U.S.NRC
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Protecting People and the Environment

NUREG-2113

Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium Deconversion Plant in Lea County, New Mexico

Draft Report for Comment

Office of Federal and State Materials and
Environmental Management Programs

AVAILABILITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS IN NRC PUBLICATIONS

NRC Reference Material

As of November 1999, you may electronically access NUREG-series publications and other NRC records at NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html.
Publicly released records include, to name a few, NUREG-series publications; *Federal Register* notices; applicant, licensee, and vendor documents and correspondence; NRC correspondence and internal memoranda; bulletins and information notices; inspection and investigative reports; licensee event reports; and Commission papers and their attachments.

NRC publications in the NUREG series, NRC regulations, and *Title 10, Energy*, in the Code of *Federal Regulations* may also be purchased from one of these two sources.

1. The Superintendent of Documents
   U.S. Government Printing Office
   Mail Stop SSOP
   Washington, DC 20402–0001
   Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov
   Telephone: 202-512-1800
   Fax: 202-512-2250
2. The National Technical Information Service
   Springfield, VA 22161–0002
   www.ntis.gov
   1–800–553–6847 or, locally, 703–605–6000

A single copy of each NRC draft report for comment is available free, to the extent of supply, upon written request as follows:

Address: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Administration
Publications Branch
Washington, DC 20555-0001
E-mail: DISTRIBUTION.SERVICES@NRC.GOV
Facsimile: 301–415–2289

Some publications in the NUREG series that are posted at NRC's Web site address http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs are updated periodically and may differ from the last printed version. Although references to material found on a Web site bear the date the material was accessed, the material available on the date cited may subsequently be removed from the site.

Non-NRC Reference Material

Documents available from public and special technical libraries include all open literature items, such as books, journal articles, and transactions, *Federal Register* notices, Federal and State legislation, and congressional reports. Such documents as theses, dissertations, foreign reports and translations, and non-NRC conference proceedings may be purchased from their sponsoring organization.

Copies of industry codes and standards used in a substantive manner in the NRC regulatory process are maintained at—

The NRC Technical Library
Two White Flint North
11545 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852–2738

These standards are available in the library for reference use by the public. Codes and standards are usually copyrighted and may be purchased from the originating organization or, if they are American National Standards, from—

American National Standards Institute
11 West 42nd Street
New York, NY 10036–8002
www.ansi.org
212–642–4900

Legally binding regulatory requirements are stated only in laws; NRC regulations; licenses, including technical specifications; or orders, not in NUREG-series publications. The views expressed in contractor-prepared publications in this series are not necessarily those of the NRC.

The NUREG series comprises (1) technical and administrative reports and books prepared by the staff (NUREG–XXXX) or agency contractors (NUREG/CR–XXXX), (2) proceedings of conferences (NUREG/CP–XXXX), (3) reports resulting from international agreements (NUREG/IA–XXXX), (4) brochures (NUREG/BR–XXXX), and (5) compilations of legal decisions and orders of the Commission and Atomic and Safety Licensing Boards and of Directors' decisions under Section 2.206 of NRC's regulations (NUREG–0750).

U.S.NRC
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Protecting People and the Environment

NUREG-2113

Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium Deconversion Plant in Lea County, New Mexico

Draft Report for Comment

Manuscript Completed: November 2011
Date Published: December 2011

Office of Federal and State Materials and
Environmental Management Programs

Comments on Draft Report

Any interested party may submit comments on this report for consideration by the NRC staff. Comments may be accompanied by additional relevant information or supporting data. Please specify the report number NUREG-2113, draft, in your comments, and send them by February 27, 2012, to the following address:

Chief, Rules, Announcements and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop TWB-05-B01M
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Electronic comments may be submitted to the NRC by email to INIS_EIS.Resource@nrc.gov

For any questions about the material in this report please contact:

Asimios Malliakos
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mail Stop T-8D30
Washington, DC 20555-0001
Telephone (301) 415-6458
Email: asimios.malliakos@nrc.gov

NUREG-2113 has been reproduced from the best available copy

ABSTRACT

International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc. (IIFP), a wholly-owned subsidiary of International Isotopes, Inc., has submitted a license application to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to construct, operate, and decommission Phase 1 of a fluorine extraction and depleted uranium deconversion facility in Lea County, New Mexico. The proposed facility would provide services to the uranium enrichment industry, which makes fuel for nuclear power reactors. The IIFP facility would deconvert depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF_6) into fluoride products for commercial resale, and depleted uranium oxides for disposal. The license application for Phase 1 requests NRC to license the possession of up to 750,000 kilograms (827 tons) of depleted uranium under Title 10 "Energy" of the *U.S. Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 40, "Domestic Licensing of Source Material" in accordance with the *Atomic Energy Act of 1954*.

This draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared in compliance with the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) and the NRC regulations for implementing NEPA (10 CFR 51). This draft EIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action, which is to construct, operate, and decommission Phase 1 of the fluorine extraction and depleted uranium deconversion facility, and its reasonable alternatives, and describes IIFP's monitoring program and proposed mitigation measures.

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

This NUREG contains and references information collection requirements that are subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.). These information collection requirements were approved by the Office of Management and Budget, approval numbers 3150-0014, 3150-0026, 3150-0021, 3150-0135, 3150-0009, 3150-0008, 3150-0002, and 3150-0123.

Public Protection Notification

The NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a request for information or an information collection requirement unless the requesting document displays a currently valid OMB control number.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section				Page
ABSTRACT				**iii**
LIST OF TABLES				**xii**
LIST OF FIGURES				**xvi**
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY				**xvii**
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS				**xxv**
1.0	**INTRODUCTION**			**1-1**
1.1	Background			1-1
1.2	Proposed Action			1-2
1.3	Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action			1-3
1.4	Scope of this Environmental Analysis			1-4
	1.4.1	Scoping Process and Public Participation Activities		1-5
	1.4.2	Issues Studied in Detail		1-6
	1.4.3	Issues Beyond the Scope of the EIS		1-7
1.5	Applicable Statutory and Regulatory Requirements			1-7
	1.5.1	State of New Mexico Laws and Regulations		1-7
	1.5.2	Lea County and Local Laws and Regulations		1-11
	1.5.3	Permit and Approval Status		1-12
		1.5.3.1	Permits, Licenses, Authorizations, Approvals, and Consultations Required for Preconstruction and Construction.	1-12
		1.5.3.2	Permits, Authorizations, Approvals and Consultations Required for Operations	1-12
1.6	Cooperating Agencies			1-12
1.7	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 Consultations			1-12
	1.7.1	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 Section 106 Consultation		1-12
	1.7.2	Endangered Species Act of 1973 Section 7 Consultation		1-18
1.8	References			1-19
2.0	**ALTERNATIVES**			**2-1**
2.1	Proposed Action			2-1
	2.1.1	Site Location and Description		2-2
	2.1.2	IIFP Deconversion Process		2-2
		2.1.2.1	Deconversion of DUF_6 to DUF_4	2-2
		2.1.2.2	SiF_4 Production	2-6
		2.1.2.3	BF_3 Production	2-6
	2.1.3	Description of the Proposed Facility		2-6
	2.1.4	Preconstruction and Construction		2-11
	2.1.5	Utilities and Other Services		2-12
		2.1.5.1	Electrical Power	2-13
		2.1.5.2	Water	2-13
		2.1.5.3	Natural Gas	2-13
		2.1.5.4	Internal Utilities	2-13

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section			Page
2.1.6	Facility Operations		2-14
	2.1.6.1	Workforce	2-14
	2.1.6.2	Feedstocks	2-14
	2.1.6.3	Products	2-14
	2.1.6.4	Waste Streams	2-14
	2.1.6.5	Product and Byproduct Packaging and Shipping	2-22
2.1.7	Decommissioning		2-23
2.1.8	Depleted Uranium Disposition Options		2-24
2.2	Alternatives to the Proposed Action		2-25
2.2.1	No-Action Alternative		2-25
2.2.2	Alternatives Considered But Eliminated		2-30
	2.2.2.1	Alternative Sites	2-30
	2.2.2.2	Alternative Technologies	2-33
	2.2.2.3	Overseas Shipment of DUF_6 for Deconversion	2-35
	2.2.2.4	Indefinite Storage of DUF_6	2-36
	2.2.2.5	Commercial Enrichment Plant Deconversion of DUF_6 at Uranium Enrichment Facilities	2-36
2.3	Comparison of Predicted Environmental Impacts		2-36
2.4	Staff Recommendation Regarding the Proposed Action		2-37
2.5	References		2-37
3.0	**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**		**3-1**
3.1	Site Location		3-1
3.2	Land Use		3-1
3.3	Historic and Cultural Resources		3-4
3.3.1	Prehistoric Occupation		3-5
3.3.2	Historic Indian Tribes		3-5
3.3.3	Historic Euro-American Exploration and Settlement		3-6
3.3.4	Archaeological and Historic Resources at the Proposed IIFP Site		3-7
3.4	Visual Resources		3-8
3.5	Climatology, Meteorology, and Air Quality		3-9
3.5.1	Climatology		3-9
3.5.2	Greenhouse Gases		3-10
	3.5.2.1	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks in the United States	3-11
	3.5.2.2	Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks in New Mexico	3-12
	3.5.2.3	Projected Impacts from Construction and Operation of the Proposed IIFP Facility on Carbon Dioxide and Other Greenhouse Gases	3-14
3.5.3	Meteorology		3-14
3.5.4	Air Quality		3-17
	3.5.4.1	Regulatory Setting	3-17
	3.5.4.2	Existing Conditions	3-21

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section			Page
3.6	Geology, Minerals, and Soil		3-22
	3.6.1	Regional and Site Near-surface Geology	3-22
	3.6.2	Seismicity and Volcanism	3-23
	3.6.3	Minerals	3-23
	3.6.4	Soil	3-27
3.7	Water Resources		3-31
	3.7.1	Groundwater	3-31
		3.7.1.1 Regional Groundwater	3-31
		3.7.1.2 Local Groundwater	3-32
		3.7.1.3 Groundwater Use	3-43
		3.7.1.4 Groundwater Quality	3-43
	3.7.2	Surface Water	3-44
3.8	Ecological Resources		3-49
	3.8.1	Ecosystems in the Proposed Facility	3-49
		3.8.1.1 Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie	3-49
		3.8.1.2 Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub	3-49
		3.8.1.3 Wetland and Riparian Habitat	3-51
	3.8.2	Vegetation of the Proposed Facility	3-51
	3.8.3	Wildlife that Could Occur on the Site and Proposed Facility	3-51
	3.8.4	Wildlife Travel Corridors for Resident and Migratory Species	3-55
		3.8.4.1 Migratory Species	3-55
		3.8.4.2 Resident Species	3-55
	3.8.5	Critical Habitats	3-55
	3.8.6	Wildlife Sanctuaries, Wildlife Management Areas, Refuges, and Preserves	3-55
		3.8.6.1 Green Meadow Lake	3-55
		3.8.6.2 Prairie Chicken Wildlife Area	3-56
		3.8.6.3 Lesser Prairie-Chicken Habitat Preservation Area of Critical Environmental Concern and Proposed Lesser Prairie-Chicken Expansion Corridor	3-56
	3.8.7	Special-Status Species	3-56
		3.8.7.1 Federally Endangered Species	3-59
		3.8.7.2 Federally Proposed Endangered Species	3-59
		3.8.7.3 Federal Candidate Species	3-60
		3.8.7.4 Federal Species of Concern	3-60
		3.8.7.5 New Mexico Threatened Species	3-61
3.9	Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice		3-61
	3.9.1	Demography	3-62
		3.9.1.1 Populations within the Socioeconomic ROI	3-62
		3.9.1.2 Environmental Justice: Minority and Low Income Populations	3-66
	3.9.2	Employment and Income	3-73
		3.9.2.1 Employment	3-73
		3.9.2.2 Income	3-73

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section			Page
3.9.3	Taxes		3-73
	3.9.3.1	Income Taxes	3-73
	3.9.3.2	Sales Tax/Gross Receipts Tax	3-76
	3.9.3.3	Property Taxes	3-77
3.9.4	Housing		3-78
3.9.5	Public Utilities		3-79
	3.9.5.1	Major Public Water Suppliers	3-79
	3.9.5.2	Major Public Wastewater Treatment Facilities	3-79
3.9.6	Community Services		3-80
	3.9.6.1	Education	3-80
	3.9.6.2	Fire Protection	3-80
	3.9.6.3	Law Enforcement	3-81
	3.9.6.4	Hospitals and Physicians	3-81
3.10	Traffic and Transportation		3-82
3.10.1	Roadways		3-82
3.10.2	Railroads		3-82
3.10.3	Airports		3-84
3.11	Noise		3-84
3.11.1	Noise Level Standards		3-84
3.11.2	Noise Receptors in the Vicinity of the Proposed Facility		3-85
3.11.3	Noise in the Vicinity of the Proposed Facility		3-85
3.12	Public and Occupational Health		3-85
3.12.1	Background Radiological Exposure		3-85
3.12.2	Background Chemical Characteristics		3-86
3.13	References		3-87
4.0	**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**		**4-1**
4.1	Proposed Action		4-1
4.1.1	Environmental Impacts of Construction		4-1
	4.1.1.1	Land Use	4-1
	4.1.1.2	Historic and Cultural Resources	4-2
	4.1.1.3	Visual Resources	4-3
	4.1.1.4	Climatology, Meteorology, and Air Quality	4-3
	4.1.1.5	Geology, Minerals, and Soil	4-9
	4.1.1.6	Water Resources	4-9
	4.1.1.7	Ecological Resources	4-12
	4.1.1.8	Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice	4-13
	4.1.1.9	Traffic and Transportation	4-20
	4.1.1.10	Noise	4-21
	4.1.1.11	Public and Occupational Health Impacts	4-21
	4.1.1.12	Waste Management	4-22

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section				Page
4.1.2	Environmental Impacts of Operation			4-24
	4.1.2.1	Land Use		4-24
	4.1.2.2	Historic and Cultural Resources		4-25
	4.1.2.3	Visual Resources		4-25
	4.1.2.4	Climate, Meteorology and Air Quality		4-25
	4.1.2.5	Geology, Minerals, and Soil		4-30
	4.1.2.6	Water Resources		4-31
	4.1.2.7	Ecological Resources		4-34
	4.1.2.8	Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice		4-34
	4.1.2.9	Traffic and Transportation		4-40
	4.1.2.10	Noise Impacts		4-44
	4.1.2.11	Public and Occupational Health Impacts		4-44
	4.1.2.12	Waste Management Impacts		4-53
	4.1.2.13	Impacts of Postulated Accidents		4-57
4.1.3	Decommissioning Impacts			4-63
4.2	Cumulative Impacts			4-67
4.2.1	Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions			4-68
	4.2.1.1	Proposed IIFP Facility Preconstruction Activities		4-68
	4.2.1.2	Proposed Phase 2 of the IIFP Facility		4-69
	4.2.1.3	URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment Facility		4-70
	4.2.1.4	DOE Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)		4-71
	4.2.1.5	Regional Energy Production Facilities		4-71
4.2.2	Cumulative Impacts to Environmental Resources			4-71
	4.2.2.1	Land Use		4-71
	4.2.2.2	Historic and Cultural Resources		4-72
	4.2.2.3	Visual Resources		4-72
	4.2.2.4	Climatology/Meteorology/Air Quality		4-72
	4.2.2.5	Geology, Minerals, and Soil		4-75
	4.2.2.6	Water Resources		4-76
	4.2.2.7	Ecological Resources		4-77
	4.2.2.8	Socioeconomic Resources		4-78
	4.2.2.9	Traffic and Transportation		4-78
	4.2.2.10	Noise		4-80
	4.2.2.11	Public and Occupational Health		4-80
	4.2.2.12	Waste Management		4-81
4.3	No-Action Alternative			4-86
4.4	References			4-88
5.0	**MITIGATION MEASURES AND COMMITMENTS**			**5-1**
5.1	References			5-10

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section			Page
6.0	**ENVIRONMENTAL MEASUREMENTS AND MONITORING PROGRAMS**		**6-1**
6.1	Radiological Monitoring Program		6-1
	6.1.1	Effluent Monitoring Program	6-1
		6.1.1.1 Gaseous Effluent Monitoring	6-3
		6.1.1.2 Liquid Effluent Monitoring	6-4
	6.1.2	Radiological Environmental Monitoring Program	6-4
		6.1.2.1 Sampling Program	6-4
		6.1.2.2 Procedures	6-6
		6.1.2.3 Reporting	6-7
6.2	Physicochemical Monitoring		6-7
	6.2.1	Introduction	6-7
	6.2.2	Evaluation and Analysis of Samples	6-8
	6.2.3	Quality Assurance	6-9
	6.2.4	Lower Limits of Detection	6-9
	6.2.5	Effluent Monitoring	6-9
	6.2.6	Stormwater Monitoring Program	6-10
	6.2.7	Environmental Monitoring	6-11
	6.2.8	Meteorological Monitoring	6-12
6.3	Ecological Monitoring		6-12
	6.3.1	General Ecological Conditions of the Site	6-12
	6.3.2	Monitoring Program Elements	6-13
	6.3.3	Observations and Sampling Design	6-13
		6.3.3.1 Vegetation	6-13
		6.3.3.2 Birds	6-14
		6.3.3.3 Mammals	6-14
		6.3.3.4 Reptiles and Amphibians	6-14
6.4	References		6-15
7.0	**COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS SUMMARY**		**7-1**
7.1	Costs and Benefits of the No-Action Alternative		7-1
7.2	Costs of the Proposed Action		7-2
	7.2.1	Construction Costs	7-2
		7.2.1.1 Internal Costs	7-2
		7.2.1.2 External Costs	7-3
	7.2.2	Operations Costs	7-4
		7.2.2.1 Internal Costs	7-4
		7.2.2.2 External Costs	7-6
7.3	Benefits of the Proposed Action		7-7
	7.3.1	Construction	7-7
	7.3.2	Operations	7-8
7.4	Evaluation Summary of the Proposed IIFP Facility		7-9
7.5	References		7-10

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Section			Page
8.0	**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**		**8-1**
8.1	Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts		8-2
8.2	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources		8-3
8.3	Relationship between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity		8-4
8.4	References		8-5
9.0	**LIST OF PREPARERS**		**9-1**
9.1	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Contributors		9-1
9.2	Straughan Environmental and Tetra Tech Contributors		9-2
10.0	**GLOSSARY**		**10-1**
APPENDICES			
	APPENDIX A	SCOPING SUMMARY	A-1
	APPENDIX B	CONSULTATION/CORRESPONDENCE	B-1
	APPENDIX C	AIR EMISSIONS	C-1
	APPENDIX D	SOCIOECONOMIC INFORMATION	D-1
	APPENDIX E	TRANSPORTATION OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS	E-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1-1	Applicable State of New Mexico Laws, Regulations, and Agreements	1-8
1-2	Legal/Regulatory Requirements and Authorizations for Site Preparation and Construction of the Proposed IIFP Facility	1-13
1-3	Legal/Regulatory Requirements and Authorizations for Operation of the Proposed IIFP Facility	1-15
2-1	Facility Design Basis Inventories	2-15
2-2	Projected Annual Gaseous Emissions to the Atmosphere from Phase 1 Facility Operations	2-15
2-3	Phase 1 Estimated Annual Solid Waste Generation - Operations	2-22
2-4	Comparison of Impacts between Proposed Action and No-Action Alternatives	2-26
2-5	IIFP's Evaluation Criteria for Fine Screening	2-30
3-1	New Mexico GHG Emissions, by Sector	3-13
3-2	Comparison of New Mexico vs. U.S GHG Emissions (Percent) by Sector	3-14
3-3	Monthly Temperature in Hobbs, New Mexico, 1912 to 2010	3-15
3-4	Monthly Precipitation in Hobbs, New Mexico, from 1912 to 2010	3-16
3-5	Weather Stations Located Near the Proposed IIFP Site	3-17
3-6	Federal and New Mexico Ambient Air Quality Standards	3-19
3-7	Allowable Prevention of Significant Deterioration Increments	3-20
3-8	Ambient Levels of Criteria Pollutants in Nearby Counties	3-21
3-9	Lea County Criteria Pollutant Emissions in 2002	3-22
3-10	Summary of Active Mines, Mills, Pits and Quarries in Lea County	3-27
3-11	Oil and Gas Wells within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the Site	3-29
3-12	Site Soil Characteristics	3-29
3-13	Summary of Potential Deep-Aquifer Groundwater Sources for Lea County	3-38
3-14	Summary of Supply Wells within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the Site	3-40
3-15	Summary of Groundwater Use in Lea County, 2005	3-43
3-16	Summary of City of Hobbs Municipal Water System Groundwater Water Quality, 2005 – 2009	3-45
3-17	Mammal, Bird, Amphibian, and Reptile Species Likely to be Present at the Proposed Site and Vicinity	3-52
3-18	Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species Listed for Lea County, New Mexico.	3-58
3-19	Select Population Characteristics of Counties within the ROI and the State of New Mexico	3-64
3-20	Population Estimates of ROI Counties and Incorporated Municipalities, 2009	3-65
3-21	Historic Population in the ROI, 1990 to 2009	3-65
3-22	Projected Population in the ROI, 2005 to 2035	3-65
3-23	Block Groups within 80 km (50 mi) of the Proposed IIFP Site with Significant Minority or Low-Income Populations (Meeting 50 Percent Criteria or Exceeding Respective County or State Percentages by 20 Percent)	3-71
3-24	Employment in ROI, by Industry, 2001 to 2008	3-74
3-25	Labor Statistics, ROI and New Mexico, 2001 to 2010	3-76

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table		Page
3-26	Income Statistics, ROI Counties and Population Centers, and New Mexico, 2008	3-76
3-27	Gross Receipts Tax Rates in the ROI, as of July, 2010	3-77
3-28	IIFP Annual Property Tax Information	3-78
3-29	Housing Characteristics in ROI Counties and Population Centers, 2008	3-78
3-30	Major Public Water Suppliers in ROI, 2007 – 2009	3-79
3-31	Major Wastewater Treatment Facilities in ROI	3-79
3-32	Public School Districts in the ROI, 2008	3-80
3-33	Fire Protection in the ROI, 2010	3-80
3-34	Law Enforcement in ROI Counties and Incorporated Places, 2009	3-81
3-35	AADT Volumes for Roadways that Access the Proposed IIFP Site	3-82
4-1	CO_2 Emissions from Construction Equipment	4-4
4-2	Emissions from Workforce Commuting and Delivery Activities During Construction	4-4
4-3	Construction Equipment and Hours of Operation by Type and Month	4-6
4-4	Estimated Maximum Annual Emissions from Construction of the IIFP Facility	4-7
4-5	Comparison of Maximum Annual Emissions from Construction of the IIFP Facility to Lea County Baseline Conditions	4-8
4-6	Comparison of Predicted Maximum Downwind Concentrations Due to Construction Activities to NAAQS	4-8
4-7	Assumptions for Workforce Characterization during Peak Construction Period	4-15
4-8	Direct and Indirect Employment	4-15
4-9	Nonfatal/Fatal Occupational Injuries Projected for IIFP Facility Construction	4-21
4-10	Solid Waste Generation - Construction	4-23
4-11	Hazardous Waste Generation - Construction	4-23
4-12	Low Level Radioactive Waste Generation - Construction	4-23
4-13	Annual Transportation-Related CO_2 Emissions During IIFP Facility Operations	4-26
4-14	Estimated Maximum Annual Criteria Pollutant Emissions from Phase 1 Operation of the IIFP Facility	4-28
4-15	Estimated Maximum Annual Criteria Pollutant Emissions from Highway Vehicles during Phase 1 Operation of the IIFP Facility	4-28
4-16	Comparison of Maximum Annual Emissions from Phase 1 Operations to Lea County Baseline Conditions	4-28
4-17	Predicted Property Boundary Concentrations Due to Phase 1 Operations, NAAQS and Allowable Class II PSD Increments	4-29
4-18	Annual Nonradioactive Gaseous Emissions from the Operation of the Proposed IIFP Facility	4-30
4-19	Assumptions for Workforce Characterization During Phase 1 Operation	4-35
4-20	Direct and Indirect Employment during IIFP Phase 1 Operation	4-36
4-21	Estimated Gross Receipts and Income Tax Payments to New Mexico and Lea County for the Phase 1 Operation Period, 2009 Dollars	4-37

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table		Page
4-22	Annual Collective Doses to Various Receptors from Radiological Transportation	4-43
4-23	Estimated and Bounding Radiological Releases from the Stacks	4-45
4-24	Annual and Committed Dose Equivalents for Exposures to the MEI from Gaseous Effluents	4-47
4-25	Annual and Committed Dose Equivalents for Exposure to the Nearest Resident from Gaseous Effluents	4-47
4-26	Collective Dose Equivalents to All Ages Population (person-Sv) (gas release pathways)	4-49
4-27	Collective Dose Equivalents to All Ages Population (person-rem) (gas release pathways).	4-50
4-28	Estimated Annual Nonradiological Gaseous Fluoride Emissions	4-52
4-29	Annual Nonfatal and Fatal Occupational Injuries Projected for Operation of the IIFP Facility	4-53
4-30	Solid Waste Generation – Operations	4-55
4-31	Hazardous Waste Generation – Operations	4-55
4-32	Low Level Radioactive Waste Generation – Operations	4-55
4-33	Accident Consequence Categories	4-59
4-34	Chemical Consequence Exposure Thresholds	4-59
4-35	Summary of Accident Analysis Results	4-60
4-36	Summary of Annual Radiological Transportation Shipments	4-62
4-37	Annual Accident Dose-Risk and LCF-Risk from Radiological Transportation	4-62
4-38	Phase 2 Construction Solid Waste Generation	4-82
4-39	Phase 2 Construction Hazardous Waste Generation	4-82
4-40	Phase 2 Construction Radioactive Waste Generation	4-82
4-41	Cumulative Solid Waste Generation – Phase 1 and 2 IIFP Facility	4-84
4-42	Cumulative Hazardous Waste Generation -– Phase 1 and 2 IIFP Facility	4-85
4-43	Cumulative Radioactive Waste Generation – Phase 1 and 2 IIFP Facility	4-85
5-1	Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures Proposed by IIFP for Construction (including preconstruction activities)	5-2
5-2	Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures Proposed by IIFP for Operations	5-6
6-1	Guidance Documents Applicable to Radiological Monitoring Program	6-2
6-2	Gaseous Effluent Sampling Program	6-3
6-3	Radiological Sampling and Analysis Program	6-5
6-4	Baseline Radiological Soil and Vegetation Samples	6-6
6-5	Physicochemical Sampling	6-8
6-6	Required Minimum Detectable Concentrations for Environmental Sample Analyses	6-9
6-7	Stormwater Monitoring Program	6-10
6-8	Baseline Physicochemical Soil Sample Results	6-11
6-9	Baseline Physicochemical Vegetation Sample Results	6-12
7-1	Construction Capital and Labor Costs for the IIFP Facility (millions of 2009 dollars)	7-2

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table		Page
7-2	Estimated Annual Waste Disposal Costs (millions of 2009 dollars)	7-5
7-3	Estimated Replacement Capital Expenditures (millions of 2009 dollars)	7-6
7-4	Total Annual Internal Operations Costs (millions of 2009 dollars).....	7-6

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2-1	General Site Location Map.	2-3
2-2	Proposed IIFP Facility Boundary.	2-4
2-3	Plant Throughput for the DUF_6 Deconversion Process.	2-5
2-4	Process Flow Chart for Deconversion of DUF_6 to DUF_4.	2-7
2-5	Process Flow Chart for SiF_4 Production.	2-8
2-6	Process Flow Chart for BF_3 Production.	2-9
2-7	Plant KOH Scrubbing System Process Flow.	2-17
2-8	EPP HF Neutralization and KOH Regeneration Processes.	2-20
3-1	80-km (50-mi) Radius Map	3-2
3-2	10-km (6-mi) Radius Map	3-3
3-3	Wind Roses For Midland-Odessa, Roswell, Hobbs, and Eunice for 1993	3-18
3-4	Physiography of New Mexico	3-24
3-5	PGA 10% for New Mexico	3-25
3-6	Mineral Resource Map	3-26
3-7	Oil and Gas Well Map	3-28
3-8	Section 27 Soils Map	3-30
3-9	Underground Water Basins of NM	3-33
3-10	Geologic Cross-section Showing the Deep Aquifers of Lea County	3-34
3-11	Groundwater Flow Map	3-35
3-12	Depth to Groundwater Map	3-36
3-13	Critical Management Areas Lea County Basin	3-39
3-14	1-Mile Radius Groundwater Well Map	3-41
3-15	6-Mile Radius Groundwater Well Map	3-42
3-16	Ephemeral Stream Map	3-46
3-17	Water Distances Map	3-47
3-18	FEMA Map	3-48
3-19	Vegetation Communities Map	3-50
3-20	Proposed Lesser Prairie-Chicken Corridor Map	3-57
3-21	Region of Influence Map	3-63
3-22	African American Map	3-68
3-23	Some Other Race Map	3-69
3-24	Hispanic Ethnicity Map	3-70
3-25	Low-Income Household Map	3-72
3-26	AADT Location Map	3-83
3-27	Major Sources and Levels in the Vicinity of the Proposed FEP/DUP Background Radiation Exposure	3-87
4-1	50-Mile Sectors	4-48

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

Under the provisions of the *Atomic Energy Act* and pursuant to Title 10 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Part 40 (10 CFR 40), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering whether to issue a license that would allow International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Incorporated (IIFP) to possess, use, transfer, or deliver source and byproduct materials at a proposed fluorine extraction and depleted uranium deconversion facility near Hobbs in Lea County, New Mexico. The scope of activities to be conducted under the license would include the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility. The facility would deconvert commercially generated depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF_6) into depleted uranium dioxide (DUO_2) for long-term stable disposal, and into fluorine products for resale. DUF_6 is the by-product of uranium enrichment. The application for the license was filed with the NRC by IIFP, on December 30, 2009. To support its licensing decision on IIFP's proposed facility, the NRC determined that the NRC's implementing regulations in 10 CFR 51 for the National Environmental Policy Act require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS is used to examine the potential environmental impacts of the proposed IIFP facility and reasonable alternatives. Based on the EIS and other information, the NRC will determine whether to issue a license to IIFP for the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility.

The Proposed Action

The proposed action considered in this draft EIS is for NRC to grant IIFP a license to construct, operate, and decommission a fluorine extraction and depleted uranium deconversion facility. The IIFP facility would include a commercial plant to produce specialty fluoride gas products for sale and DUO_2 for disposal. IIFP would own the facility and be responsible for its operation and performance. The proposed facility, if licensed, would be 22.5 kilometers (km) (14 miles [mi]) west of Hobbs, New Mexico. The proposed tract of land (IIFP site) occupies 259 ha (640 ac), and the proposed facility would occupy an estimated 16 ha (40 ac) of the tract, not including roadways and other infrastructure improvements.

If the license is approved, facility construction activities would begin in the second quarter of 2012 and operations would begin in the fourth quarter of 2013. The proposed facility is designed to be capable of deconverting up to 3.4 million kilograms (kg) (7.5 million pounds, or 3,750 tons) per year of DUF_6. The annual capacity of approximately 3.4 million kg (3,750 tons) per year equates to about 9,300 kg/day (10.3 tons/day) on average. Following operations the facility is expected to be decommissioned following termination of the license.

Preconstruction Activities

The applicant's license application states that IIFP anticipates commencement of certain preconstruction activities on the proposed IIFP site prior to the NRC's decision on whether to issue a license for the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed facility. The preconstruction activities would be considered by the NRC as a cumulative effect and not a part of the proposed action. Preconstruction could include the following activities and facilities: land clearing; site grading (excavating and/or blasting); erosion control and stormwater control measures installation; access road and parking facilities construction; and others.

Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

Detailed information on the purpose and need for action is described in Chapter 1 of this draft EIS. The proposed action is intended to satisfy the need for a facility that would deconvert DUF_6 into DUO_2 for disposal. An added goal of IIFP would be to produce fluoride products for commercial resale. Without a facility such as the proposed IIFP facility, DUF_6 would continue to be stored, typically in 12.7-metric ton (14-ton) cylinders, at commercial uranium enrichment facilities in the United States. Although DUF_6 could be transferred to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for a fee, DOE's existing inventory of DUF_6 is not projected to be deconverted for approximately 25 years. Further, long-term storage of DUF_6 represents a potential chemical hazard if the material is not properly managed, and deconversion to DUO_2 is preferable. The fluoride products are potentially valuable for applications in the electronic, solar panel, and semi-conductor markets, among others. In addition, anhydrous hydrogen fluoride (AHF) is a by-product of the deconversion process and is an important chemical in various industrial applications.

Alternatives

A detailed analysis of alternatives is included in Chapter 2 of this draft EIS. The no-action alternative is considered in this draft EIS as a baseline for comparison. Under the no-action alternative, NRC would not grant a license to IIFP to construct, operate, and decommission the proposed facility near Hobbs, New Mexico, to receive and process source material, and to ship products and low-level radioactive waste (LLW). However, impacts from preconstruction activities could occur under the no-action alternative. The proposed site would remain in its current or preconstruction condition. The regional economy would not be changed either positively or negatively, except by preconstruction. LLW would not be shipped to licensed disposal facilities for disposal. Fluoride products would not be manufactured and sold to end users. Planned or existing commercial enrichment facilities would not be able to send their DUF_6 to the IIFP facility for deconversion.

Four options would be open to these commercial facilities, in the event of the no-action alternative: (1) ship the DUF_6 to DOE facilities, (2) ship the DUF_6 to facilities overseas, (3) indefinitely store the DUF_6, or (4) construct their own deconversion facilities. DOE has constructed two facilities to deconvert DUF_6 to uranium oxides (different compounds than that which would be produced by IIFP's proposed facility) and hydrofluoric acid: one in Paducah, Kentucky and one in Piketon (Portsmouth), Ohio. Therefore, shipment to these DOE facilities is a viable option under the no-action alternative. Given that DOE has a backlog of 700,000 metric tons (771,618 tons) of DUF_6 (stored in approximately 57,000 cylinders) to deconvert, it may take DOE approximately 25 years to complete its mission before beginning to deconvert privately generated DUF_6. The DOE process does not produce the fluoride products, and it produces a hydrofluoric acid solution rather than the anhydrous hydrogen fluoride, which is an important chemical in various industrial applications.

IIFP conducted a site selection process to determine the best location, by IIFP criteria, for the proposed site. The NRC staff reviewed the IIFP site selection process and determined that the process was rational and objective. Accordingly, no alternate sites are evaluated in the draft EIS.

The NRC staff evaluated several alternative technologies, including: (1) a direct deconversion process; (2) the DOE deconversion process that is used at Paducah, Kentucky, and Piketon (Portsmouth), Ohio; and (3) a foreign (European) process. The direct deconversion, DOE

deconversion, and foreign conversion alternative processes were eliminated from analysis in the draft EIS because (1) the applicant owns and has expertise in a competing technology, (2) the impacts of implementing these technologies would be sufficiently similar to the proposed action, and (3) none of these processes would satisfy the goal to produce marketable fluoride by-products.

The NRC staff also considered an alternative that would ship the U.S.-generated DUF_6 to overseas facilities for deconversion. However, because of prohibitive cost of such shipments, this alternative was eliminated from consideration in the draft EIS. An alternative that would indefinitely store the DUF_6 was also eliminated from consideration because long-term storage of DUF_6 represents a potential chemical hazard if not properly managed, and such an alternative would not meet the underlying need for deconversion of the DUF_6. Lastly, the NRC staff considered an alternative in which the four U.S.-based enrichment companies could construct and operate their own deconversion facilities. However, because none of these firms has expressed an interest in constructing such a facility, NRC staff concluded that this alternative should be eliminated from consideration in this draft EIS.

Potential Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

In this draft EIS, NRC staff evaluates the existing conditions (Chapter 3) and potential environmental impacts of the proposed action (Chapter 4). A standard of significance, (see text box), has been established for assessing environmental impacts. The NRC staff has assigned each impact one of the three significance levels described in the textbox. The environmental impacts from the proposed action are SMALL or MODERATE and could be mitigated by the methods described in Chapter 5. Environmental monitoring methods are described in Chapter 6.

Determining the Significance of Potential Environmental Impacts

NRC has established a standard of significance for assessing environmental impacts. Each impact is assigned one of the following three significance levels:

- **SMALL:** The environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.
- **MODERATE:** The environmental effects are sufficient to noticeably alter but not destabilize important attributes of the resource.
- **LARGE:** The environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

Summarized below are the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action on each of the resource areas considered in this draft EIS. Each summary is preceded by the impact significance level for the respective resource areas.

Land Use

SMALL. Construction activities would occur on about 16 ha (40 ac) within the 259-ha (640-ac) site. Construction of the proposed facility would alter the current land use of the entire IIFP site, a tract known as Section 27 of Township 18 South, Range 36 East, which is primarily used for cattle grazing. The transfer and conversion of the land for the facility would not conflict with any existing Federal, State, local, or Tribal Nation land use plans, or restrict current or planned mineral resource exploitation. The operation of the proposed facility would be consistent with the existing land use of the neighboring tracts, which support industrial facilities, natural gas and oil extraction and transmission infrastructure, and agriculture and open land.

Historical and Cultural Resources

SMALL. An archaeological survey of the entire 259-ha (640-ac) site failed to identify any archeological resources other than several isolated artifacts that were not considered to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Consultation with Federally recognized Tribal Nations and the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Division (which serves as the State Historic Preservation Officer) did not identify any additional information on historically or culturally significant resources within the area potentially affected by the proposed facility. The preconstruction, construction, and operation of the proposed facility would not adversely affect historic resources or other cultural resources (e.g., significant archaeology sites).

Visual and Scenic Resources

SMALL. The proposed 259-ha (640-ac) site is flat and sparsely developed with a few irregularly-spaced structures for natural gas and oil extraction, and overhead transmission lines. The proposed IIFP facility would be approximately 22.5 km (14 mi) west of the nearest population center, Hobbs, New Mexico and would not be visible from Hobbs. The proposed site received the lowest scenic-quality rating using the U.S. Bureau of Land Management visual resource inventory process.

Climatology, Meteorology, and Air Quality

SMALL to MODERATE. Air concentrations of (1) criteria pollutants predicted for vehicle emissions and (2) emissions of particulate matter of less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) from fugitive dust during construction would be below the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for carbon monoxide (CO) and sulfur dioxide (SO_2) emissions, and above NAAQS for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}) emissions. Fugitive dust emissions would be temporary and localized. During construction of the IIFP facility, carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions are projected to be 2,110 metric tons (2,326 tons) or 0.003 percent of New Mexico's statewide output and 0.00003 percent of the projected nationwide CO_2 emissions for the same period. A National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Title V permit would not be required for operations due to the low levels of estimated emissions. All stack emissions would be monitored. During any typical year of IIFP facility operation, CO_2 emissions are projected to be 5,774 metric tons (6,373 tons), approximately 0.009 percent of the New Mexico statewide output or 0.0009 percent of the nationwide emissions for calendar year 2000.

Geology, Minerals, and Soils

SMALL. Construction-related impacts on the geology, minerals, and soils would occur within the 16 ha (40 ac) of the 259-ha (640-ac) site on which the proposed facility would be built, and for the construction of the access road, which would extend roughly 1 kilometer (1/2 mi) from Arkansas Junction Road (NM 483) to the entrance of the proposed facility. The site has no prime farmland, as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The site has been explored for oil and gas and mined for caliche and, thus, it has very limited leasable, locatable, or marketable mineral resources. Therefore, the proposed facility construction activities would not result in loss of mineral resources. No impact to the underlying bedrock, mineral resources, or soils is expected during the facility operations. The site is in an area of limited seismic activity and operation of the IIFP facility is not expected to cause seismic or fault-related impacts. Any seismic risk would be mitigated by incorporation of seismic criteria in the facility design.

