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1. WIEB’s answer to the NWTRB Question
2. WIEB’s Oct. 10-11 Meeting: Purpose & Topics
3. Ideas for a Vision Statement: The Basis for Partnership
1. WIEB’s Views on the Transportation Recommendations Adopted by the BRC.

- We’re for them (& for BRC recommendations generally)
- Want to work with DOE-NE (and any successor agency) to implement BRC recommendations.
- Have lots of thoughts re particulars and linkages.
- View transportation systems broadly, like NAS.
- Had a fully-loaded meeting on all this, just last week.
- Expect to organize our inquiries on two related paths.
  a) Removal from orphan sites.
  b) Removal from still-operating sites.
2. WIEB HLW Committee Meeting in Denver: Oct. 10-11

a) Status of the Nuclear Waste Program in Reformulation
   BRC Findings & Recommendations (Alex Thrower, BRC Staff)
   Litigation (Mike McBride, Van Ness Feldman)
   Legislation (Sam Fowler, Senate Energy Committee)
   Regulation (Earl Easton, NRC)
   DOE-NE Initiatives (Corinne Macaluso, DOE-NE)

b) Review of NAS Recommendations: Going the Distance, 2006
   • A comprehensive list of the issues
   • BRC generally adopted NAS recommendations
     i. Should these be part of SNF/HLW transp. system design?
     ii. What question/issues must be addressed in implementation?
     iii. What directions/priorities for WIEB?
The NAS recommendations as reviewed:

- Cask design & testing (Bob Halstead, NV)
- Modal choice/acceptance order (Bob Halstead, NV)
- Route assessment/selection (Fred Dilger, NV)
- Transp. operations, inclu. Section 180(c) (Anne deL Clark, NM)
- Transportation security (Rich Baker, AZ)
- Organizational Structure (Connie Nakahara, UT)

WIEB inquiries along two related tracks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cask design, testing</th>
<th>Modal choice, accept. order</th>
<th>Route assess, selection</th>
<th>Transp oper, inclu Section 180(c)</th>
<th>Transp. security</th>
<th>Organiz. structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shutdown sites:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating sites:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The Basis for Partnership: Ideas for a Vision Statement

There are “no fundamental technical barriers to the safe transportation of SNF/HLW …..However, there are a number of social and institutional challenges…… and, the challenges of sustained implementation should not be underestimated. (NAS, pgs. 7-8)

The Federal-State partnership purpose in transportation system design.
The potential Achilles Heel.......unique constituencies for the transportation component.
Risk perception and response......the approach to technical, security, social risks (trust).
Best practice process......to ensure safe and uneventful transport....consider:
  • Full-scale cask testing, as part of comprehensive program;
  • Shipment of older fuel while maximizing transport efficiency;
  • Shipment sequencing.....from individual and sub-region reactor sites;
  • Full implementation of dedicated train decision;
  • Use of advanced monitoring/tracking tools;
  • Advanced route assessment tools;
  • Communication processes: with local officials, media, in advance of and during oper.

Costs in Context: Cost premiums vs. costs of contention and delay, both in transport and in linked aspects of program.

Federal transportation management: Consistent & adequate funding; long lead-times; reliable agency support; recruit and retain top-flight team.

STATUS: PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR REVIEW WITH DOE-NE & SRGs
Questions??
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