(E) SR 127 Yucca Mtn.

Katy Walton
07/14/2003 05:34 PM

To: Brad Mettam/D09/Caltrans/CAGov,
cc:
cc:
Subject: draft notes from 7/3/3 meeting

Brad - I think you and I need to prepare notes from our 7/3 meeting and send them to Tom H. and Anne M. I've taken the first shot at these notes. Would you please me to refine and edit them? Thanks,

Regarding the SR 127 Feasibility Analysis Report (FAR) that was recently signed by both Anne and Tom: Brad Mettam, Project Manager and I met on July 3, 2003 with Inyo Supervisors Michael Dorame and Ted Williams, BLM Regional Manager, Tim Read, and their real estate person, Roxie Trost, Inyo County Yucca Mtn coordinator, Andrew Remas, and San Bernardino County Supervisor Bill Postmus's Legislative Director, Jim Wilshire (via teleconference). The FAR studies the feasibility of a Heavy Haul Scenario of Control Quantities of High Level Waste, identifies potential impacts and resultant mitigation needed (if SR 127 were to be considered to transport nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain). The purpose of the meeting was to provide an Overview of the Radioactive Waste Transportation on SR 127, the background/history, the studies that have been done jointly between Inyo and Caltrans, and a Review of the FAR.

The background/overview provided by Brad and Andrew discussed requirements for low-level haul verses controlled quantities (high level) which allows a lot of carrier discretion; 1) how low-level has been occurring historically often through Las Vegas but has shifted onto SR 127 during the last 5 years because of NV's concerns. There are 15 to 20 cleanup site that low-level that will continue to ship over the next 20-35 years. 2) WHIPP shipments (transuranic waste - uranium and lab waste - NRC type programs) were expected to start shipping June 30 . Senator Feinstein and CHP letters delayed shipments. They are expecting to ship roughly 100 barrels (1450 gal/cask) of DOE Type B canisters through 2009. 3) Possible high-level (Yucca) via highway route controlled quantities regulations. DOE's preferred alternative is via Rail line but would require the construction of a new $1 billion spur line through mountainous terrain. Nevada may make this difficult to construct. DOE's target date for accepting shipments is 2010 but more realistically 2012-2014. NRC is in the process of reviewing the licensing proposal. and, 4) Also, looking at a mix waste site for potential licensing under ground (at Yucca) target date 2003 for receiving shipments.

Then I reviewed the 1994/95 O & D, traffic counts, pavement management and classification studies we did jointly with Inyo County to develop baseline information used in the update of the SR 127 TCR. We talked about the studies done by CHP (lead for designation of routes in California) with Vanderbilt University using TransRad modeling that resulted in the State dedesignating some of the Interstate Routes in urban areas. But this opened the door for an annual review for further designations/designations to occur. And, the assumptions/factors that go into the TransRad model that favor urban environments/settings. We discussed size of trucks that would be used in a heavy haul scenario (ie., 40 ton 148'), the lack of Emergency Response and facilities along the Route and the inadequate infrastructure (being a paved Wagon Trail).

The review of the FAR included the level of analysis done and what still needs to be studied. The FAR doesn't address emergency response, socioeconomic impacts, cultural or environmental concerns. A PSR and ED would be needed in order to fully analyze impacts, propose remediation, and estimate costs. I-15 through California was identified in the licensing report done by DOE and Nevada approved this recommendation. We talked a little about NRC's role seems to be focused on developing a Security Plan, cask and site-suitability for meeting licensing requirements (transportation and routing are vague and may only be remotely tied into security). If transportation were to end up being done via legal weight trucks the number of shipments would approximately triple that of heavy haul. Should the heavy haul scenario using SR 127 be selected then we estimate 240 acres would be needed. Current R/W width

varies from 61 to 122' - we only have prescriptive rights (RS-2477). Being that the route borders in places designated Wilderness and the DVNP Congressional action would be needed to acquire R/W. Caltrans, since the early 1990's have been working with the California Energy Commission (Barbara Byron and Daniel Nix). Both Barbara and Daniel have been provided copies of the FAR. The CEC works closely with the Western States Energy Board. We agreed that it's really up to the CEC, CHP and the Governor's Office to establish policy and Brad and I reiterated that Caltrans' position was one of neutrality. We also emphasized that we don't want this FAR to be construed that there's a price tag on the use of the State Route as further engineering and environmental studies would be needed.

Andrew R. discussed a proposal that Inyo County (as an Affected Unit of Local Govt.) is financing to look at a normal haul trucking scenario on SR 127. The RFP is being developed and hi hopes to have it start the end of this year by consultant services. It will cover parts of SRs 190 and 178 for low level, too. Jim offered assistance to finance that portion of the study covering San Bernardino. Andrew accepted his offer and agreed to work closely with Bill Postmus' office and Caltrans in scoping and coordinating this study.

Per Andrew once DOE has the green light from NRC to proceed they will do a call for 180(c) funds to the affected states to implement emergency response, training, and other site readiness improvements only three years before accepting shipments. This does not provide the front-end time to develop and construct major transportation/routing improvements.

There was consensus that we collectively should continue to urge DOE, NRC, DOT and/or Congress to study transportation, including routing and coordination between adjoining states earlier rather than later since it would take years to see infrastructure projects implemented and on the ground.

If you have any questions please feel free to call me or Brad (8-627-5214)

Katy Walton
Deputy District Director
Planning & Programming
District 9
500 S. Main Street
Bishop, CA 93514
(760) 872-0691 or 8-627-0691
katy_walton@dot.ca.gov