Water Resources

SMALL. The site has no permanent surface water and no jurisdictional wetlands. The closest source of a named ephemeral stream is more than 5 km (3 mi) from the property, and the nearest permanent surface water is more than 32 km (20 mi) from the site. The site, which overlies the Lea County Underground Water Basin, would utilize water from the Ogallala Aquifer to support construction and operation. Groundwater demand on the Ogallala Aquifer during construction would be relatively low, mainly for dust suppression. During operations, groundwater use for potable water and process water needs is estimated to be less than 38,000 liters (10,000 gallons [gal]) per day peak, averaging an estimated 13,000 liters (3,000 gal) per day. The proposed facility would use approximately 0.5 percent of the estimated additional annual 40-year planning period groundwater demand for Lea County and only 0.15 percent of the unappropriated water rights that have been assigned to Lea County.

Ecological Resources

SMALL. Approximately 16 ha (40 ac) of land would be disturbed, which represents approximately 6 percent of the site's 259 ha (640 ac). There are no wetlands or unique habitats, and no threatened or endangered species on the proposed site. Fencing around the proposed IIFP facility would restrict wildlife access to the facility. Mitigation measures proposed by the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (Appendix B - Consultation/Correspondence) would be considered to lessen impacts.

Socioeconomics

SMALL. Construction of the IIFP facility would employ approximately 140 people. Eighty percent of this staff is expected to be current residents in the socioeconomic region of influence (ROI): Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico. It is expected that the other 20 percent (28 workers) would migrate into the socioeconomic ROI. Including family members, the total increase in residents to the ROI is expected to be 72 people, which would result in a 0.06 percent increase in the ROI population. During operation, the proposed IIFP facility would employ approximately 140 people, and 20 percent (28 individuals with their families) are expected to in-migrate, increasing the population in the socioeconomic ROI by 90 people, or less than 0.1 percent of the 2009 population. The impacts on the local unemployment rate, housing vacancies, schools, and public services and utilities would be minimal during operations and construction.

Environmental Justice

SMALL. The environmental justice analysis focused on census blocks and block groups in an area within 80 kilometers (50 miles) of the proposed IIFP site. The largest minority population within 80 kilometers (50 miles) of the proposed site is the Hispanic/Latino population. The nearest minority or low-income population as defined by NRC criteria is 22.5 km (14 mi) from the proposed site. The impacts of IIFP construction and operation on resources would be SMALL and, in most cases, localized. Therefore, because all impacts would be SMALL, and the identified minority and low-income populations are not in close proximity to the proposed site, impacts would not be disproportionately high and adverse for any populations in the region, including minority or low-income populations.

Noise

SMALL. Noise would come predominantly from construction equipment and traffic. Construction activities would be temporary and limited to daytime working hours. The nearest residence is approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi) northwest of the site and there are no recreational areas within 8.0 km (5.0 mi) of the proposed site. Noise levels during operations would be within the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines.

Traffic and Transportation

SMALL. The potential maximum increase from construction workforce traffic would be 280 round trips per weekday, and the potential maximum increase to traffic due to construction deliveries and waste removal would be 40 round trips per weekday. The majority of the construction worker trips would use US 62/180 to access NM 483. These trips would increase traffic on NM 483 by 33.5 percent daily, but the design capacities of NM 483 and US 62/180 would not be exceeded. Statistically, the risk of an accident with injuries (risk of less than 0.8 injury crashes per year) or fatality (risk of less than 0.03 fatal crashes per year) to the construction workforce is unlikely.

The operational workforce could increase the traffic on NM 483 by 29 percent and on US 62/180 by 8 percent daily. With the predicted increased traffic volumes, the design capacities of NM 483 and US 62/180 would not be exceeded. Statistically the risk of an accident with injuries (risk of less than 0.7 injury crashes per year) or a fatality (risk of less than 0.02 fatal crashes per year) for the operations traffic is unlikely.

Operation of the IIFP facility would require shipment of full DUF_6 cylinders from commercial enrichment facilities, empty DUF_6 cylinders back to the commercial enrichment facilities, DUO to waste disposal facilities, and other miscellaneous process and LLW to waste disposal facilities. Approximately 730 radiological shipments would occur annually. The collective doses from shipments and accidents involving shipments would be comparatively low, versus natural sources of radiation (Appendix E - Transportation of Radioactive Materials).

Public and Occupational Health and Safety

SMALL. During construction, a fatality would be unlikely (the probability of fatality is less than one per year). During normal operations, based on statistical probabilities, there could be six industrial injuries per year and no fatalities. Worker radiological doses were conservatively estimated to be about 0.75 mSv/yr (75 millirem/yr) for those workers involved in the deconversion processing operations within the proposed facility. The average individual dose for workers at the cylinders yards was estimated to range from a low of 4.3 mSv/yr (430 millirem/yr) to a high of 6.9 mSv/yr (690 millirem/yr). All public radiological exposures would be significantly below the 10 CFR 20 regulatory limit of 1 mSv (100 millirem) per year. The maximally exposed member of the public would receive approximately 0.21 mSv/yr (21 millirem/yr) from the proposed facility operations. For comparison purposes, the average annual dose to a member of the public due to background radiation is estimated to be about 3.1 mSv/yr (310 millirem/yr) (see details in the body of the draft EIS [Section 3.12]).

The most significant possible accident consequences would be those associated with the rupture of a cylinder containing liquefied DUF_6. However, the facility emergency plan addresses this type of event, and all other high- and intermediate-consequence events. The facility design and procedures would reduce the likelihood of this type of event by requiring a robust cylinder

design that maintains its integrity during credible drops, shocks, collisions, and thermal events. In addition, facility design features, which prevent release of liquid UF_6 or rupture of cylinders during processing cycles, would be implemented. Procedures would be instituted which would minimize the possibility of an accident scenario occurring, and would provide steps to take should an accident occur. The NRC staff concludes that through the combination of facilities design, engineered controls, and administrative controls, including procedures, accidents at the facility would pose a small risk to workers, the environment, and the public.

Waste Management

SMALL. Nonhazardous waste generated from the proposed construction activities would result in a negligible increase (less than 0.0007 percent) in the waste that the Lea County landfill receives annually from all sources. Less than 0.9 metric ton/yr (1 ton/yr) of hazardous wastes would be expected from construction of the proposed IIFP facility. This would represent less than 0.00009 percent of the overall hazardous waste generated in the State.

During operations, industrial waste generated from the proposed facility would result in an increase of approximately 0.06 percent in the waste that the Lea County landfill receives annually from all sources. Hazardous waste generated during operations would also be small, resulting in an increase of less than 0.02 percent in the hazardous waste generated in the State of New Mexico. Up to 3,170 tons per year of LLW could be sent for disposal annually. There is enough existing national disposal capacity to accept the LLW that would be generated at the proposed facility.

Summary of the Costs and Benefits of the Proposed Action

The costs of construction activities is estimated to be between $100 million and $140 million (in 2009 dollars), excluding escalation, contingencies, and interest. Construction-related activities, purchases, and workforce expenditures would incur several types of taxes, including individual income taxes, gross receipts taxes, and property taxes. Approximately $554,400 of fee in lieu of property tax would be paid to the Hobbs Municipal School District and the New Mexico Junior College during the construction period.

During operations, about $56 million to $71 million (in 2009 dollars) in wages (wages account for $7.9 million to $9.1 million), benefits, goods and services would be spent annually. Construction and operation of the facility would have additional indirect economic impacts by creating additional employment and economic activity within the region of influence. Over the lifetime of operations, the low estimate of corporate income taxes and gross receipts taxes paid is $144,200,000 to the State of New Mexico. Over the lifetime of operations, the low estimate of gross receipts taxes is $6,500,000 (in 2009 dollars) to Lea County.

Comparison of Alternatives

Under the no-action alternative, NRC would not grant a license to IIFP to construct the proposed facility near Hobbs, New Mexico, to receive and process source material, and to ship products and LLW. The four planned or existing commercial enrichment facilities would not be able to send their UF_6 to the IIFP facility for deconversion. DOE has constructed two deconversion facilities to convert UF_6 to U_3O_8 and hydrofluoric acid: one in Paducah, Kentucky and one in Piketon (Portsmouth), Ohio. Therefore, shipment to these DOE facilities is a viable option under the no-action alternative, but the timeframe for deconversion would be much greater than what the proposed IIFP facility would provide, and goals to create commercial fluorine products would

not be realized. Under the no-action alternative, the proposed site would be impacted by preconstruction, but would not be impacted by operation of the proposed facility. The no-action alternative would have cumulative impacts due to preconstruction on current land use; visual/scenic and cultural resources; air; water; ecological resources; geology, minerals and soils; socioeconomics; environmental justice; traffic and transportation; public and occupational health; and waste management. These impacts would be SMALL for all resources except for air quality, for which they would be SMALL to MODERATE.

In comparison to the no-action alternative, the proposed action would have SMALL impacts on land use; air; water; ecological resources; geology, minerals and soils; noise; traffic and transportation; public and occupational health; socioeconomics (these impacts would be SMALL and positive); environmental justice; and waste management.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

^{0} C	degrees Celsius
º F	degrees Fahrenheit
AADT	annual average daily traffic
ac	acre(s)
ACEC	area of critical environmental concern
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
AEGL	acute exposure guideline levels
AHF	anhydrous hydrogen fluoride
ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
APE	area of potential effect
API	American Petroleum Institute
AQCR	Air Quality Control Region
B_2O_3	boron oxide
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
BF_3	boron trifluoride
bgs	below ground surface
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMP	best management practice
Bq/L	becquerel per liter
$CaCO_3$	calcium carbonate
CaF_2	calcium fluoride
$Ca(OH_2)$	calcium hydroxide
CCS	Center for Climatic Strategies
CEDE	committed effective dose equivalent
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH_4	methane
Ci	curie
cm	centimeter
CMA	critical management areas

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS
(continued)

CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel (sound pressure level)
dB(A)	decibel, A-weighted (humanly audible frequency)
DNFSB	Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
DU	depleted uranium
DUF_4	depleted uranium tetrafluoride
DUF_6	depleted uranium hexafluoride
DUO_2	depleted uranium dioxide
DUO	depleted uranium oxides (general term; not a compound that exists)
DUO_2F_2	depleted uranyl dioxyfluoride
DWB	Drinking Water Bureau
EDE	effective dose equivalent
EPP	environmental protection process
EIS	environmental impact statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Eq	equivalents
ER	environmental report
ERPG	Emergency Response Planning Guideline
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FD&C	Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FEP/DUP	Fluorine Extraction Process/Depleted Uranium Deconversion Plant
ft	foot or feet
FR	Federal Register
g	gravity
gal	gallon(s)
GHG	greenhouse gases
gpd	gallons per day

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS
(continued)

gpm	gallons per minute
GPS	global positioning system
GWP	global warming potential
H_2	hydrogen
ha	hectare(s)
HAP	hazardous air pollutant
HF	hydrofluoric acid or hydrogen fluoride
HFC	hydrofluorcarbon
HPD	[New Mexico] Historic Preservation Division
HS&E	health, safety and environmental
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
IIFP	International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc
in	inch
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRB	industrial revenue bond
ISA	integrated safety analysis
kBq	kilobecquerel
KF	potassium fluoride
kg	kilogram
KOH	potassium hydroxide
km	kilometer(s)
km/hr	kilometers per hour
km^2	square kilometer
kV	kilovolt
L	liter
lb	pound
LCF	latent cancer fatality
LLD	lower limit of detection
LES	Louisiana Energy Services
LLRW	low-level radioactive waste
LLW	low-level (radioactive) waste
L/min	liters per minute

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS
(continued)

m	meter(s)
MCL	maximum contaminant levels
MDC	minimum detection concentrations
MEI	maximally exposed individual
mg	milligram
MGD	million gallons per day
mg/kg	micrograms per kilogram
mg/L	milligrams per liter
mg/m^3	milligrams per cubic meter
mi	mile(s)
mi^2	square mile
MM	modified Mercalli
mpg	miles per gallon
mph	miles per hour
mrem	millirem
mSv	millisievert
MW	megawatt
N_2O	nitrous oxides
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NCRP	National Council on Radiation Protection
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAP	National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NH_3	ammonia
NM	New Mexico
NMAAQS	New Mexico Ambient Air Quality Standards
NMAC	New Mexico Administrative Code
NMDOT	New Mexico Department of Transportation
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NMEDAQB	New Mexico Environmental Department Air Quality Bureau
NMEDHWB	New Mexico Environmental Department Hazardous Waste Bureau

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS
(continued)

NMEDRCB	New Mexico Environmental Department Radiation Control Board
NMEDWQB	New Mexico Environmental Department Water Quality Bureau
NMGF	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
NMOSE	New Mexico Office of the State Engineer
NMRL/CID	New Mexico Regulations and Licensing/Construction Industries Division
NMRPR	New Mexico Radiation Protection Regulations
NMRPTC	New Mexico Rare Plant Technical Council
NMSA	New Mexico Statutes Annotated
NM SHPO	New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office
NMSLO	New Mexico State Land Office
NMSS	Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards
NMVOC	non-methane volatile organic compound
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NO_x	oxides of nitrogen
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O&M	operating and maintenance
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
pCi/L	picocurie per liter (1×10^{-12} curie/liter)
PFC	perfluorocarbon
PGA	peak [horizontal] ground acceleration
PILT	payment in lieu of taxes
$PM_{2.5}$	particulate matter with a diameter less than 2.5 microns
PM_{10}	particulate matter with a diameter less than 10 microns
PPE	personal protective equipment
ppm	parts per million
PSD	prevention of significant deterioration
psig	pounds per square inch
PSTB	Petroleum Storage Tank Bureau
QA	quality assurance
RAI	Requests for Additional Information

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (continued)

RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
REMP	Radiological Environmental Monitoring Program
ROD	record of decision
ROI	region of influence
RMP	resource management plan
RMPA	resource management plan amendment
SARA	Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act
SF_6	sulfur hexafluoride
SiF_4	silicon tetrafluoride
SiO_2	silicon dioxide
SPCC	Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SRP	site redress plan
s.u.	standard units
SVOC	semivolatile organic compound
SWPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWU	separative work unit
TDS	total dissolved solids
TEDE	total effective dose equivalent
Tg	teragram [1 x 10^{12} gram]
TLD	thermo luminescent dosimeters
TSD	treatment, storage, disposal
TSP	total suspended particulate
U-234	a uranium isotope
U-235	a uranium isotope
U-236	a uranium isotope
U_3O_8	variously known as uranium oxide, triuranium octoxide, or "yellowcake"
UF_4	uranium tetrafluoride
UF_6	uranium hexafluoride
µCi/g	microcuries per gram
µg/L	micrograms per liter

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS
(continued)

$\mu g/m^3$	microgram per cubic meter
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UO_2	uranium oxide or uranium dioxide
UO_2F_2	uranyl oxyfluoride
USACE	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
USCB	U.S. Census Bureau
USEC	U.S. Enrichment Corporation
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UWB	underground water basin
VA	volt-ampere
VOC	volatile organic compound
WCS	Waste Control Specialists
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Nuclear reactor fuel requires uranium with a higher proportion of the uranium-235 (U-235) isotope than is found in naturally occurring uranium (approximately 0.7 percent by weight). To increase the portion of U-235 isotopes in the fuel, an enrichment process is used. Uranium in the form of uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) is the feed for the enrichment process, and depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF_6) is a byproduct of the process. During enrichment, the U-235 is extracted from a portion of the natural uranium in order to concentrate the U-235 into nuclear fuel. This lowers the concentration of U-235 in the remainder of the material so that its proportion is lower than the 0.7 percent by weight found in natural uranium (DOE, 2004). The UF_6 with an increased concentration of U-235 is known as "enriched uranium". The UF_6 with a reduced concentration of U-235 is referred to as DUF_6, which is primarily stored at the enrichment facilities. DUF_6 is considered source material. Source material licensees are regulated under Title 10, Part 40, of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR 40), in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Forecasts of operating nuclear-generating capacity suggest a continuing demand for uranium enrichment services both in the United States and abroad. Four new commercial enrichment plants in the U.S. are either in planning, construction, or start-up-phases, and the amounts of DUF_6 are projected to increase. Although there are potential beneficial uses for depleted uranium (DU), the current need for DU is low compared to the existing inventory, and the potential for significant commercial demand is considered to be low. The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) has reported that long-term storage of DU in the UF_6 form represents a potential chemical hazard if not properly managed, and conversion to more-stable DU oxides is preferable to continued long-term storage (NRC, 2005). Because significantly increased use of DU is not expected, this material will likely require disposal. DU can be disposed of as low level (radioactive) waste (LLW).

In 1998, Congress directed the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to construct DU deconversion facilities next to the existing gaseous diffusion uranium enrichment plants in Piketon (Portsmouth), Ohio and Paducah, Kentucky. The Portsmouth, Ohio facility began operating in October, 2010. The Kentucky plant is expected to be operational in 2011. When both are fully operational, these plants will deconvert more than 700,000 metric tons (771,000 tons) of DUF_6 currently stored by DOE. This inventory is projected to require 25 years to deconvert, once the facilities become operational. DOE plans to dispose of the 551,000 metric tons (607,200 tons) of deconverted DU as LLW (DOE, 2004).

International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc. (IIFP) proposes to construct, operate, and decommission a facility for deconversion of DUF_6 (IIFP, 2009a). The deconversion process is used to convert DU to more chemically stable uranium oxide compounds, such as triuranium octoxide (U_3O_8) or uranium dioxide (UO_2), that are similar to the chemical form of natural uranium (DOE, 2004) and are generally suitable for disposal as LLW.

High-purity silicon tetrafluoride (SiF_4) and boron trifluoride (BF_3) would be manufactured in the IIFP facility from the fluorine derived from the deconversion of DUF_6. The fluoride gas products are valuable for applications in the electronic, solar panel, and semi-conductor markets. Anhydrous hydrogen fluoride (AHF), which is not produced by the DOE facilities described

above, is another by-product of the deconversion process, which is used for various industrial applications (IIFP, 2009a).

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in response to an application submitted by IIFP for a license that would allow the construction, operation, and decommissioning of a commercial facility for deconversion of DUF_6 in Lea County, New Mexico.

The NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs has prepared this draft EIS as required by 10 CFR 51, "Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions." The NRC's regulations under 10 CFR 51 implement the requirements of the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*, as amended (NEPA) (Public Law 91-190). NEPA requires Federal agencies to prepare an EIS for every major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Source material licenses, such as the one requested for the IIFP facility, are regulated under 10 CFR 40. This licensing action is considered a major federal action because it may significantly affect the quality of the human environment consistent with 10 CFR 51, and must therefore meet the requirements of the NEPA for an EIS. The NRC staff has prepared this draft EIS to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed IIFP facility and reasonable alternatives to the proposed action.

1.2 Proposed Action

The proposed action is for the NRC to grant IIFP a license (under 10 CFR 40, "Domestic Licensing of Source Material") to construct, operate, and decommission a facility to deconvert commercially generated DUF_6 to depleted uranium dioxide (DUO_2) and other deconversion products. IIFP would own the facility and be responsible for its operation and performance. If the NRC issues a license to IIFP under the provisions of the *Atomic Energy Act of 1954*, as amended, the license would authorize IIFP to possess and use special nuclear material, source material, and byproduct material at the proposed IIFP facility for a period of 40 years in accordance with the NRC's regulations in 10 CFR 40. The scope of activities to be conducted under the license would include the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility.

If issued a license by NRC, IIFP has proposed that the IIFP facility, comprising 16 hectares (ha) (40 acres [ac]) would be located within a 259-ha (640-ac) section in Lea County, near Hobbs, New Mexico. This parcel of land which was previously publicly-owned and comprises open range land used for grazing as well as overhead transmission

Potential Beneficial Uses of DU

- Further enrichment – DU can be used as feedstock for uranium enrichment. The low cost of uranium ore and postponed deployment of advanced enrichment technology have indefinitely delayed this application.
- Nuclear reactor fuel – DU can be mixed with plutonium oxide from decommissioned nuclear weapons to make mixed oxide fuel (typically about 6 percent plutonium oxide and 94 percent depleted uranium oxide) for commercial power reactors.
- Down-blending highly-enriched uranium – Nuclear disarmament treaties allow the down-blending of some weapons-grade highly enriched uranium with DU to make commercial reactor fuel.
- Munitions – DU metal can be used for tank armor and armor-piercing projectiles.
- Biological shielding – DU metal has a high density, which makes it suitable for shielding from x-rays or gamma rays for radiation protection.
- Counterweights – Because of its high density, DU has been used to make small but heavy counterweights.

Source: NRC, 2005

lines and underground petroleum pipelines, has been conveyed from the State of New Mexico to Lea County and, ultimately, to IIFP for construction and operation of the proposed facility.

The IIFP initial (Phase 1) plant would include two main chemical processes that, when integrated, will comprise the Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium Deconversion Plant (FEP/DUP). The potential future Phase 2 facility expansion would provide additional deconversion capability.

Construction of the IIFP facility is expected to begin in 2012 and operations would begin in late 2013. The construction for the Phase 2 expansion, which is not part of the current license application but is anticipated, is expected to begin in 2015 and full operations would begin in late 2016. At the end of its useful life, the IIFP FEP/DUP plant would be decommissioned consistent with the plan developed and submitted to NRC in the IIFP License Application.

IIFP expects to capture beneficial byproducts as result of the deconversion process, including SiF_4, BF_3, and AHF. IIFP's license application states that IIFP also intends to convert DUF_6 to chemically stable compounds discussed in Section 1.1 above, for disposal. Additional details, including volumes of nuclear material, are discussed in Section 1.3.

1.3 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action under consideration by the NRC is a license application to construct, operate, and decommission a facility to deconvert DUF_6 into depleted uranium oxides for disposal. Additionally the process will recover fluoride products for commercial sale. With the existing inventory of stockpiled depleted uranium and four new commercial enrichment plants in the United States expected to be operating within the next few years, there is a need to deconvert the quantity of DUF_6 that exists and would be produced at these enrichment facilities. Without a deconversion facility, DUF_6 would continue to be stored, primarily at commercial uranium enrichment facilities in the United States, typically in 12.7-metric ton (14-ton) cylinders. Although DUF_6 could be transferred to DOE for deconversion for a fee, DOE's existing inventory of DUF_6 is not projected to be deconverted for 25 years. The proposed IIFP facility should be capable of deconverting up to 3.4 million kilograms (kg) (7.5 million pounds, or 3,750 tons) per year of DUF_6, (NRC, 2010a) which would be approximately one-tenth of the DUF_6 that is projected to be produced annually in the United States by commercial enrichment facilities. The annual capacity of 3.4 million kg (3,750 tons) per year equates to about 9,340 kg/day (10.3 tons/day) on average.

The NRC Environmental and Safety Reviews

The focus of an EIS is a presentation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and reasonable alternatives. In addition to meeting its responsibilities under NEPA, the NRC prepares a Safety Evaluation Report (SER) to analyze the safety of the proposed action and assess its compliance with applicable NRC regulations.

The safety and environmental reviews are conducted in parallel. Although there is some overlap between the content of an SER and that of an EIS, the intent of the documents is different. To aid in the decision process, the EIS provides a summary of the more detailed analyses included in the SER. For example, the EIS does not address how accidents are prevented; rather, it addresses the environmental impacts that could result should an accident occur. Much of the information describing the affected environment in the EIS also is applicable to the SER (e.g., demographics, geology, and meteorology).

Source: NRC, 2005

IIFP is proposing to perform the following activities:

- Construct, operate, maintain, and decommission the proposed facility.
- Receive full and return empty DUF_6 cylinders from various commercial enrichment facilities.
- Transport marketable deconversion byproducts to end users.
- Transport depleted UO_2 for LLW disposal or other potential disposition.

IIFP is planning, but has not formally submitted an application for, an expansion of the facility. Expansion and operation of the expanded facility (Phase 2) would be a reasonably foreseeable action and is evaluated as a cumulative impact in this draft EIS.

Activities that do not constitute construction under 10 CFR 40 and 51 are those that do not have a reasonable nexus to radiological health and safety or the common defense and security, and could include clearing of the facility area, grading, installation of drainage and erosion control and other environmental mitigation measures, and construction of access roads. These "preconstruction" activities are evaluated in this draft EIS as cumulative impacts because they are expected to occur independently of the proposed licensing action by NRC.

1.4 Scope of this Environmental Analysis

On December 30, 2009, IIFP submitted an application to the NRC (IIFP, 2009b), seeking a license to construct, operate, and decommission a facility for deconversion of DUF_6. As part of that license application, IIFP submitted an Environmental Report (ER) (IIFP, 2009a) for the proposed facility.

On February 24, 2010, the NRC accepted the IIFP application for formal review (NRC, 2010b). A safety review team and an environmental review team are conducting both safety and environmental reviews of the license application. To fulfill its responsibilities under NEPA, the NRC staff has prepared this draft EIS to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed IIFP facility, and of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action. The scope of this draft EIS includes consideration of both radiological and nonradiological (including chemical) impacts associated with the proposed action and the reasonable alternatives. The draft EIS also addresses the potential environmental impacts of transportation. It addresses cumulative impacts to physical, biological, and socioeconomic resources. In addition, it identifies monitoring and mitigation activities. This draft EIS is the result of the NRC staff's review of the IIFP facility license application, the ER, information obtained from the NRC staff's independent research, and IIFP's responses to Requests for Additional Information (RAIs). This review has been closely coordinated with the NRC staff's development of the Safety Evaluation Report (SER).

Scoping

Scoping is an early and open part of the NEPA process designed to help determine the range of actions, alternatives, and potential impacts to be considered in the EIS, and to identify significant issues related to the proposed action. In addition to the public scoping process, the NRC solicits input from State, local, and other Federal agencies, and potentially affected Native American Tribes in order to focus on issues of genuine concern.

1.4.1 Scoping Process and Public Participation Activities

The NRC regulations in 10 CFR 51 contain requirements for defining the scope of an EIS and identifying issues that should be addressed in depth. The scoping process was used to solicit public and agency input to identify those issues to be discussed in the EIS in detail, and to identify those issues that are either beyond the scope of this draft EIS or are not directly relevant to the assessment of potential impacts from the proposed action.

As part of the NRC staff's environmental review and in compliance with 10 CFR 51.26 and 10 CFR 51.27, the scoping process was initiated on July 15, 2010, with the publication in the Federal Register (FR) of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS (NRC, 2010a). The NOI summarized the NRC's plans to prepare an EIS and presented background information on the proposed IIFP facility. The NOI also invited comments on the appropriate scope of issues to be considered and announced NRC's plan to hold a public scoping meeting. The public scoping comment period ended on August 30, 2010.

On July 29, 2010, the NRC staff held a public scoping meeting in Hobbs, New Mexico, to receive oral and written comments from interested parties. The public scoping meeting began with the NRC staff providing a description of the NRC's roles, responsibilities, and mission. A brief overview of the licensing process was followed by a description of the environmental review process and a discussion of how the public can effectively participate. Most of the meeting was reserved for attendees to ask questions and make comments on the scope of the environmental review. Prior to the public scoping meeting, the NRC staff hosted an informal "open house" for those who wished to attend. The open house provided members of the public with an opportunity to speak informally with individual NRC staffers.

Scoping meeting attendees submitted oral and written comments. Additional comments were received during the scoping period via electronic and postal mail. As a result of the scoping process, the following public comments were received:

- Expressions of general support for the IIFP facility.
- Opposition to locating the IIFP facility, or any facility that deals with nuclear byproducts, over an aquifer and in an area with a history of earthquakes.
- Expressions of support for the project, specifically for the jobs that would be created by construction and operation of the facility and the positive economic impact it would have on the region.
- Support for the project as a way to use depleted uranium that will be generated at the nearby URENCO USA uranium enrichment plant, which would otherwise have to be stored or disposed of as DUF_6 waste.
- Concern that a disposal path for waste from the IIFP facility to the Andrews County, Texas, nuclear waste disposal facility is an unsafe disposal path.
- A statement that the EIS should include the aquifer map that has been prepared by Mesa Water Company.
- A statement that the EIS should address the seismic hazards that have been indicated for Lea County by the U.S. Geological Survey.

Appendix A (Scoping Summary) of this draft EIS includes the scoping summary report that summarizes the comments received during the scoping process as required in 10 CFR 51.29(b).

The NRC staff has requested information regarding the scope of its environmental review from the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer (NM SHPO) and Native American Tribes identified by the NM SHPO. The NRC staff has also asked for comment from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMGF) regarding threatened and endangered species. The NRC staff also sought information from the New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources Department. The NRC staff has not identified any cooperating agencies for the preparation of this draft EIS.

Information received from these agencies and potentially affected Native American Tribes was important in assessing impacts to cultural and ecological resources and determining if there were environmental justice concerns. Correspondence with the NM SHPO and potentially affected Native American Tribes (Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, Comanche Tribe of Oklahoma, Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma, Mescalero Apache Tribe, Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, and Shawnee Tribe) is included in Appendix B (Consultation/Correspondence) of this draft EIS. Correspondence with the USFWS and the NMGF is also included in Appendix B of this draft EIS.

1.4.2 Issues Studied in Detail

In the (July 15, 2010) NOI, the NRC staff tentatively identified issues to be studied in detail as they relate to implementation of the proposed action. These issues were:

- Land Use: plans, policies, and controls.
- Historic and Cultural Resources: archaeological sites (historic and prehistoric archaeological artifacts/features and information), architectural historic resources (structures and districts), and historic properties of traditional religious significance to the Native American Tribes.
- Visual Resources: the visual setting on and near the proposed site.
- Transportation: transportation modes, routes, quantities, and risk estimates.
- Geology and Soils: physical geography, topography, geology, and soil characteristics.
- Water Resources: surface water and groundwater hydrology, water use and quality, and the potential for degradation.
- Ecology: wetlands; aquatic, and terrestrial economically or recreationally important species; and threatened and endangered species.
- Air Quality: meteorological conditions, ambient air quality, pollutant sources, and the potential for degradation.
- Socioeconomics: demography, economic base, labor pool, housing, transportation, utilities, public services and facilities, and education.
- Environmental Justice: potential disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations.
- Noise: noise receptors and potential noise impacts in the vicinity of the proposed facility.

- Public and Occupational Health: potential public and occupational consequences from construction, routine operation, transportation, and credible accident scenarios (including natural events).
- Waste Management: types of wastes expected to be generated, handled, and stored.
- Cumulative Effects: impacts from past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions at and near the site.

After completion of the scoping process, the NRC staff determined that these issues are still appropriate for detailed study in the EIS, for the following reasons: (1) the fact that the resources identified for study are present and have the potential to be impacted by the action; and (2) the fact that participants in the scoping process raised many of the same issues, including perceived beneficial impacts, that were identified in the NOI. Therefore, the initial issues identified in the July 5, 2010, NOI for consideration were carried forward for further analysis. In addition, the NRC staff identified no new issues that require detailed study in the EIS.

1.4.3 Issues Beyond the Scope of the EIS

The purpose of an EIS is to assess the potential environmental impacts of a proposed federal action in order to assist in an agency's decision-making process. In this case, the NRC's decision is whether to grant the license. Some issues and concerns raised during the scoping process are not relevant to the EIS because they are not directly related to the environmental impact analysis or to the NRC's decision. The lack of an in-depth discussion in the EIS, however, does not mean that an issue or concern lacks value. Issues beyond the scope of the EIS either may not yet be at the point where they can be resolved, or are more appropriately discussed and decided in other venues. Appendix A includes a discussion of issues identified during scoping that are beyond the scope of the EIS.

Some of the issues raised during the public scoping process for the proposed facility are outside the scope of the EIS, but are analyzed in the SER. For example, health and safety issues are considered in detail in the SER prepared by the NRC staff for the proposed action and are summarized in the EIS. The EIS and the SER may cover some of the same topics and may contain similar information, but the analysis in the EIS is focused on the assessment of potential environmental impacts. In contrast, the SER deals primarily with safety evaluations and procedural requirements or license conditions to ensure the health and safety of workers and the general public.

1.5 Applicable Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

This section summarizes compliance with legal/regulatory requirements, including permits, licenses, and other authorizations, and approvals at the Federal, State, and local level, which would be necessary for the proposed IIFP facility's construction, operation, and decommissioning, should NRC grant the license.

1.5.1 State of New Mexico Laws and Regulations

Certain Federal environmental requirements, including some discussed earlier, have been delegated by the Federal agencies to State authorities for implementation, enforcement, or oversight. In addition, the State of New Mexico has its own state laws, and Lea County has its own local laws. Table 1-1 provides a list of applicable New Mexico laws, regulations, and

Table 1-1. Applicable State of New Mexico Laws, Regulations, and Agreements

Law, Regulation, or Agreement	Citation	Requirements
New Mexico Wildlife Conservation Act	NMSA, Chapter 17, Game and Fish and Outdoor Recreation, Article 2, Hunting and Fishing Regulations, and Part 3, Wildlife Conservation Act	Requires a permit and coordination if a project may disturb habitat or otherwise affect threatened or endangered species. There are no known, or anticipated (other than transient), threatened or endangered species on the proposed site.
New Mexico Raptor Protection Act	NMSA, Chapter 17, Game and Fish and Outdoor Recreation, Article 2 Part 14, Hawks, Vultures, and Owls; taking, possessing, trapping, destroying, maiming, or selling prohibited except by permit; penalties	The act makes it unlawful to take, attempt to take, possess, trap, ensnare, injure, maim, or destroy individuals of any species of hawk, owl, or vulture.
New Mexico Cultural Properties Act	NMSA, Chapter 18, Libraries and Museums, Article 6, Cultural Properties	The act defines the NM SHPO role and responsibilities, and establishes requirements to prepare an archaeological and historic survey and consult with NM SHPO. A cultural resources inventory was completed for the project. The survey for cultural resources consisted of a file search, field inventory, and inventory report. A negative declaration was prepared by the applicant and the NM SHPO concurred. NRC staff has not yet completed its consultation with the NM SHPO.
New Mexico Occupational Safety and Health	NMSA, Chapter 50, Employment Law NMAC Title 11, Labor Workers Compensation, Chapter 5, Occupational Safety and Health	The act and implementing regulations establish State requirements for assuring safe and healthful working conditions for every employee. These State regulations are being followed to ensure any additional requirements beyond the Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations are adequately addressed.
New Mexico Air Quality Control Act	NMSA, Chapter 74, Environmental Improvement, Article 2, Air Pollution NMAC Title 20, Environmental Protection, Chapter 2, Air Quality	The act and implementing regulations establish air quality standards and permit requirements that must be met prior to construction or modification of an emissions source. These regulations also define requirements for an operating permit for major producers of air pollutants and impose emission standards for hazardous air pollutants.

Table 1-1. Applicable State of New Mexico Laws, Regulations, and Agreements (Continued)

Law, Regulation, or Agreement	Citation	Requirements
New Mexico Radiation Protection Act	NMSA, Chapter 74, Environmental Improvement, Article 3, Radiation Control NMAC, Title 20, Environmental Protection, Chapter 3, Radiation Protection	The act and implementing regulations establish State requirements for worker protection from radiation sources. Because the facilities would be privately owned, the State will require registration of security X-ray machines.
New Mexico Hazardous Waste Act (see note below)	NMSA, Chapter 74, Environmental Improvement, Article 4, Hazardous Waste NMAC Title 20, Environmental Protection, Chapter 4, Hazardous Waste	The act and implementing regulations establish State standards for the management of hazardous wastes. The New Mexico Environmental Development (NMED) regulations imposed on a generator or on a treatment, storage, or disposal (TSD) facility, vary according to the type and quality of material or waste generated, treated, stored, or disposed. The method of treatment, storage, or disposal also impacts the extent and complexity of the requirements. The IIFP plant may generate hazardous waste during construction and operation. These hazardous wastes will be temporarily stored and shipped off site for treatment and disposal in accordance with applicable NMAC and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) requirements.
Note: Source, special nuclear, or by-product, material as defined by the *Atomic Energy Act of 1954* is specifically excluded from the definition of a solid waste and therefore is not a hazardous waste regulated under RCRA or NMSA, Chapter 74, Article 9, Solid Waste Act and implementing regulations at NMAC Title 20, Chapter 9, Solid Waste. The IIFP facilities would not store (other than temporarily) or dispose of hazardous waste on site. IIFP may need a permit for operation of its Environmental Protection Process under the authority of RCRA or the New Mexico Hazardous Waste Act.		
New Mexico Radioactive and Hazardous Materials Act	NMSA, Chapter 74 Environmental Improvement,, Article 4, Article 4A, Radioactive and Hazardous Materials	The act establishes a system of assuring public health and safety with regard to safe treatment, disposal, and transportation of radioactive and hazardous materials and coordinates efficient and timely emergency response to accidents and natural disasters with a centralized and coordinated source of information.

Table 1-1. Applicable State of New Mexico Laws, Regulations, and Agreements (Continued)

Law, Regulation, or Agreement	Citation	Requirements
New Mexico Hazardous Chemicals Information Act	NMSA, Chapter 74 Environmental Improvement,, Article 4E-1, Hazardous Chemicals Information Act	The act implements the hazardous chemicals information and toxic release reporting requirements of the *Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986* (*Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act* [SARA] Title III) for facilities such as the proposed IIFP plant.
New Mexico Water Quality Act	NMSA, Chapter 74, Environmental Improvement, Article 6, Water Quality NMAC Title 20, Environmental Protection, Chapter 6, Ground and Surface Water Protection	The act and implementing regulations establish water quality standards and apply to permitting prior to construction, during operation, and decommissioning, if necessary. Generally, a permit is required for discharges that could affect surface or groundwater. Any impoundments for sewage treatment facilities, cooling water or other discharges that exceed the standards listed in 20.6.2.3103 NMAC or contain toxic constituents require a permit. No site-specific issues have been identified which would preclude permitting of needed water control and treatment facilities at the IIFP Site.
New Mexico Groundwater Protection Act	NMSA, Chapter 74,Environmental Improvement, Article 6B, Groundwater Protection NMAC Title 20, Environmental Protection, Chapter 5, Petroleum Storage Tanks	The act and implementing regulations establish State standards for protection of groundwater from leaking underground and above-ground storage tanks.
New Mexico Night Sky Protection Act	NMSA Chapter 74, Environmental Improvement, Article 12, Night Sky Protection	The act establishes requirements to preserve and enhance the State's dark sky while promoting safety, conserving energy and preserving the environment for astronomy. These requirements will be addressed during detailed design of the IIFP facility.
Exchanges of State Trust Lands	NMAC Title 19, Natural Resources and Wildlife, Chapter 2 State Trust Lands, Part 21, Land Exchanges	The act establishes State standards and procedures for exchanges of lands held in trust, including consideration of cultural resources, natural resources, and wildlife.

Table 1-1. Applicable State of New Mexico Laws, Regulations, and Agreements (Continued)

Law, Regulation, or Agreement	Citation	Requirements
New Mexico Endangered Plant Species Act	NMAC Title 19, Natural Resources and Wildlife, Chapter 21, Endangered Plants	The act establishes an endangered plant species list and rules for collection. There are no threatened or endangered plant species on the proposed IIFP site.
Registration of Tanks	NMAC, Title 20, Environmental Protection, Chapter 5, Petroleum Storage Tanks, Part 2, Registration of Tanks	The regulations establish the State standards for the regulation of petroleum storage tanks. If needed at the IIFP facility, storage tanks would be designed in accordance with State requirements and registration application made.
Drinking Water Regulations	NMSA, Chapter 74, Environmental Improvement, Article 1, General Provisions, Sections 1-8 and 1-13.1, and Article 6 Water Quality NMAC Title 20, Environmental Protection, Chapter 7, Wastewater and Water Supply Facilities, Part 10 Drinking Water	The acts require the establishment of drinking water standards for New Mexico. These standards are found at 20.7.10 NMAC. The proposed facility would use an on-site groundwater supply for all domestic water needs. Under the New Mexico drinking water regulations, the facility would be classified as a non-transient, non-community water supply system because it would regularly serve more than 25 people.
Transportation and Highway	NMAC Title 18, Transportation and Highways, Chapter 31, Classification and Design Standards, Part 6, State Highway Access Management Requirements	The regulations establish State highway access management requirements that will protect the functional integrity of and investment in, the State highway system.
Threatened and Endangered Species of New Mexico	NMAC, Title 19, Natural Resources and Wildlife, Chapter 33, Endangered and Protected Species	The regulations establish the State of New Mexico's list of threatened and endangered wildlife species. There are no threatened or endangered species on the proposed plant site.

