# TRANSPORTATION WORKING GROUP (TWG) MEETING

State of Nevada Grant Sawyer Building
4th Floor Conference Room 4412
555 E. Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89101
November 2, 2011, at 10 a.m.

TWG Mission – Provide a forum for information exchange for the Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) analysis of low-level and mixed low-level radioactive waste transportation to the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS), formerly known as the Nevada Test Site.

Present:

Brok Armantrout, City of Boulder City

Marta Adams, Nevada Attorney General Office (Video Conferencing)

Kathy Bienenstein, Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board

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

Linda Cohn, NNSA/NSO

Frank Di Sanza, NNSA/NSO

Sandy Enyeart, Science Applications International Corporation

Hanne Epstein, State of Nevada Division of Emergency Management

Sydney Gordon, National Security Technologies, Inc.

Bob Halstead, Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects (Video Conferencing)

Cash Jaszczak, Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office

Phil Klevorick, Clark County

Lisa Lewis, State of Nevada Highway Patrol Commercial Enforcement

Dona Merritt, Navarro-Intera (N-I)

John Penuelas, City of Henderson Traffic Engineer

Cheng Shih, City of Las Vegas

Mark Silverstein, Clark County Department of Aviation (Tele-Conferencing)

Mike Skougard, Potomac Hudson Engineering

Joe Strolin, Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects (Video Conferencing)

Barb Ulmer, N-I

1. **Opening Remarks/Introductions**

Frank Di Sanza called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. by welcoming everyone.

Frank Di Sanza requested that TWG members respond to the e-mail meeting invitations to give permission for their contact information to be included in a TWG Contact Information listing that will be made available to the TWG membership.

Reminder: the U.S. Department of Energy, NNSA/NSO extended the public comment period for the Draft SWEIS from October 27 to December 2, 2011.

Meeting attendees introduced themselves and their agencies.

2. **Panel Discussion**

Nohemi Brewer, moderator, introduced the panel:

- Brok Armantrout, City of Boulder City (BC)
- John Penuelas, City of Henderson (HEND)

The purpose of the panel was to share comments and information on the Draft SWEIS and the constrained and unconstrained transportation analyses documented in the Draft SWEIS. Each panel member gave their input and comments on two topics (documented below). These comments will be made available to the TWG for preparing a final document their organizations may use to make formal comments on the Draft SWEIS.

The topics presented to the panel were as follows:
**Question 1:** Please share any comments that you may have on the Draft SWEIS for the Continued Operations of the DOE/NNSA Nevada National Security Site and Off-Site Locations in the State of Nevada.
**Question 2:** Please share any comments regarding the constrained and unconstrained transportation cases discussed in the Draft SWEIS.

**Responses for Question #1:**
**(HEND)** Need to review and address all impacts for anything other than status quo; the City of Henderson is looking at a resolution in support of the Governor's letter to Secretary Chu

**(BC)** Biggest concern ~ the new bypass bridge has impacted traffic in BC; BC supports the Governor and the concerns expressed in his letter to Secretary Chu; with two (2) lanes available each direction, the traffic is backed up during weekends and especially during special events and holidays; concern ~ if a radiological incident should occur, BC has a very small emergency management/first responder team and the response time is slow, surrounding communities do assist, but the response time is lengthy due to distance and traffic congestion.

**Question:** Is there a plan in place for BC to deal with congestion?
**Answer:** BC is working with Nevada Department of Transportation and they have prepared draft drawings for proposed alternatives, but funding has been an impediment. Initially, there was a wait and see attitude to see what the traffic patterns would be after the O'Callahan – Tillman Bridge was completed. Since the completion, the traffic is actually more congested on weekends than before it was opened. One solution is a bypass toll road and the city is currently looking for investors.

**Question:** Would the Department of Energy (DOE) invest in road infrastructure for shipping routes in this case?
**Answer:** Congress, not DOE, would be the approval authority for funding, the probability is very low.

**Responses for Question #2:**
**(HEND)** concern ~ bottlenecks, especially in two locations: 1) westbound Clark County (CC) 215 and Highway 93 and 2) Green Valley Shopping District and CC 215. As 40% of Henderson's population or 112,000 people live within 1 mile of these routes, no risk is an acceptable one.

**(BC)** remain with constrained case; concerns ~ 1) on Highway 95, periodic wind storms that close the roadways, 2) potential for accidents with solar panels in El Dorado Valley, 3) there is 22 miles of BC for first responders to cover

**Question:** What is the capability for Emergency Response in Henderson?
**Answer:** Will get back to the TWG with specifics. (HEND)

**Question:** How far west and north does Henderson's city limits extend?
**Answer:** Approximately Eastern to the west and south to the M Resort.

**Question:** Is the intersection of I-15 and NV State Route 160 within Henderson?
**Answer:** No, within Clark County

3. **Outline White Paper/Open Discussion**

**(Bienenstein)** Recommendation for constrained case; DOE needs to address the comments of all agencies regarding the constrained versus unconstrained cases

**(Halstead)** Since Yucca Mountain is no longer on the table, the Expanded Operations Alternative needs to look at all solutions *that do not required the use highway or rail routes through metro Las Vegas, the Spaghetti Bowl or the Las Vegas Beltway* and keep a broad approach in analyzing roads into and on NNSS (existing or potential) for ways to make them less dangerous for the shipment of waste and other materials; specifically need additional studies in regards to choke points on potential truck routes (e.g., SR160 in Pahrump, US6 in Tonopah, US95 in Goldfield and Beatty); need to start dialogue with the Air Force on potential transportation routes if DOE wants to consider intermodal transfer at Caliente.

