

TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP (TWG) MEETING
Clark County Government Center, Training Room 3
500 S. Grand Central Pkwy, Las Vegas, NV 89155
August 11, 2011 at 2 p.m.

Present:

Richard Arnold, Tribal Representative

Kathy Bienenstein, Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board

Nohemi Brewer, National Nuclear Security Administration Nevada Site Office (NNSA/NSO)

Frank Di Sanza, NNSA/NSO

Sandy Enyeart, Science Applications International Corporation

Randy Fultz, City of Las Vegas

Syd Gordon, National Security Technologies

Cash Jaszczak, Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office

Lt. Lisa Lewis, State of Nevada Highway Patrol Commercial Enforcement

Scott Page, State of Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP)

Russ Peacock, White Pine County

John Penuelas, City of Henderson Traffic Engineer

Jim Przybylski, NNSA Contractor

Doug Rankin, City of Las Vegas

Cheng Shih, City of Las Vegas

Lynn Shomers, State of Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT)

Mike Skougard, Potomac Hudson Engineering

Kelly Snyder, NNSA/NSO

Barb Ulmer, Navarro-Intera

Scott Wade, NNSA/NSO

Mike West, Potomac Hudson Engineering

Aaron White, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Oak Ridge

1. Welcome.

Frank Di Sanza called the meeting to order at 2 p.m. by welcoming everyone. Meeting attendees introduced themselves and their agencies.

Mr. Di Sanza reported that the tour to the Area 5 Radioactive Waste Management Site (RWMS) this morning went well. Attendees had the opportunity to shadow an actual Low-Level Waste (LLW) shipment through the entire receiving and offloading process. During the tour, attendees were able to have discussions with Operating personnel on the procedures followed to ensure shipments are compliant with NDOT regulations and Nevada National Security Site Waste Acceptance Criteria (NNSWAC).

Question: How do RWAP personnel verify the internal contents of a waste package?

Answer: The NSO certifies each generator's program for packaging of the waste. The waste received is approved through a waste profile. The certified generator is then responsible for ensuring that the internal contents match the approved waste profile. The NNSWAC quality assurance program has auditors

that review the paperwork (photos, forms, checklists) to verify that what is being shipped is what is actually in the container. If not, the generator could lose their certification to ship waste to the NNSS.

Frank Di Sanza gave an update on the large radioactive shipment being shipped by Cal Edison across Nevada to EnergySolutions in Utah. The shipment will reach the California/Nevada border on US Highway 6 this evening for inspections and maintenance. The escorted shipment will then continue its three day journey across Nevada starting on Monday, August 15, 2011.

Question: How long is the truck?

Answer: 373 feet in length.

2. Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) - Transportation Analysis Briefing.

Frank Di Sanza introduced the speakers for the SWEIS – Transportation Analysis Briefing: Mike West from Potomac Hudson Engineering and Sandy Enyeart from Science Applications International Corporation. Their presentation can be viewed on the website at:

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

Question: Under the Expanded Operations Alternative on page 3 of the presentation, is that the volume of LLW/Mixed LLW (MLLW) being disposed currently at the NNSS?

Answer: No, what is currently received at NNSS is around five percent of what is DOE-generated.

Question: What happens to the rest of the DOE-generated waste?

Answer: Approximately 90 percent is disposed at the facility of origination and the other 5 percent is disposed at commercial sites.

Question: Under the Expanded Operations Alternative column on page 3 of the presentation, what does the 52 million cubic feet of LLW/MLLW represent?

Answer: Using the data in the Waste Management Information System for each DOE facility, the SWEIS task group included the forecasts from all DOE sites for the next ten years for shipments that are marked to be shipped to the NNSS, and that total was added to the “To Be Determined” numbers for all shipments that have an undetermined site of disposal at this time.

Question: On page 3 of the presentation, why are the No Action Alternative and Reduced Operations Alternative totals for LLW/MLLW the same?

Answer: The No Action and Reduced Operations Alternatives waste disposal estimates are based on an average over the last ten years of the actual waste volumes. The Reduced Operations Alternative represents a lesser operations effort and reflects the minimum levels in order to fulfill DOE’s mission. There are two types of waste, Classified and MLLW Greater than Class A, that have no other path to disposal through the NNSS at this time. MLLW is regulated by NDEP, and 900,000 cubic feet is the permitted volume and reflects the remaining capacity.

Question: On page 4 of the presentation, what is the difference between in-state versus out-of-state radioactive waste shipments?

Answer: The difference is the physical location of the generators and the origination of the waste.

Question: Is it safer to ship by rail than by truck?

Answer: The impacts are much less by rail (upcoming slides in presentation cover).

Question: For clarification on the map on page 6 of the presentation, are the pictured locations the farthest reasonable point in each region of origination from the NNSS?