Source: IIFP, 2009a

agreements, whereas Table 1-2, includes anticipated requirements of those agency laws, regulations, and policies where federal agencies have delegated authority to the state, and those laws, regulations and policies administered under autonomous state legal authority. New Mexico Statutes Annotated (NMSA) and implementing regulations in New Mexico Administrative Code (NMAC) are listed numerically by citation (primarily by NMSA statutory Chapter, Article, and Section; or secondarily by NMAC regulation Title, Chapter, and Part).

1.5.2 Lea County and Local Laws and Regulations

Lea County requires county permits for most major construction activity, but these permits are issued in accordance with subdivision ordinances at the time when parcel subdivision is

approved; thus most other parcels where subdivision is not requested are not restricted by local subdivision ordinances and do not require county permits for construction activity. In other words, building permits for foundations, structures, electrical/mechanical systems, roadways, or temporary construction-related structures are not required by local ordinance, except where subdivision regulations apply. Because subdivision is not necessary for the IIFP facility, Article 8 of Lea County's subdivision regulations (or other local regulations) do not apply.

1.5.3 Permit and Approval Status

IIFP would prepare and submit several construction and operating permit applications, and regulatory approval and/or permits would be received prior to preconstruction, construction, or facility operation. It is IIFP's responsibility to adhere to necessary permit application schedules and permit requirements prior to preconstruction, construction, or operation, as applicable. Tables 1-2 and 1-3 list the required Federal and State construction and operation permits and their status.

1.5.3.1 Permits, Licenses, Authorizations, Approvals, and Consultations Required for Preconstruction and Construction

Table 1-2 identifies the anticipated legal/regulatory requirements for site preparation and construction of the proposed IIFP facility. These include any permits, licenses, authorizations, approvals, or other regulatory entitlements required for constructing the proposed facility. Table 1-2 also identifies the status of these possible requirements.

1.5.3.2 Permits, Authorizations, Approvals and Consultations Required for Operations

Table 1-3 identifies the anticipated legal/regulatory requirements for operation of the proposed IIFP facility. Table 1-3 also identifies the status of these possible requirements.

1.6 Cooperating Agencies

No Federal, State, or local agencies or Native American Tribes have requested to be considered as cooperating agencies in the preparation of this draft EIS.

1.7 National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 Consultations

The consultation requirements of the *National Historic Preservation Act* (NHPA) and *Endangered Species Act* (ESA) apply to the NRC with regard to the proposed IIFP facility licensing action. Consultation correspondence is provided in Appendix B (Consultation/Correspondence).

1.7.1 National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 Section 106 Consultation

NRC staff initiated the NHPA Section 106 consultation process by letter dated July 2, 2010. NRC staff contacted the NM SHPO regarding information about historic sites and cultural resources that could potentially be affected by the proposed IIFP facility. In the letter, the NRC staff identified the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the proposed project and requested information from the NM SHPO related to the proposed action's potential to affect cultural resources. Also in the letter, the NRC staff stated its intent to use the NEPA process to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA as allowed in 36 CFR 800.8. The NM SHPO replied on July 15,

Table 1-2. Legal/Regulatory Requirements and Authorizations for Site Preparation and Construction of the Proposed IIFP Facility

Agency	Legal/Regulatory Authority	Activity Covered	Status	Permits, Licenses, Authorizations, Approvals, and Consultations Identification	Permit Dates
Federal – NRC	10 CFR 40	Domestic licensing of source material	IIFP's application accepted February 24, 2010; pending NRC review ongoing	License Application (LA-IFP-001, IFP-002, & ER-IFP-001)	pending
Federal – EPA Region 6 and State – NMED	CWA 33 USC 1251	Construction Stormwater General Permit and NOI	2nd Qtr. 2011; Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and NOI (IIFP)	pending	pending
Federal – USACE	CWA 33 USC 1251	Fill of wetlands	Applicability of depressions onsite determined by consultation (IIFP)	Jurisdictional Determination complete (no wetlands present; no permit necessary)	No permit needed; no jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the U.S. are present.
State – NMDOT District 2	NMAC Title 18, Chapter 31, Part 6, State Highway Access Management Requirements	Highway Access Management Permit for NM 483 and/or US 62/180 driveway entry and/or second (emergency) access point	2nd Qtr. 2011 (IIFP or Lea County). The District 2 permit, if issued, would stipulate any required highway safety enhancements.	pending	pending

Table 1-2. Legal/Regulatory Requirements and Authorizations for Site Preparation and Construction of the Proposed IIFP Facility (Continued)

Agency	Authority	Activity Covered	Status	Permits, Licenses, Authorizations, Approvals, and Consultations Identification	Permit Dates
State – AQB	Title 20 Chapter 2 Part 72	Preconstruction and New Source Review	Projected for 3rd Qtr. 2011(IIFP). A "Request for a No Permit Required Determination" for pre-licensing construction activities would be submitted.	pending	pending
State – AQB	Clean Air Act Title V & NESHAP	NESHAP Permit (if needed; pending consultation with State AQB)	Projected for 3rd Qtr. 2011(IIFP), if needed	pending	pending
State – NMRL/CID	NMAC Title 14	Building permits for foundations, structures, and electrical / mechanical systems, as well as temporary construction-related structures	Projected for 3rd Qtr. 2011(IIFP), if needed	pending	pending
State – PSTB	Above Ground Storage Tank Registration	Petroleum storage tanks (size, design specifications, and fuel type)	Projected for 4th Qtr. 2012 (IIFP)	pending	pending

Source: IIFP, 2009a

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; USACE – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; NESHAP – National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollution; NHPA – National Historic Preservation Act; NMDOT – Department of Transportation; AQB – Air Quality Bureau; PSTB – Petroleum Storage Tank Bureau; NM RL/CID – New Mexico Regulation and Licensing/Construction Industries Division.

Table 1-3. Legal/Regulatory Requirements and Authorizations for Operation of the Proposed IIFP Facility

Agency	Authority	Activity Covered	Status	Permits, Licenses, Authorizations, Approvals, and Consultations Identification	Permit Dates
Federal – NRC	10 CFR 40	Domestic licensing of source material	Accepted February 24, 2010 (IIFP); pending review	License Application (LA-IFP-001, LA-IFP-002, & ER-IFP-001)	pending
Federal – NRC	10 CFR 73 and 74	Domestic licensing of physical protection and material control / accountability	IIFP's application accepted February 24, 2010; pending NRC review	License Application (LA-IFP-001, IFP-002, & ER-IFP-001)	pending
Federal – NRC	10 CFR 20	Standards for Protection Against Radiation	IIFP's application accepted February 24, 2010; pending NRC review	License Application (LA-IFP-001, IFP-002, & ER-IFP-001)	pending
Federal – EPA Region 6 and NMED	CWA 33 USC 1251	Multi-sector Industrial Stormwater General Permit	Projected for 2nd Qtr. 2011 (IIFP)	pending Multi-sector Industrial General Permit (IIFP)	pending
Federal – EPA Region 6 (and possibly HWB)	RCRA Operations Permit	EPA Operation	If necessary, IIFP would submit 4th Qtr. 2011 (IIFP)	pending (if necessary)	pending
Federal – EPA and HWB	RCRA	EPA Waste Activity, EPA ID Number, for storage and use of hazardous chemicals	2nd Qtr. 2012 (IIFP)	Small Quantity Generator pending	pending
State – NMED AQB	Clean Air Act Title V	Air Operation Permit (if needed; pending consultation with State)	Projected for 3rd Qtr. 2011 (IIFP); A Title V operating permit is not likely necessary based on emissions being below Federal and State regulatory standards.	pending	pending

Table 1-3. Authorizations Legal/Regulatory Requirements for Operation of the Proposed IIFP Facility (Continued)

Agency	Authority	Activity Covered	Status	Permits, Licenses, Authorizations, Approvals, and Consultations Identification	Permit Dates
State – NMED AQB	NESHAP	(if needed; pending consultation with State)	Projected for 3rd Qtr. 2011 (IIFP) if needed. Anticipated emissions are below regulatory limits.	pending	pending
State – HWB	Hazardous Chemicals Information Act	Hazardous Waste Permit	Projected for 3rd Qtr. 2011 (IIFP)	pending	pending
State – HWB	Title 20, Chapter 4, Hazardous Waste	EPA Waste Activity EPA ID Number	Notification Form 8700-12 projected for 3rd Qtr. 2011 (IIFP)	pending	pending
State – RCB	NMSA, Chapter 74, Article 3, Radiation Control and Title 20, Chapter 3	Machine-Produced Radioactivity (X-Ray Inspection)	May be required for security contractor (not IIFP)	pending	pending
State – DWB	Safe Drinking Water Act (40 CFR 141, 142, 143; 07/01/2009) and 20-7.10 NMAC (10/15/2008)	Drinking Water System Permit	Projected for 2nd Qtr 2012 (IIFP)	pending	pending
State – WQB	Title 20 Chapter 6, Groundwater	Groundwater Discharge Plan and Permit; Liquid Waste Permit	Projected for 3rd Qtr. 2011 (IIFP)	pending	pending
State – WQB	NPDES	NPDES Industrial Stormwater Permit	Submit if required by 2nd Qtr. 2011 (IIFP)	pending	pending

Table 1-3. Authorizations Legal/Regulatory Requirements for Operation of the Proposed IIFP Facility (Continued)

Agency	Authority	Activity Covered	Status	Permits, Licenses, Authorizations, Approvals, and Consultations Identification	Permit Dates
State – RCB	OSHA Regulations, 29 CFR 1910; Federal FD&C Act; New Mexico Radiation Control Act	Required for x-ray security inspection machines	Identify permit-holder by 1st Qtr. 2011 (IIFP); submit list of source equipment 2nd Qtr. 2012 (IIFP)	Machine-produced radiation registration (X-Ray inspection)	pending (possibly a separate contractor)
State – Utah	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act (Northwest Interstate Compact, Utah Code Title 19 Chapter 3)	LLW disposal at Nuclear Solutions (if chosen)	To be determined		
State – Washington	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act (Northwest Interstate Compact, Compact for the State of Washington)	LLW disposal at Hanford (Richland) (if chosen)	To be determined		
State – Texas	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act and Texas Radiation Control Act (Texas LLW Interstate Compact with Vermont)	LLW disposal at Waste Control Specialists (if chosen)	Would require approval from Rocky Mountain Compact		

Source: IIFP, 2009a

CWA – Clean Water Act; FD&C – Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; DWB – Drinking Water Bureau; HWB – Hazardous Waste Bureau; RCB – Radiation Control Bureau; WQB – Water Quality Bureau; NPDES – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System; OSHA – Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

2010, that the SHPO had no record of any cultural resources surveys having been conducted and outlined the process for completing a survey, undertaking tribal consultation, and completing the Section 106 consultation process. IIFP conducted an archeological reconnaissance survey of the proposed site (as explained in later chapters of this document) according to New Mexico's *Cultural Properties and Historic Preservation, Standards for Survey and Inventory* (NMHPD, 2005). By letter dated October 14, 2010, the New Mexico Commissioner of Public Lands, following his review of IIFP's cultural resources survey document, recommended "a finding of no effect/no cultural properties/no historic properties....There are no documented cultural properties within the APE when considering direct effects. Similarly, there are no registered cultural properties within the assumed, five-mile APE when considering indirect effects." The NM SHPO concurred with the New Mexico Commissioner of Public Lands determination on October 25, 2010.

Consultation under NHPA with Native American Tribes (listed below) was undertaken using a list maintained by the NM SHPO. The list is based partially on U.S. Indian Claims Commission data and also on an NM SHPO Historic Preservation Division (HPD) ethnographic study, the National Park Service's Native American Consultation Database, and Tribes that have notified NM SHPO directly that they wish to be consulted. Based on tribal information provided for Lea County, in July 2010, the NRC staff contacted the Tribes listed below and requested information on historically or culturally significant resources within the APE of the proposed facility. The NRC staff also contacted the NM SHPO tribal liaison (Appendix B). Correspondence between NRC staff and the responding tribes is provided in Appendix B.

- Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
- Comanche Tribe of Oklahoma
- Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma
- Mescalero Apache Tribe
- Ysleta del Sur Pueblo
- Shawnee Tribe

NRC staff will consider comments received from tribes concerning this draft EIS. Otherwise, the coordination that has been conducted in accordance with the NHPA is complete.

1.7.2 Endangered Species Act of 1973 Section 7 Consultation

The NRC staff consulted with the USFWS to comply with the requirements of Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act (ESA)*. On July 2, 2010, the NRC staff sent a letter to the USFWS (New Mexico Ecological Field Office) describing the proposed action and requesting a list of threatened and endangered species and critical habitats that could potentially be affected by the proposed action. The USFWS, in a letter dated August 10, 2010, provided general information about species of concern and critical habitat in New Mexico and Lea County, but made no site-specific comments. In response to a verbal inquiry from the NRC staff, the NMGF responded in a letter dated June 21, 2011, with further information about wildlife habitat on the proposed IIFP site, recommendations for avoiding impacts to wildlife, and other best management practices (Appendix B). No federally threatened or endangered species or critical habitat have been identified on the proposed IIFP site to date; therefore formal Section 7 ESA consultation is not required for the NRC action (licensing) to occur.

1.8 References

(DOE, 2004) U.S. Department of Energy. 2004. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Construction and Operation of a Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility at the Paducah, Kentucky, Site, DOE/EIS-0359. June 2004. ADAMS Accession No. ML 050380331.

(IIFP, 2009a) International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc. 2009. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Environmental Report, Revision A, ER-IFP-001. December 27, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML100120758.

(IIFP, 2009b) International Isotopes Fluorine Products. Inc. 2009. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) License Application, Revision A, ER-IFP-001. December 23, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML100630503.

(NMHPD, 2005) New Mexico Historic Preservation Division, Department of Cultural Affairs. 2005. New Mexico Register, Volume XVI, Number 15, Title 4, Cultural Properties and Historic Preservation; Chapter 10, Cultural Properties and Historic Preservation; Part 15, Standards for Survey and Inventory. Santa Fe, NM. August 15, 2005. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710497.

(NRC, 2005) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2005. Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed National Enrichment Facility in Lea County, New Mexico, NUREG-1790, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C. June 2005. ADAMS Accession No. ML051730238.

(NRC, 2010a) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2010. Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed International Isotopes Uranium Processing Facility. July 8, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML101330539.

(NRC, 2010b) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2010. Letter from Matt Bartlett (NRC) to John J. Miller (IIFP), “License Application for International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc. Facility – Acceptance Review (TAC No’s L32739 and L32740), February 23, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML100480302.

2.0 ALTERNATIVES

This chapter describes and compares the proposed action and its alternatives. As discussed in Section 2.1, the proposed action is for IIFP to construct, operate, and decommission a DUF_6 deconversion facility near Hobbs in Lea County, New Mexico. In this draft EIS; the NRC staff evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed action, including alternative sites for the IIFP facility, alternative deconversion technologies, other DUF_6 management options, and the no-action alternative. Under the no-action alternative, IIFP would not construct, operate, or decommission the proposed facility. Therefore, the no-action alternative provides a basis against which the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action are evaluated and compared.

Section 2.1 presents detailed technical descriptions of the proposed action and related actions, including descriptions of the proposed site, preconstruction and construction activities, chemical process operations within the proposed plant, and decommissioning. Disposition of DUO_2 is also discussed in Section 2.1. Section 2.2 describes alternatives to the proposed action, including the no-action alternative. The chapter concludes with a comparison of predicted potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and no-action alternative (Section 2.3) and a preliminary recommendation from the NRC staff regarding the proposed action (Section 2.4).

2.1 Proposed Action

The proposed action evaluated in this draft EIS is for NRC to grant IIFP a license to construct, operate, and decommission a facility (the proposed IIFP facility) in Lea County, New Mexico, for the deconversion of commercially generated DUF_6 inventories into DUO_2 and other deconversion products. The NRC would grant IIFP a license under 10 CFR 40 (Domestic Licensing of Source Material) to possess and use special nuclear material, source material, and byproduct material at the proposed IIFP facility.

If the NRC issues a license to IIFP, the license would authorize IIFP to:

- construct, operate, and decommission the proposed DUF_6 conversion facility.
- receive DUF_6 cylinders from various commercial uranium enrichment facilities.
- transport marketable deconversion byproducts to end users.
- transport DUO_2 for disposal as LLW or other potential disposition.

IIFP anticipates that the proposed project would be implemented in two phases, but the current license application is for the first phase only (Phase 1), and only the potential impacts of the first phase are evaluated in this draft EIS. Phase 2 would be an expansion of the facility that would use a direct conversion technology described in Section 2.2.2.2.1. Because Phase 2 is a "reasonably foreseeable future action" (as defined in 40 CFR 1508.7), impacts associated with Phase 2 are considered cumulative impacts under NEPA. Cumulative impacts are discussed in Section 4.2.2 of this draft EIS.

Phase 1 and 2 milestones are shown below. Phase 2 milestones are presented for information only.

IIFP submitted license application to NRC	December 30, 2009
IIFP begins construction (Phase 1)	2Q 2012
IIFP begins Phase 1 operations	4Q 2013
IIFP submits license application for plant expansion (Phase 2)	2Q 2013
IIFP begins construction of plant expansion (Phase 2)	2Q 2015
IIFP begins Phase 2 operations	late 2016

The proposed action is described in detail in Sections 2.1.1 through 2.1.8. Unless otherwise indicated, the information presented in Section 2.1 is from the IIFP's environmental report (IIFP, 2009) and responses to NRC staff requests for additional information (IIFP, 2011a).

2.1.1 Site Location and Description

The proposed IIFP site is 22.5 km (14 mi) west of Hobbs, in Section 27 of Township 18S, Range 36E, in Lea County, New Mexico. Figure 2-1 depicts the general site location in southeast New Mexico. Approximately 16 ha (40 ac) of the 259-ha (640-ac) Section would be dedicated to the deconversion facility. The remaining 243 ha (600 ac) would remain undeveloped. Figure 2-2 locates the 16-ha (40-ac) facility within the Section. The Section now consists of mostly undeveloped land that has been used in the past for cattle grazing and gas and oil production.

2.1.2 IIFP Deconversion Process

At the proposed IIFP facility, the FEP/DUP would employ three basic processes, as described in detail in the sections that follow. In summary, the DUF_6 would first be deconverted from DUF_6 to depleted uranium tetrafluoride (DUF_4), with marketable AHF produced as a byproduct. Then, DUF_4 would be processed to produce two marketable deconversion byproducts: high-purity SiF_4, and BF_3, as needed. Plant throughputs are provided in Figure 2-3. The amount of silicon and boron byproducts produced would likely outpace the demand for these byproducts if all the potentially available DUF_6 were converted using this process. Therefore, Phase 2 of the project would support a process that allows the direct conversion of DUF_6 to uranium oxide, without producing the silicon and boron compounds.

2.1.2.1 Deconversion of DUF_6 to DUF_4

As described in Chapter 1, DUF_6 results from the enrichment of natural uranium during the manufacture of nuclear reactor fuel. It is stored and transported as a solid in cylinders specifically designed for these purposes. DUF_6 is a solid at temperatures below 52ºC (125ºF). After receipt at the proposed IIFP facility, as the first step in the deconversion process, the cylinders would be placed in an autoclave enclosed in containment to vaporize the contents. The DUF_6 vapor would be captured in a reaction vessel where it would react with hydrogen to produce DUF_4 powder and AHF. The chemical equation for this process is as follows:

$$DUF_6\ (\text{gaseous}) + H_2\ (\text{gas}) \rightarrow DUF_4\ (\text{solid}) + 2HF\ (\text{anhydrous})$$

The DUF_4 powder would be continuously withdrawn from the bottom of the vessel and fed to the FEP for further deconversion in either the silicon separation process or the boron separation process (Sections 2.1.2.2 and 2.1.2.3, respectively). Also, hydrogen fluoride (HF) can be anhydrous (meaning pure hydrogen fluoride without water) or not. In chemical equations, hydrogen fluoride is depicted as HF, but the parenthetic expression (anhydrous) is added when


Roosevelt
Cochran
Hockley
Levelland
Chaves
Brownfield
Terry
Yoakum
Lovington
Denver City
Artesia
Hobbs
Seminole
Gaines
Eddy
Eunice
Carlsbad
Proposed IIFP Facility Location
Lea
Andrews
Andrews
New Mexico
Texas
Culberson
Loving
Winkler
Ector
Odessa
Kermit
Reeves
Legend
Section 27 of T018SR036E
Urban Area
County Boundary
State Boundary
Major Highways
Limited Access
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 5 10 20 30
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 2-1 General Site Location Map



FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 2-2 Proposed IIFP Facility Boundary

Figure 2-3. Plant Throughput for the DUF_6 Deconversion Process



appropriate. Hydrofluoric acid is another term for hydrogen fluoride combined with water. HF offgases would be filtered, and any residual DUF_6 would be trapped on carbon filters. The AHF would then be condensed to liquid form, and any entrained hydrogen burned. Offgas treatment is described in Section 2.1.6.4.1. AHF would be collected in 3,630-kg (8,000-lb) storage vessels to limit inventory should a leak occur. AHF storage vessels would be located in a building designed to contain a leak. The AHF would be loaded from this building into tanker trucks and shipped to customers. Figure 2-4 shows the process flow chart for this process.

2.1.2.2 SiF_4 Production

To produce SiF_4, the powdered DUF_4 would be mixed with powdered silicon dioxide (SiO_2) in a rotary calciner, and heated to react to form gaseous SiF_4 and solid UO_2 (U_3O_8) triuranium octoxide, sometimes referred to simply as uranium oxide or "yellowcake." The chemical equation for this process is as follows:

$$SiO_2 \text{ (solid)} + DUF_4 \text{ (solid)} \rightarrow SiF_4 \text{ (gas)} + DUO_2 \text{ (solid)}$$

The gaseous SiF_4 would be collected from the calciner, filtered to remove any particulate contamination, and cooled to condense any hydrofluoric acid or other trace gases. The purified, gaseous SiF_4 then would be collected in cold traps. The cold traps would be warmed to vaporize the SiF_4, and the gaseous SiF_4 would be stored in a vessel for subsequent packaging and shipment to customers. Offgas treatment is described in Section 2.1.6.4.1. Figure 2-5 shows the process flow chart for this process.

2.1.2.3 BF_3 Production

The BF_3 production process would be very similar to that for SiF_4, except that there would be a pretreatment step in which a feed mixture of boron oxide (B_2O_3) and DUF_4 would be heated prior to mixing in the rotary calciner (Figure 2-6). The preheating would remove moisture by reacting the water with the DUF_4, releasing gaseous (anhydrous) HF. The gaseous (anhydrous) HF would be filtered and scrubbed in the offgas system. The remainder of the process would be very nearly the same as for SiF_4 production. The chemical equation for this process is as follows:

$$2B_2O_3 \text{ (solid)} + 3DUF_4 \text{ (solid)} \rightarrow 4BF_3 \text{ (gas)} + 3DUO_2 \text{ (solid)}$$

2.1.3 Description of the Proposed Facility

The proposed facility would be typical of specialty industrial chemical facilities. The proposed 16-ha (40-ac) facility would be enclosed with a security fence with a surveillance road just inside the fence. Pole-mounted security lighting would be installed around the entire perimeter. Entry into the proposed facility would be from the west via a paved road accessed from New Mexico Highway (NM) 483 which bounds the proposed site on the west (Figure 2-2). Structures within the security fence would include process, administration, and laboratory buildings; a maintenance shop; security facilities; utilities; cylinder storage pads; and warehouses. The parking lot would be outside the security fence. The tallest building is expected to be approximately 21 meters (m) (70 feet [ft]) high, and the tallest structure a 40 m (131 ft) meteorological tower.

Figure 2-4. Process Flow Chart for Deconversion of DUF_6 to DUF_4



Figure 2-5. Process Flow Chart for SiF_4 Production



Figure 2-6. Process Flow Chart for BF_3 Production



The proposed IIFP facility would have a Full DUF_6 Cylinder Storage Pad with bollards to protect the cylinders from vehicles. The Pad is designed to be 53.3 m wide by 61 m long (175 ft wide by 200 ft long) and is sized to store up to 60 full cylinders. The Pad would be curbed for stormwater collection and provided with underground drains to a stormwater retention basin south of the Pad. There would also be a 32 m by 56.3 m (105 ft by 185 ft) Empty DUF_6 Cylinder Storage Pad, with capacity for 40 empty cylinders. It would be the staging area for the shipment of empty cylinders.

The main process buildings, listed below, would be on the proposed 16-ha (40-ac) facility.

- DUF_6 Autoclave Building
- DUF_4 Process Building
- DUF_4 Container Staging Building
- Decontamination Building
- FEP Process Building
- FEP Oxide Staging Building
- DUF_4 Container Storage Building
- FEP Product Storage and Packaging Building
- AHF Staging Containment Building
- Fluoride Products Trailer Loading Building
- SiO_2 Storage Silo
- Potassium Hydroxide (KOH) Storage Tank
- FEP and DUF_4 Scrubbers and Scrubber Containment Pads

Hydrogen used as a reactant in the deconversion processes would be generated onsite from natural gas using a vendor-supplied steam reforming system. The system would provide approximately 6 to 9 pounds per hour of hydrogen at 24.7 to 29.7 pounds per square inch absolute. The natural gas requirement is approximately 18.7 pounds per hour (420 standard cubic feet per hour). Other than a small surge tank, the site would not store hydrogen gas.

All the building area aprons and areas surrounding outside equipment would have concrete curbing dikes designed to contain the largest possible spill of liquid chemicals, based on the volume of chemicals expected to be stored in each building/area. Pads for the storage of hazardous or corrosive chemicals would be coated to prevent leaks penetrating through the pads. The dikes would be equipped with pumps to transfer any spills to the Environmental Protection Process (EPP) equipment (Section 2.1.6.4.2). Radiological hand and foot monitors would be installed at exits of buildings where uranium would be handled. Fluoride and radiological detection systems, local alarms, and alarms in the control rooms would alert workers to potentially hazardous conditions.

Auxiliary buildings would generally house:

- materials
- maintenance shops

- laboratories
- steam boilers and supporting utilities
- electrical utility equipment
- sanitary water treatment equipment
- equipment for process water treatment and recycling
- personnel offices, break rooms, changing rooms, and restrooms

2.1.4 Preconstruction and Construction

Preconstruction activities include activities that would occur prior to issuance of the license and are discussed in cumulative impacts (Section 4.2.2). Preconstruction activities include site preparation activities and would not include the construction of process buildings or any safety-related structures. Preconstruction activities would include:

- clearing land
- grading the site and installing erosion controls
- building the main entrance roadbed and drainage
- setting up construction trailers
- preparing preliminary site roadways and gravel parking area
- (potentially) drilling water wells
- constructing an electrical substation
- stubbing in gas line to meter
- constructing the administrative building shell
- constructing the maintenance and storage building
- constructing the material warehouse building shell
- installing temporary fencing
- constructing facility roadbeds and gravel parking areas
- installing a geothermal heat pump loop
- installing a firewater tank
- installing a truck washing station

During preconstruction, the 16-ha (40-ac) IIFP facility site would be graded to provide an approximately level grade at elevation 1,157 meters (3,797 ft) above mean sea level. Approximately 11-ha (26-ac) on the northeast would be cut approximately 0.3 meters (1 foot) in depth, resulting in a cut of an estimated 32,400 cubic meters (42,400 cubic yards). This excavated material would be used as fill in the northwest and southwest areas of the proposed facility location, including two isolated depressions on the west side of the site (approximately 7.3-ha [18-ac]). The amount of fill required would be approximately 32,600 cubic meters (42,600 cubic yards), resulting in a deficit of 150 cubic meters (200 cubic yards) of fill needed that would be obtained onsite.

Heavy equipment that would be required for preconstruction (and construction) would include tractor/backhoes, graders, excavators, dozers, dump trucks, cranes, fuel trucks, water trucks, forklifts, and flatbeds. Additional equipment could include air compressors, concrete pumps, generators, and welding machines. During "construction," which refers to all construction activities that occur after the license is issued, the remainder of the facility, including the process buildings, would be constructed. The following activities would occur during construction:

- connecting utilities
- completing the access road and parking lot
- completing the construction of multiple structures including 13 process buildings, an administration building, laboratories, a maintenance shop, security facilities, cylinder storage pads, and warehouses
- construction of a meteorological tower
- installation of process equipment and other interior infrastructure
- construction of the wastewater management system

Construction of Phase 1 of the facility is expected to require 140 workers.

During construction, a 0.6-m (2-ft) depth of topsoil (approximately 2,400 cubic meters [3,100 cubic yards]), would be removed in the areas of buildings and adjacent pads to provide adequate bearing for concrete floors and pads. Additionally, an estimated 3,000 cubic meters (4,000 cubic yards) would be removed at an approximate 0.6-m (2-ft) depth in the areas for the (full and empty) DUF_4 cylinder pads. The material used to fill back to the foundation level would have soil compacting specifications suitable for the load bearing requirements that would be determined during the detailed engineering of the project.

Foundations and footings for buildings, tanks and equipment, and for evaporation basins and the storm and sanitary sewer systems, would require excavation of an equivalent 3,170 cubic meters (4,150 cubic yards), encompassing excavation less backfill.

The roadbed for the access road from NM 483 to the 16-ha (40-ac) site would require approximately 6,700 cubic meters (8,800 cubic yards) of fill. This fill would use most of the 8,600 cubic meters (11,250 cubic yards) of material from the excavations described above. Any excess (or unsuitable fill material) would be spread approximately 0.15-m (6 inches [in]) deep and compacted over an estimated 0.4 to 0.8-ha (1 to 2-ac) area of the 258-ha (640-ac) Section. The grading and temporary preparation of a construction access road would be included in the preconstruction activities, but final construction would occur during Phase 1 activities.

2.1.5 Utilities and Other Services

The FEP/DUP plant would require the installation of electrical and natural gas service lines from existing utilities that cross the proposed site and are outside the facility boundary. It is expected that these utility connections would be installed during preconstruction. Steam and compressed air would be generated on site (Section 2.1.5.4). Nitrogen would be internally generated on site or procured from a vendor. Hydrogen would be generated on site. Water would be obtained from on-site groundwater wells.

2.1.5.1 Electrical Power

Most of the electrical power required by the proposed facility would be to operate four reaction vessels (calciners) in the FEP process building, and the refrigeration system and reaction vessel in the DUP process building. A new electrical substation and distribution line are proposed for providing electrical service to the facility. Currently 115- and 230-kilovolt transmission lines run along NM 483 and across Section 27. The local electric utility would install a 4.9 kilovolt-ampere substation and distribution lines to the facility. The substation would be within the facility fence. For some lighter loads, solar electric panels, both ground- and roof-mounted, would supplement the offsite power.

2.1.5.2 Water

The proposed facility would require relatively low volumes of process water because it would recycle process water and re-circulate cooling water. IIFP estimates that the total water supply requirement is less than 38,000 liters (L) (10,000 gallons [gal]) per day. Sanitary water requirements for showers, lavatories, drinking, toilets, and the laboratory would be 11,000 L to 17,000 L (3,000 to 4,500 gal) per day of the total. Treated sanitary waste water would be used for landscape watering. Boiler blow-down would be sent to the EPP (Section 2.1.6.4.2) for treatment, if needed, and evaporation.

No municipal water line runs near the proposed site. Therefore, it is anticipated that there would be at least one but no more than two groundwater wells to supply water for the facility. Lea County will install and provide one groundwater well as part of the land transfer to IIFP; IIFP would install another, if necessary, to obtain the desired yield for operations (of both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 facilities operations). A package treatment plant would render the groundwater acceptable for potable water use.

2.1.5.3 Natural Gas

The proposed facility would require natural gas for two gas-fired boilers that would support process steam production, the autoclave feed system, and the hydrogen production plant. Several natural gas pipelines cross Section 27. Gas would be conveyed to the facility from one of these existing pipelines via a smaller-diameter distribution pipeline.

2.1.5.4 Internal Utilities

2.1.5.4.1 Steam

Steam would be the primary heat source for vaporizing DUF_6 in the autoclave, heating some process and warehouse buildings, and warming pipes as necessary to prevent solidification of temperature-sensitive substances. Steam requirements for the facility are estimated to be 2,500 to 3,500 pounds per hour. Steam would be generated on-site at 150 pounds per square inch (psig) using package boilers of about 10,000 pounds per hour capacity.

2.1.5.4.2 Compressed Air

Compressed air would be needed for operation of some instrumentation, control valves, dust collector blow-back, hopper vibrators, and miscellaneous uses. Ambient air would be filtered, compressed, and dried to deliver approximately 100 psig.

2.1.5.4.3 Nitrogen

Gaseous nitrogen would be required for purge gas and for cooling pre-condensers in the FEP process building. Liquid nitrogen would be used for the cold traps. The cold nitrogen vapor exiting the product cold traps would be used for the pre-condenser cooling. Gaseous nitrogen leaving the condensers would be collected and compressed to supply gaseous nitrogen to the parts of the facility that require a dry inert gas. The main application would be for purge and seal systems, such as the rotary calciner inlet and discharge seals. IIFP plans to conduct a cost-benefit analysis during detailed design to determine whether to make or buy the liquid nitrogen or to use another cryogenic system, such as gaseous helium. It is assumed for this draft EIS that liquid nitrogen would be procured from a vendor.

2.1.6 Facility Operations

2.1.6.1 Workforce

During Phase 1 operations, the continuous, fulltime workforce is expected to be approximately 140 workers.

2.1.6.2 Feedstocks

The primary raw materials used in the facility would be DUF_6, SiO_2, and B_2O_3. Annual throughputs of these materials are provided in Figure 2-3. Other materials needed would be hydrogen, nitrogen, potassium hydroxide (KOH), and lime.

2.1.6.3 Products

The finished products are fluoride products, namely AHF, SiF_4, and BF_3. The byproduct of the facility is a chemically stable DUO_2 suitable for permanent offsite disposal, if desired (Section 2.1.8). The expected annual production of these materials is provided in Figure 2-3. The design-basis inventories are provided in Table 2-1.

2.1.6.4 Waste Streams

The wastes from the FEP/DUP plant include gaseous emissions, process wastewaters, sanitary wastes, and solid wastes. These waste streams and their treatment methods are described below. Gaseous emissions rates are provided in Table 2-2.

2.1.6.4.1 Process Offgas Treatment and Stacks

The plant would have three stacks to vent treated process offgases and particulates to the atmosphere: the KOH Scrubbing System Stack, the DUF_4 Dust Collector System Stack, and the FEP Dust Collector System Stack. Prior to venting, the particulate and gas process streams would be filtered and/or scrubbed using multi-stage equipment. Additionally, one boiler vent stack would release natural gas combustion products to the atmosphere.

Offgas Treatment

Final off-gas streams from the DUF_6 to DUF_4, SiF_4, and BF_3 processes (comprised mostly of nitrogen, air, and trace fluorides) would enter the Plant KOH Scrubbing System, a three-stage

Table 2-1. Facility Design Basis Inventories

Material	Maximum Limit Agreement with New Mexico	Projected Average Phase 1
Total depleted uranium (DUF_6, DUO_2 and DUF_4)	2,200,000 kg (4,851,000 lb)	See Note 2
DUF_6	See Note 1	15-20 full cylinders 165,000-220,000 kg (363,000-484,000 lb)
DUF_6 in process	See Note 1	19,500-30,000 kg (43,000-66,000 lb)
DUF_4	See Note 1	63,500-136,100 kg (140,000-300,000 lb)
Uranium oxides as DUO_2	See Note 1	154,200-213,200 kg (340,000-470,000 lb)
HF (aqueous)	23,300 kg (51,400 lb)	4,500-6,800 kg (10,000-15,000 lb)
AHF	45,000 kg (99,200 lb)	14,000-15,900 kg (31,000-35,000 lb)
SiF_4 (packaged + in-process)	64,700 kg (142,700 lb)	21,800-31,800 kg (48,000-70,000 lb)
BF_3 (packaged + in-process)	22,400 kg (49,400 lb)	7,800-15,000 kg (17,000-33,000 lb)
KOH	8,100 kg (17,900 lb)	6,800-7,700 kg (15,000-17,000 lb)
CaF_2 (calcium fluoride)	36,500 kg (80,500 lb)	20,400-22,700 kg (45,000-50,000 lb)

Source: IIFP, 2009
lb = pound; kg = kilogram
Note 1: The "Maximum Limit" applies to the total depleted uranium as either DUF_6 (both in cylinders and in process), DUO_2 or DUF_4.
Note 2: The "Projected Average" is provided as individual breakdowns for DUF_6 in cylinders and in process, DUO_2, and DUF_4.

Table 2-2. Projected Annual Gaseous Emissions to the Atmosphere from Phase 1 Facility Operations

Pollutant	Emissions	Units
CO	1,200 (1.3)	kg/yr (tons/yr)
NO_2	290 (0.32)	kg/yr (tons/yr)
$PM_{2.5}$	100 (0.11)	kg/yr (tons/yr)
PM_{10}	100 (0.11)	kg/yr (tons/yr)
SO_2	18 (0.02)	kg/yr (tons/yr)

Table 2-2. Projected Annual Gaseous Emissions to the Atmosphere from Phase 1 Facility Operations (Continued)

Pollutant	Emissions	Units
SiF_4	3.7 (8.2)	kg/yr (lbs/yr)
BF_3	64 (141)	kg/yr (lbs/yr)
HF	53 (117)	kg/yr (lbs/yr)
CaF_2	3.5 (7.8)	kg/yr (lbs/yr)
$CaCO_3$	61 (134)	kg/yr (lbs/yr)
B_2O_3	4.9 (10.8)	kg/yr (lbs/yr)
U-234	5.2×10^5 (1.4×10^{-5})	becquerels (Bq)/yr curies (Ci)/yr
U-235	4.8×10^4 (1.3×10^{-6})	Bq/yr (Ci/yr)
U-238	4.4×10^7 (1.2×10^{-3})	Bq/yr (Ci/yr)

Source: IIFP, 2011a
CO = carbon monoxide; NO_2= nitrogen dioxide; $PM_{2.5}$=particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter; PM_{10}=particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter; CaF_2=calcium fluoride; $CaCO_3$ = calcium carbonate; U-234, U-235 and U-238= isotopes of uranium.

scrubber system, to remove fluoride from the offgases prior to releasing them to the atmosphere.

Two parallel systems would provide operating flexibility. The first stage of each scrubber system would consist of a primary wet venturi scrubber. The second stage would consist of a countercurrent-flow, gas-liquid packed tower scrubber. The third-stage scrubber would route gas exiting the secondary packed tower scrubber though a bed of sized coke (a cellular, carbonaceous material derived from the destructive distillation of coal or petroleum products). The coke would be wetted by an aqueous KOH solution that serves as the scrubber liquor. The aqueous KOH solution would be recycled within each of the scrubbers until the concentration of KOH needs replenishment (i.e., until the KOH no longer effectively captures the fluoride residuals, referred to as being “spent”). The KOH solution concentration in the scrubber equipment would be maintained to ensure it effectively reacts with (scrubs) the fluoride components in the gas stream.

When the KOH scrubbing liquor concentration needs replenishment, some of the spent scrubbing solution, containing potassium fluoride (KF), water, and some excess KOH, would be pumped from the scrubber recycle tanks to the EPP (described in Section 2.1.6.4.2). The Plant KOH Scrubbing System process flow is depicted in Figure 2-7 and consists of a KOH storage tank, KOH pump tank, regenerated KOH tank, two or three (installed spare) venturi scrubbers, two packed towers, and two coke boxes.

1 **Figure 2-7. Plant KOH Scrubbing System Process Flow**

2



The three-stage KOH scrubbing system would be designed to remove fluoride-bearing components in the gas streams at approximate efficiencies of greater than 80 percent, 95 percent, and 99 percent for the first, second, and third stages, respectively. The overall system removal efficiency would be designed at greater than approximately 99.9 percent. The plant KOH scrubbing system stack would be continuously sampled to measure for traces of fluorides or uranium in the vent gas.

Process Dust Collection

Dust capture and collection systems would be installed in areas where depleted uranium particulates, such as DUF_4 or DUO_2, would be handled or processed. The dust collection systems would be filter-type baghouses that would remove the depleted uranium particulates prior to discharging the process gas to the outside environment through the DUF_4 Dust Collector Vent Stack.

