

**TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP (TWG) MEETING**  
**Clark County Government Center, Training Room 3**  
**500 S. Grand Central Pkwy, Las Vegas, NV 89155**  
**July 28, 2011 at 1 p.m.**

Present:

Brok Armantrout, Boulder City Community Development Department  
Richard Arnold, Tribal Representative  
Kathy Bienenstein, Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board  
Nohemi Brewer, National Nuclear Security Administration Nevada Site Office (NNSA/NSO)  
Daniel Burns, Nevada Division of Emergency Management  
Jhon Carilli, NNSA/NSO  
Linda Cohn, NNSA/NSO  
Frank Di Sanza, NNSA/NSO  
Ken Elgan, Esmeralda County Sheriff  
Sandy Enyeart, Science Applications International Corporation  
Nathan Goldberg, City of Las Vegas  
Syd Gordon, National Security Technologies (NSTec)  
John Higley, City of Mesquite Emergency Management  
Cash Jaszczak, Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office  
Phil Klevorick, Clark County Comprehensive Planning Department, Nuclear Waste Division  
Darrell Lacy, Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office  
Jeff MacDougall, State of Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP)  
Greg McDermott, City of Las Vegas  
Bud Marshall, State of Nevada Division of Emergency Management  
Eric Matus, State of Nevada Health Division, Radiation Control Program  
Tom Miller, State of Nevada Public Utilities Commission, Rail Safety Division  
Robert Murnane, City of Henderson Public Works  
Tim Murphy, NDEP  
Irene Navis, Clark County Office of Emergency Management/Yucca Mountain Oversight  
Scott Page, NDEP  
Gene Pasinski, Clark County  
Russ Peacock, White Pine County  
Cheng Shih, City of Las Vegas  
Lynn Shomers, State of Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT)  
Mike Skougard, Potomac Hudson Engineering  
Ken Small, NNSA/NSO  
Kelly Snyder, NNSA/NSO  
Rick Stevers, Lincoln County  
Joe Strolin, Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects  
Barb Ulmer, Navarro-Intera  
Aaron White, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge  
John Wong, NDEP

1. Welcome.

Ken Small called the meeting to order at 1 p.m. by welcoming everyone. Ken introduced the day's speakers.

2. Meeting Purpose.

Ken Small explained that the purpose for reestablishing the TWG is to exchange information, to have a forum for the draft *Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) for the Continued Operation of the Department of Energy/National Nuclear Security Administration Nevada National Security Site and Off-Site Locations in the State of Nevada*, and to receive comments and feedbacks from city, county, and state government agencies regarding the draft SWEIS.

3. SWEIS Video.

Meeting attendees were shown an introductory video on the SWEIS. The video can be viewed on the website: <http://www.nv.energy.gov/SWEIS>.

The public comment period for the draft SWEIS runs from July 29, 2011, through October 27, 2011. Enclosure 1 includes information on all the methods available to comment on the draft SWEIS.

4. Introductions.

Meeting attendees introduced themselves and their agencies.

5. TWG Background.

Frank Di Sanza gave attendees a historical background of the original TWG and the group's accomplishments on providing comments in the form of a white paper for the 1996 Draft SWEIS. Mr. Di Sanza also gave a status update of the six recommendations submitted by the original TWG. The presentation can be viewed on website: <http://www.nv.energy.gov/emprograms/transportationWG.aspx>.

**Question:** What is the definition of Low-Level Waste?

**Answer:** Will be included in Jhon Carilli's presentation to follow.

**Question:** Will there be an adjustment to the \$.50 surcharge per shipment paid by the generators, which is distributed as sub-grants to the six counties that are part of the Emergency Preparedness Working Group (EPWG), through a grant from DOE to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management?

**Answer:** No, there is no current plan to change the \$.50 surcharge. In the past ten years, more than \$10 million dollars has been distributed to the six counties (Clark, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Elko County/City of West Wendover, White Pine, and Nye) to assist them in fulfilling their priority needs for their emergency management programs in the form of vehicles, equipment, training, and facilities. Several county representatives that were present commented that the program has been highly successful.