Answer: Yes, it builds in flexibility for DOE for its inventory and builds in conservatism.

Question: On page 7 of the presentation, where did the SWEIS task group get the assumptions for the models?

Answer: Different scenarios for truck and rail were used in the models. In Appendix E of the draft SWEIS, there is detailed documentation.

Question: Based on the information in the draft SWEIS, does DOE anticipate the NNSS WAC to be revisited?

Answer: No; however, DOE will use comments on the SWEIS to reevaluate its policy regarding LLW transportation routes within Nevada.

Question: Can different types of waste be constrained by different routes?

Answer: Yes, it is conceivable that higher activity waste could use the interstate system as the preferred route and lower activity waste could go through Pahrump on Nevada State Route 160.

Question: By looking at all reasonable routes, will it open the door to stratification of waste and what NNSS will accept?

Answer: Yes, it opens up discussion of using other modes of transportation, such as rail. DOE may also look at using time of day and time of week restrictions, for example, waste might only be transported during the early morning hours. These types of decisions need to be made and possibly included in the NNSS WAC.

Question: In regards to rail transportation, truck to rail transfers system, and then back to truck transportation, was the safety through Las Vegas analyzed?

Answer: Yes, human health impacts are calculated and results are displayed in the draft SWEIS.

Question: Was rail all the way to the NNSS considered in the draft SWEIS?

Answer: No, initially Yucca Mountain had the lead on rail transportation; so the NNSS has not pursued it and now with the economic downturn, it is probably not an option due to fewer available federal dollars.

Question: Is the vision of the SWEIS to force transportation route selections?

Answer: No, the SWEIS will not decide on specific transportation routes. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires federal agencies to look at all alternatives. All impacts (including political) will be included in any decision-making process. It is a DOE value to be a good steward and protect its citizens, but by regulation, federal agencies cannot interfere or dictate interstate commerce. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the carrier of the shipment to decide the routing of any shipment, but they need to follow any requirements in the NNSS WAC to ship to the NNSS.

Question: From the perspective of Las Vegas when a truck goes through the metropolitan area, doesn't the impact to Las Vegas citizens go up?

Answer: The SWEIS did not break out the Las Vegas area impacts, but it will show the impacts of the unconstrained and constrained case routes.

Question: On page 9 of the presentation, if the transportation goal is to get the waste to the NNSS safely, from the north the carrier can use Highway 6 to Highway 95 to the NNSS. There has been some discussion about taking Interstate 15 from the north, could the carrier use Highway 50 to Highway 6 to the NNSS and not go through Las Vegas?

Answer: This route has been used by the carriers over the last ten years.

Question: Beyond the scope of the routes in the SWEIS, what will be included in the document?

Answer: Results will be presented in the SWEIS, but there will not be any route recommendations in the document. Any transportation requirements by DOE will be included in the NNSS WAC.

Question: What impact will the public have on the SWEIS outside of the analysis?

Answer: The TWG mission is to review the draft SWEIS. The TWG comments will provide the building blocks for the TWG to continue to work with DOE and stakeholders until policy decisions are made.

Question: In the analysis there are many elements, is there a law to protect the preferred routes so developers do not build around these routes?

Answer: No, for example, around Carlsbad, New Mexico, the city built a bypass route to relieve transportation issues, but developers then built around the bypass. Ultimately, these discussions and policy decisions remain with local public leaders.

Question: If road conditions in the model between constrained and unconstrained alternatives are mostly equal, was there a consideration to improve the roads that would make the constrained case more attractive?

Answer: No consideration was made for improved infrastructure, just status quo with the constrained case routes.

Question: Is there a way of mitigating any transportation impacts?

Answer: Yes, through the Emergency Preparedness Emergency Group (EPWG) funding. This funding is distributed as sub-grants to the six counties that are part of the EPWG, through a grant from DOE to

the Nevada Division of Emergency Management. A county representative present at the meeting commented that the program has been highly successful and has made vast improvements within the counties.

Question: Did any counties opt out of the EPWG funding?

Answer: No, all six counties participated.

Question: How much funding has been dispersed through the EPWG grant?

Answer: 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).

Question: How do the counties utilize the EPWG funding?

Answer: EPWG funding assists counties in fulfilling their priority needs for their emergency management programs in the form of vehicles, equipment, training, and facilities.

Question: How much funding is the EPWG grant?

Answer: Generators are charged a \$.50 per cubic foot of waste disposal fee that is used to fund the EPWG grants. In FY 2010, 2.3 million cubic feet of waste was received by the NNSS which equated to \$1.15 million in EPWG grants.

Question: On page 13 of the presentation, if an incident occurred in a rural area, how is the person-rem calculated?

Answer: The calculation is dependent on the dose received and the distance that the individuals were located from the incident site. The models used conservatism that tends to overestimate the impacts of an incident.