Equipment where depleted uranium-bearing powders would be handled or stored, such as storage hoppers and enclosed drum packaging stations, would be connected to the dust collection intakes. Uranium particulates captured by the dust collection systems either would be recycled back to the respective process operations or packaged and sent to an approved off-site disposal facility. The design efficiency of baghouse dust collectors would be greater than 99.5 percent for each collector. At least two components would be used in series to ensure an overall system efficiency of greater than 99.9 percent in the collection and removal of particulate uranium from the vented process gas.

Sampling and analysis for uranium would be performed routinely on each baghouse dust collector. If an unacceptable level of uranium carryover was detected on any given dust collector, it would be removed from service for maintenance. Additionally, each baghouse would be continuously monitored for differential pressure across the filter bag sections to ensure bag design integrity was maintained.

2.1.6.4.2 Environmental Protection Process

The EPP would treat KF solutions to regenerate KOH, and neutralize weak aqueous HF. Both of these waste streams originate from offgas scrubbing systems designed to prevent air emissions, as described in Section 2.1.6.4.1.

A KF solution would be generated when KOH was used as a scrubbing medium. In the KOH regeneration process of the EPP, the KF solution, water, and excess KOH spent solution from the plant KOH scrubbing system would react with a lime slurry, producing calcium fluoride (CaF_2) and regenerated KOH solution. The regenerated KOH would be recycled and reused in the plant scrubbing process. The CaF_2 would be filtered, dried, and packaged for shipment to an approved disposal facility, to an HF producer, or to another potential user.

The other stream treated in the EPP would consist of a weak aqueous HF solution, water, or KOH solution that may contain a low concentration of fluorides. Also, small spills that could occur in spill control containment areas and require clean up and that could contain weak fluoride concentrations would be treated in the EPP like the weak HF solution. In these cases, the fluoride-bearing liquids could have too much water to send to the KOH regeneration system. The HF neutralization process would use lime slurry to react with weak HF to produce CaF_2 and water.

Figure 2-8 depicts the EPP HF Neutralization and KOH Regeneration processes. These processes are discussed below.

KOH Regeneration

Lime would be fed to an agitated mix tank and mixed with water. The lime/water slurry would be approximately 30 percent solids. Spent KOH solution (KOH solution with a weak concentration of KOH) would be transferred from a storage tank to an agitated reaction vessel that has a volume of about 22,712 L (6,000 gal). The lime slurry would be transferred from the mix tank to the reaction vessel. The solutions would remain in the reaction vessel tank for one hour or more to ensure the reaction was complete. Then the contents of the reaction vessel would be transferred to a thickening tank for settling. CaF_2 from the chemical reaction and excess lime would be transferred by a slurry pump from the bottom of the thickening tank to a rotary drum vacuum filter. Solids would be discharged from the filter to a dryer to remove excess water. Liquors would be transferred from the filter to a clarifier to allow trace solids to settle. Regenerated KOH solution would be decanted from the top of the clarifier and passed through a set of filters to the regenerated KOH storage tank. The regenerated KOH solution would be recycled to the Plant KOH Scrubbing System, as needed, for reuse by the scrubbers. Solids from the clarifier would be transferred via a slurry pump from the bottom of the clarifier to the rotary drum vacuum filter and subsequently transferred to the dryer. The dried material would be packaged and stored for sale or sent to an approved disposal facility. The primary chemical reaction is:

$$2KF + Ca(OH)_2 \text{ (calcium hydroxide)} \rightarrow CaF_2 + 2KOH$$

HF Neutralization

The HF Neutralization process would operate intermittently, as needed. A lime silo would hold an inventory of hydrated lime. The silo would include a dust collector. Lime would be fed to a mix tank and mixed with water. The slurry would be approximately 30 percent solids. Dilute HF solution would be transferred from the weak HF solution tank to an agitated acid reaction vessel with a volume of about 22,712 L (6,000 gal). The lime slurry would be transferred from the mix tank to the acid reaction vessel. The solutions would remain in the acid reaction vessel for one hour or more to ensure the reaction was complete. Then the solution from the acid reaction vessel would be transferred to a thickening tank for settling. After thickening, CaF_2 and excess lime would be transferred by a slurry pump from the bottom of the thickening tank to a rotary drum vacuum filter. Solids would be discharged from the filter to a dryer to remove excess water. Liquors from the filter would be recycled to the weak HF solution tank for recycling. After drying, the CaF_2 would be packaged for sale or disposal at an approved disposal facility. The primary chemical reaction is:

$$2HF + Ca(OH)_2 \rightarrow CaF_2 + 2H_2O \text{ (water)}$$

2.1.6.4.3 Sewer Systems

Storm Sewers and Stormwater Collection Basins

The facility storm sewer system design assumes a 100-year storm for the Hobbs, New Mexico, area of 8.9 to 10.2 centimeters (cm) (3.5 to 4 in) of rain falling in one hour. IIFP performed preliminary engineering of the drainage system size and layout to estimate costs, determine requirements, and provide information for later detailed design. The preliminary design includes

Figure 2-8. EPP HF Neutralization and KOH Regeneration Processes



the locations of the process buildings, auxiliary buildings, pads, roads, parking lot, and water treatment plant and electrical substation. All of the storm sewer systems would be inside the fenced area and would collect rainwater runoff from an estimated 8- to 10-ha (20- to 25-ac) area, including roadways, building roofs, and pads.

Two collection basins are planned to handle storm water drainage surges. One basin would serve the Full DUF_6 Cylinder Storage Pad. The other would be the main holding basin for the site storm sewer drainage system. Preliminary engineering calculations performed by IIFP estimate the main basin needs to be approximately 2,800,000 L (100,000 cubic ft) in volume, assuming a 20 percent freeboard above the maximum design water level. The basin would be double-lined with impervious synthetic materials typically used in these applications. IIFP's current plans are to use a sand base with a layer of geo-synthetic liner and a second layer of high density polyethylene. Detail engineering and specifications would be refined after civil engineering data are obtained from the site surveys and after discussions with the New Mexico Environment Department regarding permits.

Sanitary Sewer

Preliminary design of the sanitary sewer system provides for capability to handle hydraulic loading of about 11,356 to 17,034 L (3,000 to 4,500 gal) per day. Sanitary sewer discharge would be treated in primary and secondary package systems for digestion and activation. Tertiary treatment with disinfection, probably using ultraviolet radiation, would follow. Biomass generated by the treatment would be removed from the site by a licensed disposal contractor. The triple-treated water would be re-used as process water in the facility or for landscape irrigation.

Process Sewer

Process water and solutions, and KOH liquors would be pumped, when contaminant concentrations dictate, from process systems or the air emissions scrubbing units, respectively, to the EPP via above-ground piping. Pipes would be double-walled to prevent leakage of hazardous solutions out of the piping system if the piping cannot be routed through areas with adequate spill containment.

2.1.6.4.4 Solid Wastes

IIFP would use solid waste management systems including facilities, administrative procedures, and practices for the collection, temporary storage, and disposal of categorized solid waste. No solid waste processing is planned. The facility would generate industrial (nonhazardous), radioactive, hazardous, and mixed wastes. Radioactive and mixed waste would be segregated according to the volume of liquid that could not be readily separated from the solids. Solid radioactive wastes would be low-level (radioactive) waste (LLW) as defined in 10 CFR 61, "Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste." Table 2-3 provides the estimated annual quantities of solid waste.

Industrial waste, including sanitary waste, miscellaneous trash, vehicle air filters, empty cutting oil cans, miscellaneous scrap metal, and paper would be shipped off site for minimization, if appropriate, and then disposed in an appropriate licensed landfill.

Table 2-3. Phase 1 Estimated Annual Solid Waste Generation - Operations

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Low-Level Waste	1,309,000 – 2,875,000 kg (2,885,650 – 6,337,300 lbs)
Hazardous Waste [a]	92,000 – 140,000 kg (203,200 – 308,400 lbs)
Other Solid Waste	27,510 – 41,400 kg (60,650 – 91,300 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

[a] Includes calcium fluoride which would not be hazardous waste if it is sold as a byproduct.

The DUO_2 waste from the deconversion process could be shipped to an offsite LLW disposal facility licensed to accept DUO_2 (Section 2.1.6.5.3 and Section 2.1.8). Other LLW, including dust collector bags, ion exchange resin, crushed contaminated drums, contaminated trash, contaminated coke, and carbon trap material would be collected in labeled containers in each radiological Restricted Area and transferred to the Radioactive Waste Storage Area for inspection. Waste would be volume-reduced, if appropriate, and disposed at a licensed LLW disposal facility.

Hazardous wastes and some mixed wastes would be collected at the point of generation, transferred to the Waste Storage Area, inspected, and classified. Any mixed waste that could be processed to meet land disposal requirements would be treated in its original collection container and shipped as LLW for disposal at a licensed LLW disposal facility. Hazardous wastes would be collected and packaged in approved containers and shipped by a licensed transporter to a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility. There would be no on-site disposal of any solid waste at the IIFP facility.

2.1.6.5 Product and Byproduct Packaging and Shipping

Three types of products/byproducts would be shipped: AHF, FEP products (SiF_4 and BF_3), and depleted uranium oxides (e.g., DUO_2). Given the hazards of fluoride products, especially AHF, the AHF Staging Containment Building and the FEP Products Trailer Loading Building would be equipped with an array of water-fog nozzles that would automatically activate in the event of a leak of AHF or fluoride product chemicals. Fluoride detectors would be deployed throughout the two buildings to ensure effective coverage. The detection and control system would be designed for automatically closing isolation valves at the storage tanks and at the tank trailer fill lines. The detection system would also provide automatic and manual controls for initiating the water deluge system in event of chemical leaks in either building.

2.1.6.5.1 AHF

The AHF Staging Containment Building and equipment would provide temporary storage of AHF received from the DUF_6 to DUF_4 process AHF condensers. AHF would be stored in the AHF Staging Containment Building in approximately 3,630-kg (8,000-lb) capacity tanks. Dikes around each storage tank would be sized to hold the contents of the storage tank, with a margin of safety to minimize the surface area (and evaporation rate of the AHF) in the unlikely event the tank breached and spilled liquid AHF.

When AHF inventories reach a volume suitable for shipment, the AHF would be loaded into an approved tank trailer staged in the Fluoride Products Trailer Loading Building, which would be connected to the AHF Staging and Containment Building. The transporter-owned or customer-owned tank trailer would be approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and of the design and type routinely used for shipping AHF nationwide (typically type DOT-412 trailer, loaded to about 13,608 to 18,144 kg [30,000 to 40,000 lb] of product). The Fluoride Products Trailer Loading Building would have a truck entrance door that remained closed, sealed, and controlled except for short periods when the tank trailer would be moved in and out. A transfer line from the storage tanks in the AHF Staging Containment Building would enter the tank trailer side of the Fluoride Products Trailer Loading Building. Safety precautions, controls, and barriers would prevent the tank trailer from inadvertently being moved or from contacting the fill line.

2.1.6.5.2 FEP Products

The SiF_4 and BF_3 products awaiting shipment to customers would be stored in the FEP Product Storage and Packaging Building until packaged within the Building into customer-owned, DOT-approved shipping cylinders (typically type 3A or 3AA). The SiF_4 or BF_3 product could be packaged into DOT-approved shipping tube trailers, and in this case the product would be transferred from the storage vessels to a tube trailer parked in the Fluoride Products Trailer Loading Building.

2.1.6.5.3 Depleted Uranium Oxides

DUO_2 and all other LLW materials generated at the facility would be transported by truck in 208-(wet) or 242-(dry) L (55-gal) drums in accordance with NRC and DOT packaging and shipping regulations (10 CFR 71 and 49 CFR 171-173). Trucks would carry 20 to 25 drums per shipment. The drums would be disposed of at a licensed off-site LLW disposal facility. For purpose of analysis in this draft EIS, the expected disposal site is considered to be the Energy*Solutions* facility at Clive, Utah. See Section 2.1.8 for a discussion of depleted uranium oxide disposal options.

2.1.7 Decommissioning

The proposed IIFP facility would be licensed to operate for 40 years. At the end of this period, unless IIFP files a timely application for license renewal, the proposed facility would be decontaminated and decommissioned in accordance with applicable NRC license termination requirements. The FEP/DUP facility would be decommissioned such that the site and remaining facilities could be released for unrestricted use as defined in 10 CFR 20.1402. Decontamination and decommissioning would occur over three years, after the NRC operating license expires and if no application to renew the license is submitted. Decommissioning would employ 40 workers for the three-year period (IIFP, 2009).

Two possibilities exist for the facility structures and paved areas. One is to leave the structures and most (non-uranium-processing) support equipment in place after it is decontaminated to free release levels, in accordance with 10 CFR 20, for ultimate use by another industrial tenant or owner. The second scenario is to raze the structures and remove the pavement, restoring the site for use as open range land (e.g., grazing and wildlife habitat). IIFP's analytical assumption is that decommissioning would involve the removal of the internal equipment (both Phase 1 and Phase 2 expansion, if built), utilities, and products from the building(s); however, the physical structures, associated foundations, access roads, and utility lines would likely

remain intact, (i.e., the first scenario). Decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility would include decontamination and removal of uranium-processing equipment and other materials that would be shipped offsite for licensed disposal. Radioactively contaminated equipment and materials would be sent to a licensed treatment and/or disposal facility in a manner authorized by the NRC (IIFP, 2009). Prior to the expiration of the license or cessation of facilities operation, whichever comes first, IIFP would submit a detailed decommissioning plan, which would undergo additional NEPA review.

2.1.8 Depleted Uranium Disposition Options

On average, the facility would produce approximately 0.32 to 0.36 kg (0.7 to 0.8 lb) of DUO_2 for every pound of DUF_6 processed, yielding approximately 2.5 million kg (5.6 million lb) of DUO_2 annually (Figure 2-3). The DUO_2 could either be disposed as LLW or recycled. Potential reuses of depleted uranium are as aircraft and ship ballast, as ingredients in pigments and glazes, as shielding material, as forklift counterweights, in armor-piercing projectiles, in high density concrete, as material to downblend highly enriched uranium, as a component of fuel in fast breeder reactors (including the proposed variant, the traveling wave reactor), as an ingredient in mixed-oxide fuel for thermal reactors, and as shielding/absorber in waste repositories. Some of these uses are conceptual and have never been employed. Others are in little demand or use only small quantities of depleted uranium, making them unfavorable for disposition of large volumes of depleted uranium. The uranium fuel cycle as currently configured in the U.S. does not have the capacity to accept significant quantities of depleted uranium (DOE, 1999).

Depleted uranium is different from most LLW in that it consists mostly of long-lived isotopes of uranium, with small quantities of thorium-234 and protactinium-234. The Commission affirmed that depleted uranium is properly considered a form of LLW in Louisiana Energy Services, L.P. (National Enrichment Facility), CLI-05-5, 61 NRC 22 (January 18, 2005; NRC, 2005a). This means that depleted uranium could be disposed of in a licensed LLW facility if the licensing requirements for land disposal of radioactive waste in 10 CFR 61 are met. However, a specific site may place additional limits on concentration, volume, or waste form.

Disposal options, including waste form, would be determined after licensing and may change over the operating life of the facility; however, licensed LLW disposal facilities, including the U.S. Ecology site in Richland, Washington, Energy*Solutions* site in Clive, Utah, DOE's site in Area 5 of the Nevada National Security Site (formerly the Nevada Test Site), and the Waste Control Specialists (WCS) facility in Andrews, Texas are potential options, provided regulatory and contractual conditions can be satisfied. The U.S. Ecology facility is in the Pacific Northwest Compact which has an agreement with the Rocky Mountain Compact (of which New Mexico is a member) to dispose of waste, but the U.S. Ecology facility's license would need a revision in the allowable total uranium inventory. Energy*Solutions* accepts shipments from all states and is currently developing a performance assessment to establish inventory limits, if needed. Shipment to the Nevada National Security Site would require DOE to accept possession of the LLW (consistent with Section 13 of the USEC Privatization Act of 1996).

The WCS facility is 42 km (26 mi) southeast of the proposed site but is currently limited to waste from the Texas Compact and therefore, would have to establish approval mechanisms for out-of-compact waste to be disposed. Furthermore, the Rocky Mountain Compact would have to approve shipment outside the compact. The analysis in the draft EIS is not intended to support selection of the LLW disposal facility for the DUO_2.

2.2 Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The range of alternatives to the proposed action was determined by considering the underlying purpose and need for the proposed action and consideration of the no-action alternative. In addition, DUF_6 management options from the DOE's programmatic EIS on long-term DUF_6 management (DOE, 1999) were considered. From this evaluation, the NRC staff developed a set of reasonable alternatives. These alternatives include:

- a no-action alternative under which the proposed FEP/DUP facility would not be constructed
- deconversion of DUF_6 at DOE facilities
- alternative sites for the proposed facility
- alternative technologies available for DUF_6 deconversion
- overseas deconversion of DUF_6
- indefinite storage of DUF_6 at the uranium enrichment facilities
- deconversion of DUF_6 at the uranium enrichment facilities

2.2.1 No-Action Alternative

Under the no-action alternative, NRC would not grant a license to IIFP to construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility near Hobbs, New Mexico. The proposed site would remain undeveloped except for preconstruction activities performed by IIFP. The regional economy would not be changed either positively or negatively. LLW would not be shipped to disposal facilities. Fluoride products would not be manufactured, sold, and shipped to end users.

The comparison of impacts between the proposed action and no-action alternative is provided in Table 2-4. Environmental impacts of the no-action will be less than the proposed action. However, the no-action alternative does not serve the purpose and need. Presently, there are four existing or planned domestic commercial enrichment facilities: URENCO USA (formerly Louisiana Energy Services) National Enrichment Facility, Eunice, New Mexico; AREVA Eagle Rock, Idaho Falls, Idaho; American Centrifuge Plant, Piketon, Ohio; and GE Global Laser Enrichment, Wilmington, North Carolina. Under the no-action alternative, the four planned or existing domestic, commercial uranium enrichment facilities would not send their DUF_6 to the IIFP facility for deconversion. Four other options would be open to them: (1) ship the DUF_6 to a DOE deconversion facility; (2) ship the DUF_6 to one of the deconversion facilities overseas; (3) indefinitely store the DUF_6; or (4) construct their own deconversion facilities. As explained in the subsequent paragraphs of this Section and in Section 2.2.2, all of these options but the first are identified in Section 2.2.2 as alternatives considered but eliminated from further consideration in this draft EIS.

DOE has constructed two deconversion plants to convert DUF_6 to U_3O_8 and hydrofluoric acid; one in Piketon (Portsmouth), Ohio and one in Paducah, Kentucky (DOE, 2004a; DOE, 2004b). The Ohio facility began operating in October 2010, and the Kentucky facility is slated to begin operating in 2011. Therefore, shipment to these DOE facilities is a viable option under the no-action alternative. Such shipment is allowed under the provisions of the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) Privatization Act of 1996.

The option to ship DUF_6 to the DOE deconversion facilities was considered in the National Enrichment Facility EIS (NUREG-1790; NRC, 2005b). This facility, near Eunice, New Mexico, is now known as the URENCO USA facility. As quoted in its Commission Order CLI-05-05 (NRC, 2005a), NRC stated (in CLI-04-3 regarding the LES facility) that, "an approach by LES to transfer to DOE for disposal by DOE of LES['s] depleted tails pursuant to Section 3113 of the USEC Privatization Act constitutes a 'plausible strategy' for dispositioning the LES depleted tails" if the tails could be considered LLW under 10 CFR 61.[1] Commission Order CLI-05-05 further stated that DUF_6 tails are a form of LLW. Accordingly, deconversion by DOE is retained as part of the no-action alternative for this draft EIS.

Given that DOE has a backlog of 700,000 metric tons (771,618 tons) of DUF_6 (DOE, undated) (in approximately 57,000 cylinders) to deconvert, it is expected to take DOE approximately 25 years to complete its mission (DOE, undated) and have the facility capacity to begin deconverting privately generated DUF_6. The DOE process does not produce the FEP products, and it produces hydrofluoric acid solution rather than the more useful AHF.

Table 2-4. Comparison of Impacts between Proposed Action and No-Action Alternatives

Affected Environment	**Proposed Action** *IIFP would construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility in Lea County, New Mexico.*	**No-Action Alternative** *IIFP would perform preconstruction activities, but would not construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility.*
Land Use	The NRC staff has determined that land use impacts resulting from construction of the facility and restricting the current land use would be SMALL due to the abundance of other nearby undeveloped land.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site, complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility, and institute restrictions on grazing and agriculture. The 16-ha (40-ac) site would be cleared and potentially reseeded. Grazing could resume on the entire 259-ha (640-ac) site. Impacts would be SMALL.
Historic and Cultural Resources	The NRC staff has determined that impacts of the construction and operations of the facility to historic resources or other cultural resources would be SMALL.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. The site would be cleared and graded. Impacts to historic and cultural resources would be SMALL.
Visual Resources	The NRC staff has determined that the proposed facility would not affect visual resources.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility which would not adversely affect visual resources.

[1] See Louisiana Energy Services, L.P. (National Enrichment Facility), CLI-04-3, 59 NRC 10, 22 (2004), reprinted in 69 FR 5873, 5877 (Feb. 6, 2004).

Table 2-4. Comparison of Impacts between Proposed Action and No-Action Alternatives (Continued)

Affected Environment	**Proposed Action** *IIFP would construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility in Lea County, New Mexico.*	**No-Action Alternative** *IIFP would perform preconstruction activities, but would not construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility.*
Climatology, Meteorology, and Air Quality	Small amounts of nonradioactive emissions and small quantities of uranium isotopes would be released to the atmosphere. The NRC staff concludes that impacts to air quality during construction and operation of the IIFP would be SMALL to MODERATE.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. Smaller amounts of nonradioactive air emissions would be released than by the proposed action. Impacts would be SMALL.
Geology, Minerals, and Soil	The NRC staff has concluded that construction impacts and operation of the proposed IIFP facility to geology, minerals, seismicity, and soil would be SMALL, if proper best management practices are instituted as mitigation. Note that seismicity was a key consideration in IIFP's site evaluation process, and the proposed site is not in Seismic Zone 4 or within 48 km (30 mi) of a quaternary active fault.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. Impacts would be SMALL.
Water Resources	The NRC staff has concluded that no impacts would occur to surface waters, and groundwater use impacts during construction and operations are expected to be SMALL.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. Additional groundwater use may or may not occur, depending on future uses of the site. Impacts would be SMALL.
Ecological Resources	The NRC staff has concluded that direct and indirect adverse impacts to ecological resources during construction and operation of the proposed facility would be SMALL.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. The 16-ha (40-ac) site would be cleared and potentially reseeded. Impacts would be SMALL.
Noise	The NRC staff has determined that the proposed facility would not affect ambient noise levels.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility which would not adversely affect ambient noise levels.
Traffic and Transportation	The NRC staff has concluded that impacts to traffic due to the IIPF construction and operation would be SMALL on NM 483 and US 62/180.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. Impacts would be SMALL.
Public and Occupational	Regulated gaseous effluents would be below regulatory limits as	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the

Table 2-4. Comparison of Impacts between Proposed Action and No-Action Alternatives (Continued)

Affected Environment	Proposed Action *IIFP would construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility in Lea County, New Mexico.*	No-Action Alternative *IIFP would perform preconstruction activities, but would not construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility.*
Health	specified by the New Mexico Air Quality Bureau. Radiological impacts to off-site receptors from routine combined effluent releases and direct radiation are anticipated to be SMALL. Doses to public receptors at other sites of interest are also anticipated to be SMALL. The radiation exposure of involved workers is estimated to be well within public health standards and impacts would be SMALL. The impacts to human health from occupational injuries during operation would be SMALL.	IIFP facility. Impacts would be SMALL.
Waste Management	Waste DUO_2 and LLW materials would be disposed of at a licensed LLW disposal facility. There would be no onsite disposal of any solid waste at the IIFP facility. Hazardous wastes would be shipped to a *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act* (RCRA) disposal facility. The quantity of construction and operations hazardous and nonhazardous waste material would result in SMALL impacts that could be managed effectively.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. Impacts would be SMALL.
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	The NRC staff has determined that impacts of the IIFP facility on tax revenues, housing, and community services for the two-county Region of Interest (ROI), consisting of Lea and Eddy Counties, where most in-migrating construction and operations workers are likely to live, and where the majority of economic impacts	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. Impacts would be SMALL.
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice (Continued)	would occur would be SMALL and positive; and where not positive, would still be SMALL. Decommissioning would provide short-term employment, and	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. Impacts would be SMALL.

Table 2-4. Comparison of Impacts between Proposed Action and No-Action Alternatives (Continued)

Affected Environment	Proposed Action *IIFP would construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility in Lea County, New Mexico.*	No-Action Alternative *IIFP would perform preconstruction activities, but would not construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility.*
	depending upon the option chosen, the facility could be used for other industry and/or the site for agriculture. All resource impacts are SMALL and the identified minority and low-income populations are not in close proximity to the proposed site, so impacts would not be considered disproportionately high and adverse for any populations in the region, including minority or low-income populations.	
Accidents	NRC regulations and IIFP's operating procedures for the proposed facility would ensure that the high and intermediate probability accident scenarios would be unlikely. Items which mitigate or prevent emergency conditions, and the implementation of emergency procedures and protective actions in accordance with the facility emergency plan, would limit the consequences and reduce the likelihood of accidents that could otherwise extend beyond the proposed facility site and property boundaries. IIFP would be required by NRC and DOT regulations to package and manage the transported waste to minimize the probability of accidental release of radioactive material. IIFP facility design, passive and active engineered controls, and administrative controls would reduce the likelihood of accidents. Therefore, the NRC staff has concluded that accident impacts would be SMALL.	IIFP would obtain the proposed site and complete preconstruction of the IIFP facility. Impacts would be SMALL.

1

2

2.2.2 Alternatives Considered But Eliminated

2.2.2.1 Alternative Sites

IIFP conducted a site selection process (IIFP, 2009) to determine a suitable location for the proposed facility. The NRC staff reviewed the IIFP process to determine whether an obviously superior site was identified. This section discusses IIFP's site-selection process, identifies the candidate sites for the proposed FEP/DUP facility, and discusses NRC staff's review of the process, screening criteria, and results used by IIFP for selecting the preferred site.

The IIFP site selection process involved (1) a solicitation of community interest to find potential sites; (2) coarse screening to identify the viable sites among those suggested; (3) fine screening to further narrow to the candidate sites based on the criteria listed in Table 2-5; and (4) final site selection based on quantitative criteria.

Table 2-5. IIFP's Evaluation Criteria for Fine Screening

Evaluation Criteria	Project Objective	Impact Value
Local community residents must accept and support facility siting	Required	Pass/Fail
Local and state governments must support Regulatory Activities	Required	Pass/Fail
Site cannot be in Seismic Zone 4	Required	Pass/Fail
Site cannot be within 50 km of a quaternary active fault	Required	Pass/Fail
Presence of nearby activities or structures that could be exposed to a hazard by the facility (NUREG-1513)	Regulatory	0.8
Presence of nearby activities or structures that could pose a hazard to the facility (NUREG-1513)	Regulatory	0.8
Commitment of natural resources for site offered including the destruction or diminution of wildlife habitats, flora, woodlands, and marshlands	Regulatory	0.8
Presence of endangered or threatened species, or critical habitat in Endangered Species Act	Regulatory	0.8
Environmental Justice Requirements (minority and low-income populations: multiple effects to be considered)	Regulatory	0.8
Will action cause a violation of Federal, State, local, tribal laws or requirements for protection of environment (Air Quality, Water Quality, other)	Regulatory	0.8
Location of adjacent hazards or hazardous operations leading to cumulative impacts	Regulatory	0.8
State and local government financial incentives	Cost	0.4
Property tax incentive	Cost	0.8
State Income taxes	Cost	0.8
State Sales and use taxes	Cost	0.8
Transportation routes (impacts) for incoming feed material, considering distances & routes	Cost	0.8
Transportation cost to uranium oxide waste disposal site	Cost	0.8
Transportation cost to primary anhydrous HF buyers	Cost	0.8
Schedule time required to license and construct	Schedule	0.4

Table 2-5. IIFP's Evaluation Criteria for Fine Screening (Continued)

Evaluation Criteria	Project Objective	Impact Value
Existence of chemical or radiological contamination	Regulatory	0.4
Adequate water supply and cost	Cost	0.4
Presence of special interest groups (interveners)	Regulatory	0.4
Acreage Offered (min 640-acres) and cost	Cost	0.4
Waste types generated during construction, operation and demolition, RCRA, etc.	Regulatory	0.4
Cost of construction and operation	Cost	0.4
Electrical supply and cost	Cost	0.4
Gas supply and cost	Cost	0.4
Impact on water quality or water supply (reduction)	Regulatory	0.4
Site characteristics: Geology, topography, seismic	Regulatory	0.2
Decommissioning Requirements	Regulatory	0.2
Site characteristics: depth to frost line	Regulatory	0.2
Infrastructure incentive	Cost	0.2
Contaminants	Regulatory	0.2
Training, accessibility, availability of emergency response personnel / facilities	Regulatory	0.2
Existing environmental data	Regulatory	0.2
Ambient noise levels	Regulatory	0.1
Site characteristics: climatology and meteorology	Regulatory	0.1
Sanitary wastewater treatment availability	Cost	0.1
Availability of road, rail, and airport	Cost	0.1
Buildings offered and terms	Cost	0.1
Condition of land	Cost	0.05
Unemployment insurance tax	Cost	0.05

Source: IIFP, 2009

Potential environmental impacts can be avoided or significantly reduced through proper site selection. IFFP used an approach to select a preferred site based on technical, environmental, safety, and economic considerations (IIFP, 2009). The NRC staff reviewed the site selection process used by IIFP and determined that the process is comprehensive because it takes into account all applicable criteria, structured because it follows from coarse to more fine screening process, and appropriate for identifying and evaluating the proposed site and alternative candidates.

2.2.2.1.1 Solicitation of Interest

IIFP determined that desirable locations for the plant would be proximate to existing, private, DUF_6 sources and near LLW disposal facilities that could accept DUO_2 for disposal. This resulted in IIFP soliciting site proposals from communities in the states of Texas, Idaho, and New Mexico (IIFP, 2011b). The IIFP inquiry package requested information about the

community and any interest or proposal for attracting and accepting a DUF_6 deconversion facility. As a result, six potential sites were identified: one in Texas, two in Idaho, and three in New Mexico.

2.2.2.1.2 First-Phase Screening

IIFP used the following criteria to evaluate the six potential sites:

- acceptance of the proposed facility by community
- acceptance of the proposed facility by state and local governments
- appropriate seismic qualifications (not to be in seismic zone 4)
- no environmental legacy potential liabilities
- location in proximity to customers and waste disposal sites
- availability of utilities infrastructure

The NRC staff reviewed the IIFP's first-phase screening process, elimination criteria, and results and determined that they are reasonable and appropriate because the elimination criteria consists of considerations relevant to the evaluation of potential impacts to environmental resource areas discussed in this draft EIS. Further, the NRC staff agrees that these elimination criteria allow IIFP to exclude from further consideration certain sites due to their potential environmental impacts.

Sites were excluded from further consideration based on the outcomes of these screening criteria when applied to each potential site: two of the six potential sites were eliminated from consideration. One New Mexico site was eliminated because it was distant from utilities and population centers, and it had no characterization data. One of the Idaho sites was eliminated because it was located on a previous radioactive materials processing site and, thus, had legacy issues that IIFP chose to avoid. As a result, one Texas site, one Idaho site, and two New Mexico sites moved on to IFFP's fine screening. The NRC staff agreed it was appropriate to eliminate the two sites, based on the first-phase screening criteria.

2.2.2.1.3 Second-Phase Screening

The second-phase screening occurred in two rounds in which IIFP evaluated the remaining four sites using used various categories of evaluation criteria. The first round evaluated the four sites on qualitative site-specific criteria and quantitative cost-benefit criteria. The qualitative criteria included public and state support, seismic characteristics, land/soil issues, land/mineral rights, aesthetics, and licensing and permits. The cost-benefit criteria included incentives, infrastructure cost, operating costs, state and local taxes, and transportation costs.

During this screening, two sites (one in New Mexico and one in Idaho) were eliminated because of site-specific features and excessive land and/or infrastructure costs. Subsequently, the communities that had offered the eliminated sites were asked to nominate a second (replacement) site, resulting in a second iteration of first-phase screening. The New Mexico replacement site was rejected in a reiteration of first-phase screening because of numerous oil wells on the site and the complexity of acquiring the land. The Idaho replacement site survived this screening (IIFP, 2011b). This left three sites to undergo the second round of IIFP's second-phase screening: one in Texas, one in Idaho, and one in New Mexico (the Hobbs site).

Table 2-5 identifies the screening criteria used by IIFP in their siting selection process and the criterion's relative importance.

The NRC staff reviewed the IIFP's second-phase screening process and determined that it is reasonable and appropriate as it consists of criteria allowing the applicant to consider potential environmental impacts as a result of the site selection process. Further, appropriate consideration was given to seismic potential, threatened and endangered species and critical habitat, economic considerations, emergency preparedness and response, air quality, climatology and meteorology, water quality and water supply, waste management, acreage, noise, nearby hazards or hazardous operations, and environmental justice. The NRC staff finds that consideration of these criteria is appropriate and comprehensive because it takes into consideration environmental resources such as wildlife habitats, potential for exposure to hazards to the facility, proximity to quaternary active faults, and applicable Federal State, local, and Tribal laws for protecting the environment. The application of the criteria allow for the identification and selection of a site that would be expected to result in reduced potential environmental impacts.

2.2.2.1.4 Final Site Selection

In the final site selection, the sites were evaluated by IIFP using the criteria listed in Table 2-5, assigning an impact value and an evaluation value to each criterion in Table 2-5 (IIFP, 2009). For each potential site the impact value of each criterion listed in Table 2-5 was multiplied by an evaluation number assigned for each potential site. The evaluation number for each criterion ranged from 1 for most favorable to 10 for least favorable potential site. The summation of the product of these multiplications produced the total score for each site. The lower the evaluation score the more favorable the site. The Hobbs, New Mexico site was ultimately selected because it has the lowest (best) score.

IIFP determined that the Hobbs site offers overall the most beneficial combination of technical, safety, economic, and environmental factors (IIFP, 2009). IIFP selected the Hobbs, New Mexico, site for the proposed facility in part because it is not near an active fault, there is no legacy chemical or radiological contamination, there are no air quality non-attainment areas in the vicinity, the site is sparsely populated, the availability of water, electricity and natural gas, and public and state, and local support. Consideration was also given to threatened and endangered species, critical habitats, and historic and cultural properties.

The NRC staff reviewed the IIFP process and determined that the process used by IIFP is reasonable and appropriate because the list of criteria is comprehensive and considers elements relevant to the evaluation of potential environmental impacts. It also includes regulatory requirements, and considers costs, scheduling impacts, and community support. The results concluding that the Hobbs site offers overall the most beneficial combination of environmental, technical, safety, and economic factors are reasonable. The NRC staff further concludes that none of the candidate sites is obviously superior to the IIFP preferred site.

2.2.2.2 Alternative Technologies

2.2.2.2.1 Direct Deconversion (IIFP Facility Phase 2)

In Section 2.1.2, a direct conversion process is mentioned as a possible, future Phase 2 licensing action. This technology is very similar to that of the proposed action, but it does not yield the marketable FEP products, SiF_4 and BF_3. In direct conversion, all the fluorides in the DUF_6 would be converted to AHF. As an alternative, IIFP could seek a license for the Phase 2 process without obtaining a license for Phase 1. The process, which directly converts DUF_6 to uranium oxide, mainly as U_3O_8, is described in more detail below.

In the direct conversion to oxide process, the UF_6 feed would be vaporized in the same type of autoclave as in the proposed UF_6 to UF_4 process. The UF_6 vapor would be fed to a first-stage reaction vessel where it would react with a feed of a vaporized mixture of HF and steam that has been recycled from the back end (distillation system) of the process. The reaction results in the formation of uranyl oxyfluoride (UO_2F_2) and HF.

The UO_2F_2 powder would be withdrawn from the bottom of the reaction vessel and sent to a second-stage reaction vessel where it would undergo a reaction with steam to form U_3O_8 and HF. A more concentrated HF vapor mixture and water would exit the tops of the first and second stage reaction vessels and be condensed using heat exchanger equipment. The condensed and concentrated HF would then be distilled to produce commercial grade AHF. The resulting distillation bottom material of less concentrated HF would be recycled, vaporized, and returned as feed to the first-stage reaction vessel.

U_3O_8 formed in the second-stage reaction vessel would be transferred to storage hoppers. A two-stage dust collector system would control and recycle U_3O_8 dust generated by air or gas flows associated with the solids handling equipment. The U_3O_8 in the storage hoppers would be packaged into DOT-approved shipping containers and transported to an off-site, licensed LLW disposal facility.

The potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative technology of direct conversion would be nearly the same, because the throughput of UF_6 would be the same, both processes produce large volumes of AHF (the alternative technology somewhat larger), both produce the same quantity of chemically stabilized uranium (although in slightly different chemical forms), and the basic chemical processes are very similar. Because (1) direct conversion is analyzed as a cumulative impact in this draft EIS and (2) there is so little difference in the expected environmental impacts between the proposed action and the direct conversion alternative, this alternative is eliminated from consideration in this draft EIS as a separate alternative.

2.2.2.2.2 DOE Deconversion Technology

DOE has constructed two deconversion facilities, one at the site of the former Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Paducah, Kentucky and the other at the site of the former Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant near Piketon, Ohio. These plants were constructed to deconvert the approximately 700,000 metric tons (771,618 tons) of UF_6 stored at the Paducah plant, the Portsmouth plant, and the East Tennessee Technology Park (formerly the K-25 Gaseous Diffusion Plant) at the Oak Ridge Reservation, Tennessee. Shipment of full UF_6 cylinders to these plants is allowed as described in Section 2.2.1 (the no-action alternative).

As an alternative technology to the technology proposed in this draft EIS, IIFP could construct a plant that uses the technology of the DOE plants. The DOE deconversion process reacts UF_6 with water (steam) and hydrogen to produce U_3O_8 and aqueous HF. The UF_6 is directly converted to U_3O_8 in a one-stage reaction vessel. HF and water vapor exit the reaction vessel and are collected as aqueous HF. The U_3O_8 solids exit the reaction vessel, and are stored temporarily until they are shipped to a waste disposal site. DOE plans to market the aqueous HF, but any HF that is not sold may have to be treated as a waste liquid. This liquid waste would likely be reacted with lime to form CaF_2 and stored in retention basins or sold. (DOE, 2004a; DOE, 2004b). Assuming the CaF_2 can be sold, it could be used to produce AHF at an industrial AHF production plant.

This alternative is eliminated from consideration in this draft EIS because:

- The DOE process has already been analyzed in two DOE-prepared NEPA documents (DOE, 2004a; DOE, 2004b), and the impacts of implementing the DOE technology would be sufficiently similar to the proposed action. For this reason no value would be gained by further analyzing this technology as an alternative to the proposed action. The throughput of DUF_6 would be the same, both processes would produce the same quantity of chemically stabilized depleted uranium (although in slightly different chemical forms), and the basic chemical processes are very similar.
- The DOE alternative has greater uncertainty regarding the disposition of the aqueous HF, and could result in higher environmental consequences should the conversion of HF to CaF_2 and then AHF, be required.

2.2.2.2.3 European Deconversion Technology

Three processes can convert DUF_6 to uranium oxide; the IIFP process, the DOE process, and the European process. The European process involves reacting DUF_6 directly with steam in a first-stage reaction vessel, producing aqueous HF and depleted uranyl dioxyfluoride (DUO_2F_2). The DUO_2F_2 is processed further in a second-stage reaction vessel to form aqueous HF and depleted uranium oxide for disposal. The HF is collected in an aqueous form that can be sold or treated (IIFP, 2009).