**(Strolin)** Abdicating the existing agreement between DOE and the state that requires shipments to avoid the Las Vegas metro area, the Spaghetti Bowl, and the Las Vegas beltway is NOT an option. If the objective then is to reduce the number of shipments using SR 160, DOE should consider working with California to fund needed improvements on CA 127.

California's original objections to making greater use of CA 127 for low-level waste (LLW) and mixed low-level waste (MLLW) shipments were (1) concern over the precedent that could be set for potential Yucca Mountain high-level waste (HLW) shipments and (2) issues related to the physical condition of the highway and the propensity for washouts and flooding. With Yucca off the table, CA may be more amenable to LLW and MLLW shipments if DOE is willing to deal with the infrastructure issues and pay to improve conditions along the route. It should also be noted that the informal agreement we have with CA regarding the use of CA 127 is that LLW and MLLW

shipments would be shared, half and half, between SR 160 and CA 127. That is not happening because DOE's shippers are using SR 160 much more than half the time. This would appear to be something DOE can and should be influencing.

Frank reminded TWG members that he and Nohemi Brewer will travel to California next week to meet with Barbara Byron from the California Energy Commission for her written statement in regards to the Draft SWEIS.

**(Klevorick)** Look at all alternatives; in support of Halstead comments (above); impacts for intermodal transportation needs to be further analyzed; the frequency, timing, and size of shipments need to be analyzed; need to know impacts on the infrastructure; outreach to citizens regarding the risks involved; not in support for anything under the unconstrained case without knowing the impacts.

**(Penuelas)** concern~ large volumes in the Expanded Operations Alternative, **(FRANK RESPONSE)** to aid in the decision-making process, would not change the volumes but provide additional studies of the volumes of waste going to the NNSS over time

**(Klevorick)** Analyze the First Responders capability under the Expanded Operations Alternative; the cumulative impacts on the Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) waste is limited in the Draft SWEIS and needs to be factored into the analyses, radiological aspects related to GTCC need to be evaluated **(LINDA COHN RESPONSE)** Decisions regarding GTCC will not be made in the near future. If GTCC waste were accepted at the NNSS, more NEPA analysis would need to be done, and at a minimum, a supplemental EIS.

**(Epstein)** Important to look at local and state capabilities for Emergency Management

**(Jasczak)** Identify the pinch points and the improvements that can be made as there are safety issues that need to be addressed

**(Shih)** 1) Draft SWEIS does not properly address a worst case scenario, i.e. potential radiological contamination of storm drain and water within Lake Mead, 2) Concern with the possibility of extended exposure with a rail car sitting in Las Vegas before being unloaded, 3) Question the accuracy of the models, 4) Look at all possibilities other than going through Metro Las Vegas, 5) In support of Governor Sandoval's letter to Secretary Chu

**(Penuelas)** need to have an estimate of the number of trucks on specific routes and then the traffic issues can be analyzed and mitigated, also look at air quality issues

**(Armantrout)** look at all agencies involved with Emergency Response within Nevada, California, and Arizona; small communities may not have the HazMat capabilities required to respond to an incident

**(Halstead)**
Comments:
1) State of Nevada strongly supports continuation of constrained case routing
2) Regarding GTCC, State has submitted detailed comments on DOE DEIS-0375-D
3) Recommend a broad approach at looking at the infrastructure needs/solutions/alternatives

Recommendations:

1) Need to have a good handle on the potential range of wastes(LLW/MLLW) and other RAMs, and modes of shipments, to determine maximum and minimum number of shipments annually and over a 10 year period
2) More precise understanding of maximum radionuclides in shipments(e.g., how representative are the values provided in Tables E-5, E-6, E-7, E-8, &E-9, Appendix E of the Draft SWEIS); great concern about certain radionuclides, such as Strontium-90; need risk informed analyses based on more precise radionuclide inventories
3) Transportation accident issues go beyond release fraction assumptions that DOE uses for Type A packages based on the DOE Handbook 1994 (see discussion at DEIS Pp. E-33 to E-57); performance of Type A packages in severe rail accidents a particular concern
4) There are unique local conditions that need to be taken account, i.e. population, economic activity, and building types, in assessment of transportation impacts; State to use own GIS data analyses to assess impacts with ½-1 mile (800-1600 meters) of transportation routes
5) Look at limits of the DOE models ~ RISKIND and RADTRAN; RISKIND model allows use of local data
6) Most shipments in the Expanded Operations Alternative fall into categories of LLW, MLLW, GTCC, but another category to look at is the shipment of nuclear weapons-8,200 shipments over the next 10 years

## 4. Closing Remarks/Next Meeting

Frank Di Sanza informed attendees that the meeting summary will be drafted and sent out to respective members for edits on their comments. Once edits are incorporated, the final summary will be made available for the TWG to utilize in preparing their comments/recommendations for a white paper or similar document.

The next meeting is scheduled for the afternoon of Monday, November 14.

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.