Jeff Frederiksen on 08/19/99 09:39:40 AM

To: Matthew Goike/D09/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
cc:
Subject: Re: LLW Data Collection

Matthew,

The best response I can give to your inquiry about specific areas where weather-related events might pose significant hazards for LLW trucks is this:

Flash Flooding occurs throughout the area year-round with the greatest concentration usually occurring during the summer months. As for specific areas of concern, it seems that SR 127 from PM 1.0 to PM 29.0 floods more frequently with serious mudflows.

Another area of concern is the Amargosa River which crosses SR 127 at six locations. The river, normally a dry wash, flows under the highway through CMP's with the exception of SBD PM 32 which is concrete box culverts. Flows have been measured in excess of 10,000 CFM during major storms.

Additionally, there is one dip-section on SR 178 where the river frequently rises above the roadbed since there are only two CMP's to handle the flow in the main channel.

The aforementioned areas are the most critical. The rest of 178 East is generally trouble-free but has seen the rare mudslide in isolated locations. Of course, any portion of the highway can be affected by unusual weather events.

If you need more specifics, please let me know ASAP. I will be out of town until Sept30.

Thanks,
Jeff

50 yr 83-84

this yr briefly

Matthew Goike
08/13/99 08:23 AM

To: Lawrence Monsalud/D09/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
cc:
Subject: Risk Analysis

---------- Forwarded by Matthew Goike/D09/Caltrans/CAGov on 08/13/99 08:23 AM ----------

Pete Conn on 08/12/99 01:51:14 PM

To: Matthew Goike/D09/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
cc:
Subject: Risk Analysis

Please pass this along...

Thanks

---------- Forwarded by Pete Conn/D09/Caltrans/CAGov on 08/12/99 01:42 PM ----------

Jeff Frederiksen on 08/12/99 01:34:08 PM

To: Pete Conn/D09/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
cc: Manny Ortiz/D09/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
Subject: Risk Analysis

Pete,

Here are some observations from my perspective. It seems to me that the time allocated to respond to this was rather limited given the scope of the survey. By the way, Katy Walton has the most/best info.
Thanks,
Jeff

SRs 127 & 178 are being considered as possible Low - level Radioactive Waste (LLW) shipment routes to Nevada Test Site (NTS). The Planning Division is in the process of gathering information about SR 127 (PM 0.000 to 49.420) and SR 178 (PM 42.920 to 62.186) for risk analysis. We will provide the risk analysis to Western Governors Association (WGA) meeting in the first week of October. The following factors and information are needed for evaluation:

A. Roadway Conditions:
1. Highway Capacity rating
2. Number of travel lanes **(Two lanes throughout the segment)**

3. Width of travel lanes **(Generally 12'. No improved shoulders)**
4. Width of emergency parking lanes **(none)**
5. Left and right turn lanes **(none)**
6. Divided highway segments, with and without medians **(none)**
7. General pavement conditions **(Good to Poor)**
8. Weight and size restrictions which would affect a legal truck (US DOT standards) **(SR 127 has poor subgrade/base conditions throughout and cannot withstand heavier than legal loads. In fact, recent increases in LEGAL loads have contributed to a rapidly deteriorating roadbed.)**
9. Steep grades and sharp curves **(Several sharp curves beginning at SBD 127 PM 38 and continuing throughout INYO 127. Consideration should be given to re-aligning as many of these curves as possible before allowing extremely hazardous waste to be transported on this route.)**

B. Traffic and Safety Conditions
1. Latest traffic counts by vehicle classifications
2. Accident statistics for the past three years, noting types of accidents
3. Seasonal weather conditions and months these are likely to affect commercial truck operations, i.e. flash floods. snow and ice. **(Flash floods occur mainly in the Summer months however, the rare heavy winter or spring rains can also cause severe flooding)**
4. Proposed construction activities (State/regional TIP) which would result in lane closures.

C. Special Operating Conditions
1. State restriction of a route for use for hazardous material shipments.
2. Time of day or week restrictions on hazardous material shipments.
3. Dates or special events which would cause significant traffic congestion problems. **(One annual race during the month of April on a Saturday causes severe congestion)**
4. Tourist and special commuter conditions. **(limited services throughout the area. High incidence of Foreign Tourists especially during the summer months.)**

D. Vehicle Operating Considerations
1. Driver services , i.e. fuel, food, repair and rest facilities **(very limited)**
2. Communications dead spots (satellites and FM radio) **(Poor radio reception throughout the area)**
3. Emergency response and recovery services. **(Limited Volunteer Emergency services)**

E. Other Factors
1. Residential development within a half mile of the roadway **(Some housing roadside in Baker and within one half mile or the highway in Shoshone)**
2. Schools, hospitals, convention and large meeting facilities **(Two schools. One in Baker and one in Shoshone)**
3. Other factors affecting the normal operation of a combination commercial vehicle (legal weight factor - trailer combination).

Your input / comment on the above list of factors and information is greatly appreciated. You also can provide additional information which may help us in the assessment of SRs 127 & 178. Please submit your input / comment by **August 16, 1999**. You can call me (ext-644) or Matthew Goike (ext-786) if you have any question.