

U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board

Fall, 2012 Board Meeting: Oct. 17, 2012

SRG's Views on BRC Transportation Recommendations

Jim Williams, WIEB HLW Program Manager

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:

	Cask design, testing	Modal choice, accept. order	Route assess, selection	Transp oper, inclu Section 180(c)	Transp. security	Organiz. structure
Shutdown sites:						
Operating sites:						

# 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??

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