As with the DOE technology, this alternative is eliminated for the following reasons:

- The impacts of implementing the European technology would be sufficiently similar to the proposed action such that no value would be gained by further analyzing this technology as an alternative to the proposed action. The throughput of DUF_6 would be the same, both processes would produce the same quantity of chemically stabilized uranium (although in slightly different chemical forms), and the basic chemical processes are very similar (IIFP, 2009).
- The European alternative has greater uncertainty regarding the disposition of the aqueous HF, and could result in higher environmental consequences should the conversion of HF to CaF_2 and then AHF, be required.

2.2.2.3 Overseas Shipment of DUF_6 for Deconversion

URENCO and AREVA are foreign companies that operate or are planning to operate enrichment plants in the U.S. These firms own and operate deconversion facilities overseas and could choose to ship their U.S.-generated DUF_6 to those facilities for deconversion. Also, Russia has recently commissioned a deconversion facility and is planning another. Under this alternative, any of the four U.S.-based commercial enrichment companies could ship their DUF_6 overseas for deconversion. However, this would involve shipping DUF_6 long distances overseas and the uranium oxides would have to be shipped back to United States for licensed disposal (IIFP, 2009). The cost of such shipments would likely be significant.

In its EIS for the National Enrichment Facility (now URENCO USA), the NRC staff (NRC, 2005b) examined three foreign disposition alternatives for DUF_6: Russian re-enrichment, French deconversion or re-enrichment, and Kazakhstan deconversion. The NRC staff concluded, “Due to the costs for disposition in Russia, France, or Kazakhstan, the NRC staff does not consider these alternatives to be viable” (NRC, 2005b).

For reasons discussed above, the NRC staff concludes that overseas shipment of DUF_6 for deconversion is not a reasonable alternative. Thus, this alternative has been eliminated from further analysis.

2.2.2.4 Indefinite Storage of DUF_6

Commercial enrichment facilities in the U.S. could store their DUF_6 at their enrichment facilities, much like DOE has done for decades. As described in Section 2.2.1, No-Action Alternative, the DOE deconversion facilities could eventually (approximately 25 years in the future) take this DUF_6, making this alternative evolve over time to the no-action alternative.

The DNFSB has reported that long-term storage of DUF_6 represents a potential chemical hazard (DNFSB, 1995). DOE policy (DOE, 2000) is that alternatives for the long-term management of DUF_6 include its deconversion to a more stable uranium oxide. DOE evaluated long-term storage in its Programmatic EIS on DUF_6 management (DOE, 1999), but did not select the long-term storage option (64 FR 43358).

In addition to creating a potential chemical hazard, the alternative of indefinite storage of DUF_6 does not meet the need to deconvert this material (as discussed in Section 1.3) and has therefore been eliminated from consideration in this draft EIS.

2.2.2.5 Commercial Enrichment Plant Deconversion of DUF_6 at Uranium Enrichment Facilities

The four U.S.-based enrichment companies could decide to construct and operate their own deconversion facilities. The only operational commercial enrichment facility in the U.S., the URENCO USA plant near Eunice, New Mexico, has already signed an agreement with IIFP for IIFP to accept URENCO's DUF_6. Furthermore, it is expected that the potential environmental impacts of implementing this alternative at each enrichment facility would be similar to that for the proposed action. However in this event these impacts would occur at up to four locations as a result of the construction of four deconversion facilities rather than just one as would be the case for the proposed action. One deconversion facility for each U.S.-based enrichment company would have greater environmental impacts than the construction of one facility to support all the enrichment facilities, which is the proposed action. Thus, the NRC staff has concluded that this alternative offers no meaningful advantages over the proposed action, and therefore does not warrant further consideration in this draft EIS.

2.3 Comparison of Predicted Environmental Impacts

Chapter 4 of this draft EIS presents a detailed evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative. Table 2-4summarizes and compares these environmental impacts. A common element between the two alternatives is the occurrence of preconstruction activities. It is assumed that preconstruction activities take place under both alternatives and, therefore, the impacts associated with preconstruction activities would occur regardless of which alternative is selected. As a result, the comparison of alternatives presented in Table 2-4 is intended primarily to highlight the differences between the two alternatives after preconstruction activities have occurred. A standard of significance has been established for assessing potential environmental impacts. In its implementation of the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations on significance (40 CFR 1508.27), NRC staff has assigned each impact one of the following three significance levels, as defined in NRC (2003):

- SMALL. The environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.
- MODERATE. The environmental effects are sufficient to noticeably alter but not destabilize important attributes of the resource.
- LARGE. The environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

These impact levels are used in the summary and comparison of alternatives in Table 2-4.

2.4 Staff Recommendation Regarding the Proposed Action

After weighing the impacts of the proposed action in Chapter 4 and comparing the impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative in Table 2-4, the NRC staff, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.71(f), sets forth its preliminary NEPA recommendation regarding the proposed action.

The NRC staff preliminarily recommends that, unless safety issues mandate otherwise, the proposed license be issued to IIFP. The NRC staff has concluded that potential environmental impacts are in all aspects SMALL or MODERATE, and application of the environmental monitoring program described in Chapter 6 and the proposed IIFP mitigation measures discussed in Chapter 5 would eliminate or substantially lessen any potential adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

The NRC staff has concluded that the overall benefits of the proposed IIFP facility outweigh the SMALL or MODERATE negative environmental impacts, based on consideration of the following:

- The proposed IIFP facility would deconvert DUF_6 into depleted uranium oxides for disposal. With the existing inventory of stockpiled depleted uranium as well as four new commercial enrichment plants in the U.S. expected to be operating within the next few years, there is a need to deconvert the quantity of DUF_6 that exists and would be produced at these enrichment facilities. Without a deconversion facility, DUF_6 would continue to be stored, primarily at commercial uranium enrichment facilities in the United States. Although DUF_6 could be transferred to DOE for a fee, DOE's existing inventory of DUF_6 is not projected to be deconverted for 25 years.
- The potential environmental impacts from the proposed action are in most aspects SMALL with the exception of short term construction related air quality impacts and in some cases, beneficial.

2.5 References

(DNFSB, 1995) U.S. Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. 1995. Integrity of Uranium Hexafluoride Cylinders. Technical Report DNFSB/TECH-4. May 5, 1995.

(DOE, undated) U.S. Department of Energy. Undated. Transporting DOE Uranium Oxide from Portsmouth Ohio, and Paducah Kentucky. Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office, Lexington, KY. ADAMS Accession No. ML110120583.

(DOE, 1999) U.S. Department of Energy. 1999. Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Alternative Strategies for the Long-term Management and Use of Depleted

Uranium Hexafluoride, DOE/EIA-0269. Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, Washington D.C. April 1999. ADAMS Accession No. ML050180302.

(DOE, 2000) U.S. Department of Energy. 2000. Assessment of Preferred Depleted Uranium Disposal Forms. ORNL/TM-2000/161, Oak Ridge, TN. June 2000. ADAMS Accession No. ML060110351.

(DOE, 2004a) U.S Department of Energy. 2004. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Construction and Operation of a Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility at the Paducah, Kentucky Site, DOE/EIS-0359, Washington, D.C., June 2004. ADAMS Accession No. ML 050380331.

(DOE, 2004b) U.S. Department of Energy. 2004. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Construction and Operation of a Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility at the Portsmouth, Ohio Site, DOE/EIS-0360, Washington, D.C., June 2004. ADAMS Accession No. ML051030392.

(IIFP, 2009) International Isotopes Fluorine Products. 2009. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Environmental Report, Revision A, ER-IFP-001, Revision A. December 27, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML100120758.

(IIFP, 2011a) International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc. 2011. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Official Responses to Environmental Report RAIs, Revision A. March 31, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML110970481.

(IIFP, 2011b) International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc. 2011. "Site Selection Information for International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Incorporated (IIFP) Fluorine Extraction and Depleted Uranium Deconversion Facility near Hobbs in Lea County, New Mexico," E-mail, September 22, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML11265A322.

(NRC, 2003) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2003. Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with NMSS Programs. Final Report. NUREG 1748, Division of Waste Management, Washington, D.C. August 2003. ADAMS Accession No. ML032450279.

(NRC, 2005a) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2005. In the matter of Louisiana Energy Services, L.P. (National Enrichment Facility), CLI-05-05, Memorandum and Order. Docket No. 70-3103-ML. January 18, 2005. ADAMS Accession No. ML050180295.

(NRC, 2005b) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2005. Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed National Enrichment Facility in Lea County, New Mexico, NUREG-1790, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C. June 2005. Available at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr1790/vl/. ADAMS Accession No. ML051730238.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This chapter describes the existing regional and local environmental conditions at and near the proposed IIFP site before any preconstruction activities begin and prior to the proposed action. This chapter presents information on land use; historic and cultural resources; visual resources; climatology, meteorology, and air quality; geology, minerals and soils; water resources; ecological resources; socioeconomic resources; traffic and transportation; noise; and public and occupational health. The data and information presented here provide a baseline against which to assess impacts (Chapter 4) of the proposed action described in Chapter 2 of this draft EIS.

3.1 Site Location

The proposed IIFP site would occupy Section 27, in Township 18S, Range 36E of southeastern New Mexico, in Lea County. The 259-ha (640-ac) site is approximately 22.5 kilometers (km) (14 miles [mi]) west of Hobbs, New Mexico, 27.4 km (17 mi) west of the Texas/New Mexico border, and 362 km (225 mi) southeast of Albuquerque, New Mexico. The nearest population center is Hobbs, New Mexico, which had an estimated population of 30,838 in 2009 (USCB, 2010a). The nearest important permanent surface water is the Pecos River, approximately 146 km (91 mi) west of the site. The southern boundary of Section 27 is 1.6 km (1 mi) north of U.S. Highway 62/180 (US 62/180) and the western boundary is NM 483. Figures 3-1 and 3-2 depict the 80-km (50-mi) and 10-km (6-mi) radii surrounding the site, respectively, and are referred to in subsequent analyses.

IIFP has set aside approximately 16 ha (40 ac) in the northeast quadrant of the proposed site for the deconversion facility (see Figure 2-2). The remainder of Section 27 would remain as undeveloped (IIFP, 2009). The facility's location was selected to avoid, to the extent possible, utility rights-of-way including overhead transmission lines and underground pipelines. The facility would be enclosed by a security fence with a surveillance road just inside the fence. See Section 2.1.3 for a list of the structures at the facility.

3.2 Land Use

This section includes a description of land use on and near the proposed IIFP site, including a description of offsite areas and the regional setting. For the purposes of this draft EIS, the Region of Influence (ROI) for land use is defined as the area within a 10-km (6-mi) radius of the center point of the proposed IIFP site (see Figure 3-2 for site location and nearby features within the ROI).

The proposed IIFP site is in Section 27, in Township 18S, Range 36E of southeastern New Mexico, in Lea County, approximately 22.5 km (14 mi) west of Hobbs, New Mexico. Property ownership in the county (which is approximately 1.1 million ha [2.8 million ac] in size) is 17 percent Federal ownership, 31 percent State ownership, and 52 percent private ownership. The Federally owned land is primarily in the southwestern portion of the county, the State-owned land is located throughout the central portion of the county, and the privately owned land primarily extends from north to south in the county's eastern portion. Large tracts of land in Lea County are privately owned by farmers, ranchers, and oil, gas, and mining companies. Urbanized areas near cities and towns include smaller tracts used for residential, municipal, and commercial purposes. Approximately 93 percent of Lea County is used as range land for grazing and approximately 4 percent is used for crop farming. Urban areas and the roadway


Roosevelt
Cochran
Hockley
Levelland
Chaves
Brownfield
Terry
Yoakum
Lovington
Denver City
Artesia
Hobbs
Seminole
Gaines
Eddy
Section 27
Eunice
Carlsbad
Lea
Andrews
Andrews
New Mexico
Texas
Winkler
Culberson
Loving
Ector
Odessa
Kermit
Reeves
Legend
Section 27 of T018SR036E
80-km (50-mi) Radius of Section 27
Urban Area
County Boundary
State Boundary
Major Highways
Limited Access
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 5 10 20 30
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-1 80-km (50-mi) Radius Map


2.6 km (1.6 mi)
483
2.4 km (1.5 mi)
Nearest Residence
Colorado Energy Station
1.6 km (1 mi)
3.7 km (2.3 mi)
238
Xcel Energy Cunningham Generating Station
Xcel Energy Maddox Generating Station
529
62/180
62/180
DCP Midstream Linam Ranch Plant
5 km (3.1 mi)
Arkansas Junction
8
Legend
Section 27 Centroid
Power & Gas Plants
Nearest Residence
Facility Boundary
Section 27 of T018SR036E
10-km (6-mi) Radius of Section 27
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 0.5 1 2 3
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-2 10-km (6-mi) Radius Map

system account for the county's remaining land use. Most of the land actively farmed in Lea County is irrigated (Leedshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

The public roadways closest to the proposed IIFP site are US 62/180 running east-west and NM 483 running north-south (Figure 3-2). These roadways mostly traverse open range land in the ROI.

The proposed 259-ha (640-ac) IIFP site and the surrounding ROI are largely undeveloped. The land has been used for cattle grazing and for gas and oil development (IIFP, 2009). There are 715 oil or gas wells within the 10-km (6-mi) ROI. Seven of these wells, all of which have been abandoned, are within 1.6 km (1.0 mi) of the site (Oil and gas wells are discussed in more detail in Section 3.6.3). Both overhead and underground utilities, and their associated rights-of-way, cross the site and the ROI. Several overhead transmission lines and underground gas/oil pipelines run generally east to west across the proposed IIFP site. Xcel Energy's Cunningham Station, just west of Section 27, has four groundwater monitoring wells in Section 27 (see Figures 3-2 and 3-14). Three other energy production facilities are within 10 km (6 mi) of the proposed facility: the Colorado Energy Station (also known as the Hobbs Generating Station) is 2.4 km (1.5 mi) northeast of the proposed IIFP site; the Xcel Energy Maddox Generating Station is 3.7 km (2.3 mi) east-southeast of the proposed site; and the DCP Midstream Linam Ranch Plant is 5 km (3.1 mi) southeast of the proposed site (Figure 3-2).

The nearest residence is west-northwest of the site approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi) from the northern boundary of the site (Figure 3-2). There are no public recreational areas or National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed historic structures or properties within 10 km (6 mi) of the proposed facility.

Other than the proposed IIFP facility (Phase 1 and Phase 2), there are no current developments or proposed developments in the ROI. The proposed IIFP site is not subject to local or county zoning, land use planning, or associated review process requirements; and there are no potential conflicts of land use plans, policies, or controls (Appendix A).

The State of New Mexico and Lea County have transferred ownership of the proposed 259-ha (640-ac) site from the State and Lea County to IIFP. The transfer to IIFP was part of an economic incentives package developed by the Economic Development Corporation of Lea County. The land transfer was carried out in accordance with the *New Mexico Economic Development Act*.

See Section 3.6.4 for a discussion of farmland protection programs in New Mexico.

3.3 Historic and Cultural Resources

This section includes a description of the potential and documented human habitation on and near the proposed IIFP site, and a discussion of significant offsite historic resources and the regional setting. The ROIs for historic and cultural resources are explained later in this section, corresponding to Areas of Potential Effect (APEs), which vary for different resources that could be directly or indirectly affected.

Southeastern New Mexico was settled by humans approximately 12,000 years ago. The cultural sequence in the region includes six chronological periods: the Paleo-Indian period (10,000 B.C. to 7,000 B.C.), the Archaic period (5,000 B.C. to A.D. 1000), the Formative period (A.D. 900 to 1500), the Protohistoric/Spanish Colonial period (1541 to 1800), the Mexican

period (1828 to 1834), the Territorial period (1834 to 1912), and the Statehood period (1912 to present) (NMHPD, 2001).

While archeological sites documenting occupation during all of these periods have been identified in southeastern New Mexico, the proposed project site on the Llano Estacado is part of a flat, arid plain without permanent or even intermittent water sources. While the Paleo-Indians used the Llano Estacado for hunting when the climate was less arid (prior to 6000 B.C.), it was not hospitable to more extensive human occupation (Rothman and Holder, 1998). Archaeological resource records indicate prehistoric, protohistoric, and historic human occupation in areas of southeastern New Mexico within the Llano Estacado only in areas with reliable potable water, shelter, and food. Therefore, because there is no permanent water source near the site (see Section 3.7.2), the potential for archeological resources is low at the IIFP site and any prehistoric, protohistoric, or historic activity would have been transient. Only isolated artifacts have been found in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP site (Daras, 2009).

3.3.1 Prehistoric Occupation

The initial prehistoric period in New Mexico, the Paleo-Indian period, is characterized by kill sites, camp sites, butchering sites, and lithic quarries associated with small, nomadic groups subsisting by the hunting of now-extinct large game animals such as mammoths and large bison. The Paleo-Indian period is better represented in the southeastern quadrant of the State than in any other area of New Mexico (Main, 1992). Several Paleo-Indian hunting sites have been found on the Llano Estacado, although none have been found in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP site (Daras, 2009). During the Archaic period, people became more sedentary as a society, settling in small bands along major watercourses in response to drier conditions. The vicinity of the proposed IIFP site, far from permanent watercourses, would have been unattractive for hunting, gathering, or settlement (Rothman and Holder, 1998). During the Formative (or Ceramic) period tribal groups became increasingly settled and concentrated within villages and base campsites. Formative period sites also were generally located near permanent sources of water, and the proposed site's setting within the Llano Estacado - far from watercourses - remained unsuitable for increasingly sedentary and growing populations (Rothman and Holder, 1998). Therefore, the proposed IIFP site is not expected to yield significant Formative period archaeological resources.

3.3.2 Historic Indian Tribes

By the early 1540s, when Spanish explorer Vasquez de Coronado arrived in New Mexico, the southeastern quadrant of the State was dominated by small hunter-gatherer groups and small settlements along river valleys such as the Pecos (Rothman and Holder, 1998). The groups occupying the region included the Suma, the Tigua, and the Jumano (Gerald, 1974; Kelley, 1986; Hickerson, 1994). In the nineteenth century, these groups were replaced by Apache and Plains Indians, including the Kiowa and Comanche (Hickerson, 1994). Tribal testimony before the U.S. Indian Claims Commission indicates that the proposed IIFP site lies west of a large area used and/or or occupied by the Plains Apache, Comanche, and Kiowa; and east of a large area used by the Mescalero Apache (ICC, 1979). However, the proposed IIFP site was not known to be occupied, or known to have been used, other than for hunting, by tribes who occupied lands to the east (Plains Apache, Comanche, and Kiowa) and west (Mescalero Apache).

Today, the Mescalero Apache Reservation is approximately 190 km (118 mi) west of the proposed site, in northeast Otero County, New Mexico. The Kiowa, Plains Apache, and

Comanche reservations are in south central Oklahoma, approximately 570 km (354 mi) to the northeast. A remnant group of the Tigua (Ysleta del Sur Pueblo) has traditional-use areas, where activities such as hunting and gathering have traditionally occurred, in the general project area, which includes large areas appropriate for traditional cultural uses throughout the region. Therefore, the land containing the proposed IIFP site is not unique in providing traditional cultural use opportunities for Native Americans.

3.3.3 Historic Euro-American Exploration and Settlement

Historic Euro-American interests in the region began with Spanish exploration in the mid- to late-sixteenth century during the Protohistoric/Spanish Colonial Period. There is no indication that any of the Spanish expeditions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ventured near the vicinity of the proposed project site, with almost all activity confined to the river valleys of the Rio Grande and Pecos River (Rothman and Holder, 1998). The Llano Estacado region was one of the last areas of New Mexico to be settled by Euro-Americans, because of the lack of surface water and semiarid climate. No settlement or significant activities took place in the vicinity of the proposed site during the Mexican Period. In the 1810s and 1820s, sheep ranchers, formerly concentrated west of and along the Rio Grande River, began to move into the eastern plains and the Pecos Valley (Merlan, 2010), but would not likely have ventured into the dry Llano Estacado region in the vicinity of the proposed site, and no archeological resources from this period were found in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP site.

During the Territorial Period, some Texas cattle ranchers drove their herds through southeastern New Mexico along the Goodnight-Loving Trail, which followed the Pecos River approximately 80 km (50 mi) west of the proposed site (Clampitt, 2008). Euro-American settlement in the area began in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries during the Territorial period, prior to New Mexico achieving statehood in 1912. After the American Civil War, homesteaders established ranches at Monument Springs, near Monument, New Mexico (Anderson, Undated).

The Hat Ranch, established in 1890 and variously known as “Monument Springs” and the “Monument Springs Ranch,” was the largest ranch in the area. It operated on more than one million acres of purchased and leased public lands from Seminole, Texas westward to the Pecos River, and northward to the vicinity of Tatum, New Mexico, including the area of the proposed project. The ranch headquarters was established near Monument Springs, about 10 km (6 mi) south-southeast from the southern extent of the proposed IIFP site (Anderson, Undated). As one of New Mexico's first large-scale cattle ranching operations, the Hat Ranch at its peak in the early 1900s had 50,000 head of cattle, 500 saddle horses, 26 water wells, and several windmills and ranch houses (Anderson, Undated; NMMA, Undated), however, no structures associated with the Hat Ranch have been documented on the IIFP site.

During the early Statehood Period, most of the land continued to serve as pasture for cattle grazing. In the open-range tradition, no fences were used to demarcate property lines in Lea County into the 1910s and 1920s (Merlan, 2010). The ranch continues operation today on reduced acreage, and the headquarters remain at Monument Spring, where the ranch owners reside (Hat Ranch, 2010). The Hat Ranch is not listed in or determined eligible for the NRHP, but is listed on New Mexico’s State list of historic resources (NMHPD, 2011).

3.3.4 Archaeological and Historic Resources at the Proposed IIFP Site

This section describes the historic and cultural resources in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP facility. Historic and cultural resources include archaeological sites, architectural resources (such as historic structures, objects, districts, or landscapes) and places of cultural importance to groups for maintaining their heritage. Cultural resources are nonrenewable; that is, once adversely altered, the information contained in cultural resources cannot be recovered.

The *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966*, as amended (NHPA), requires that all adverse effects to *National Register of Historic Places* (NRHP)-listed and eligible historic and cultural resources be considered during Federal undertakings, such as the NRC licensing activity for the proposed IIFP facility. The requirement to consider adverse effects to cultural resources takes the form of a consultation process and/or mitigation. A resource is eligible for listing on the NRHP if it meets at least one of the following four criteria (36 CFR 60.4): (1) association with an historic person, (2) association with a historic event, (3) representation of the work of a master, or (4) potential to provide information on the history or prehistory of the United States.

Section 106 of the NHPA identifies the process for considering whether a project would affect significant cultural resources, which are discussed in Chapter 4 of this draft EIS. The archaeological APE for the Section 106 review for the proposed IIFP facility is the 16 ha (40 ac) proposed facility site (Figure 2-2), the access road from NM 483, and an external parking lot immediately outside the security fence surrounding the facility property all of which would be directly affected by construction. The architectural resource APE includes the viewshed from any NHRP-eligible historic resources which would include the proposed facility structures. The APE also considers the potential auditory or direct physical impacts of the project to historic architectural resources. A distance of 10 km (6 mi) from the project site was determined to be an appropriate APE, based on the height of the facility security fence and the facility buildings, which would generally be less than 6 m (20 ft) high.

The Section 106 process requires consultation between the lead Federal agency and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which is the custodian of information on cultural resources for the State. The Section 106 process also requires that Federally recognized Native American Tribes who have ancestral interest in the property be consulted to determine if resources important to the Tribe are present (36 CFR 800.2(4)(c)(ii)).

Information on historic and archaeological resources at the proposed IIFP site was obtained by a file review completed by the applicant's archaeological resources consultant at the Historic Preservation Division of the New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs on April 17, 2009, and from an archaeological survey conducted by IIFP's archaeological consultant in response to the New Mexico State Land Office for the proposed project in May 2009 (Daras, 2009).

According to the Archaeological Resource Management Records Section of the New Mexico Office of Cultural Affairs, the proposed IIFP site had not been the focus of a cultural resource survey, and no archaeological or historic architectural resources were identified at the proposed site prior to the 2009 cultural resources survey (Daras, 2009) conducted by the applicant.

The New Mexico State Register of Cultural Resource Properties lists one historic resource within 10 km (6 mi) of the proposed site. This is the cluster of stone ranch houses and outbuildings that make up the Hat Ranch Headquarters (Site LA 43256, SR #162), which is approximately 9.5 km (5.9 mi) from the southern boundary of the proposed site. As noted earlier, the Hat Ranch Headquarters has not been listed in or determined eligible for the NRHP

(NMHPD, 2011); therefore, it is not an historic property subject to protection under Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act*.

IIFP's archaeological consultant conducted a cultural resource survey in May 2009 on the entire 249-ha (640-ac) Section 27 tract. The survey was conducted according to New Mexico's Cultural Properties and Historic Preservation, Standards for Survey and Inventory (NMHPD, 2005 and consisted of systematic surface pedestrian coverage at 15-m (49-ft) intervals. The survey identified three isolated artifacts, but no archaeological sites. The isolated artifacts were the distal end of a San Jose (Archaic period) chert projectile point, a gray quartzite hammerstone, and three decolorized manganese glass vessel fragments. In accordance with Section 18-6-5 of the New Mexico Cultural Properties Act, the archaeological consultant completed a "negative survey report" to describe the survey and record the isolated artifact occurrences. The isolated occurrences were recorded, and the State Land Office and their contract archaeologists recommended no further archaeological studies or evaluations (Daras, 2009). The State Land Office cultural resources survey did not note the presence of any historic structures or structural remains.

Consultation with Native American Tribes was undertaken using a list maintained by the New Mexico (NM) SHPO. The NRC staff received three responses (Appendix B). On July 13, 2010, the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo stated that the Pueblo believes the project will not adversely affect traditional, religious, or culturally significant sites, but requested consultation should human remains or artifacts regulated by the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act* be discovered. On June 15, 2011, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Comanche tribe noted that he had no comments on the project. On July 13, 2011, the Shawnee Tribe's Tribal Historic Preservation Department concurred that no known historic properties would be impacted by the project, but also requested consultation if archaeological materials are encountered during construction or operation of the facility.

In a letter dated October 14, 2010, from David C. Eck, Trust Land Archaeologist, in the office of the State of New Mexico Commissioner of Public Lands, to Jan Biella, New Mexico Historic Preservation Division (Appendix B), the Commissioner's Office states that it "recommends a finding of no effect/no cultural properties /no historic properties…. There are no documented cultural properties within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) when considering direct effects. Similarly, there are no registered cultural properties within the assumed, five-mile APE when considering indirect effects." The New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with this determination (Appendix B).

3.4 Visual Resources

This section includes a description of the visual setting on and near the proposed IIFP site. For the purposes of this draft EIS, the ROI for visual resources is defined as the area within a 10 km (6 mi) radius of the center point of the proposed IIFP site; accounting for the view of, and view from, the proposed facility.

The 259-ha (640-ac) site is flat and sparsely developed with a few irregularly spaced structures for natural gas and oil extraction, and overhead transmission lines. The proposed IIFP facility would be approximately 22.5 km (14 mi) west of the nearest population center, Hobbs, New Mexico, and would not be visible from Hobbs. As noted in Section 3.2, four energy industry facilities are less than 10-km (6-mi) of the proposed site, and three are visible from the site. The proposed IIFP site is 1.6 km (1 mi) north of US 62/180 and is bordered on the west by NM 483.

Although the proposed IIFP facility would be located near the center of the site, it is anticipated that it would be visible from both roads.

No mountain ranges are in the site vicinity. The landscape of the site and vicinity is typical of a semi-arid climate and consists of caliche soils with Plains vegetation such as mesquite bushes and native prairie grasses.

As noted in Section 3.2, no recreational areas are within 10 km (6 mi) of the site. The closest recreation facilities are golf courses 12 km (7.5 mi) east and northeast (Hobbs Country Club, 2010; Ocotillo Park Golf Course, 2010), and a motorsports park, also 12 km (7.5 mi) northeast (Hobbs Motorsport Park, 2010). These recreational facilities are not within the visual resources ROI of the site. The nearest residence is approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi) northwest of the site boundary. A State-listed historic site, Monument Springs, is approximately 10 km (6 mi) southeast of the site.

IIFP assessed the scenic quality of the proposed IIFP site using the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) visual resource inventory process (BLM, 2007). A visual rating is determined by evaluating potential impacts of a proposed project on the surrounding area. Classes range from Classes I and II (most valued), through Class III (moderate value), to Class IV (least valued). Based on the visual resource inventory, the proposed IIFP site was determined to be in Class IV (IIFP, 2009). This rating means that the level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high, and allows for the greatest level of landscape modification.

3.5 Climatology, Meteorology, and Air Quality

3.5.1 Climatology

The climate in the region of the proposed IIFP site is semi-arid with mild temperatures, low precipitation and humidity, and a high evaporation rate. The weather is often dominated in the winter by high-pressure systems in the central part of the U.S. and low-pressure systems in north-central Mexico. The region is typically affected by low-pressure systems located over Arizona in the summer (WRCC, 2010).

The mean monthly temperature over the last 98 years has ranged from 5.7ºC (42.2ºF) in January to 26.8ºC (80.2ºF) in July. July is the hottest month with an average maximum of 34.3ºC (93.9ºF) and an average minimum of 19.2ºC (66.6ºF). January is the coldest month with an average minimum of -2.3ºC (27.9ºF) and an average maximum of 13.6ºC (56.4ºF) (WRCC, 2010).

The average annual total rainfall in Hobbs, New Mexico, is 40.54 cm (15.96 in). Average monthly rainfall ranges from 1.14 cm (0.45 in) in January to 6.58 cm (2.59 in) in September. The mean annual snowfall in Hobbs is 12.7 cm (5.01 in) (WRCC, 2010).

Thunderstorms occur in Lea County throughout the year, though they are most common in the spring and summer, and occasionally include hail. Thunderstorms occur on average 36 days per year. Summer rains fall almost entirely during brief, but frequently intense, thunderstorms. Rain showers and thunderstorms from June through September account for more than half the annual precipitation. The general southeasterly circulation towards the Gulf of Mexico brings moisture from the Pacific into New Mexico, and strong surface heating, combined with lifting as the air moves over higher terrain, causes air currents and condensation. As storms move inland

from the Pacific Coast, much of the moisture is precipitated over the coastal and inland mountain ranges of California, Nevada, Arizona, and Utah. Much of the remaining moisture falls on the western slope of the Continental Divide, which is west of the proposed site, and over northern and high-central mountain ranges. Winter is the driest season in eastern New Mexico.

On average, nine tornadoes are reported per year in New Mexico. Ninety-two tornadoes were reported in Lea County from January 1950 to May 2010. There has only been one tornado reported in Hobbs, New Mexico, in May 1997 (NCDC, 2010).

Wind speeds in New Mexico are usually moderate, although relatively strong winds often accompany occasional weather fronts during late winter and spring and sometimes occur just in advance of thunderstorms. Frontal winds may exceed 48.3 kilometers per hour (km/hr) (30 miles per hour [mph]) for several hours and reach peak speeds of more than 80.5 km/hr (50 mph) (WRCC, 2010). Winds are generally stronger in the eastern plains, to the north of the proposed facility, than in other parts of the state. Winds are generally from the southeast in summer and from the west in winter, but local surface wind directions will vary greatly because of local topography and mountain and valley breezes (WRCC, 2010).

Blowing sand may occur occasionally in the area due to the combination of strong winds, sparse vegetation, and the semi-arid climate. High winds associated with thunderstorms are frequently a source of localized blowing dust. Dust storms that cover an extensive region are rare; and those that reduce visibility to less than 1.6 km (1 mi) occur only with the strongest pressure gradients such as those associated with intense extra-tropical cyclones which occasionally form in the area during winter and early spring (DOE, 2006).

3.5.2 Greenhouse Gases

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) include those gases, such as carbon dioxide (CO_2), water vapor, nitrous oxide (N_2O), methane (CH_4), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), that are transparent to solar (short-wave) radiation but opaque to long wave (infrared) radiation from the earth's surface. The net effect over time is a trapping of absorbed radiation and a tendency to warm the planet's surface and the boundary layer of the earth's atmosphere, which constitute the "greenhouse effect" (IPCC, 2007). Some direct GHGs[1] (CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O) are both naturally occurring and the product of industrial activities, while others, such as the hydrofluorocarbons, are man-made and are present in the atmosphere exclusively due to human activities. Each GHG has a different radiative forcing potential, which is defined as the gas' ability to affect a change in climatic conditions in the troposphere[2] (IPCC, 2007). The radiative efficiency of a GHG is directly related to its concentration in the atmosphere.

As a way to compare the radiative forcing potentials of various GHGs without directly calculating changes in their atmospheric concentrations, an index known as the Global Warming Potential (GWP) (IPCC, 2007) has been established with CO_2 as the reference point[3]. GWPs are calculated as the ratio of the radiative forcing that would result from the emission of 1 kg

[1] Direct GHGs are those gases that can directly affect global warming once they are released into the atmosphere.

[2] Radiative forcing potential is expressed as the amount of thermal energy [in watts] trapped by the gas per square meter of the earth's surface.

[3] Water vapor is the most abundant and most dominant greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. However, it is neither long-lived nor well mixed in the atmosphere, varying from 0 to 2 percent. CO_2 is the most abundant of GHGs released to the atmosphere after water vapor.

(2.2 lbs) of a GHG to that which would result from the emission of 1 kg (2.2 lbs) of CO_2 over a fixed period of time. GWPs represent the combined effect of the amount of time each GHG remains in the atmosphere and its ability to absorb outgoing thermal infrared radiation. As the reference point in this index, CO_2 has a GWP of 1. On the basis of a 100-year time horizon, GWPs for other key GHGs are as follows: 21 for CH_4, 310 for N_2O, 11,700 for HFC-23, and 23,900 for SF_6 (IPCC, 2007). Indirect GHGs, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x)[4], nonmethane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs), and sulfur dioxide (SO_2), indirectly affect terrestrial solar radiation absorption by influencing the formation and destruction of tropospheric and stratospheric ozone or, in the case of SO_2, by affecting the absorptive characteristics of the atmosphere.

3.5.2.1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks in the United States

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for preparation and maintenance of the official U.S. Inventory of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks to comply with existing commitments under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. GHG sinks are those activities or processes that can remove GHGs from the atmosphere. GHG emissions[5] are reported in sectors, using the GWPs established in the Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)[6]. Site preparation, construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility would result in the release of GHGs as a result of the same human activities that were identified by EPA as the sources of GHGs in the U.S. Inventory. Results of the most recent report on the U.S. Inventory of GHG Emissions and Sinks (EPA, 2010a) for direct GHGs that are most relevant to the proposed IIFP facility include:

- The primary GHG emitted by human activities in the U.S. was CO_2, representing approximately 85.1 percent of the total GHG emissions.
- In 2008, total U.S. GHG emissions were 6,957 teragrams of CO_2 equivalent (Tg CO_2 Eq), an increase of 14 percent from 1990.
- Overall emissions of GHGs fell 2.9 percent from 2007 to 2008.
- CO_2 emissions for 2008 were 5,921.2 Tg CO_2 Eq, of which 5,572.8 was the result of the combustion of fossil fuel primarily related to electricity generation (2,363.5), transportation (1,785.3), industrial applications (819.3), residential heating (342.7), and commercial applications (219.5) (this considers only fossil fuel emissions in the 50 U.S. states, not the U.S. territories).
- Fifty-three percent of the CO_2 emissions related to transportation were the result of consumption of gasoline in privately owned vehicles; the remainder was from combustion of fuels in diesel trucks and aircraft.
- Emission of CH_4 in 2008 as a result of combustion of fossil fuels in mobile sources was 2.0 Tg CO_2 Eq.

[4] NO_x represents all thermodynamically stable oxides of nitrogen, excluding nitrous oxide (N_2O).
[5] In keeping with the GWP convention that names CO_2 as the reference gas, assigning it a GWP of 1, GWPs of other direct GHGs are expressed as equivalents (Eq.) of CO_2, as teragrams (Tg) of CO_2 equivalent (Tg CO_2 Eq.). One Tg is equal to 10^{12} grams, or one million metric tons (1.102 million tons).
[6] IPCC assessment reports are a compilation of separate reports of the various working groups that are established by the Panel. IPCC periodically updates assessment reports to incorporate newly established data, including revisions to GWPs and radiative forcing potentials of GHGs.

- Emission of N_2O in 2008 as a result of combustion of fossil fuels in mobile sources was 26.1 Tg CO_2 Eq.
- Emission of HFCs (released from equipment) in 2008 was 113 Tg CO_2 Eq.
- Emission of SF_6 in 2008 as a result of electrical transmission and distribution[7] was 13.1 Tg CO_2 Eq.
- The primary GHG sinks functional in 2008 included carbon sequestration in forests, trees in urban areas, agricultural soils, and landfilled yard trimmings and food scraps, all of which, in aggregate, offset 13.5 percent of the total GHG emissions in 2008.
- The most significant emissions of indirect GHGs in 2008 included:
    - 13,578 Tg CO_2 Eq. of NOx, primarily from mobile fossil fuel combustion (7,441), stationary fuel combustion (5,148), and industrial processes (520).
    - 60,739 Tg CO_2 Eq. of CO, primarily from mobile fossil fuel combustion (51,533), stationary fossil fuel combustion (4,792), and industrial processes (1,682).
    - 13,254 Tg CO_2 Eq. of NMVOCs, primarily from mobile fossil fuel combustion (5,447), solvent use (3,834), industrial processes (1,804), and stationary fossil fuel combustion (1,321).
    - 10,368 Tg CO_2 Eq. of SO_2, primarily from stationary fossil fuel combustion (8,891), industrial processes (795), and mobile fossil fuel combustion (472).

As noted above, consumption of fossil fuels for electricity generation represents the single greatest source of CO_2 emissions in 2008 (2,363.5 Tg CO_2 Eq.). The total gross GHG emissions in the United States from all sectors (transportation, industrial, residential, and commercial) in 2008 were 6,957 Tg CO_2 Eq. Net emissions (considering all emissions and sinks) were 6,016.4 Tg CO_2 Eq.

3.5.2.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks in New Mexico

A review of statewide emissions of GHGs can inform an understanding of the impact anticipated GHG emissions from the proposed IIFP facility would have in a regional context. Among the United States, New Mexico ranks 35th with respect to GHGs emissions and 35th in population, based on 2003 data (CRS, 2007). The Center for Climate Strategies[8], published a report in November 2006 on New Mexico's Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reference Case Projections for the period 1990–2020 (CCS, 2006). Table 3-1 shows New Mexico GHG emissions by sector. Table 3-2 compares the most recent GHG inventories by sector in New Mexico with the United States as a whole in calendar year 2000.

[7] SF_6 is a gas at standard conditions and is used as a dielectric medium in high-voltage electrical equipment.

[1] SF_6 is a gas at standard conditions and is used as a dielectric medium in high-voltage electrical equipment.

on established in 2004 to assist in climate policy development at the Federal and State levels.

[8] The Center for Climate Strategies is a public-purpose, nonprofit, nonpartisan 501(c)(3) partnership organization established in 2004 to assist in climate policy development at the Federal and State levels.

Table 3-1. New Mexico GHG Emissions, by Sector

Sector	Carbon Dioxide Equivalents (million metric tons)			
	1990[1]	2000[1]	2010[2]	2020[2]
Electricity Production	29.5	33.2	33.3	38.8
Coal	28.0	30.7	30.4	35.5
Natural Gas	1.4	2.5	2.9	3.2
Oil	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Residential/Commercial/Non-Fossil Industrial (RCI)	7.0	7.3	8.5	9.9
Coal	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
Natural Gas	3.8	4.6	4.5	5.4
Oil	3.1	2.5	3.8	4.3
Wood (CH_4 and N_2O)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transportation	11.0	14.2	17.6	22.3
On-road Gasoline	7.2	8.7	10.2	12.2
On-road Diesel	2.5	4.2	5.6	7.9
Natural Gas, LPG, Other	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Jet Fuel and Aviation Gasoline	1.2	1.2	1.6	2.0
Fossil Fuel Industry	15.2	19.5	20.3	20.7
Natural Gas Industry	12.7	17.0	17.3	17.7
Oil Industry	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Coal Mining (Methane)	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.7
Industrial Processes[3]	0.5	1.5	2.0	2.8
ODS Substitutes	0.0	0.5	1.3	2.3
PFCs in Semi-conductor Ind.	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.1
SF_6 from Electric Utilities	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Cement & Other Industry	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4
Waste Management	0.8	1.2	1.4	1.2
Solid Waste Management	0.6	1.0	1.1	0.9
Wastewater Management	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
Agriculture	4.5	6.0	6.4	6.7
Manure Management & Enteric Ferment (CH_4)	2.3	3.5	4.1	4.4
Agricultural Soils (N_2O)	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.3
Total Gross Emissions	68.5	82.9	89.4	102.4
Forestry and Land Use	-20.9	-20.9	-20.9	-20.9
Net Emissions (incl. forestry)	47.6	62.0	68.5	81.5

Source: CCS, 2006

[1] Historical estimates

[2] Projected estimates

[3] The proposed facility would be classified in the Industrial Processes sector.

Table 3-2. Comparison of New Mexico vs. U.S. GHG Emissions (Percent) by Sector[1]

Sector	Percent of State Total GHG Emissions[2]	Percent of U.S. GHG Emissions[2]
Electricity	40	32
Fossil fuel industry (CH_4)	23	3
Transportation	17	26
Agriculture	7	7
Residential/commercial fuel use	5	9
Non-Fossil Industrial fuel use	4	14
Waste	2	4
Industrial processes	2	5

Source: CCS, 2006

[1] All data, calendar year 2000

[2] As shown in Table 3-1, total net CO_2 emissions for New Mexico for the year 2000 were 62 million metric tons (68 million tons) of CO_2 equivalents. For the United States for that same year, total net CO_2 emissions were 5,977 million metric tons (6,588 million tons) (EPA, 2010a)

In March 2010, the NMED published the Inventory of New Mexico Greenhouse Gas Emissions: 2000-2007 which presented estimates of historical New Mexico anthropogenic GHG emissions. This information was compiled to support efforts to address anthropogenic climate change, including those of the Climate Change Action Implementation Team, which was created by Executive Order 2006-69 – New Mexico Climate Change Action. As reported in the inventory, after a 3 percent annual GHG emissions growth rate experienced from 1990 to 2000, the total (gross) direct emissions in New Mexico remained essentially level from 2000 to 2007 despite a 6.7 percent growth in New Mexico's population over that period (NMED, 2010a).

3.5.2.3 Projected Impacts from Construction and Operation of the Proposed IIFP Facility on Carbon Dioxide and Other Greenhouse Gases

Site preparation, construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility can be expected to result in emissions of CO_2 and other GHGs through various mechanisms, primarily from combustion of fossil fuels in both mobile and stationary sources. Individual contributions of construction and operations are discussed in Chapter 4. Transportation volumes used in the following sections were established in Section 4.1.2.9 and are applied here without modification.

3.5.3 Meteorology

The closest National Climatic Data Center Cooperative Network weather station to the IIFP site with the longest length of service is the Hobbs weather station, at the Hobbs Regional Airport, approximately 13 km (8 mi) east of the proposed site, which has been in service since 1912. The most recent data available for the Hobbs weather station from the Western Regional Climate Center are from July 2010.

Table 3-3 presents a summary of temperatures from the Hobbs weather station from 1912 to 2010. July, on average, is the hottest month and January is the coldest month. The highest temperature measured over the period of record, 45.6ºC) (114ºF), occurred in June 1998. The lowest temperature measured, -21.7ºC (-7ºF), occurred in January 1962.

Table 3-3. Monthly Temperature in Hobbs, New Mexico, 1912 to 2010

	Monthly Averages			Daily Extremes			
Month	**Maximum**	**Minimum**	**Mean**	**High**	**Date**	**Low**	**Date**
January	13.6°C (56.4°F)	-2.3°C (27.9°F)	5.7°C (42.2°F)	28.3°C (83°F)	1/11/1953	-21.7°C (-7°F)	1/11/1962
February	16.6°C (61.8°F)	0.0°C (32.0°F)	8.3°C (46.9°F)	30.6°C (87°F)	2/12/1962	-18.9°C (-2°F)	2/2/1985
March	20.6°C (69.1°F)	3.1°C (37.5°F)	11.8° (53.3°F)	35.0°C (95°F)	3/27/1971	-17.2°C (1°F)	3/2/1922
April	25.4°C (77.8°F)	7.9°C (46.3°F)	16.7°C (62.1°F)	36.7°C (98°F)	4/30/1928	-7.8°C (18°F)	4/4/1920
May	29.8°C (85.6°F)	12.9°C (55.3°F)	21.3°C (70.4°F)	41.7°C (107°F)	5/30/1951	1.1°C (34°F)	5/2/1916
June	33.9°C (93.0°F)	17.5°C (63.5°F)	25.7°C (78.2°F)	45.6°C (114°F)	6/27/1998	4.4°C (40°F)	6/3/1919
July	34.4°C (93.9°F)	19.2°C (66.6°)	26.8°C (80.2°F)	43.3°C (110°F)	7/15/1958	10.0°C (50°F)	7/1/1927
August	33.4°C (92.2°F)	18.7°C (65.6°F)	26.1°C (78.9°F)	41.7°C (107°F)	8/9/1952	8.3°C (47°)	8/29/1916
September	29.9°C (85.8°F)	15.2°C (59.3°F)	22.5°C (72.5°F)	40.6°C (105°F)	9/5/1948	1.1°C (34°F)	9/23/1948
October	25.0°C (77.0°F)	9.1°C (48.4°F)	17.1°C (62.7°F)	36.7°C (98°F)	10/3/2000	-11.1°C (12°F)	10/29/1917
November	18.4°C (65.2°F)	2.7°C (36.8°F)	10.6°C (51.0°F)	31.1°C (88°F)	11/1/1952	-15.6°C (4°F)	11/29/1976
December	14.3°C (57.7°F)	-1.4°C (29.4°F)	6.5°C (43.7°F)	28.9°C (84°F)	12/9/1922	-18.3°C (-1°F)	12/24/1983

Source: WRCC, 2010

Table 3-4 summarizes precipitation at the Hobbs weather station from 1912 to 2010. September, on average, is the wettest month, while January and February receive the least precipitation. The one-day maximum rainfall of 19.05 cm (7.5 in) occurred in September, 1995.

The NRC staff prepared an EIS for the National Enrichment Facility in Eunice, New Mexico (NRC, 2005). The NRC staff examined climatology data from four weather stations in the area: Eunice, New Mexico; Hobbs, New Mexico; Midland-Odessa, Texas; and Roswell, New Mexico. Table 3-5 describes these weather stations' locations relative to the proposed IIFP site, and the historic records available for each station.

The data presented in the National Enrichment Facility EIS indicate that the general wind patterns for Midland-Odessa, Hobbs, and Eunice were similar (NRC, 2005). Roswell data appeared to have a stronger northerly and westerly component.

Midland-Odessa and Hobbs had comparable climate data based on a comparative analysis of meteorological data at the four weather stations nearest the proposed IIFP site (Table 3-5).

Table 3-4. Monthly Precipitation in Hobbs, New Mexico, from 1912 to 2010

	Rainfall							Snowfall		
Month	**Mean**	**High**	**Year**	**Low**	**Year**	**1-Day Maximum**		**Mean**	**High**	**Year**
January	1.14 cm (0.45 in)	7.52 cm (2.96 in)	1949	0.00	1924	3.07 cm (1.21 in)	1/11/49	3.30 cm (1.3 in)	31.75 cm (12.5 in)	1983
February	1.19 cm (0.47 in)	6.22 cm (2.45 in)	2010	0.00	1917	5.08 cm (2.0 in)	4/10	2.79 cm (1.1 in)	36.32 cm (14.3 in)	1973
March	1.42 cm (0.56 in)	7.57 cm (2.98 in)	2000	0.00	1918	5.08 cm (2.00 in)	3/20/02	1.27 cm (0.5 in)	25.40 cm (10.0 in)	1958
April	2.01 cm (0.79 in)	13.13 cm (5.17 in)	1922	0.00	1917	4.75 cm (1.87 in)	4/20/26	0.51 cm (0.2 in)	22.86 cm (9.0 in)	1983
May	5.05 cm (1.99 in)	35.13 cm (13.83 in)	1992	0.00	1938	13.21 cm (5.20 in)	5/22/92	0.0	0.0	1913
June	4.78 cm (1.88 in)	23.62 cm (9.30 in)	1921	0.00	1924	11.23 cm (4.42 in)	6/7/18	0.0	0.0	1913
July	5.38 cm (2.12 in)	23.90 cm (9.41 in)	1988	0.00	1954	11.35 cm (4.47 in)	7/19/88	0.0	0.0	1913
August	6.12 cm (2.41 in)	23.29 cm (9.17 in)	1920	0.10 cm (0.04 in)	1938	11.30 cm (4.45 in)	8/9/84	0.0	0.0	1913
September	6.58 cm (2.59 in)	32.99 cm (12.99 in)	1995	0.00	1939	19.05 cm (7.50 in)	9/15/95	0.0	0.0	1913
October	4.01 cm (1.58 in)	20.70 cm (8.15 in)	1985	0.00	1917	14.22 cm (5.60 in)	10/9/85	0.25 cm (0.1 in)	11.43 cm (4.5 in)	1976
November	1.42 cm (0.56 in)	11.00 cm (4.33 in)	1978	0.00	1915	9.65 cm (3.80 in)	11/4/78	1.52 cm (0.6 in)	41.91 cm (16.5 in)	1980
December	1.42 cm (0.56 in)	12.90 cm (5.08 in)	1986	0.00	1917	4.72 cm (1.86 in)	12/21/42	2.54 cm (1.0 in)	24.13 cm (9.5 in)	1986
Annual	40.54 cm (15.96 in)	81.76 cm (32.19 in)	1941	13.41 cm (5.28 in)	1917	19.05 cm (7.50 in)	9/15/95	12.7 cm (5.0 in)	68.83 cm (27.1 in)	1980

Source: WRCC, 2010

Table 3-5. Weather Stations Located Near the Proposed IIFP Site

Station	Distances and Direction from Proposed Site	Length of Record (years)[1]	Station Elevation
Eunice, New Mexico	34 km (21 mi) south of site	1 (1993)	1,050 m (3,445 ft)
Hobbs, New Mexico	13 km (8 mi) east of site	16 (1982-1997)	1,115 m (3,658 ft)
Midland-Odessa, Texas	138 km (86 mi) southeast of site	16 (1982-1997)	872 m (2,861 ft)
Roswell, New Mexico	129 km (80 mi) northwest of site	16 (1982-1997)	1,118 m (3,668 ft)

Source: NRC, 2005 and WRCC, 2010
[1] Years of compiled data for climatology analysis.

Because Midland-Odessa was a first-order weather station with data completeness exceeding EPA requirements, NRC staff used the data from the Midland-Odessa weather station for its dispersion modeling for the National Enrichment Facility EIS. Hourly meteorological observations at Midland-Odessa were used to generate wind rose plots. Monthly wind speeds and prevailing wind directions at Midland-Odessa for the years 1987 to 1991 are presented in Figure 3-3. The annual mean wind speed was 17.7 km/hr (11 mph) and the prevailing wind direction was 180 degrees with respect to north. The maximum 5-second wind speed was 112.7 km/hr (70 mph) (NRC, 2005). At Hobbs, the average wind speed varied from 16.1 km/hr (10.0 mph) for the month of August to 21.6 km/hr (13.4 mph) for the month of April. The annual average wind speed recorded at Hobbs was 18.3 km/hr (11.4 mph). The prevailing wind direction was out of the north blowing to the south.

3.5.4 Air Quality

3.5.4.1 Regulatory Setting

3.5.4.1.1 Criteria Pollutants

Under the *Clean Air Act*, the EPA has established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) that specify the maximum concentrations for seven criteria air pollutants: CO, particulate matter with aerodynamic diameters of 10 microns or less (PM_{10}), particulate matter with aerodynamic diameters of 2.5 microns or less ($PM_{2.5}$), ozone, SO_2, lead, and NO_2. New Mexico also has ambient air quality standards in place (New Mexico Ambient Air Quality Standards [NMAAQS]), which are equal to or more stringent than the NAAQS. NMAAQS are enforced by New Mexico, and allowed under the Clean Air Act by EPA. Table 3-6 lists the Federal and Mew Mexico Ambient Air Quality Standards. Areas with air quality as good as or better than the standards are designated as “attainment areas.” Areas with air quality that is worse than the standards are designated as “non-attainment areas.” Areas that were designated non-attainment and subsequently re-designated as attainment due to meeting the standards are termed “maintenance areas.” States with maintenance areas are required to develop an air quality maintenance plan as an element of the State Implementation Plan.

The EPA divided the nation into 247 Air Quality Control Regions (AQCRs) based on a number of factors that influence regional air quality including climate and meteorology, topography, vegetation, land use patterns, population characteristics, and growth projections. Lea County is in the Pecos-Permian Basin Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR 81.242) and is in attainment for all of the NAAQS, as is the rest of the Pecos-Permian Basin Intrastate AQCR (40 CFR 81.332). The

Figure 3-3. Wind Roses for Midland-Odessa, Roswell, Hobbs, and Eunice for 1993



Source: NRC, 2005

closest non-attainment areas are in the El Paso-Las Cruces-Alamogordo Interstate AQCR (40 CFR 81.82), approximately 314 km (195 mi) southwest of the proposed IIFP facility. The Anthony area in Doña Ana County, New Mexico and the city of El Paso in El Paso County, Texas are designated as moderate non-attainment areas under the PM_{10} NAAQS (40 CFR 81.332 and 40 CFR 81.344).

3.5.4.1.2 Hazardous Air Pollutants

Provisions of the *Clean Air Act* as amended required EPA to establish technology-based standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAP). Under Federal law, HAPs are those air pollutants listed in Section 112 of the Clean Air Act for which no NAAQS have been established.

Table 3-6. Federal and New Mexico Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Period	NAAQS	NMAAQS
CO	8-hour	9 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	8.7 ppm
	1-hour	35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)	13.1 ppm
NO_2	Annual	0.053 ppm	0.05 ppm
	24-hour	None[5]	0.10 ppm
	1-hour	0.100 ppm	None[5]
Ozone	8-hour	0.075 ppm	None
	1-hour[1]	0.12 ppm	None
SO_2	Annual	Revoked[6]	0.02 ppm
	24-hour	Revoked[6]	0.10 ppm
	3-hour	0.50 ppm	None
	1-hour	0.075 ppm	None
$PM_{2.5}$	Annual	15.0 µg/m^3	None
	24-hour	35 µg/m^3	None
PM_{10}	Annual	Revoked[7]	None
	24-hour	150 µg/m^3	None
Lead	Rolling 3-month	0.15 µg/m^3	None
Total Suspended Particulates	Annual Geometric Mean	Not an NAAQS Pollutant	60 µg/m^3
	30-day		90 µg/m^3
	7-day		110 µg/m^3
	24-hour		150 µg/m^3
Hydrogen Sulfide (H_2S)	1-hour[2]	Not an NAAQS Pollutant	0.010 ppm
	½-hour[3]		0.100 ppm
	½-hour[4]		0.030 ppm
Total Reduced Sulfur	½-hour[2]	Not an NAAQS Pollutant	0.003 ppm
	½-hour[3]		0.010 ppm
	½-hour[4]		0.003 ppm

Source: : 40 CFR 50; NMAC 20.2.3

[1] The 1-hour ozone NAAQS will not apply to an area one year after the effective date of the designation of that area for the 8-hour ozone NAAQS. The effective designation date for most areas is June 15, 2004 (40 CFR 50.9).

[2] For the state, except for the Pecos-Permian Basin Intrastate AQCR.

[3] For the Pecos-Permian Basin Intrastate AQCR.

[4] For within 5 miles of the corporate limits of municipalities within the Pecos-Permian Basin Intrastate AQCR.

[5] Regulatory agencies have not established standards.

[6] The 24-hour and annual SO_2 NAAQS was revoked by EPA on June 22, 2010.

[7] The annual PM_{10} NAAQS was revoked by EPA on September 21, 2006.

µg/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter

mg/m^3 = milligrams per cubic meter

ppm = parts per million

There are currently 188 hazardous air pollutants listed, including, but not limited to, the pollutants controlled by the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) program (40 CFR 61 and 63).

3.5.4.1.3 Prevention of Significant Deterioration

Under the *Clean Air Act*, the EPA established Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) regulations, which apply to proposed new or modified sources in an attainment area that have the potential to emit NO_2, $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, or SO_2 in excess of predetermined levels (40 CFR 52.21). Allowable deterioration to air quality can be expressed as the incremental increase in ambient concentrations of criteria pollutants, or PSD increment. Increments for criteria pollutants are based on the PSD classification of the area. Class I areas, which include certain national parks and wilderness areas, allow the lowest amount of permissible deterioration by precluding development near designated areas. All other areas of the United States are Class II areas where moderate, well-controlled industrial growth is allowed. The allowable PSD increments for Class I and Class II areas are identified in Table 3-7.

The proposed IIFP facility is in a PSD Class II area. There are no PSD Class I areas within 100 km (62 mi) of the proposed IIFP facility (40 CFR 81, Subpart D). The nearest PSD Class I areas to the proposed IIFP facility are Carlsbad Caverns National Park and the Guadalupe Mountains National Park, located about 114 km and 154 km (71 mi and 96 mi), respectively, southwest of the proposed site. Therefore, due to the distances involved to the closest PSD Class I areas; there is no reason to expect deterioration of air quality from the volumes of IIFP facility-generated NO_2, particulate matter, and SO_2.

Table 3-7. Allowable Prevention of Significant Deterioration Increments

Pollutant	Averaging Period	Class I PSD Increment ($\mu g/m^3$)	Class II PSD Increment ($\mu g/m^3$)
NO_2	Annual	2.5	25
$PM_{2.5}$	Annual	1	4
	24-hour	2	9
PM_{10}	Annual	4	17
	24-hour	8	30
SO_2	Annual	2	20
	24-hour	5	91
	3-hour	25	512

Source: 40 CFR 52.21

3.5.4.1.4 Regional Haze

Regional haze is a visibility impairment caused by cumulative air pollutant emissions from numerous sources over a wide geographic area. The primary cause of regional haze in many parts of the country is light scattering from fine particles ($PM_{2.5}$) in the atmosphere. Course particles (PM_{10}) can also contribute to light extinction. Section 169 of the *Clean Air Act* established a national goal for visibility, defined as the "prevention of any future, and remedying of any existing, impairment of visibility in Class I areas…from manmade air pollution." Under the regional haze rule, States are required to develop State Implementation Plans to address visibility at designated mandatory PSD Class I areas, including designated national parks,

wilderness areas, and wildlife refuges (40 CFR 51.309). A visibility analysis is required for each PSD Class I area located within 100 km (62 mi) of any new or modified major stationary sources whose emissions exceed PSD modeling thresholds. As discussed above, there are no PSD Class I areas within 100 km (62 mi) of the proposed IIFP so no visibility analysis is required.

3.5.4.1.5 General Conformity for Federal Actions

According to Section 176 of the *Clean Air Act* (40 CFR 51.853), a Federal agency must make a conformity determination in the approval of a project with air emissions that exceed specified thresholds in nonattainment and/or maintenance areas. This General Conformity Rule ensures that the actions taken by Federal agencies in non-attainment and maintenance areas meet national standards for air quality and do not cause further degradation to air quality which would be inconsistent with the attainment and maintenance of ambient air quality standards. The proposed project is not in a non-attainment or maintenance area; therefore, no general conformity analysis is required.

3.5.4.2 Existing Conditions

Air quality in Lea County, New Mexico is considered unimpaired. Farming, ranching, oil and gas development, a few industrial facilities, and vehicular traffic are the primary activities that would affect ambient air quality.

The closest air quality monitoring station to the proposed IIFP site is in Hobbs, New Mexico. The Hobbs station monitors NO_2, ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10}. The nearest air quality monitoring stations for CO, SO_2, and lead are in Rio Rancho, New Mexico, Artesia, New Mexico, and El Paso, Texas, respectively. The monitored criteria pollutant concentrations for the years 2006 through 2008 are summarized in Table 3-8.

Table 3-8. Ambient Levels of Criteria Pollutants in Nearby Counties

Pollutant	Averaging Time	NAAQS	2006	2007	2008	Monitor Location
CO (ppm)	8-hour	9	1.4	0.6	NA	Rio Rancho, NM[1]
	1-hour	35	1.6	1.1	NA	
NO_2 (ppm)	Annual	0.053	0.008	0.006	0.006	Hobbs, NM
	1-hour	0.100	0.054	0.053	0.052	
Ozone (ppm)	8-hour	0.075	0.075	0.064	0.067	Hobbs, NM
SO_2 (ppm)	Annual	0.03	0.001	0.001	0.001	Artesia, NM
	24-hour	0.14	0.004	0.001	0.001	
	3-hour	0.50	0.017	0.005	0.001	
	1-hour	0.075	0.066	0.011	0.002	
$PM_{2.5}$ ($\mu g/m^3$)	Annual	15.0	6.82	7.26	6.85	Hobbs, NM
	24-hour	35	12.5	14.8	14.6	
PM_{10} ($\mu g/m^3$)	24-hour	150	60	55	39	Hobbs, NM
Lead ($\mu g/m^3$)	Quarterly	0.15	0.04	0.05	0.02	El Paso, TX

Source: EPA, 2009a
[1] The CO monitor in Rio Rancho did not operate in 2008.

3.6 Geology, Minerals, and Soil

3.6.1 Regional and Site Near-surface Geology

The proposed IIFP site is in the Llana Estacado section of the Southern High Plains physiographic region. The Llana Estacado is an isolated mesa that slopes gently to the east-southeast and covers a large part of eastern New Mexico and western Texas. The Mescalero Ridge escarpment, which defines the southwestern limit of the Llano Estacado (Figure 3-4) crosses the western and central portions of Lea County as a nearly perpendicular cliff (Nicholson and Clebsch, 1961).

The site is underlain by (in descending order) Quaternary-age alluvium, Triassic- and Cretaceous-age rocks, and Permian-age rocks that fill the Permian Basin. The Permian Basin underlies an area approximately 402 km (250 mi) wide and 483 km (300 mi) long and is a major oil and natural gas producing area (UTPB, 2010). Beginning in 1921, more than 40,000 exploration wells and 200,000 development wells have been drilled in the Permian Basin region (Scholle, 2000). The Basin produces 17 percent of the nation's crude oil (UTPB, 2010). The Basin is also a major source of potassium salts (potash) (UTPB, 2010). Oil, gas, and potash production in Lea County are summarized in Section 3.6.3.

According to the EPA, there were 95 point sources of criteria pollutants in Lea County, New Mexico for emissions year 2002 (EPA, 2009b). Emission data for 2002 are the most recent data available from EPA. Motor vehicles and various area sources also contributed to the criteria pollutant emissions in Lea County. Table 3-9 presents a summary of the 2002 annual Criteria Air Pollutants emissions for Lea County.

The Ogallala Formation consists of valley-fill deposits of clay, silt, fine- to coarse-grained sand, gravel and caliche (hardened calcium carbonate), the distributions of which vary both vertically and horizontally. The formation ranges in thickness from 0 to as much as 107 m (350 ft) (Fahlquist, 2003; Tillery, 2008). Locally, the top of the Ogallala Formation consists of a resistant layer of caliche as thick as 18 m (60 ft) (Nicholson and Clebsch, 1961).

Table 3-9. Lea County Criteria Pollutant Emissions in 2002

Pollutant	Point metric tons per year (tons per year)	Mobile metric tons per year (tons per year)	Area metric tons per year (tons per year)	Total metric tons per year (tons per year)
CO	7,250 (7,992)	13,376 (14,744)	618 (681)	21,244 (23,417)
NO_2	25,605 (28,225)	1,386 (1,528)	128 (141)	27,119 (29,894)
SO_2	7,197 (7,933)	67.8 (74.7)	68.5 (75.5)	7,334 (8,084)
$PM_{2.5}$	214 (236)	47.9 (52.8)	2,630 (2,899)	2,892 (3,188)
PM_{10}	244 (269)	57.2 (63.1)	24,747 (27,279)	25,048 (27,611)
VOC	1,996 (2,200)	1,067 (1,176)	1,373 (1,513)	4,436 (4,890)

Source: EPA, 2009b

Quaternary-age alluvial deposits underlying the site consist of sand ranging up to 1 m (3 ft) thick (Hunt, 1977) that mantles the underlying late Tertiary-age Ogallala Formation (NMBGMR, 2003).

3.6.2 Seismicity and Volcanism

The proposed IIFP site is in a seismically quiet region, with local earthquakes of relatively small magnitude (moment magnitude of less than 2 on the Modified Mercalli-Revised 1931 scale [MM]). No Quaternary faults or folds, thought to be associated with most earthquakes of moment magnitude 6 or greater over the last 1.6 million years, exist in the southeast New Mexico/west Texas region (Crone and Wheeler, 2000; Machette et al., 1988; Yarger, 2009). The nearest faulting is more than 161 km (100 mi) west of the site and is associated with the Rio Grande Rift.

Seismic activity in southeastern New Mexico is typically of small magnitude and generally caused by oil field injection activities. However, the largest recent major earthquake (5.0 MM) in New Mexico occurred south of Eunice in January, 1992 (Sanford et al., 2002; Sanford et al., 2006; Yarger, 2009). A seismic event of 5.0 MM would be felt outside only and observed inside by swinging doors or swaying wall pictures.

The New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology using instrumental data has estimated probabilistic seismic hazards for New Mexico of duration magnitude 2.0 MM or greater for the time period 1962 through 1998 (Sanford et al., 2002; Sanford et al., 2006). Figure 3-5 shows the probabilistic seismic hazard map in the format of peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGA) at 10 percent probability of exceeding 6 MM in a 50-year period (or, approximately once every 500 years). PGA is a measure of earthquake force at ground surface and is an index of hazard for structures. The units for PGA are in percent gravity (g). As shown in Figure 3-5, the highest predicted PGA, approximately 0.18 g, is approximately 40 km (25 mi) north of Socorro. The IIFP site area has a predicted PGA of approximately 0.02 g. A PGA of 0.02 g is considered the acceleration level at which considerable damage can begin to occur to poorly designed or weakly-built structures of masonry, adobe, or stone (Sanford et al., 2002; Sanford et al., 2006).

New Mexico has experienced almost 700 volcanic events over the past 5 million years, ranging from small basalt flows to large eruptions. The volcanic events are roughly aligned with two zones of structural weakness that cross New Mexico: the Colorado Plateau Transition Zone and the Rio Grande Rift. The most recent volcanic activities were the eruptions of two relatively large basalt flows associated with the tectonic activity along Rio Grande Rift: the Carrizozo and McCarty's basalts (Limburg, 2009). The Carrizozo basalt covers approximately 329 km^2 (127 mi^2) near the town of Carrizozo, approximately 258 km (160 mi) west of the site. Studies indicate that the age of the basalt flow is between 4,800 and 5,200 years. The McCarty basalt flow covers approximately 344 km^2 (133 mi^2) near the town of Grants, approximately 547 km (340 mi) northwest of the site. Isotope studies indicate that the Grants flow is approximately 3,000 years old (Zimbelman and Johnston, 2001).

3.6.3 Minerals

Mineral resources in Lea County include industrial minerals such as fluorite and gypsum; construction materials such as potash, caliche, sand, and gravel; and energy sources such as coal, oil, and gas (Figure 3-6).

Although there are no designated mining districts in Lea County (McLemore et al., 2007), industrial and construction materials including potash, salt, sulfur, sand, gravel and caliche are mined at the eight active commercial mines/pits/mills in Lea County listed on Table 3-10.



Source: Modified from NMBGMR, 2010.
Used with permission.

FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-4 Physiography of New Mexico



Source: Lin and Sanford, 2000.
Used with permission.

FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-5 PGA 10% for New Mexico


Crushed Stone
Cochran
Sand and Gravel
Sand and Gravel
Chaves
Aggregate
Yoakum
New Mexico
Texas
Aggregate and Caliche
Section 27
Sulfur
Lea
Sand and Gravel
Gaines
Salt
Aggregate, Caliche, Other
Eddy
Potash
Sulfur
Potash
Sulfur
Aggregate, Clay, Shale
Salt
Sand and Gravel
Potash
Salt
Sand and Gravel
Andrews
Aggregate
Winkler
Legend
Mineral Resources
Section 27 of T018SR036E
County Boundary
State Boundary
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 5 10 20
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-6 Mineral Resource Map
Sources: NMEMNRD, 2010b & USGS, 2005a.
Used with permission.

Table 3-10. Summary of Active Mines, Mills, Pits and Quarries in Lea County

Name	Commodity	Operation
Lea County Pit	Base course, crushed rock, caliche, top soil, sand	Pit/Mill
Hawthorne Pit	Caliche	Pit
Constructors	Aggregate, caliche, other	Pit
Eunice Pit	Sand and gravel	Pit
Old Baldy Pit	Aggregate	Pit
Intrepid Potash	Potash	Mill
Rowland Salt	Salt	Mine
Eunice Plant Sulfur	Sulfur	Pit

Sources: USGS, 2005a; Pfeil, et al., 2001; NMEMNRD, 2010a

Caliche caps the Llano Estacado to a maximum thickness of 18 m (60 ft). It is mined throughout southeastern New Mexico, including Lea County, for construction and cement uses. Lea County is riddled with hundreds of small, abandoned caliche pits that were used by the New Mexico Department of Transportation for road construction material. There is a small caliche pit in the southeastern corner of Section 27. Caliche is currently mined at the Hawthorne Pit north of Lovington in Lea County.

Coal is not mined in Lea County (McLemore et al., 2007).

The New Mexico portion of the Permian Basin contains 1,112 designated, discovered oil reservoirs and 672 designated, discovered gas reservoirs. Large active oil and gas fields have existed in Lea County for more than 50 years (Leedshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

According to the New Mexico Oil & Gas Wells database (NMEMNRD, 2010b), 715 oil or gas wells are within a 10-km (6-mi) radius of the proposed IIFP site. Seven of these wells are within a 1.6-km (1-mi) radius. The seven wells were drilled between 1987 and 1999, but subsequently abandoned. One abandoned well is in the extreme southwestern corner of Section 27, but no oil or gas wells are located within the proposed facility boundary. The locations of the seven wells are shown in Figure 3-7, and well details are summarized in Table 3-11. The proposed IIFP site has been explored for oil and gas and caliche. The site has very limited leasable, locatable, or marketable mineral resources (NMEMNRD, 2010a; NMEMNRD,2010b; NMT, 2010; Pfeil, et al., 2001; USGS, 2005a).

3.6.4 Soil

Soils occupying the southern High Plains in Lea County generally comprise shallow to deep gravelly and loamy soils, or deep sandy soils formed from windblown and water-deposited materials in the Quaternary and late Tertiary periods. Soft or hard caliche is generally found below the soils in most of the southern High Plains.

Soils underlying the proposed IIFP site include those of Kimbrough, Lea, Portales, Stegall and Slaughter soil associations. The distribution of these soil associations are shown in Figure 3-8, and the soil characteristics are summarized in Table 3-12.

In October 2010, a study was conducted by GL Environmental, Inc. for IIFP (GL Environmental, 2010a). They collected two soil samples from the site, which were analyzed to characterize



Source: NMT, 2010. Used with permission.

FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-7 Oil and Gas Well Map

Table 3-11. Oil and Gas Wells within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the Site

Grid Name	American Petroleum Institute (API) Number	Spud Date[1]	Depth Meters (ft)	Comments
Yates Petroleum Corp	3002529864	1987	3,360 (11,025)	Plugged and abandoned
Chevron USA Inc	3002528999	1999	3,475 (11,400)	Abandoned
Basin Alliance LLC	3002528083	1982	3,708 (12,164)	Abandoned
Westbrook Oil Corp	3002526605	1999	1,728 (5,670)	Abandoned
Shell Oil Company	3002512733	1999	1,612 (5,289)	Abandoned
Getty Oil Company	3002503974	1999	1,433 (4,700)	Abandoned
Texas Pacific & Pure	3002503977	1999	3,733 (12,245)	Abandoned

Source: NMT, 2010
[1] Spud date is the date when the drill bit first hits the ground.
API = American Petroleum Institute

Table 3-12. Site Soil Characteristics

Soil Association	Soil Map Symbol	Section 27 Hectares (Acreage)	Description
Kimbrough gravelly loam	KO	17.7 (43.7)	Gravelly loam from zero to 15.2 cm (6 in). Cemented material from 15.2 to 40.6 cm (6 to 16 in). Well-drained with a very low capacity to transmit water.
Kimbrough-Lea Complex	KU	227.3 (561.7)	Loam from zero to 66 cm (26 in). Cemented material from 25.4 to 66 cm (10 to 26 in). Well-drained with a very low capacity to transmit water.
Portales loam	PC	18 (44.5)	Farmland of Statewide Importance. Loam from zero to 20.3 cm (8 in). Clay loam from 20.3 to 152.4 cm (8 to 60 in). Well-drained with a high capacity to transmit water.
Portales-Stegall loam	PS	0.4 (0.9)	Farmland of Statewide Importance. Loam from zero to 22.9 cm (9 in). Clay loam from 22.9 to 71.1 cm (9 to 28 in). Cemented material from 71.1 to 96.5 cm (28 to 38 in). Variable from 96.5 to 152.4 cm (38 to 60 in). Well-drained with a very low to moderate capacity to transmit water.
Stegall and Slaughter soils	SS	2.0 (5.0)	Farmland of Statewide Importance. Loam from zero to 5.1 cm (2 in). Clay from 5.1 to 38.1 cm (2 to 15 in). Cemented material from 38.1 to 63.5 cm (15 to 25 in). Variable from 63.5 to 152.4 cm (25 to 60 in). Well-drained with a very low to moderately high capacity to transmit water.

Source: NRCS, 2010


PS
PS
PS
PS
KU
PC
KO
KU
KO
SS
Legend
Section 27 of T018SR036E
Soils
KO
KU
PC
PS
SS
Source: NRCS, 2010.
Note: See Table 3-12 for soil definitions.
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0
0.05
0.1
0.2
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-8 Section 27 Soils Map

baseline soil conditions. The soil samples were collected from a depth of 6 in and analyzed for radiological parameters, RCRA metals, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs).

U-234 was reported in the two soil samples at concentrations from 4.42×10^{-7} to 5.95×10^{-7} microcuries per gram (µCi/g). U-235/-236 was reported in concentrations from 5.58×10^{-9} to 2.60×10^{-8} µCi/g. U-238 results were from 5.86×10^{-7} to 5.95×10^{-7} µCi/g. All isotope concentrations are consistent with background levels in the site area.

Detected RCRA metals included barium with concentrations from 88.5 to 109 milligrams per kilograms (mg/kg), cadmium from 0.27 to 0.42 mg/kg, chromium from 10.0 to 12.2 mg/kg, and lead from 11.7 to 14.7 mg/kg. All other RCRA metals were at less than laboratory method detection limits. These elements are not uncommon in soils, but levels may have been elevated due to past petrochemical-related operations in the area. No VOCs or SVOCs were detected (GL Environmental, 2010a).

New Mexico has farmland protection programs to help slow the conversion of farmland to developed uses. Farmland is usually divided into three distinct categories: prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide or local importance. Prime farmland is land of exceptional physical and chemical soil characteristics that can be used in agriculture with minimum input of nutrients, labor, etc. Prime farmland cannot be committed to urban development or water storage. Unique farmland is of lower quality than prime farmland but is still able to produce high-value food or grain products. Farmland of statewide or local importance does not meet the criteria for prime or unique farmland, but the soil is still considered important for the production of food and fiber.

The proposed IIFP site has approximately 20.4 ha (50.5 ac) of soils classified as farmland of statewide importance. The soils on the proposed site do not include tracts of land that have been designated for agriculture by state law (Carter, 2010).

3.7 Water Resources

These sections consider the groundwater and surface water use, and groundwater and surface water quality that could affect water use or quality at the site, or be affected by the construction or operation of the proposed IIFP facility.

3.7.1 Groundwater

Regional and site-specific data on the physical and hydrologic characteristics of the groundwater resources at, and in the vicinity of, the site are summarized in this section to provide basic data for an evaluation of impacts on the aquifers of the area.

3.7.1.1 Regional Groundwater

The High Plains aquifer, also known as the Ogallala aquifer, is a regional aquifer system that underlies 450,660 km^2 (174,000 mi^2) in parts of eight States: Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming (USGS, 2010a; McGuire et al., 2003). Because of its large size, the High Plains aquifer has been geographically subdivided into three aquifer regions: the southern High Plains, central High Plains, and the northern High Plains. About 27 percent of the irrigated land in the United States overlies this aquifer system, which yields about 30 percent of the nation's groundwater for irrigation. In addition, the aquifer system

provides drinking water to 82 percent of the population within the aquifer boundary (USGS, 2010a).

The proposed IIFP site and surrounding region are underlain by the southern High Plains aquifer (Hart and McAda, 1985). The southern High Plains aquifer is an unconfined aquifer and is composed primarily of Quaternary-age alluvial sediments and the Tertiary-age Ogallala Formation. The Ogallala Formation, which underlies about 80 percent of the High Plains, is the principal geologic unit forming the aquifer (USGS, 2010a). The Ogallala aquifer is typically underlain by impermeable clays and shale, although in some places the underlying Cretaceous-age formations are hydraulically connected to the aquifer. Beneath the Ogallala aquifer in the Lea County underground water basin (UWB) are the Triassic-age Lower Dockum Group Santa Rosa aquifer and the deeper Permian-age rocks, which include the Rustler Formation, Capitan aquifer, and San Andres aquifer (Figure 3-9) (NMOSE, 2009; McCoy and Perry, 2004).

3.7.1.2 Local Groundwater

Groundwater resources in Lea County include hydrogeologic strata within five UWBs (Figure 3 10). The UWBs are areas of underground water with reasonably ascertainable boundaries declared by the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer (NM OSE). The four primary basins, from north to south, are the Lea County UWB, the Capitan UWB, the Carlsbad UWB, and the Jal UWB. A small area (approximately 142 km^2 [55 mi^2]) of a fifth UWB, the Roswell UWB, lies beneath west-central and northeast Lea County. The UWBs are designated based on their distinct hydrogeologic configurations, which do not typically end at county or State boundaries. The four primary UWBs include the following primary aquifers: Lea County UWB (Ogallala aquifer), Capitan UWB (Capitan aquifer), Carlsbad UWB (Santa Rosa aquifer), and the Jal UWB (Alluvial aquifer) (Leedshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

The Lea County UWB is discussed in detail below because it underlies the proposed IIFP site. Following that discussion, site and vicinity groundwater are more specifically characterized.

3.7.1.2.1 Lea County Underground Water Basin

The proposed IIFP site is above the Lea County UWB, which encompasses 5,646 km^2 (2,180 mi^2) and covers most of northern Lea County and small portions of Chaves and Eddy Counties in southeast New Mexico (Stephens & Assoc., 2009). The basin boundaries are shown in Figures 3-9, 3-10, and 3-11.

The Ogallala aquifer is the primary water source in the Lea County UWB, which extends the width of Lea County to the east and west. To the south, the Lea County UWB is bounded by the Mescalero Ridge and associated escarpment (Figures 3-11 and 3-4), which indicates the southern extent of the High Plains aquifer. The maximum saturated thickness of the Ogallala aquifer within the UWB is about 76 m (250 ft) (Leedshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000). The depth to groundwater in the Ogallala Formation is approximately 9.1 m (30 ft) in the site area (Figure 3-12).

Generally, the Ogallala Formation has an upward fining of sediments, which may have a significant effect on the distribution of porosity and permeability in the aquifer, controlling both the amount of water that can be stored and its movement through the aquifer (Stephens & Assoc., 2009).



FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-9 Underground Water Basins of NM

Source: NMOSE, 2011. Used with permission.



Source: Modified from McCoy & Perry, 2004.
Used with permission.

FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-10 Geologic Cross-section Showing the Deep Aquifers of Lea County



Source: Tillery, 2008.
Used with permission.

FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-11 Groundwater Flow Map



Source: Tillery, 2008. Used with permission.

FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-12 Depth to Groundwater Map

The hydraulic conductivity of the Ogallala aquifer in the Lea County UWB, as reported by a number of different studies (McGuire et al., 2003; Musharrafieh and Chudnoff, 1999; Stephens & Assoc., 2009), ranges from 0.9 to 80 m per day (3 to 262 ft per day), with higher hydraulic conductivities near Hobbs (i.e., near the proposed IIFP site) and eastward toward the Texas border. Irrigation well yields in the aquifer range from 757 to nearly 7,571 liters per minute (L/min) (200 to nearly 2,000 gallons per minute [gpm]) (Leedshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

Discharge from the Ogallala aquifer in Lea County occurs through groundwater pumping and subsurface flow. The largest amount of natural groundwater discharge is the subsurface flow into Texas (Figure 3-11). A small amount of groundwater discharges through the Quaternary alluvium to southern Lea County (McAda, 1984).

The principal source of recharge to the aquifer occurs from precipitation infiltrating into the subsurface, primarily in areas covered by dune sand or playa lakes. Annual average recharge is estimated to range from 1.3 to 2.5 cm (0.5 to 1 in) (Tillery, 2008). It is estimated that approximately 3,840,000 ha-m (31,100,000 ac-ft) of groundwater is presently in storage in the UWB, of which only 45 percent (approximately 1,730,000 ha-m [14,000,000 acre-ft]) can actually be recovered because the saturated thickness of much of the aquifer is too shallow for water recovery to be feasible (Musharrafieh and Chudnoff, 1999; Leedshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

Under pre-pumping conditions, recharge of the Ogallala aquifer was in equilibrium with natural discharge. Because current pumping for municipal, industrial, irrigation and other uses exceed the Ogallala's recharge rate, the aquifer has experienced significant drawdown. The water level in the Ogallala aquifer has declined as much as 30 m (97 ft) in the Lea County UWB from 1914 to 2007. The area of maximum saturated thickness is generally near or coincident with the area of maximum water-level decline, which is north of Hobbs and near the Texas state line (Tillery, 2008). Groundwater in the Ogallala aquifer flows east-southeast towards Texas (Figure 3-11). Depths to groundwater in the Lea County UWB range from 6.1 m (20 ft) in the Monument area to 76 m (250 ft) near the exposed caprock of the Mescalero Ridge (Figure 3-12) (Tilllery, 2008; Musharrafieh and Chudnoff, 1999).

Modeling by Musharrafieh and Chudnoff (1999) and observed water level declines indicate portions of the aquifer may become unsaturated by the year 2045. Other portions of the aquifer are also predicted to have a saturated thickness inadequate to sustain existing water rights (NMOSE, 2009).

Due to the limited groundwater supply within the southern High Plains aquifer, the NM OSE issued an order on March 10, 2009 closing the southern High Plains aquifer to the filing of applications under NMSA Section 72-12-3, which is the statute that regulates wells for new appropriations other than those applications filed under Section 72-12-1. The order does not apply to applications filed under NMSA Section 72-12-1.1 (wells required for relatively small amounts of water for single or multiple households, or for drinking or sanitary uses in conjunction with a commercial operation); Section 72-12-1.2 (livestock wells); or Section 72-12-1.3 (wells used for a period not to exceed one year for specifically listed purposes) (NMOSE, 2009).

Applications filed under NMSA Section 72-12-3 to appropriate groundwater from the units listed on Table 3-13 are considered on a case-by-case basis (NMOSE, 2009).

Table 3-13. Summary of Potential Deep-Aquifer Groundwater Sources for Lea County

Aquifer	Geologic Age	Typical Depth to Top of Aquifer m (ft) bgs	Typical Thickness m (ft)	Estimate Yields L/min (gpm)
Santa Rosa aquifer	Triassic	150 to 335 (500 to 1,100)	60 to 76 (200 to 250) [730 (2,400) max]	23 to 379 (6 to 100)
Rustler Formation	Upper Permian	210 to 410 (700 to 1,350)	24 to 43 (80 to140) [110 (360) max]	38 to 379 (10 to 100)
Capitan aquifer	Permian	850 to 1,400 (2,800 to 4,600)	270 to 430 (900 to1,400) [670 (2,200) max]	189 to 4,921 (50 to 1,300)
San Andres aquifer	Permian	910 to 1,500 (3,000 to 5,000)	210 to 610 (700 to 2,000)	833 (220)

Source: McCoy and Perry, 2004
bgs = below ground surface
gpm = gallons per minute
L/min = litters per minute

The NM OSE guidelines for new groundwater withdrawal applications for all UWBs include block administration and local assessment methods to limit aquifer drawdown. The block administration consists of 1.6 km^2 (1 mi^2) blocks that correspond to model cells in the groundwater-flow model (Musharrafieh and Chudnoff, 1999). A 40-year planning period ending in 2045 has been selected for block administration (NMOSE, 2009).

Model cells predicted to become unsaturated or with an inadequate saturated thickness for continued well operation require a higher level of restriction. Areas requiring such restriction are designated Critical Management Areas (CMAs). The CMAs include those model cells predicted to have a saturated thickness of 17 m (55 ft) or less by the year 2045 (Figure 3-13).

Key aspects of the NM OSE guidelines for new groundwater applications include the following: (1) water rights can be moved from one block to another throughout the basin, (2) the administrative groundwater flow model will be used to determine regional drawdowns resulting from an application, (3) applications to move water rights cannot create more drawdown than 0.0076 m/yr (0.025 ft/yr) in a CMA, or 0.061 m/yr (0.20 ft/yr) in a non-CMA, and (4) local area impacts from the proposed water-rights application will be performed and will include evaluation of impacts to the saturated thickness and reductions in water columns of existing wells (NMOSE 2009). On March 10, 2009, the NM OSE issued an order closing the Lea County UWB to the filing of groundwater applications (NMOSE, 2009). In 1999, in order to meet the projected groundwater demands of Lea County, 138 applications were filed by the Lea County Water Users Association to appropriate 6,389 ha-m (51,797 ac-ft) per year of groundwater, which was essentially all the unappropriated groundwater in the Lea County UWB (Leadshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

A portion of the applications to appropriate groundwater, totaling 4,215.2 ha-m (34,173 ac-ft) per year, have been assigned to Lea County during (at least) the 40-year planning period to allow the County to hold the subject water rights unused until the rights can be put to beneficial use at projects currently under construction, select future projects, and homes and businesses in unincorporated areas. The proposed IIFP site has been included in Lea County's 40-Year Water Development Plan as an area of proposed development where up to 21.6 ha-m (175 ac-ft) per year of the Lea County's water rights would be put to beneficial use. The estimated



Source: NMOSE, 2009.
Used with permission.

FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-13 Critical Management Areas
Lea County Basin

quantity of groundwater that Lea County would need by the end of the 40-year planning period for all projects that currently exist, are being constructed, or have a high likelihood of being constructed in the near future is 1,173.5 ha-m (9,514 ac-ft) per year (Leadshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

3.7.1.2.2 Site and Vicinity Groundwater

A data query of the NM OSE Statewide well database on water supply wells within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the site is summarized in Table 3-14, and the locations of the wells are shown in Figure 3-14. The depth to groundwater in the 10 water supply wells within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the site ranges from 8.5 to 21 m (28 to 70 ft) below ground surface (bgs). One well (L 04011) has insufficient data and was most likely not completed. The wells are installed in the Ogallala aquifer at depths ranging from 35 to 62.5 m (115 to 205 ft) bgs.

Xcel Energy's Cunningham Station, located just west of Section 27 has four groundwater monitoring wells (M-3, CU-6, -8, and -9) in Section 27 (Figure 3-14).

According to the NM OSE Statewide well database (2010), 261 groundwater wells are within a 10-km (6-mi) radius of the site (Figure 3-15). Most of the wells are categorized as prospecting wells. There is a domestic well approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi) northwest of the site.

Table 3-14. Summary of Supply Wells within 1.6 km (1 mi) of the Site

Owner	POD Number	Well Use	Drill Date	Total Depth m (ft)	Depth to Water m (ft)	Well Yield L/min (gpm)
Abbott, Murrell	L 03757	PRO	1957	38.1 (125)	13.7(45)	NA
Abbott, Murrell	L 03928	PRO	1958	35 (115)	18.3 (60)	NA
NA	L 04011	PUB	NA	NA	NA	NA
Abbott Bros	L 05176 X	IND	1965	60.4 (198)	16.8 (55)	200 (53)
Abbott Bros	L 05176 X-2 (M-3)	IND	1965	50 (164)	16.8 (55)	151 (40)
Abbott Bros	L 05176 X-3	IND	1965	58 (190)	21.3 (70)	159 (42)
Abbott Bros	L 05176 X-4	IND	1965	54 (177)	21.3 (70)	144 (38)
Abbott Bros	L 05176 X-5	IND	1965	62.5 (205)	15.2 (50)	151 (40)
Abbott Bros	L 05176 X-6	IND	1965	61.9 (203)	8.5 (28)	151 (40)
NA	L 07469	DOM	1976	48.8 (160)	21.3 (70)	NA
Keith, Ronny	L 12341 POD1	SAN	2009	58 (190)	21.3 (70)	NA

Source: NMOSE, 2010
DOM = Domestic
IND = Industrial
NA = Not available
POD = Point of diversion
PRO = Prospecting/development of natural resources
PUB = Construction of public works
SAN = Sanitary in conjunction with a commercial use



Source: NMOSE, 2010. Used with permission.

FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-14 1-Mile Radius Groundwater Well Map


6-Mile Radius
3-Mile Radius
1-Mile Radius
18
483
238
529
62
62/180
8
Legend
Groundwater Wells
Section 27 of T018SR036E
1-Mile Radius of Section 27
3-Mile Radius of Section 27
6-Mile Radius of Section 27
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 0.5 1 2 3
Miles
Source: NMOSE, 2010. Used with permission.
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-15 6-Mile Radius Groundwater Well Map

The nearest municipal water system is the City of Hobbs municipal system, approximately 16 km (10 mi) east northeast of the site. The system comprises 29 active groundwater supply wells, which are grouped into five well fields or systems. The wells range in depth from 54 to 81.7 m (177 to 268 ft) bgs, and the depth to water ranges from 23 to 51 m (75 to 167 ft) bgs. Yields for the wells range from 927 to 3,407 L/min (245 to 900 gpm). The combined yield from the five systems is estimated at 59,620 L/min (15,750 gpm) when the pumps are running 24 hours a day (Stephens & Assoc., 2009).

3.7.1.3 Groundwater Use

Groundwater use for Lea County, as reported by the NM OSE, is summarized in Table 3-15. Irrigation systems are the largest users (72.8 percent) of groundwater in the county, followed by mining (9.9 percent) and public water supply systems (7.2 percent). Smaller amounts of groundwater are used by industry, electric power generators, livestock, and domestic/ commercial users.

Table 3-15. Summary of Groundwater Use in Lea County, 2005

Groundwater Use Category	Groundwater Use ha-m (ac-ft)
Commercial (self-supplied)	403 (3,264)
Domestic (self-supplied)	175 (1,419)
Industrial (self-supplied)	751 (6,088)
Irrigated Agriculture	16,698 (135,371)
Livestock (self-supplied)	453 (3,670)
Mining (self-supplied)	2,265 (18,365)
Power (self-supplied)	545 (4,415)
Public Water Supply	1,648 (13,360)
Total	22,937 (185,952)

Source: NMOSE, 2008
ha-m = hectare meters
ac-ft – acre feet

3.7.1.4 Groundwater Quality

This section considers the groundwater quality of aquifers that could affect water use at the proposed site, or be affected by the construction or operation of the proposed IIFP facility.

3.7.1.4.1 Regional Groundwater Quality

In 2001, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) National Water-Quality Assessment Program collected groundwater samples from 48 wells screened in the Southern High Plains aquifer, primarily from domestic wells in eastern New Mexico and western Texas. Depths of wells sampled ranged from 30 to 152 m (100 to 500 ft), with a median depth of 61.3 m (201 ft). Depths to water ranged from 10 to 136 m (34 to 445 ft) bgs, with a median depth of 40.8 m (134 ft).

Of 240 parameters analyzed in the 48 wells, EPA public drinking-water standards or guidelines were exceeded in one or more wells for arsenic, boron, chloride, dissolved solids, fluoride,

manganese, nitrate, radon, strontium, or sulfate. Pesticides were detected at very low concentrations (<1 mg/L) in fewer than 20 percent of the samples (Fahlquist, 2003).

Groundwater quality data from the City of Hobbs municipal drinking water system between 2005 and 2009 are summarized in Table 3-16. Each of the 29 wells comprising the system is screened in the Ogallala aquifer. The data indicate that groundwater quality in the aquifer near Hobbs is good and water quality standard exceedances are rare.

3.7.1.4.2 Site Groundwater Quality

The three monitoring wells along the western Section boundary (Figure 3-13) were installed by Xcel Energy to monitor for the presence of contaminants in groundwater that could originate from an unlined cooling tower pond at the Cunningham Station, and runoff from agricultural fields. Groundwater analytical data collected from monitoring wells CU-6, -8, and -9 indicate that of seven constituents sampled, sulfate, total dissolved solids, and chloride exceeded the New Mexico Water Quality Bureau Control Commission Standards for Groundwater (NMAC 20.6.2); however, boron, chlorite, pH and nitrates (including nitrate nitrogen) are below or within the standards. Groundwater quality data were not available for monitoring well M-3 (GL Environmental, 2010b).

3.7.2 Surface Water

The Southern High Plains Basin in New Mexico encompasses 14,211 km^2 (5,487 mi^2) in Curry, Roosevelt, Chavez, and Lea Counties (NMWQCC, 2002). The Mescalero Ridge (see Figure 3-4) separates the Southern High Plains (and the associated Texas Gulf Basin watershed) from the Pecos River Basin watershed. The proposed IIFP site lies just east of the Mescalero Ridge, in the Southern High Plains Basin and the Texas Gulf Basin watershed (see Figure 3-4).

No perennial streams traverse the Southern High Plains although there are some ephemeral streams that occasionally have large flows after rain storms. Surface water in Lea County is limited to intermittent streams, lakes, and numerous small playa lakes that result from heavy rainfall during the summer (Leedshill-Herkenhoff, Inc. et al., 2000). Surface drainage to playa lakes captures 80 to 90 percent of rainfall (Sublett and Peery, 2009). There is no true drainage system off the High Plains within Lea County.

Several depressions that hold water after rainfalls dot Section 27. Two dry stream beds bisect the southern portion of the Section from the northwest to the southeast, outside the boundaries of the proposed facility (Figure 3-16). The US ACE has determined that these ephemeral surface waters are not jurisdictional wetlands (USACE, 2011).

The nearest surface waters flow through Monument Draw, which is an ephemeral stream that can have large flows (Leedshill-Herkenhoff, Inc. et al., 2000). The headwaters of Monument Draw's nearest tributary is approximately 4 km (2.5 mi) from the nearest Section boundary and the main reach is approximately 10 km (6 mi) from the nearest Section boundary. The nearest permanent lake is approximately 32 km (20 mi) southwest of the proposed IIFP site (Figure 3-17). The site is in an area classified as an undetermined risk for flooding (Zone D) by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (Figure 3-18) (eHow, undated). Properties in Zone D lie outside areas that are known floodplains, but may still flood.

Table 3-16. Summary of City of Hobbs Municipal Water System Groundwater Water Quality, 2005 – 2009

Parameter	MCL[a] (µg/L[b])	Number of Detections	Detected Concentrations (µg/L[b])		
			Minimum	Maximum	Average
1,2-Dichloroethane	5	3	0.47	0.61	0.52
Antimony, Total	6	4	0.09	0.13	0.11
Arsenic	10	13	6.5	8.1	7.29
Barium	2,000	13	43.51	89	69.77
Benzene	5	2	0.58	0.81	0.70
Beryllium, Total	4	1	0.25	0.25	0.25
Bromodichloromethane	100	3	0.08	0.3	0.16
Bromoform	100	4	0.092	12	6.43
Chloroform	100	4	0.057	0.24	0.13
Chromium	100	13	2.9	18.8	7.09
Combined Uranium	30	6	0.00321	0.00927	0.01
Dibromochloromethane	100	3	0.055	0.37	0.23
Dichloromethane	5	5	4.35	5.62	4.89
Ethylbenzene	700	1	0.50	0.50	0.50
Fluoride (mg/L)	4	13	0.719	1.13	0.91
Gross Beta Particle Activity (pCi/L)	4	6	2.869	7.305	4.33
Iron (mg/L)	0.3[c]	1	0.0134	0.0134	0.0134
Nickel	100	13	0.3	3.51	1.46
Nitrate (as N) (mg/L)	10	12	2.69	5.82	4.01
Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N) (mg/L)	10	30	2.7	6.97	4.24
pH (standard units)	6.5 to 8.5[c]	1	7.24	7.24	7.24
Radium-226 (pCi/L)	5	2	0.175	0.382	0.28
Radium-228 (pCi/L)	5	1	1.082	1.082	1.082
Selenium	50	13	0.00589	18	5.24
Total Haloacetic Acids)	60	11	1	105.3	14.01
Total Trihalomethanes	80	20	0.602	13.95	6.85
Thallium, Total	2	2	0.05	0.05	0.05
Xylenes, Total	10,000	6	0.7	2.05	1.37

Note: Includes water quality data for five ground storage reservoirs and Well 5, which pumps directly into the distribution system. Samples were collected after the raw water had been chlorinated.
Source: Stephens & Associates, 2009.
[a] Maximum contaminant level specified in EPA National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (40 CFR 141 (2010))
[b] Unless otherwise noted
[c] EPA National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations (40 CFR 143 (2010))
µg/L = micrograms per liter
MCL = maximum contaminant level
mg/L = milligrams per liter
pCi/L = picocuries per liter


6-Mile Radius
18
483
Section 27
238
529
62
62/180
8
Legend
Rivers, Streams, and Inland Waters
Lakes, Ponds, and Reservoirs
Section 27 of T018SR036E
6-Mile Radius of Section 27
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 0.5 1 2 3
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-16 Ephemeral Stream Map


769
457
Chaves
18
Yoakum
83
82
249
132
New Mexico
Texas
33
238
6-Mile Radius
483
18
Gaines
529
Lea
31.7 km
38.5 km
3.97 km
Tonto, Laguna
Plata, Laguna
Gatuna, Laguna
35.5 km
8
Monument Draw
176
207
Andrews
8
176
Eddy
Legend
Rivers, Streams, and Inland Waters
Lakes, Ponds, and Reservoirs
Section 27 of T018SR036E
6-Mile Radius of Section 27
County Boundary
State Boundary
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 2 4 8 12
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-17 Water Distances Map


18
483
238
529
62
62/180
Section 27
8
Legend
Section 27 of T018SR036E
Major Highways
Limited Access
Highway
Major Road
Urban Area
Flood Hazard
0.2 pct Annual Chance Flood Hazard
Zone A , AE, AO (100-yr flooding)
Zone D (undetermined_)
Zone X (500-yr Floodplain)
X Protected by Levee
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 0.5 1 2 3
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-18 FEMA Map

3.8 Ecological Resources

This section describes the ecological communities on the 259-ha (640-ac) proposed IIFP site, which includes the 16-ha (40-ac) proposed facility, and in the vicinity of the proposed site. It also discusses important species that occur or have the potential to occur on the site or in the vicinity, and habitats in the vicinity that are important to those species.

Surveys were conducted for IIFP for vegetation and wildlife, including the dunes sagebrush lizard (*Sceloporus arenicolus*) and the lesser prairie chicken (*Tympanuchus pallidicintus*), two Federal candidate species (GL Environmental, 2010c; GL Environmental, 2010d; SORA, 2011). The dunes sagebrush lizard's range encompasses the IIFP site and a BLM resource management plan has been proposed to preserve habitat for the lesser prairie-chicken and the dunes sagebrush lizard, roughly 11 km (7 mi) from the IIFP site, and create a travel corridor for the lesser prairie-chicken roughly 52 km (32 mi) from the site, as discussed in Section 3.8.6.3.

3.8.1 Ecosystems in the Proposed Facility

As described in Section 3.6.1, the site is on the Llano Estacado of the Southern High Plains physiographic region. The western portion of the Llano Estacado supports shortgrass prairie habitat, and the southern portion is transitional to the more arid Chihuahuan Desert. The site lies in a transitional zone between two distinct ecoregions: Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie and Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub (Figure 3-19) (USGS, 2010b).

3.8.1.1 Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie

Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie habitat covers approximately 55 percent of the proposed site. The short grasses that dominate the system are extremely drought- and grazing-tolerant. This ecosystem is characterized by blue grama grass (*Bouteloua gracilis*). Scattered shrub and dwarf-shrub species such as sand sagebrush (*Artemisia filifolia*), prairie sagewort (*Artemisia frigida*), little sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentate*), fourwing saltbush (Atriplex canescens), crispleaf buckwheat (*Eriogonum effusum*), broom snakeweed (*Gutierrezia sarothrae*), and pale desert-thorn (*Lycium pallidum*) may also be present. Climate, fire, and grazing maintain this system (NatureServe, 2009; USGS, 2010b).

3.8.1.2 Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub

Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub habitat covers approximately 45 percent of the proposed site. This ecosystem often occurs as invasive upland shrublands such as those that are concentrated in the foothills and piedmont of the Chihuahuan Desert (NatureServe, 2009). Vegetation is dominated typically by honey mesquite (*Prosopis glandulosa*) or velvet mesquite (*Prosopis velutina*) and succulents. Grass cover is typically low and composed of desert grasses such as low woollygrass (*Dasyochloa pulchella*), bush muhly (*Muhlenbergia porteri*), curlyleaf muhly (*Muhlenbergia setifolia*), and tobosagrass (*Pleuraphis mutica*) (NatureServe, 2009). During the last century, the area occupied by this ecosystem has increased through conversion of desert grasslands as a result of drought, overgrazing by livestock, and decreases in fire frequency (NatureServe, 2009; USGS, 2010b).


6-Mile Radius
Section 27
Legend
Section 27 of T018SR036E
6-Mile Radius of Section 27
Vegetation Communities
Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub
Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 0.5 1 2 3
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-19 Vegetation Communities Map

3.8.1.3 Wetland and Riparian Habitat

As described in Section 3.7.2, there are no wetlands or stream systems within the footprint of the proposed facility. Depressions that hold ephemeral water, which are located throughout Section 27, are important breeding and nursery sites for amphibians, and can be important stopovers for migrating waterfowl and shorebirds. Vegetated arroyos, such as the one running across the southern part of Section 27 (and outside the 16-ha [40-ac] facility footprint), serve as excellent wildlife corridors, and nesting habitat for birds (New Mexico Department of Game and Fish [NMGF] correspondence in Appendix B).

3.8.2 Vegetation of the Proposed Facility

Most of the plant species on the proposed facility are typical of Plains-Mesa Grassland and Desert Grassland communities (Dick-Peddie, 1993). These communities are characterized by significant amounts of grasses and less than 10 percent of total cover being forbs and shrubs (Dick-Peddie, 1993).

A vegetation survey was conducted by GL Environmental on behalf of IIFP at the proposed 16-ha (40-ac) facility on October 16, 2010 to determine total vegetative cover and relative cover (GL Environmental, 2010c). Total vegetative cover represents the percentage of ground that has living vegetation on it compared to bare ground or litter. Relative cover represents the fraction of total vegetative cover that is composed of a certain species or category of plants (e.g., perennial plants). Total vegetative cover is approximately 45 percent with 98 percent of this cover consisting of perennial grasses, including blue grama, burrograss (*Scleropogon bevifolius*), black grama (*Bouteloua eripoda*), and James Galleta grass (*Pleuraphis jamesii*). Shrubs included honey mesquite and hedgehog cactus (*Echinocereus* sp.). Forbs on the site included Texas croton (*Croton texensis*), Texas blueweed, (*Helianthus ciliaris*), and curly cup gumweed (*Grindelia squarrosa*) (GL Environmental, 2010c).

3.8.3 Wildlife that Could Occur on the Site and Proposed Facility

Wildlife that could occur on the IIFP site include species typical of arid grassland and desert habitats. Table 3-17 lists mammals, birds, amphibians, and reptiles that could be present on the site, based on habitat requirements, and presents information regarding their preferred habitats. The table was compiled from the lesser prairie-chicken survey (SORA, 2011) conducted by SORA on behalf of IIFP for the proposed site in April 2011 and surveys conducted in 2004 for the Louisiana Enrichment Services (LES) National Enrichment Facility, located approximately 33 km (20 mi) southeast of the proposed IIFP (NRC, 2005). Comparison with the LES site is appropriate because both facilities are in the transition zone from the shortgrass prairie to the Chihuahuan desert (USDA, 2004).

A diverse assemblage of animals, including several commercially and recreationally important game species are typical of this habitat. Pronghorn “antelope” (*Antilocapra americana*) and mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) are plentiful in eastern New Mexico (NMGF, 2009). NMGF has assigned sections of the State to specific Antelope Management Units in order to better manage pronghorn antelope populations. The proposed IIFP site is within Antelope Management Unit 26, one of several management units in southeastern New Mexico. An estimated 44 pronghorn were harvested from this Management Unit in 2007-2008 (NMGF, 2008a). The site is also a part of New Mexico Game Management Unit 31. Approximately 500 mule deer were harvested from Game Management Unit 31 in 2009 (NMGF, 2010a).

Table 3-17. Mammal, Bird, Amphibian, and Reptile Species Likely to be Present at the Proposed Site and Vicinity

Common Name	Scientific Name	
Mammals		**Preferred Habitat**
Black-tailed jackrabbit	*Lepus californicus*	Grasslands and open areas
Black-tailed prairie dog	*Cynomys ludovicianus*	Shortgrass prairie
Cactus mouse	*Peromyscus eremicus*	Grasslands, prairies, and mixed vegetation
Collared peccary	*Dicotyles tajacu*	Brushy, semi-desert, chaparral, mesquite, and oaks
Coyote	*Canis latrans*	Open space, grasslands, and brush country
Deer mouse	*Peromyscus maniculatus*	Grasslands, prairies, and mixed vegetation
Desert cottontail	*Sylvilagus audubonii*	Arid lowlands, brushy cover, and valleys
Mule deer	*Odocoileus hemionus hemionus*	Desert shrubs, chaparral, and rocky uplands
Ord's kangaroo rat	*Dipodomys ordii*	Hard desert soils
Plain's pocket gopher	*Geomys bursarius*	Deep soils of the plains
Pronghorn	*Antilocapra americana*	Sagebrush flats, plains, and deserts
Raccoon	*Procyon lotor*	Brushy, semi-desert, chaparral, and mesquite
Southern Plains woodrat	*Neotoma micropus*	Grasslands, prairies, and mixed vegetation
Spotted ground squirrel	*Spermophilus spilosoma*	Brushy, semi-desert, chaparral, mesquite, and oaks
Striped skunk	*Mephitis mephitis*	All land habitats
Swift fox	*Vulpes velox*	Rangeland with short grasses and low shrub density
White-throated woodrat	*Neotoma albigula*	Grasslands, prairies, and mixed vegetation
Yellow-faced pocket gopher	*Pappogeomys castanops*	Deep soils of the plains
Birds		**Seasonal Preference**
American kestrel	*Falco sparverius*	Year round
Ash-throated flycatcher	*Myiarchus cinerascens*	Spring
Bewick's wren	*Thyromanes bewickii*	Spring and summer
Black-chinned hummingbird	*Archilochus alexandri*	Spring
Blue grosbeak	*Guiraca caerulea*	Summer
Bullock's oriole	*Icterus bullockii*	Summer
Cassin's sparrow	*Aimophila cassinii*	Spring and Fall
Cactus wren	*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus*	Year round

Table 3-17. Mammal, Bird, and Amphibian, and Reptile Species Likely to be Present at the Proposed Site and Vicinity (Continued)

Common Name	Scientific Name	
Birds (Continued)		**Seasonal Preference**
Chihuahuan raven	*Corvus cryptoleucus*	Year round
Common raven	*Corvus corax*	Summer and winter
Crissal thrasher	*Toxostoma dorsale*	Migrant
Eastern meadowlark	*Sturnella magna*	Year round
European starling	*Sturnus vulgaris*	Year round
Gambel's quail	*Lophortyx gambelii*	Rare
Great-tailed grackle	*Quiscalus mexicanus*	Year round
Green-tailed towhee	*Pipilo chlorurus*	Migrant
Horned lark	*Eremophila alpestris*	Spring
House finch	*Carpodacus mexicanus*	Spring and summer
Killdeer	*Charadrius vociferus*	Spring and summer
Lark bunting	*Calamospiza melanocorys*	Winter
Lark sparrow	*Chondestes grammacus*	Spring and summer
Loggerhead shrike	*Lanius ludovicianus*	Summer
Long-eared owl	*Asio otus*	Summer and winter
Mallard	*Anas platrhynchos*	Spring
Mourning dove	*Zenaida macroura*	Spring and summer
Nighthawk	*Chordeiles minor*	Spring
Northern mockingbird	*Mimus polyglottos*	Summer
Northern bobwhite	*Colinus virginianus*	Spring
Pyrrhuloxia	*Cardinalis sinuatus*	Winter
Red-tailed hawk	*Buteo jamaicensis*	Winter
Red-winged blackbird	*Agelaius phoeniceus*	Year round
Roadrunner	*Geococcyx californianus*	Uncommon
Sage sparrow	*Amphispiza belli*	Uncommon
Say's phoebe	*Sayornis saya*	Spring
Scaled quail	*Callipepla squamata*	Spring and summer
Scissor-tailed flycatcher	*Tyrannus forficatus*	Migrant
Scott's oriole	*Icterus parisorum*	Summer and winter
Swainson's hawk	*Buteo swainsoni*	Summer
Turkey vulture	*Cathartes aura*	Summer
Vermillion flycatcher	*Pyrocephalus rubinus*	Winter and migrant
Vesper sparrow	*Pooecetes gramineus*	Spring
Western burrowing owl	*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*	Spring
Western kingbird	*Tyrannus verticalis*	Summer

Table 3-17. Mammal, Bird, and Amphibian, and Reptile Species Likely to be Present at the Proposed Site and Vicinity (Continued)

Common Name	Scientific Name	
Amphibians/Reptiles		**Preferred Habitat**
Coachwhip	*Masticophis flagellum*	Mixed grass prairie and desert grasslands
Collared lizard	*Crotaphytus collaris*	Desert grasslands
Eastern fence lizard	*Sceloporus undulates*	Mixed grass prairie and desert grasslands
Garter snake	*Thamnophis* sp.	Desert grasslands
Ground snake	*Sonora semiannulata*	Desert grasslands
Longnose leopard lizard	*Gambelia wislizenii*	Mixed grass prairie and desert grasslands
Lesser earless lizard	*Holbrookia maculata*	Mixed grass prairie and desert grasslands
Longnosed snake	*Rhinocheilus lecontei*	Desert grasslands
Ornate box turtle	*Terrapene ornate ornata*	Desert grasslands and shortgrass prairie
Pine-gopher snake	*Pituophis melanoleucus*	Shortgrass prairie and desert grasslands
Plains blackhead snake	*Tantilla nigriceps*	Shortgrass prairie and desert grasslands
Plains spadefoot toad	*Spea bombifrons*	Shallow to standing pools of water
Rattlesnakes	*Crotalus* sp.	Shortgrass prairie and desert grasslands
Six-lined racerunner	*Cnemidophorus sexlineatus*	Mixed grass prairie and desert grasslands
Tiger salamander	*Ambystoma tigrinum*	Tall-grass and mixed prairie
Texas horned lizard	*Phrynosoma cornutum*	Desert grasslands
Western whiptail lizard	*Cnemidophorus tigris*	Mixed grass prairie and desert grasslands

Source: NRC, 2005; USDA, 2004; eBird, 2011; SORA, 2011

Lea County also provides opportunities to hunt small birds, most notably scaled quail (*Callipepla squamata*) and Northern bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus*). Scaled quail occur primarily in semi-arid rangelands with mixed scrub communities (shrubs, grasses, and bare ground) (NMGF, 2008b). The vegetation on the proposed IIFP site provides habitat for scaled quail. Northern bobwhites also occur in southeastern New Mexico, including Lea County (NMGF, 2008b). Northern bobwhite habitat in New Mexico is characterized by large expanses of native warm-weather grasses mixed with annual weeds and legumes, with dense, brushy areas for escape cover and roosting (NMGF, 2008b). The near absence of dense thickets on the proposed IIFP site suggests that it offers only marginal Northern bobwhite habitat.

3.8.4 Wildlife Travel Corridors for Resident and Migratory Species

3.8.4.1 Migratory Species

Southeastern New Mexico, including Lea County, is within the Central Flyway, one of the four major North American bird migration corridors between nesting and wintering grounds (CFC, undated; TPWD, 2007). Birds of prey associated with the Central Flyway include the American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), ferruginous hawk (*Buteo regalis*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) and others. Waterfowl that use the Central Flyway to move between breeding areas in Canada and wintering areas in Texas and Mexico include the mallard (*Anas platrhynchos*), American widgeon (*Anas americana*), green-winged teal (*Anas crecca*) and others. Songbirds that migrate along the Central Flyway include the American goldfinch (*Spinus tristis*), Western kingbird (*Tyrannus verticalis*), lark bunting (*Calamospiza melanocorys*), vesper sparrow (*Pooecetes gramineus*) and others. Common shorebirds associated with the Central Flyway include the killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*), greater yellowlegs (*Tringa melanoleuca*), spotted sandpiper (*Actitis macularia*), least sandpiper (*Calidris minutilla*) and others (Stokes and Stokes, 1996). Depending on the availability of food and water that may be temporarily present in the depressions that dot Section 27 during seasonal migrations, migratory birds such as these could occasionally be present on or in the vicinity of the site.

3.8.4.2 Resident Species

Wildlife corridors are typically linear habitats that link larger habitats. They can serve a region (e.g., a river followed by migratory waterfowl), a landscape (e.g., a transmission corridor right-of-way that connects two natural areas), or a local site (e.g., a gully or strip of trees that deer use to move between bedding and feeding areas). There are no terrain features at the proposed IIFP site that would serve as wildlife corridors.

3.8.5 Critical Habitats

Under the *Endangered Species Act* "critical habitat" is defined as: (1) specific areas within the geographical area occupied by the [listed] species at the time of listing, if they contain physical or biological features essential to conservation, and those features may require special management considerations or protection; and (2) specific areas outside the geographical area occupied by the [listed] species if the agency determines that the area itself is essential for conservation.

The nearest critical habitat is the Pecos River, approximately 146 km (91 mi) northwest of the site, which supports the Pecos bluntnose shiner (*Notropis simus pecosensis*). This fish is listed as Federally threatened (USFWS, 2010a).

3.8.6 Wildlife Sanctuaries, Wildlife Management Areas, Refuges, and Preserves

Wildlife sanctuaries, management areas, refuges, and preserves are areas designated by the NM GF as open to wildlife-associated recreation activities beyond the traditional uses of hunting and fishing.

3.8.6.1 Green Meadow Lake

Green Meadow Lake is a New Mexico-designated Wildlife Area approximately 16 km (10 mi) northeast from the proposed site (NMGF, Undated 1). Migratory waterfowl using the Central Flyway may rest at the lake during migrations.

3.8.6.2 Prairie Chicken Wildlife Area

The New Mexico-designated Prairie Chicken Wildlife Area comprises parcels throughout southeastern New Mexico that provide habitat for the preservation and restoration of the lesser prairie-chicken (NMGF, Undated 2). The closest Prairie Chicken Wildlife Area is more than 80 km (50 mi) from the proposed site.

3.8.6.3 Lesser Prairie-Chicken Habitat Preservation Area of Critical Environmental Concern and Proposed Lesser Prairie-Chicken Expansion Corridor

In 2008, the BLM issued a Record of Decision (ROD) to implement a resource management plan (RMP) for all resources on approximately 343,983 surface ha (850,000 surface ac) of public land in parts of Chaves, Eddy, Lea, and Roosevelt Counties in southeastern New Mexico. To meet some of the objectives of this RMP, the BLM will establish a 23,472-ha (58,000-ac) Lesser Prairie-Chicken Habitat Preservation Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) to maintain and enhance habitat for the lesser prairie-chicken and the dunes sagebrush lizard. The entire RMP area lies west and south of the proposed facility location; the nearest part of the RMP area is approximately 11 km (7 mi) due south of the site (Figure 3-20) (BLM, 2008).

Additionally, the BLM has proposed a Lesser Prairie-Chicken Expansion Corridor in southeastern New Mexico in order to maintain a north-south travel way for lesser prairie-chickens. No final decision has been made about the corridor (BLM, 2010) which is 51.5 km (32 mi) from the proposed site at its nearest boundary (Figure 3-20).

The IIFP proposed site does not provide optimal habitat for the lesser prairie-chicken and is not included in the ACEC nor in the proposed corridor.

3.8.7 Special-Status Species

The *Endangered Species Act* defines an endangered species as any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range, and a threatened species as any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

According to the New Mexico Rare Plant Technical Council there are no special-status plant species in Lea County (NMRPTC, 1999).

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) maintains lists of endangered and threatened species, candidate species, and species of concern for Lea County (USFWS, 2010b; USFWS, 2010c). The Northern aplomado falcon (*Falco femoralis septentrionalis*), the black-footed ferret (*Mustela nigripes*), and the least tern (*Sterna antillarum athalassos*) are listed as Federally endangered species occurring in Lea County (USFWS, 2010b; NMGF, 2010b).

Candidate species are those that the USFWS has sufficient information to propose that they be added to the Federal list of threatened and endangered species, but the listing action has been precluded by other higher priority listing activities. Two candidate species are listed as potentially occurring in Lea County: the lesser prairie-chicken and the dunes sagebrush lizard. On December 14, 2010, the USFWS issued a proposal to list the dunes sagebrush lizard as a Federally endangered species (USFWS, 2010d). The USFWS also maintains a list of species of concern, however, these species are not protected by law. There are eight Federal species


172
18
457
249
83
82
238
483
132
18
51.7 km (32.1 mi)
62
11.8 km (7.4 mi)
11.4 km (7.1 mi)
360
62/180
31
8
62
176
207
31
8
Legend
Section 27
10-km (6-mi) Radius Sect. 27
Highway
Major Road
County Boundary
Prop. Lesser Prairie-Chicken Corridor
Dune Sagebrush Lizard Habitat
RMPA Boundary
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 2 4 8 12
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-20 Proposed Lesser Prairie-Chicken Corridor Map
Source: BLM, 2008, 2010.

of concern in Lea County: black-tailed prairie dog (*Cynomys ludovicianus)*, swift fox (*Vulpes velox)*, American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), arctic peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus tundrius*), Baird's sparrow (*Ammodramus bairdii*), Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii*), western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*), and the yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*) (USFWS, 2010b).

Based on the best available information, the swift fox and western burrowing owl could occur on or visit the proposed site. It is unlikely that the dunes sagebrush lizard (GL Environmental, 2010d) or the lesser prairie-chicken (SORA, 2011) would occur at the site. The black-tailed prairie dog has not been reported as occurring within Lea County; and the American peregrine falcon, arctic peregrine falcon, and Baird's sparrow have been reported only rarely or very rarely in Lea County. No preferred habitat for the Northern aplomado falcon, least tern, black-footed ferret, Bell's vireo, or yellow-billed cuckoo occurs on the proposed site.

Endangered, threatened, candidate species, and species of concern listed by the USFWS and the State of New Mexico for Lea County are described in the following sections and presented in Table 3-18.