Question: On page 15 of the presentation, why is the conversion factor of 0.0006 Latent Cancer Fatalities (LCFs) used?

Answer: The 0.0006 conversion factor is a standard methodology that is used both nationally and internationally. To assist in understanding, the reference for this item and all 700 references for the draft SWEIS can be found on the website at: <http://www.nv.energy.gov/SWEIS>.

Question: On page 16 of the presentation, what is the difference between workers and the public?

Answer: A worker is an individual exposed for the whole extent of the shipment, assuming there are no administrative controls. The public are individuals who are standing along the road when a shipment passes them.

Question: On page 16 of the presentation, what do the LCFs represent?

Answer: The numbers represent the total LCFs over the 10 year period, incorporating all shipments using conservative assumptions.

Question: When keeping statistics for LCFs, would you attribute a cancer of a worker to their occupation?

Answer: In order to get the kind of exposure used in the example, a worker would need to ride on every truck for every shipment. There is no way to determine if a cancer can be attributed to any one specific reason.

Question: What if a worker has worked in the industry for 20 years?

Answer: DOE does not collect this data. Again, there is no way to determine if a cancer is caused by any specific reason.

Question: If DOE does not track data on LCFs, how do you determine what a LCF is?

Answer: All calculations are based on statistics collected from other studies and collected over the years. For example, there were studies after Hiroshima that looked at radioactive exposure versus cancer.

Question: Is there a medical regime that employees go through to monitor their exposure?

Answer: DOE does not monitor the truck drivers as that is the responsibility of the carrier. DOE also does not monitor individuals in rural areas around the transportation routes. DOE does collect data at various stations around the region and makes analyses. NNSS workers do wear dosimeters that are monitored regularly. Employees may be pulled from the jobsite if their exposure is above recommendation amounts.

Question: What is the Desert Research Institute (DRI) study?

Answer: About 6-7 years ago, the state requested a study of truck drivers' exposure, but it was determined that it would be too difficult to provide, track, and monitor the dosimeters. DRI Radiological Department made a recommendation to construct a site to collect radiological readings along various routes to the NNSS. The study indicated that there is little dose to the truck driver or the public standing beside the road.

Question: Is the DRI study included in the draft SWEIS?

Answer: Not sure if it was ultimately factored into the analyses. The study would not have affected the modeling. If the DRI results had been factored in, the analyses would be less conservative and more realistic.

Question: Is there a similar table for "Health Impacts from Incident Transportation", like the table on page 17 of the presentation, "Health Impacts from Incident-Free Transportation?"

Answer: Contained within the draft SWEIS—Appendix E, Tables E-13, E-14, and E-16.

Question: Are all waste containers created equal?

Answer: Safety begins with the container. There is a graded approach for each specific waste: LLW can be disposed in 55 gallon drums or metal boxes. As the waste is higher in activity, then certified containers are used for Type B quantities of waste. Type B container has a double wall with a robust lid. In essence the container matches the waste—higher the activity, the more robust the container.

Question: Is there a comparison for accidents for constrained versus unconstrained cases.

Answer: Yes, there are small differences in dose in the population.

Question: Shouldn't a carrier be able to use any route they want?

Answer: By regulation, the carrier can select the route that minimizes radiological risk, but if they want to ship to the NNSS then they have to follow the NNSS WAC. If they violate the NNSS WAC, RWAP personnel issue a Corrective Action Request (CAR). A CAR will include a Corrective Action Plan on the corrective actions that will be put in place by the generator to comply with the NNSS WAC.

Question: Is waste accepted that violates the NNSS WAC transportation requirements?

Answer: If the driver is in error, RWAP will work with the generator and most often the driver is released. If the generator violates the NNSS WAC, DOE has the option of not doing business with the generator until they are in compliance.

3. Where do we go from here/general discussion.

Since the hour was growing late, Frank Di Sanza gave attendees some items to think about before the next meeting:

1. What would you like the TWG meetings to accomplish? How often should the TWG meet? Would the TWG like additional information? DOE can bring in subject experts?
2. What do you want the end result to be for the TWG? Election of a Chair? Structure comments to give to supervisors? Group comments versus individual comments?

4. Next Meetings.

August 25, 2011 – 2 p.m. – State of Nevada Grant Sawyer Building Suite 4500

- Boulder City By-Pass Status (NDOT)
- Las Vegas Valley Transportation Infrastructure/Upgrades (Regional Transportation Commission)

September 15 – Afternoon Meeting - Location TBD

- Southern Nevada Panel Discussion with Representatives from City of Las Vegas, City of North Las Vegas, City of Henderson, Boulder City, and Clark County

October 5 – Full Day - Location TBD

- Nye County Perspective
- California Perspective Regarding CA-127
- Group Discussion and Recommendation Discussion

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Please note:

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