**Question:** Have the tribes been included as part of the EPWG funding?

**Answer:** In the past, there was a Native American transportation study done through the Consolidated Group of Tribal Organizations and it was determined at that time there was not a need for EPWG funding

around the transportation routes near any reservations. An EPWG representative stated that the tribes do have access to the funding within their respective counties.

**Action Item:** NNSA/NSO will discuss with the EPWG the need to include tribal emergency preparedness needs in their grant applications.

**Question:** Will there be a decision whether to eliminate Highway 160 from the recommended transportation routes to the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) due to increased population?

**Answer:** The routes have been evaluated many times over the years to minimize risk and it has been consistently found Highway 160 to be a low-risk route. This was one of the reasons that DOE decided to reestablish the TWG to get comments and feedback regarding transportation routes to the NNSS.

**Question:** Does DOE know about a waste shipment coming from southern California?

**Answer:** Frank Di Sanza informed the group of an over-sized shipment that will be traveling across Nevada in August. Frank has been receiving e-mail updates from John Ehr, a Southern California Engineer, who is keeping him apprised of this over-sized shipment that will be entering Nevada on Highway 6 to Tonopah to Ely to 95/93 to 93/93a West Wendover to 80 to Utah on its way to an EnergySolutions Site. The shipment will be escorted by the Nevada Highway Patrol.

6. NNSS Waste Management Background.

Jhon Carilli provided attendees with background on the Waste Management Project at the NNSS. The presentation can be viewed on website: <http://www.nv.energy.gov/emprograms/transportationWG.aspx>.

**Question:** Is Area 3 permitted for disposal of Low-Level Waste (LLW)?

**Answer:** Except for radioactive waste that has a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous component, NDEP does not have regulative authority over DOE generated radioactive waste. DOE self-regulates its radioactive wastes and allows LLW disposal by issuing a Disposal Authorization Statement (DAS). Area 3 has a DAS issued by DOE for LLW disposal.

**Question:** What are examples of waste that cannot be disposed of at the NNSS?

**Answer:** High-Level Waste, Spent Fuel, Critical Waste, and Sludges

**Question:** Is there Greater Than Class C (GTCC) waste disposed at NNSS?

**Answer:** DOE follows DOE Order 435.1, Radioactive Waste Management, Change 2, when disposing of its radioactive wastes. This order categorizes radioactive wastes as high level, transuranic, and low level. DOE does not have a GTCC category. However, similar DOE waste has been disposed at the Area 5 Radioactive Waste Management Site (RWMS).

**Question:** In the presentation, it was mentioned the LLW is not a byproduct material, but you have disposed of byproduct material at the NNSS?

**Answer:** By definition, byproduct material is not LLW. DOE Order 435.1, Radioactive Waste Management, Change 2, allows byproduct material to be managed/disposed as LLW if the proposed material meets the proposed disposal site's waste acceptance criteria (WAC). It is still byproduct

material, but managed/ disposed in a LLW disposal facility. For example, the Fernald Silo byproduct material met the NNSS WAC and could have been disposed at the NNSS Area 5 RWMS.

**Question:** What does it mean in the WAC that waste must have a DOE-nexus?

**Answer:** Waste accepted at the NNSS must have originated from DOE projects, activities, sites and meet the NNSS WAC. Occasionally, DOE projects and activities are at locations that are not usually associated with DOE. However, if the generator can show that their waste was definitely created by working on a DOE project/activity, that waste can be eligible for disposal at the NNSS. On those occasions, DOE Headquarters, DOE Site Legal, and the NDEP are involved with the final conclusion that the waste is eligible for disposal at the NNSS. An example is when NASA did a project for DOE which generated radioactive wastes that were accepted and disposed at the NNSS. The instruction outlining the waste eligibility requirement for disposal at the NNSS is in Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program (RWAP), Instruction 9.

#### 7. NNSS Radioactive Waste Shipments.

Nohemi Brewer provided attendees with information on the radioactive waste shipments at the NNSS.

The presentation can be viewed on website:

<http://www.nv.energy.gov/emprograms/transportationWG.aspx>.

**Question:** How many intermodal (rail-to-truck) transports occur on an annual basis?

**Answer:** In 2010, there were 20 out of 2,800 shipments that utilized rail to truck transfers.

**Question:** Now that Highway 160 is in metro Las Vegas (especially in the southwest), is there any thought for this route to be avoided for waste transport to the NNSS?

