

HLWYM HEmails

From: Patrick Laplante
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2007 8:41 PM
To: Garcia-Santos, Norma
Subject: Status of Scoping My Review

Norma,

After looking over (skimming) the DOE EIS documents and the files in their calculation package, I have a better idea of the documents/sections to focus my review. As I continue to look in greater detail at the information I'm sure my focus will improve but I think this provides a good starting point. Feel free to provide feedback if you have any comments or want to steer me in a specific direction. The main focus of my (transportation) review will be on national and Nevada transportation radiological impact assessment documentation, methods, and results. The key sections include:

Repository DSEIS,

- Chapter 6 Transportation (this is just a summary of methods/results)
- Appendix G Transportation (more detailed info supporting Ch 6) Rail Alignment DEIS (emphasis on Caliente trans analyses and info)
- Vol II, Chapter 3, Section 3.2.10.5 Aff. Env Occ/Pub H&S trans
- Vol III, Chapter 4, Section 4.2.10 Impacts Env Occ/Pub H&S
- Vol IV, Appx K Rad H&S Methods
 - K2 Transportation Methods and Data
 - K3 Transportation Topical Areas (lower priority)
- Vol IV, Appx L Supp Trans Info (lower priority)

Transportation Calculation Package: A quick look did not find any problems other than the corrupted refs disk (i.e., my preliminary assessment is that all the expected information is included...such as inputs/outputs for TRAGIS, RESRAD, RISKIND code runs and post processing spreadsheets where "unit" code output results are converted to actual doses/impacts). As I continue to dig into this, I will let you know if I find any significant missing information. Once I have a more complete understanding of the methods and scope of calculations I will dig into representative selected routing, incident free unit dose/risk, accident unit dose/risk, and post processing impact calcs to verify key inputs/outputs match what's in the EIS documents (i.e., a "vertical slice transparency and traceability review" as some might call it) and the execution/implementation of methods is sound.

Note that the Rail Corridor DSEIS is entirely focused on Mina and is presumed to be a lower priority.

My review will follow instructions in Christine's plan and associated attachments which emphasize a doing a NEPA review (for NRC as a commenting agency) that is also implemented within the context of the YM specific adoption review procedure.

I have also reviewed the summary of changes to 2002 FEIS methods and so far have not seen anything that looks problematic (many changes serve to increase impacts).

I will contact our consultants on Monday to see where they can provide support.

Please call or write if you want to discuss further or if this does not adequately capture what we have previously discussed. I will try to keep you informed on the status of my review as it progresses.

Thanks
Pat

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YuccaMountain_Hold_EX
Email Number: 1878

Mail Envelope Properties (plaplante@cnwra.swri.edu20071019204000)

Subject: Status of Scoping My Review
Sent Date: 10/19/2007 8:40:36 PM
Received Date: 10/19/2007 8:40:00 PM
From: Patrick Laplante

Created By: plaplante@cnwra.swri.edu

Recipients:
"Garcia-Santos, Norma" <Norma.Garcia-Santos@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2878	10/19/2007 8:40:00 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: