

Discussion Questions
WIEB HLW Committee Meeting
Salt Lake City, UT, May 4, 2006

10:40 – 11:40 Discussion of NRC Cask Vulnerability and Consequence Studies:

- Presentation from Earl Easton, NRC
- Questions from Committee Members
 - WGA Resolution 04-02 “Assessing the Risks of Terrorism and Sabotage Against HLW Shipments to a Geologic Repository or Interim Storage Facility” calls for the NRC to reexamine the risks, vulnerability and consequences of terrorism or sabotage against SNF/HLW shipments. The intent of this reexamination should be to determine the adequacy of not only the casks themselves, but also the adequacy of current physical and operational protections regulations. What has NRC done and what is NRC's current plan/schedule to address these concerns and share that information with affected stakeholders?
 - We understand that information on the specifics of weapons and the effects of various weapons on casks, as well as the specifics of threat scenarios, is highly sensitive and needs to be restricted. However, what states need to adequately prepare is information on consequences of a successful attack – i.e., the amount and types of radionuclides released; the form and pathways of likely dispersion; biophysical implications; etc. Is there any reason NRC cannot provide states' emergency preparedness people with this type of information?

12:40 – 1:25 NWTRB Transportation Recommendations:

- Presentation from Howard Arnold, NWTRB
- Questions from Committee Members
 - What recent recommendation has NWTRB made to OCRWM regarding their SNF transportation system?
 - What has been the Board's reaction to the recent NAS study on SNF transportation?
 - Can you elaborate on your recommendation that DOE consider a “phased approach” to system operation? In particular, can you explain what the Board means by handling “normal” fuel first?
 - Please elaborate on your recommendation that OCRWM develop contingency plans for legal-weight and heavy-haul truck shipments.
 - Has the Board considered how the Yucca Mountain program would be affected by the government's Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP)?
 - Has the Board considered or evaluated any of the “Fix Yucca” and interim storage legislative proposals currently before Congress?
 - Has the Board reviewed DOE's revised repository design, esp. with respect to the new TAD concept and how the changes will impact the project, especially the transportation aspects?

1:25 – 2:10 OCRWM National Transportation System Update and Discussion:

- Presentation from Alex Thrower, DOE-RW (invited)
- Questions from Committee Members
 - What events could cause DOE to not meet the 2017 “earliest achievable” opening date, and what is DOE doing to try and plan for those events? What events or circumstances could cause DOE to not meet its 2008 application filing goal?
 - What is the Department’s view of the other legislative proposals (besides S.2589) currently pending before Congress? In particular, how does DOE view S.3962, the Nuclear Fuel Management and Disposal Act introduced by Senator Domenici last month?
 - If Congress elects to establish centralized away-from-reactor storage facilities, to what extent could 180(c) funds be used to prepare states for shipments to such facilities?
 - Approximately what level of funding would OCRWM need for FY07 in order to be able to go ahead with the 180(c) Pilot Program as proposed?
 - Please discuss the major points of the two Notices of Intent filed earlier this month regarding the Rail Alignment EIS and Supplemental FEIS for Yucca Mountain. What are the major transportation impacts of these for the corridor states, and what is OCRWM doing to ensure states’ concerns are addressed?
 - Now that the CD-1 package for the revised repository has been approved, can you briefly discuss what changes the CD-1 directs, and how those changes will impact transportation to Yucca?
 - The Western states have been concerned for some time about the risks and consequences of terrorism or sabotage against SNF shipments; the recent NAS study on SNF transportation expressed similar concerns. The NRC has recently begun taking steps that will, we hope, address those concerns. What steps is DOE taking?
 - We understand that DOE is considering a new rail access route within Nevada to Yucca Mountain. The new route would mean that SNF and HLW comes into the state along the Union Pacific main line located roughly parallel to the I-80 corridor. There would seem to be added impacts to the state of California if such a spur line is constructed, and the state of Utah would see waste shipped through Salt Lake City and western Utah along a main line rail that is different from the one used if the Caliente spur was used. There could also be differential impacts to other western states as well. What does DOE propose to do to assess impacts of shipments on other western states that might result for the selection of a rail spur from the north?
 - Will DOE be redoing the national transportation analysis in the final Yucca Mountain EIS as a result of the changes posed by the use of TADs and the new Mina rail access route?

2:20 – 3:00 NWPA Routing Discussion:

- Presentation from Alex Thrower, DOE-RW
- Questions from Committee Members
 - Has OCRWM had a chance yet to review the routing work done by the Midwest and Eastern CSG groups to determine if their proposed suites of routes are mutually compatible?
 - What is DOE doing to work with and prepare the railroads for selection and use of specific routes for SNF and HLW shipments, since specification of a specific route is not something a railroad company would normally engage in with a shipper? What problems does DOE anticipate in this regard?
 - When does DOE propose to have a set of identified national routes available for the western states to review? How will the review process be handled? Will DOE publish the routes in a Federal Register Notice and request comments? If not, why not?
 - Even though DOE has selected a “mostly rail” mode for shipping SNF and HLW, there will still be a significant number of truck shipments required. Will DOE identify highway routes at the same time it identifies rail routes? Will highway route identification be done by identifying specific reactor/generator sites that are not capable of shipping by rail (for one reason or another) or will highway route identification be a generic process?
 - To what extent will DOE and/or the Routing Topic Group consider barge routes as well?
 - Does DOE plan to phase-in OCRWM shipment corridors as shipments progress, similar to DOE's phasing in WIPP shipping corridors?