**Answer:** That is why the TWG was reestablished to provide a forum for DOE to receive feedback and comments from government agencies on transportation issues.

**Question:** What are some reasons for a shipment to be refused acceptance at the NNSS?

**Answer:** Does not meet the WAC, contains free liquids, manifest not filled out correctly.

**Question:** What happens when a shipper does not follow an approved route?

**Answer:** RWAP issues a Corrective Action Request and, if necessary, shuts the generator down until the problem is resolved. There are usually two actions that a generator will impose: 1) stop using the offending carrier, or 2) work with the carrier and the truck driver is usually released from duty.

**Question:** How many drivers have taken prohibited routes to the NNSS?

**Answer:** There has been three cases in the last two years (which includes 4,000 total shipments), and in all those cases the drivers were released from duty.

**Question:** How do you know when a shipper has used a prohibited route?

**Answer:** The driver self-identifies on the Drivers Route and Shipment Information Questionnaire. However, the RWAP teams check route data when conducting the audits.

**Question:** How would the NNSS know if a driver misrepresented his actual route on the Drivers Route and Shipment Information Questionnaire?

**Answer:** Shippers can track truck location with onboard GPS systems.

8. Draft SWEIS for the NNSS and Off-Site Locations in Nevada.

Mike Skougard, Potomac Hudson Engineering, provided attendees with information on the draft SWEIS. His presentation can be viewed on website:

<http://www.nv.energy.gov/emprograms/transportationWG.aspx>.

**Question:** Does NNSA identify a preferred alternative in the Draft SWEIS?

**Answer:** No; however, the Final SWEIS will identify a preferred alternative and it may be made up of a combination of parts of the three alternatives, i.e., No Action, Expanded Operations, and Reduced Operations, based on the needs of NNSA.

**Question:** What was the impact of funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) on the LLW and Mixed LLW (MLLW) management program at the NNSS?

**Answer:** For a couple of years, the waste generated doubled as a result of additional ARRA funding. In FY 2010, 60% of waste received by NNSS was a result of ARRA. Although the annual volume of waste disposed at the NNSS was greater due to ARRA funding, this did not represent an increase in the overall anticipated or potential volume of LLW/MLLW to be generated but was the result of acceleration of already-planned clean-up projects.

**Question:** What would trigger a change in the final SWEIS as a result of an increase in the volume of LLW/MLLW over the projected amount in the document?

**Answer:** The waste management program gave the SWEIS document team an upper limit number for LLW/MLLW disposal projections for the next ten years. As long as the waste meets the NNSS WAC and the overall volume does not exceed that analyzed in the SWEIS, it would not require the final SWEIS to be revisited.

**Question:** What if NNSA wanted to ask NDEP for a RCRA permit for predisposal treatment of MLLW at the NNSS?

**Answer:** It would be handled with a follow-up National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document.

**Question:** Would it be possible for the permit to include the cumulative impacts?

**Answer:** Yes, the analysis would include the proposed action (predisposal treatment of MLLW) plus the cumulative impacts.

**Question:** Why consider an unconstrained case in the draft SWEIS transportation analyses?

**Answer:** The transportation infrastructure and other conditions are very different than during the 1996 SWEIS; for instance, the new "Spaghetti Bowl," completion of the I-215/Clark County 215 route, the new O'Callahan/Tillman Bridge at Hoover Dam, and the population growth and improvements to State Route 160. In addition, NEPA encourages analyzing all alternatives.

**Question:** Why is considering an unconstrained case uncomfortable?

**Answer:** Because it is controversial.

**Question:** In analysis based on NDOT preference, what routes should be used?

**Answer:** From the perspective of the carrier, the most direct route using the interstate system (the route that minimizes radioactive risk).

