 36 fine-grained gray till CL samples (excludes outliers)

NOTE: Clay size particles defined as those sm
than 0.005 mm (Ref. ASTM D 422)

Project No.: PO-132

3423

30/36

FIGURE 3 GRAIN-SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF FINE-GRAINED BROWN AND GRAY TILL [from PARSONS, 1995]




Figure 4-2 - Grain-size Distribution, Fine-grained Gray Till CL Samples

S:\VOL1:RSAPPS\RSDATA\
PO-132\SUMDOC

② AASHTO M43 No. 78 (COVER DRAINAGE LAYER)




| ASTM D 2487 (USCS) | COBBLES | GRAVEL | | SAND | | | SILT OR CLAY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | COARSE | FINE | COARSE | MEDIUM | FINE | |

Range of 27 fine-grained brown till CL samples (excludes outliers)

Mode from visual inspection

Outlier (1 total)

Range of 36 fine-grained gray till CL samples (excludes outliers)

NOTE: Clay size particles defined as those smal than 0.005 mm (Ref. ASTM D 422)

Project No.: PO-132

3423

FIGURE 5. GRAIN-SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF THE VEGETATIVE SOIL LAYER, COVER DRAINAGE LAYER

32/36

06/29 10:33am, Rev. No.: 0

000035

Written by: Ganesh Gopalakrishnan (GG) Date: 12/16/00 Reviewed by: John F. Beech (JFB) Date: 15 Dec 00

Client: Fluor Fernald Project: Re-evaluation - Biointrusion Barrier Project/Proposal No.: GQ1030 Task No.: 14

3423

# ATTACHMENT 9

## REFERENCES

3423

Abt, S.R., Khattak, M.S., Nelson, J.D., Ruff, J.F., Shaikh, A., Wittler, R.J., Lee, D.W., and Hinkle, N.E., "*Development of Riprap Design Criteria By Riprap Testing In Flumes: Phase I*", NUREG/CR-4651 ORNL/TM-10100, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,May 1987, 111 p.

Abt, S.R. Wittler, R.J., Ruff, J.F., LaGrone, D.L., Khattak, M.S., Nelson, J.D., Hinkle, N.E., and Lee, D.W., "*Development of Riprap Design Criteria By Riprap Testing In Flumes: Phase II - Followup Investigations*", NUREG/CR-4651-V2 ORNL/TM-10100/V2, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., Sep 1988, 84 p. (plus appendices).

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), "*Stormwater Pollution Prevention Handbook*", 1st ed., California Department of Transportation, Sacremento, CA, Oct 1992, 58 p.

Caldwell, J.A. and Reith, C.C., "*Principles and Practice of Waste Encapsulation*", Lewis Publishers, Chelsea, MI, 1993, 414 p.

Earth Systems Associates, "*Vegetation Cover Recommendations for the On-Site Disposal Facility at the Fernald Environmental Management Project Site*", (Draft), Earth Systems Associates, Ltd., Athens, GA, 1996, 16 p.

Foster, G.R., and Wischmeier, W.H., "Evaluating Irregular Slopes for Soil Loss Prediction", *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers*, vol. 17, 1974, pp. 305-309.

Freshly, Phil, *Telephone conversation between Mr. Phil Freshly of Earth Systems Associates, Ltd and Messrs. David Bonnett and Dave Warren of GeoSyntec Consultants*, Athens, GA and Atlanta, GA, Feb 5, 1996.

GeoSyntec Consultants, "*On-Site Disposal Facility - Intermediate Design Package*", (Design Drawings), GeoSyntec Consultants, Atlanta, GA, Feb 1996.

Hansen, E.M., Schreiner, L.C., and Miller, J.F., "*Application of Probable Maximum Precipitation Estimates - United States East of the 105th Meridian*", Hydrometeorological Report No. 52 (HMR-52), PB83-118166, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Weather Service, Silver Spring, MD, Aug 1982, 168 p.

Hartung, F. and Scheuerlein, H., "Design of Overflow Rockfill Dams", *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Large Dams*, Montreal, Canada, Jun 1970, pp. 587-598.

Knauss, J., "Computation of Maximum Discharge at Overflow Rockfill Dams (A Comparison of Different Model Test Results)", *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on Large Dams*, New Dehli, India, Oct - Nov 1979, pp. 143-160.

NRC - See U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Nelson, J.D. Abt, S.R., Volpe, R.L., VanZyl, D., Hinkle, N.E., and Staub, W.P., "*Methodologies for Evaluating Long-Term Stabilization Designs of Uranium Mill Tailings Impoundments*", NUREG/CR-4620 ORNL/TM-10067, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C., Jun 1986, 144 p.

Olivier, H., "Through and Overflow Rockfill Dams - New Design Techniques", *Proceedings of the ICE*, Mar 1967, pp. 433-471.

Parsons, "*2000-Year Flood and Probable Maximum Flood - Sitewide Floodplain Determination*", (Calculations), CERCLA/RCRA Unit 2, Project Order 148, Fernald Environmental Management Project, Rev. 0, Fairfield, OH, November 1995 (1995a), 7 p. (plus appendices).

Parsons, "*Geotechnical Investigation Report - On-Site Disposal Facility*", CERCLA/RCRA Unit 2, Project Order 140, Fernald Environmental Management Project, Rev. 0, Fairfield, OH, Dec 1995 (1995b).

Schroeder, P. R., Aziz, N.M., Lloyd, C.M., and Zappi, P.A., "*The Hydrologic Evaluation of Landfill Performance (HELP) Model: User's Guide for Version 3*", EPA/600/R-94/168a, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, D.C., 1994, 83 p. (plus appendices).

Stephenson, D., "*Rockfill In Hydraulic Engineering*", Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, New York, NY, 1979.

Temple, D.M., Robinson, K.M., Ahring, R.M., and Davis, A.G., "*Stability Design of Grass-Lined Open Channels*", Agriculture Handbook Number 667, PB88-116629, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service, Beltsville, MD, Sep 1987, 167p.

3423

U. S. Department of Agriculture-Soil Conservation Service (USDA-SCS), "*Engineering Manual for Field Conservation Practices*", PB85-175164, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Washington D.C. November 1986,.

U. S. Department of Agriculture-Soil Conservation Service (USDA-SCS), "*Water Management and Sediment Control For Urbanizing Areas*", U. S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Washington D.C., Mar 1987.

U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE), "*Technical Approach Document, Revision II*", (Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action Project), UMTRA-DOE/AL 050425.0002, December 1989, 290p (plus attachment).

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), "*Staff Technical Position: Design of Erosion Protection Covers for Stabilization of Uranium Mill Tailings Sites*", NRC/UMT/1003-0064, Aug 1990, 23p (plus appendices).