**Question:** Did the draft SWEIS analyze the equity of going through Las Vegas versus the rural counties?

**Answer:** No

**Question:** Will the preferred routes be included in the Record of Decision?

**Answer:** No, any transportation requirements will be included in the NNSS WAC.

**Question:** What would be the difficulty of excluding Highway 160 from the preferred routes to the NNSS?

**Answer:** Would be a problem for California carriers, mostly due to their blackout dates on CA 127.

**Key Dates:**

July 29: Notice of Availability-90-day comment period ends October 27, 2011

Sept: Five Public Hearings scheduled (see enclosure 1):

5 p.m. ~ first 1 ½ hours there will be experts available to answer questions

6:30 p.m. ~ formal Public Hearing-public given microphone to make comment

Mid-2012: Federal Register Notice of Availability for Final SWEIS

Mid 2012: Record of Decision

**Question:** What determines the use of truck or rail?

**Answer:** It is determined by the waste generator.

**Question:** On what items does DOE want comments?

**Answer:** DOE particularly asks that the TWG look at waste management project and radioactive waste transportation sections of the draft SWEIS summary and/or the main body of the document and provide comments. However, comments are welcomed on any portion of the document

**Question:** Will there be a comment period after the final SWEIS?

**Answer:** No, there is no additional comment period. There will be a 30-day review period after final SWEIS is released in mid-2012. NNSA may use any comments received on the Final SWEIS in developing its Record of Decision, but there will not be another iteration of the SWEIS after the final.

9. General Discussion.

**Question:** What is DOE's expectation for the TWG?

**Answer:** Last time, the TWG formed a small group to write comments. Frank Di Sanza used these comments to develop a white paper and submit as comments for the 1996 draft SWEIS. The comments that were developed were also used to submit to elected officials.

There are two initial goals for the TWG:

1. Review the draft SWEIS and give NNSA comments, and
2. As a group collectively put down its comments and Frank Di Sanza can submit as a white paper.

Attendees were encouraged to provide names and e-mails of other government agency representatives who would be interested in participating on the TWG.

Frank Di Sanza asked the TWG to think about whether they would like to organize into a smaller group and elect a chairman.

DOE is committed to assist the public in understanding the SWEIS. If you report to an elected official that would like a briefing on the draft SWEIS, please contact Frank Di Sanza and he would be happy to accommodate them.

Next meeting will be Thursday, August 11, starting with a tour of the Area 5 RWMS at the NNS. Attendees interested in the tour need to fill out the tour form by Wednesday, August 3, which was part of the meeting handouts. Tour offered early in the morning with the meeting to follow at the Clark County Government Center, from 2-4 p.m.

Frank Di Sanza also asked if there was interest in taking a tour of the transload points at Arden and Apex. Frank would have a truck available with a demonstration of the NNS WAC in action, including the whole process from receiving to the offloading of the truck.

**Homework:** Read the Waste Management Project and Transportation portions of the draft SWEIS summary, which was provided at the start of the meeting, and be ready to have a lively discussion at the next meeting on August 3.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

**Please note:**

Copies of the presentations can be found at: <http://www.nv.doe.gov/emprograms/transportationWG.aspx>.

# How to Comment on the Draft Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement for the Continued Operation of the Department of Energy/National Nuclear Security Administration Nevada National Security Site and Off-Site Locations in the State of Nevada (NNS SWEIS)

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

**Tuesday**  
**September 20, 2011**  
Las Vegas, NV  
Cashman Center  
850 Las Vegas Blvd.  
North Las Vegas, NV 89101

**Wednesday**  
**September 21, 2011**  
Pahrump, NV  
Pahrump Nugget  
681 South Hwy. 160  
Pahrump, NV 89048

**Thursday**  
**September 22, 2011**  
St. George, UT  
Courtyard by Marriott  
185 South 1470 East  
St. George, UT 84790

**Tuesday**  
**September 27, 2011**  
Tonopah, NV  
Convention Center  
301 Brougner Avenue  
Tonopah, NV 89049

**Wednesday**  
**September 28, 2011**  
Carson City, NV  
Carson Nugget  
507 North Carson Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

---

## INTERNET

[www.nv.energy.gov/sweis](http://www.nv.energy.gov/sweis)

---

## POSTAL MAIL

National Nuclear Security Administration  
Nevada Site Office  
Attn: NNS SWEIS  
P.O. Box 98518  
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

---

## PHONE (TOLL-FREE)

877-781-6105

---

## FAX

702-295-5300

---



All comments are due by **October 27, 2011**.  
Comments received by that date will be  
considered in preparation of the Final SWEIS.