Table 3-18. Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species Listed for Lea County, New Mexico

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status[a]	State Status[a]
Mammals			
Black-footed ferret	*Mustela nigripes*	E[2]	-
Black-tailed prairie dog	*Cynomys ludovicianus*	S[2]	-
Swift fox	*Vulpes velox*	S[1]	-
Birds			
American peregrine falcon	*Falco peregrinus anatum*	S[2]	T[1]
Arctic peregrine falcon	*Falco peregrinus tundrius*	S[2]	T[1]
Baird's sparrow	*Ammodramus bairdii*	S[2]	T[1]
Mammals			
Bald eagle	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*	-	T[1]
Bell's vireo	*Vireo bellii*	S[2]	T[1]
Broad-billed hummingbird	*Cynanthus latirostris magicus*	-	T[1]
Least tern[b]	*Sterna antillarum athalassos*	E[1]	E[1]
Lesser prairie-chicken	*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*	C[2]	-
Northern aplomado falcon	*Falco femoralis septentrionalis*	E[2]	E[1]
Western burrowing owl	*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*	S[2]	-
Yellow-billed cuckoo	*Coccyzus americanus*	S[2]	-
Amphibians/Reptiles			
Dunes sagebrush lizard	*Sceloporus arenicolus*	PE[3]	E[1]

Sources: [1] NMGF, 2010b; [2] USFWS, 2010b; [3] USFWS, 2010d

[a] C = Candidate, E = Endangered, T = Threatened, S = Species of Concern, PE = Proposed Endangered, , - = Not listed.

[b] The least tern is not listed by the USFWS as occurring in Lea County, however, it is listed by the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish as occurring in Lea County.

3.8.7.1 Federally Endangered Species

Northern Aplomado Falcon

The Northern aplomado falcon is listed as both a Federal and State endangered species. The preferred habitat in New Mexico for this species consists of open yucca desert land from the Rio Grande westward and north to Deming and Separ. The few nests known to occur in New Mexico were in areas of yucca grassland (USGS, 2005b; NMGF, 2010c). This habitat does not occur on the proposed site.

Black-Footed Ferret

The black-footed ferret is a Federally listed endangered species, but is not listed by the State of New Mexico. The historic range of the black-footed ferret included all of New Mexico; however, it was extirpated from most of its range, including New Mexico, by the 1960s. Black-footed ferrets are being reintroduced to their historic range, and the State of New Mexico has pursued reintroduction efforts (USFWS, 2008). The black-footed ferret is limited to open habitat, the same habitat used by prairie dogs: grasslands, steppe, and shrub steppe. The black-footed ferret has co-evolved with the prairie dog; their ranges and habitat closely overlap; however, the prairie dog has fewer protective regulations than the ferret (USFWS, 2008; USGS, 2005b). The preferred habitat does not occur on the proposed site.

Least Tern

The least tern is Federally listed as endangered and is also listed as endangered by the State of New Mexico. Its historic distribution was coincident with the major river systems of the Midwest as its habitat includes barren shorelines of lakes, rivers, and reservoirs (USGS, 2005b). The least tern has not been documented in Lea County, but has been reported as a migrant in Eddy County, just west of the proposed site, and has been documented breeding at Bitter Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Chaves County, approximately 161 km (100 mi) northwest of the proposed site (NMGF, 2010c; USGS, 2005b). No rivers, lakes, or reservoirs occur on the site; therefore, no habitat for this species is present on the proposed site.

3.8.7.2 Federally Proposed Endangered Species

Dunes Sagebrush Lizard

On December 14, 2010, the USFWS issued a proposal to modify the listing of the dunes sagebrush lizard from its current status as a Federal candidate species to that of endangered; this species is already listed as endangered by the State of New Mexico (USFWS, 2010c).

The range of the dunes sagebrush lizard within New Mexico appears to be confined to areas of active sand dunes vegetated by shinnery oak (*Quercus havardii*) in the extreme southeastern portion of the state and adjoining areas of Texas; although adjacent open habitats may be used in some places (NMGF, 2010c). The range stretches from eastern Chaves County, southernmost Roosevelt, and northernmost Lea Counties, southward and eastward into northeastern Eddy and south/central Lea counties. The closest part of the range lies 11.9 km (7.4 mi) south of the boundary of the facility site (Figure 3-20) (BLM, 2008; Center for Biological Diversity, 2002). Shinnery oak and sand dunes do not occur on the proposed IIFP site and; therefore, it is unlikely for the dunes sagebrush lizard to occur at the proposed site (GL Environmental, 2010d).

3.8.7.3 Federal Candidate Species

Lesser Prairie-Chicken

The lesser prairie-chicken is a candidate species for Federal protection due to habitat loss (USGS, 2005b). See Section 3.8.6.3 for a discussion on the BLM Lesser Prairie-Chicken ACEC and proposed Lesser Prairie-Chicken Expansion Corridor.

Lesser prairie-chickens are most common in dwarf shrub-mixed grass vegetation, interspersed with short-grass or mixed-grass habitats. They are also found in shinnery oak and bunch sumac and squaw bush (USGS, 2005b). Lea County is historically known to have habitat for lesser prairie-chickens, but the proposed site is at the southern periphery of their range (BLM, 2010; SORA, 2011). The IIFP site could provide suitable habitat for the lesser prairie-chicken, though there are limited water sources on the site (SORA, 2011).

3.8.7.4 Federal Species of Concern

American Peregrine Falcon

The American peregrine falcon is Federal species of concern and is listed as threatened by the State of New Mexico. It breeds in mountain areas and migrates essentially statewide; however, this species has only been reported rarely in Lea County (NMGF, 2010b).

Arctic Peregrine Falcon

The arctic peregrine falcon is a Federal species of concern and is listed as threatened by the State of New Mexico. This species is migratory and is found in a variety of habitats including forests, grasslands, and the Chihuahuan Desert Scrub (NMGF, 2010c). It is a very rare migrant through the State of New Mexico, but was reported in Lea County in 2007 (NMGF, 2010b).

Baird's Sparrow

The Baird's sparrow is a Federal species of concern and is listed as threatened by the State of New Mexico. Found in a variety of habitats ranging from desert grasslands to prairies and mountain meadows, the Baird's sparrow is a transient species in eastern and southern New Mexico and is considered rare to uncommon in Lea County (NMGF, 2010b).

Bell's Vireo

Bell's vireo is a Federal species of concern and is listed as threatened by the State of New Mexico. It winters south of the Mexican border and is a rare summer resident in Lea County (NMGF, 2010b). In New Mexico, this species occurs in riparian and wooded lowland habitats (NMGF, 2010c), none of which occur on the proposed site.

Black-Tailed Prairie Dog

The black-tailed prairie dog is a Federal species of concern, but it is not listed by the State of New Mexico. The black-tailed prairie dog commonly occurs in shortgrass prairie habitats (USGS, 2005b; NMGF, 2010c). However, it has not been reported in Lea County (NMGF, 2010b).

Swift Fox

The swift fox is a Federal species of concern, but it is not listed by the State of New Mexico. It is a year-round resident throughout the State, inhabiting shortgrass, midgrass and mixed prairies and adapting to overgrazed pastures, plowed fields, and fencerows (NMGF, 2010c).

Western Burrowing Owl

The Western burrowing owl is a Federal species of concern, but it is not listed by the State of New Mexico. Habitats include well-drained grasslands, prairies, steppes, deserts, and agricultural lands. The owls normally migrate south in late fall, but may not migrate if there are abandoned mammal burrows, which the owl uses for nests (NMGF, 2010c). This species has been reported only in the summer in Lea County; however, it has been documented as a year round resident in southern New Mexico (USGS, 2005b; NMGF, 2010c).

Yellow-Billed Cuckoo

The yellow-billed cuckoo population in eastern New Mexico is listed as a Federal species of concern, while the population in western New Mexico is a Federal candidate species; but it is not listed by the State of New Mexico. Yellow-billed cuckoos are often associated with riparian forests and deciduous woodlands (USGS, 2005b; NMGF, 2010c). They have been reported to occur in Lea County during the fall (USGS, 2005b; NMGF, 2010b).

3.8.7.5 New Mexico Threatened Species

Bald Eagle

The bald eagle was removed from the Federal endangered and threatened species list in 2007; however, it remains listed as threatened by the State of New Mexico and it still receives protection under the *Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act*, *Lacey Act*, and *Migratory Bird Treaty Act*. It is a rare visitor to Lea County (NMGF, 2010b).

Broad-billed Hummingbird

The broad-billed hummingbird is listed as a threatened species by the State of New Mexico. It is rare in Eddy County (adjacent to Lea County) and is not known to occur in Lea County. It is usually associated with riparian woodlands (NMGF, 2010c), none of which occur on the proposed site.

3.9 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice

This section describes the socioeconomic resources that have the potential to be affected by the construction and operation, and decommissioning of the IIFP facility at a rural site near Hobbs, New Mexico. The section is divided into six major subsections: (1) demography, including minority and low-income populations (environmental justice); (2) employment and income; (3) taxes; (4) housing; (5) public utilities; and (6) public services. These subsections include discussions of spatial (e.g., regional, vicinity, and site) and temporal (e.g., 10-year increments of population growth) considerations, where appropriate. Supporting analyses are provided in Appendix D – Socioeconomics.

NRC staff collected and analyzed regional socioeconomic data, including the commuting points of origin and destination of all workers among Lea County and its neighboring counties, to determine the appropriate socioeconomic ROI.

The NRC staff considered counties with their land area mostly within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the site, or with a small portion of the area within the 80-km (50-mi) radius, but with a large population center within the 80-km (50-mi) radius, which was assumed to be a reasonable commuting distance. Two counties in New Mexico and three counties in Texas have these characteristics: Lea County and Eddy Counties, in New Mexico, and Andrews, Gaines, and Yoakum Counties, in Texas.

Commuting patterns of working residents in Lea County demonstrate a preference for a work site in Lea County, and residents of the surrounding counties have demonstrated a reluctance to drive to a worksite in Lea County. However, Carlsbad and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant are in Eddy County, approximately 80 km (50 mi) from the proposed site, and some residents with the appropriate skill set for the IIFP facility may commute to the proposed IIFP facility. Despite the limited employment opportunities in Andrews, Gaines, and Yoakum Counties, few residents of those counties work in Lea County, even with its larger employment base. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that most of the IIFP workforce will come from Lea or Eddy Counties.

Changes in population are the key driver of impacts to socioeconomics. Therefore, the proposed action has the potential to impact socioeconomics (employment, population, income, housing, infrastructure, and community services) within Lea and Eddy Counties, because those are the counties most likely to incur population increases due to the proposed action, and it is unlikely to affect socioeconomic variables in the Texas counties.

Based on this analysis, NRC staff assumes that the socioeconomic ROI for this project is Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico. The majority of the socioeconomic impacts would be expected to occur in Lea County because the proposed IIFP site is in Lea County, and because of Lea County's population characteristics, commuting patterns, and amenities. See Figure 3-21 for the counties and major populated areas within the ROI.

3.9.1 Demography

3.9.1.1 Populations within the Socioeconomic ROI

The socioeconomic ROI comprises Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico. The proposed IIFP site would be in unincorporated Lea County, New Mexico. The nearest population center, Hobbs, is approximately 22.5 km (14 miles) east of the proposed site. The nearest residence is approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi) northwest of the proposed site (Figure 3-2).

Table 3-19 lists selected population characteristics of the counties in the ROI, and for comparison, New Mexico. Population characteristics, including race, ethnicity, and population density of the counties in the ROI broadly reflect those same characteristics in New Mexico. The ROI 2009 estimated population of 112,938 is about 5.6 percent of the 2009 estimated New Mexico population (Table 3-19). The racial and Hispanic demographics of the ROI residents generally reflect the racial and Hispanic demographics of residents in New Mexico as a whole. However, the ROI has a noticeably greater percentage than the state of persons who identified themselves as of the white race and a markedly smaller percentage of persons who identified themselves as "American Indian and Alaskan Native." Both ROI counties are sparsely populated, as is New Mexico. New Mexico's average density is 15 persons per square mile,



FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-21 Region of Influence Map

Table 3-19. Select Population Characteristics of Counties within the ROI and the State of New Mexico

	New Mexico	Lea County	Eddy County
Population, 2009 estimate[a]	2,009,671	60,232	52,706
White, percent	83.6	90.5	93.5
Black, percent	3.1	5.8	2.5
American Indian and Alaskan Native, percent	9.7	1.4	1.6
Asian, percent	1.5	0.7	0.8
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, percent	0.2	0.1	0.2
Two or more races, percent	1.9	1.5	1.4
Hispanic or Latino Origin, percent[b]	45.6	49.6	43.4
Average Family Size, 2008[c]	3.23	2.93	3.04
Land Area, 2000, square mile[a]	121,356	4,393	4,182
Persons per square mile, 2000[a]	15.0	12.6	12.4

Source:
[a] USCB, 2010a
[b] Hispanics may be of any race, so are also included in applicable race categories
[c] USCB, 2010b

and Lea and Eddy counties' densities are between 12 and 13 persons per square mile. The average density in the United States is about 80 persons per square mile (USCB, 2010a). The average family size in Lea County (2.93 people) and in Eddy County (3.04 people) is smaller than the average family size in New Mexico (3.23 people) (USCB, 2010b).

Table 3-20 provides 2009 estimated population information for Lea and Eddy Counties and their incorporated municipalities. In 2009, the population of Lea County was estimated to be 60,232 (USCB, 2010c). Slightly more than half of the county's population resides in Hobbs, the largest municipality in the county (USCB, 2010d). Hobbs is the largest city in southeastern New Mexico and serves as a commercial center for the population within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the proposed site. The Lea County seat, Lovington, had an estimated 2009 population of 10,108 (USCB, 2010d). Other incorporated communities in the county include Eunice, Jal, and Tatum.

Tables 3-21 and 3-22 provide historic populations, population estimates, and population projection data, including average annual growth rates, for the counties in the ROI, and for comparison, New Mexico. Historically, the population growth rates in the ROI counties have generally lagged the population growth rate of New Mexico. The projected population growth rates for the counties also lag the projected growth rates for the state.

In 2009, the Eddy County population was estimated to be 52,706 (USCB, 2010a). Carlsbad, the county seat, is the largest city in the county with approximately half of the county population (USCB, 2010d). Northeastern sections of Carlsbad are within 80 km (50-mi) of the proposed site (Figure 3-1) but most of the town is just outside the 80-km (50-mi) radius. Other incorporated communities in Eddy County include Artesia, Hope, and Loving.

Table 3-20. Population Estimates of ROI Counties and Incorporated Municipalities, 2009

Political Jurisdiction	2009 Estimated Population	Percent of County Population
Lea County[a]	60,232	--
Eunice[b]	2,809	4.7
Hobbs[b]	30,838	51.2
Jal[b]	2,074	3.4
Lovington[b]	10,108	16.8
Tatum[b]	767	1.3
Eddy County[a]	52,706	--
Artesia[b]	11,338	21.5
Carlsbad[b]	26,259	49.8
Hope[b]	109	0.2
Loving[b]	1,366	2.6

Source:
[a] USCB, 2010c
[b] USCB, 2010d

Table 3-21. Historic Population in the ROI, 1990 to 2009

Political Jurisdiction	1990[a]	2000[b]	2009[b]
New Mexico	1,515,069	1,819,046	2,009,671
Lea County	55,765	55,511	60,232
Eddy County	48,605	51,658	52,706
Average Annual Growth Rate			
Political Jurisdiction		**1990 to 2000[a,b]**	**2000 to 2009[b]**
New Mexico		1.85%	1.11%
Lea County		-0.05%	0.91%
Eddy County		0.61%	0.22%

Source:
[a] USCB, 2000b
[b] USCB, 2010c

Table 3-22. Projected Population in the ROI, 2005 to 2035

Political Jurisdiction	2005[a]	2010[a]	2020[a]	2030[a]	2035[a]
New Mexico	1,969,292	2,162,331	2,540,145	2,864,796	3,018,289
Lea County	57,006	60,896	67,479	72,928	75,716
Eddy County	52,167	54,145	58,294	60,764	61,605
Average Annual Growth Rate					
Area		**2005 to 2010**	**2010 to 2020**	**2020 to 2030**	**2030 to 2035**
New Mexico		1.89%	1.62%	1.21%	1.05%
Lea County		1.33%	1.03%	0.78%	0.75%
Eddy County		0.75%	0.74%	0.42%	0.28%

Source: BBER, 2008
[a] Population projections are built on slightly different base year numbers than those presented in Table 3-22.

3.9.1.2 Environmental Justice: Minority and Low Income Populations

3.9.1.2.1 Methodology

On February 11, 1994, the President signed Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations,” which directs all Federal agencies to develop strategies that consider environmental justice in their programs, policies, and activities. Environmental justice is described in the Executive Order as “identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.” On December 10, 1997, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued Environmental Justice Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act (CEQ, 1997). The NRC has provided general guidelines on the evaluation of environmental analyses in Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with NMSS [Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards] Programs (NUREG-1748) (NRC, 2003), and issued a final policy statement on the Treatment of Environmental Justice Matters in NRC Regulatory and Licensing Actions (69 FR 52040) and environmental justice procedures to be followed in NEPA documents prepared by the NRC’s Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS).

NRC’s NMSS environmental justice guidance, as found in Appendix C to NUREG-1748 (NRC, 2003), recommends that the area for assessment for a facility in a rural area be a circle with a radius of approximately 6.4 km (4 mi) whose centroid is the facility being considered. However, the guidance also states that the scale should be commensurate with the potential impact area. Therefore to ensure consistency with the accident analysis, which considers airborne impacts to populations within an 80-km (50-mi) radius, the NRC staff concludes that an environmental justice assessment area with an 80-km (50-mi) radius would be appropriate. As such, New Mexico and Texas and each county with some land area within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the proposed IIFP site (i.e., centroid of Section 27) are appropriate areas for comparative analysis.

A minority or low-income community may be considered as either a population of individuals living in geographic proximity to one another or a dispersed/transient population of individuals (e.g., migrant workers) where either type of group experiences common conditions of environmental exposure (NRC, 2003). NUREG-1748 defines minority categories as: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, African American (not of Hispanic or Latino origin), some other race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity (of any race) (NRC, 2003). The 2000 Census introduced a multiracial category. Anyone who identifies themselves as white and a minority is counted as that minority group. Individuals that identify themselves as more than one minority are counted in a "two or more races" group (NRC, 2003). Low-income is defined as being below the poverty level as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau (NRC, 2003).

The NRC-recommended area for evaluating census data is the census block group, which is delineated by the United States Census Bureau and is the smallest area unit for which race and poverty data are available (NRC, 2003). The NRC staff used ESRI ArcGIS® 9.3 software which accessed the 2000 decennial census, to identify block groups with low-income or minority populations within 80 km (50 mi) of the proposed IIFP site. NRC staff included a block group if any part of its fell within 80 km (50 mi) of the proposed site; 96 block groups were identified as being within, or partially within the 80-km (50-mi) radius.

NRC guidance indicates that a significant minority or low-income population exists if at least one of these conditions exists:

The minority or low-income population of the block group is more than 50 percent of the entire block group population.

The minority or low-income population percentage of the block group is significantly greater (typically at least 20 percentage points) than the minority or low-income population percentage in the geographic areas chosen for comparative analysis.

3.9.1.2.2 Minority Populations

Using the U.S. Census Bureau (USCB) 2000 census data, NRC staff calculated (1) the percentage of each block group's population represented by each minority category for each of the 96 block groups within the 80 km (50-mi) radius, (2) the percentage that each minority category represented of the entire populations of New Mexico and Texas and (3) the percentage that each minority category represented of each of the counties that has some land within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the proposed site. If the percentage of any minority in any block group exceeded 50 percent of the block group's total population or exceeded the minority's corresponding county or state percentages by more than 20 percent, then that block group was identified as having a significant minority population.

Table 3-23 identifies the number of block groups that met the 50 percent criterion or the more-than-20-percent criterion (some block groups may meet both criteria) for their corresponding state and/or county. If a block group met one or both of the criterion for either the state or the county, it was not double-counted. Of the 96 census block groups within the 80-km (50-mi) radius, 16 have a significant percentage of minority residents. Thirty-two block groups have a significant percentage of Hispanic ethnicity residents. Figures 3-22 through 3-24 provide graphical representations of the data presented in Table 3-23.

Seasonal agricultural (migrant) workers may make up a portion of the minority population within the 80-km (50-mi) radius. Although migrant worker population counts are not available from the USCB, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has collected information on farms that employ migrant labor. The number of farms that employ migrant laborers in each county which falls wholly or partially within the 80-km (50-mi) radius are: in New Mexico Lea County (9), Eddy County (12), and Chaves County (19) and in Texas Loving County (1), Winkler County (2), Andrews County (2), Gaines County (27), Yoakum County (9), Terry County (26), and Cochran County (15) (USDA, 2007). The number of these farms which fall wholly or partially within the 80-km (50-mi) radius is not known.

There are no Federally recognized Native American reservations within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the proposed IIFP site (NPS, Undated).

3.9.1.2.3 Low-Income Populations

The NRC guidance defines low-income households based on statistical poverty thresholds (NRC, 2003).

Using the USCB 2000 census data, NRC staff calculated the percentage of each block group's population represented by low-income households for each of the 96 block groups within the 80 km (50-mi) radius, and the percentage of low-income households in New Mexico and Texas and in each of the counties that had some land within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the site. If the percentage of any low-income block group exceeded 50 percent of the block group's total population or exceeded the corresponding county or State low-income percentages by more


Cochran
Hockley
Chaves
Terry
Yoakum
Lovington
Denver City
Hobbs
Seminole
Gaines
Eddy
Eunice
Carlsbad
Lea
Andrews
Ector
Loving
Winkler
Culberson
New Mexico
Texas
Odessa
Legend
Section 27 T018SR036E Centroid
50-Mile Radius
Significant Block Group
State Boundary
County Boundary
Urban Area
Major Highways
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 2.5 5 10 15
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-22 African American Map



FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-23 Some Other Race Map


Cochran
Hockley
Chaves
Terry
Yoakum
Lovington
Denver City
Hobbs
Seminole
Gaines
Eddy
Eunice
Carlsbad
Lea
Andrews
New Mexico
Texas
Loving
Winkler
Ector
Culberson
Odessa
Legend
Section 27 T018SR036E Centroid
50-Mile Radius
Significant Block Group
State Boundary
County Boundary
Urban Area
Major Highways
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 2.5 5 10 15
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-24 Hispanic Ethnicity Map

Table 3-23. Block Groups within 80 km (50 mi) of the Proposed IIFP Site with Significant Minority or Low-Income Populations (Meeting 50 Percent Criteria or Exceeding Respective County or State Percentages by 20 Percent)

County Name	Number of Block Groups	African American	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic Ethnicity	Low-Income Households
Chaves	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Eddy	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Lea	64	1	0	0	0	14	0	24	10
Andrews	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cochran	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gaines	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Loving	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terry	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winkler	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yoakum	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0
Total	96	1	0	0	0	15	0	32	10

State/County	African American (%)	American Indian or Alaskan Native (%)	Asian (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (%)	Some Other Race (%)	Two or More Races (%)	Hispanic Ethnicity (%)	Low-Income Households (%)
New Mexico (State)	1.89	9.54	1.06	0.08	17.04	3.65	42.08	16.78
Chaves County	1.97	1.13	0.53	0.06	21.25	3.12	43.83	19.12
Eddy County	1.56	1.25	0.45	0.09	17.67	2.64	38.76	16.72
Lea County	4.37	0.99	0.39	0.04	23.81	3.27	39.65	19.90
Texas (State)	11.53	0.57	2.70	0.07	11.69	2.47	31.99	13.98
Andrews County	1.65	0.88	0.71	0.02	16.79	2.87	40.00	16.74
Cochran County	4.53	0.83	0.21	0.05	27.35	2.55	44.13	21.67
Gaines County	2.28	0.76	0.15	0.01	14.17	2.35	35.77	19.08
Loving County	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.96	1.49	10.45	0.00
Terry County	5.00	0.53	0.22	0.02	14.28	3.40	44.09	20.53
Winkler County	1.85	0.45	0.20	0.00	20.35	2.34	44.00	18.58
Yoakum County	1.39	0.71	0.12	0.01	25.48	1.65	45.93	18.20

Source: USCB, 2000a; USCB, 2000b; USCB, 2000c; USCB, 2000d; USCB, 2000e; USCB, 2000f;

than 20 percent, then that block group was identified as having a significant low-income population. Again, if the block group met one or both criteria, for either the state or county, it was not double-counted.

Table 3-23 lists the number of block groups in each county within the 80-km (50-mi) radius that meets the 50 percent criterion or the more than 20 percent criterion for its corresponding State or county. Ten census block groups within the 80-km (50-mi) radius have a significant percentage of low-income households. Figure 3-25 locates the low-income block groups.



FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-25 Low-Income Household Map

3.9.2 Employment and Income

3.9.2.1 Employment

Table 3-24 summarizes employment trends in the ROI from 2001 to 2008. From 2001 to 2008, growth in employment in the ROI was greater than population growth. The number of jobs in the ROI grew from 54,649 (29,463 for Lea County plus 25,186 for Eddy County) in 2001(BEA, 2011a; BEA, 2011b) to 68,314 in 2008 (BEA, 2010), an increase of 25 percent. The ROI population increased from 105,562 to 110,903 (59,129 for Lea County plus 51,774 for Eddy County) (USCB, 2010c), an increase of 5 percent. Within the ROI, 2008 employment was dominated by jobs in mining (20.6 percent), government and government enterprises (10.4 percent), retail trade (10.1 percent), and construction (8.3 percent). With the exception of employment in farming, a sector that represents less than 0.5 percent of all jobs in the ROI, the number of jobs in all industrial sectors grew from 2001 to 2008 (BEA, 2010). A major employer in the ROI is the DOE's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, in Eddy County. Nearly 600 individuals are employed at the facility (ECP, 2008). From 2001 to 2008, the ROI unemployment rate decreased from 4.6 to 3.0 percent. However, from 2008 to June of 2010, the rate increased from 3.0 to 7.0 percent.

Table 3-25 presents information about labor statistics in the ROI, and for comparison, New Mexico. The size of the ROI labor force grew from 47,199 to 57,708 (22.3 percent) between 2001 and 2008, but shrank in 2009 to 57,590 and declined again in 2010, to 56,945 (BLS, 2010a). The unemployment rate in the ROI has consistently remained below the unemployment rate in the State. As a point of comparison, the unemployment rate in the United States in June 2010 was 9.6 percent (BLS, 2010b).

3.9.2.2 Income

Table 3-26 presents income statistics for the ROI counties, their major population centers, and New Mexico. In 2008, various measures of income in Eddy County were higher and the rates of poverty in Eddy County lower than in New Mexico. With the exception of median household income, the various measures of income in Lea County were lower and the rates of poverty higher in Lea County than in New Mexico. In 2008, the poverty threshold ranged from $10,326 to $47,915, depending on family characteristics. Families and individuals residing in Lea County were more likely to be living below the poverty level than those living in Eddy County.

3.9.3 Taxes

3.9.3.1 Income Taxes

Corporate Income Taxes

New Mexico imposes a corporate income tax on the total net income (including New Mexico and non-New Mexico income) of every domestic and foreign corporation doing business in or from the State, or which has income from property or employment within the State. The percentage of New Mexico income is then applied to the gross tax. For corporations with a total net income exceeding $1,000,000 annually, corporate income tax is $56,000 plus 7.6 percent of net income over $1,000,000 (NMTRD, 2010a).

New Mexico also levies a corporate franchise tax of $50 per year (NMTRD, 2010a).

Table 3-24. Employment in ROI, by Industry, 2001 to 2008

	Lea County 2001[a]	Lea County 2008[b]	Lea County, Percent Change, 2001 to 2008	Eddy County 2001[c]	Eddy County 2008[b]	Eddy County, Percent Change, 2001 to 2008	ROI Jobs 2008	ROI, Percent Change in Jobs, 2001 to 2008
Total Employment	29,463	37,622	27.7%	25,186	30,692	21.9%	68,314	25.0%
Farm Employment	1,026	725	-29.3%	975	798	-18.2%	1,523	-23.9%
Nonfarm Employment	28,437	36,897	29.7%	24,211	29,894	23.5%	66,791	26.9%
Private Employment	24,622	33,176	34.7%	20,604	26,007	26.2%	59,183	30.9%
Forestry, fishing, and related activities	108	101	-6.5%	163	177	8.6%	278	2.6%
Mining	5,484	8,339	52.1%	3,042	4,585	50.7%	12,924	51.6%
Utilities	247	489	98.0%	134	145	8.2%	634	66.4%
Construction	2,131	3,460	62.4%	1,506	2,597	72.4%	6,057	66.5%
Manufacturing	428	805	88.1%	897	922	2.8%	1,727	30.3%
Wholesale Trade	1,199	1,255	4.7%	555	669	20.5%	1,924	9.7%
Retail Trade	3,371	3,393	0.7%	2,972	3,126	5.2%	6,519	2.8%
Transportation and Warehousing	996	1,588	59.4%	972	1,097	12.9%	2,685	36.4%
Information	251	382	52.2%	345	309	-10.4%	691	15.9%
Finance and Insurance	722	879	21.7%	701	909	29.7%	1,788	25.7%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	779	1,130	45.1%	645	890	38.0%	2,020	41.9%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	603	1,019	69.0%	715	1,315	83.9%	2,334	77.1%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	121	137	13.2%	54	219	305.6%	356	103.4%
Administrative and Waste Services	1,446	2,039	41.0%	1,563	1,924	23.1%	3,963	31.7%
Educational Services	(D)	(D)	NA	97	118	21.6%	NA	NA
Health Care and Social Assistance	(D)	(D)	NA	2,450	2,835	15.7%	NA	NA

Table 3-24. Employment in ROI, by Industry, 2001 to 2008 (Continued)

	Lea County 2001[a]	Lea County 2008[b]	Lea County, Percent Change, 2001 to 2008	Eddy County 2001[c]	Eddy County 2008[b]	Eddy County, Percent Change, 2001 to 2008	ROI Jobs 2008	ROI, Percent Change in Jobs, 2001 to 2008
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	219	605	176.3%	208	207	-0.5%	812	90.2%
Accommodation and Food Services	1,685	2,200	30.6%	1,898	2,175	14.6%	4,375	22.1%
Other Services, except Public Administration	1,652	1,921	16.3%	1,687	1,788	6.0%	3,709	11.1%
Government and Government Enterprises	3,815	3,721	-2.5%	3,607	3,887	7.8%	7,608	2.5%
Federal, Civilian	119	105	-11.8%	488	764	56.6%	869	43.2%
Military	178	160	-10.1%	165	139	-15.8%	299	-12.8%
State and Local	3,518	3,456	-1.8%	2,954	2,984	1.0%	6,440	-0.5%
State Government	286	289	1.0%	741	750	1.2%	1,039	1.2%
Local Government	3,232	3,167	-2.0%	2,213	2,234	0.9%	5,401	-0.8%

Source:
[a] BEA, 2010
[b] BEA, 2011b
[c] BEA, 2011a
NA Not Applicable
(D) Information not shown (by BEA) to avoid disclosure of confidential information, but estimates for this item are included in the totals

Table 3-25. Labor Statistics, ROI and New Mexico, 2001 to 2010

	Lea County	Eddy County	ROI	New Mexico
2001 (annualized) Labor Force	23,702	23,497	47,199	863,682
2008 (annualized) Labor Force	29,895	27,813	57,708	961,259
2009 (annualized) Labor Force	28,890	28,700	57,590	955,904
2010 (June) Labor Force	28,103	28,842	56,945	962,423
Percent Change 2001 to 2008	26.1%	18.4%	22.3%	11.3%
Percent Change, 2001 to 2010	18.6%	22.7%	20.6%	11.4%
2001 Unemployment Rate	4.3%	5.0%	4.6%	4.9%
2008 Unemployment Rate	2.9%	3.1%	3.0%	4.5%
2009 Unemployment Rate	7.6%	5.5%	6.6%	7.2%
June, 2010 Unemployment Rate	8.0%	6.1%	7.0%	8.5%

Source: BLS, 2010a

Table 3-26. Income Statistics, ROI Counties and Population Centers, and New Mexico, 2008[a]

	Lea County	Eddy County	New Mexico
Median Household Income	$43,638	$45,858	$43,202
Median Family Income	$47,853	$57,658	$51,724
Per Capita Income	$20,319	$25,151	$22,781
Families below Poverty level, percent	15.7	10.2	13.7
Individuals below Poverty Level, percent	18.9	14.4	17.9

Source: USCB, 2010b

[a] All dollar values are expressed in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars

Individual Income Taxes

New Mexico imposes an individual income tax on the net income of every resident and nonresident employed or engaged in business in or from the State or deriving any income from any property or employment within the State. The rates vary depending upon filing status and income.

The top tax bracket is 4.9 percent (NMTRD, 2010b).

3.9.3.2 Sales Tax/Gross Receipts Tax

New Mexico is one of a minority of states that has a gross receipts tax structure instead of a sales tax structure. Gross receipts are the total amount of money or value of other considerations received from (NMTRD, 2011):

- Selling property in New Mexico
- Leasing or licensing property used in New Mexico
- Granting a right to use a franchise used in New Mexico

- Performing services in New Mexico

- Selling research and development services performed outside New Mexico, the product of which is initially used in New Mexico

Although the gross receipts tax is imposed on businesses, it is common for a business to pass the gross receipts tax on to the purchaser either by separately stating it on the invoice or by combining the tax with the selling price (NMTRD, 2011).

The gross receipts tax rate varies throughout the state from 5.125 percent to 8.6875 percent, depending on the location of the business. It varies because the total rate combines rates imposed by the state, counties, and, if applicable, municipalities where the businesses are located. The business pays the total gross receipts tax to the state, which then distributes the counties' and municipalities' portions to them (NMTRD, 2011).

The current gross receipts taxes in Lea and Eddy Counties are presented in Table 3-27.

Table 3-27. Gross Receipts Tax Rates in the ROI, as of July, 2010

Lea County	Rates[a]	Eddy County	Rates
Eunice	**6.8125%**	**Artesia**	**7.1875%**
Hobbs	**6.8125%**	**Carlsbad**	**7.4375%**
Jal	**6.8125%**	**Hope**	**6.6250%**
Lovington	**6.8750%**	**Loving**	**6.8125%**
Lovington Industrial Park	**5.5%**	**Remainder of County**	**5.75%**
Tatum	**6.8125%**	**--**	**--**
Remainder of County	**5.5%**	**--**	**--**

Source: NMTRD, 2011
[a] Rates include State, county, and municipal gross receipts taxes, combined

3.9.3.3 Property Taxes

Four governmental entities in New Mexico are authorized to tax: the state, counties, municipalities, and school districts (NRC, 2005). Property assessment rates are 33.3 percent of appraised values (NRC, 2005; Eddy County, 2007). The tax applied to the assessed property value is a combination of state, county, municipal, and school district levies (NRC, 2005). The Lea County tax rate for nonresidential property outside the city limits of Hobbs is $24.949 per $1,000 of net taxable value of a property (Lea County, 2009). Rates for nonresidential properties are higher within the city limits of Hobbs. Residential property tax rates are lower for properties outside of Hobbs, and higher for those within Hobbs.

New Mexico and its local governments offer industrial revenue bonds (IRBs) as a way to encourage company relocations and expansions that provide jobs and economic opportunities for residents and communities. IRBs allow projects to qualify for certain tax incentives, including a property tax exemption on most real and personal property constituting a project's property, and possible exemptions from gross receipts tax and use tax related to the acquisition of equipment and other personal property for use in the business to be conducted at the project (City of Albuquerque, 2011). International Isotopes, the parent corporation of IIFP, has an IRB agreement with Lea County, New Mexico (IIFP, 2011). As a result, IIFP is generally exempt from property taxes. However, the school district and the New Mexico Junior College are not

part of this IRB agreement. Table 3-28 contains annual property tax revenue data for the local entities that would have the authority to levy a property tax on the proposed IIFP facilities.

Table 3-28. IIFP Annual Property Tax Information

Property Taxing Entity	Total Annual Tax Revenues	Estimated IIFP Facility in Lieu of Property Tax Payment	IIFP Facility Estimated in Lieu of Property Tax Payment as Percent of Total Annual Tax Revenues
Hobbs Municipal School District	$71,126,000[a]	$78,300 - $123,300	<1%
New Mexico Junior College	$37,201,924[b]	$139,200 - $219,200	<1%

Sources:
[a] NCES, 2008
[b] NCES, 2009

3.9.4 Housing

Table 3-29 summarizes housing data for Lea County, Eddy County and the largest city within each county, Hobbs and Carlsbad, respectively. A variety of types, prices, and settings comprise the housing inventory in the socioeconomic ROI. In 2008 there were 46,971 housing units in Lea and Eddy Counties (USCB, 2010b). The two largest population centers in the counties, Hobbs and Carlsbad, had approximately half of the total ROI housing inventory (USCB, 2010b). Within the ROI, approximately 12.4 percent (5,823 units) of the units were vacant (USCB, 2010b). Of the 41,148 occupied units, 29,021 were owner-occupied (70.5 percent) and 12,127 (29.5 percent) were renter-occupied (USCB, 2010c). The median value of an owner-occupied unit was $82,200 in Lea County and $85,600 in Eddy County (USCB, 2010b). For comparison, the median value of an owner-occupied house in New Mexico was $154,900 in 2008 (USCB, 2010b).

In 2008, the median monthly rent was $661 in New Mexico and slightly less in both Lea and Eddy Counties (USCB, 2010b). Mobile homes accounted for 16.9 percent of the housing in Lea County and 14.0 percent of the housing in Eddy County (USCB, 2010e). Mobile homes made up 16.7 percent of the housing inventory in New Mexico (USCB, 2010e). The housing inventory in the ROI grew by 1.1 percent from 2008 to 2009, while the growth in the ROI's population was 0.2 percent (USCB, 2010a; USCB, 2010d).

Table 3-29. Housing Characteristics in ROI Counties and Population Centers, 2008

County/ Population Center	Housing Units 2008[a]	Occupied Units, 2008[a]	Owner-Occupied Units, 2008[a]	Renter-occupied, 2008[a]	Vacant Housing Units, 2008[a]	Percent Units Vacant of All Units, 2008[a]	Mobile Homes, 2008[b]
Lea County	24,495	21,653	14,912	6,741	2,842	11.6%	4,134
Hobbs	12,299	10,854	6,998	3,856	1,445	11.7%	1,201
Eddy County	22,476	19,495	14,109	5,386	2,981	13.3%	3,142
Carlsbad	11,565	10,073	6,954	3,119	1,492	12.9%	556
ROI Total	46,971	41,148	29,021	12,127	5,823	12.4%	7,276

Source:
[a] USCB, 2010b
[b] USCB, 2010f

3.9.5 Public Utilities

3.9.5.1 Major Public Water Suppliers

EPA lists two major public water suppliers in Lea County and three major public water suppliers in Eddy County (EPA, 2010b). Major public water systems are those that serve more than 3,300 people. Table 3-30 presents water production and use statistics for these suppliers. Most of the major water suppliers in the ROI have excess capacity.

Table 3-30. Major Public Water Suppliers in ROI, 2007 – 2009

Water System Name[a]	County Served[a]	Population Served[a]	Primary Water Source Type[a]	Average Daily Use (MGD)[b]	Maximum Capacity (MGD)[b]
Hobbs Municipal Water Supply	Lea	33,000	Groundwater	7.0	N/A
Lovington Municipal Water Supply	Lea	9,643	Groundwater	2.5	6
Artesia Municipal Water System	Eddy	14,000	Groundwater	2.3	8.64
Carlsbad Municipal Water System	Eddy	27,000	Groundwater	3.8	28.8
Otis Mutual Domestic Water Consumer's Association	Eddy	5,000	Groundwater	1.0	NA

Source:
[a] EPA, 2010b
[b] NMED, 2010b
MGD = million gallons per day

3.9.5.2 Major Public Wastewater Treatment Facilities

The New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) lists four major public wastewater treatment facilities in Lea and Eddy Counties (NMED, 2010c). Major wastewater treatment facilities are those that serve more than 3,000 people. Table 3-31 presents wastewater treatment production and capacity statistics for these facilities. All of the major wastewater treatment facilities in the ROI have excess capacity.

Table 3-31. Major Wastewater Treatment Facilities in ROI[a]

Facility Name[b]	2009 Population Served[b]	Average Daily Production (MGD)	Maximum Permitted Capacity (MGD)[b]
City of Artesia	11,208	1.3[c]	3.0
City of Carlsbad	26,352	2.5[d]	8.5
City of Hobbs	31,151	3.4[e]	7.2
City of Lovington	10,206	0.8[f]	2.7

Source:
[a] Includes permitted, municipal wastewater treatment plants serving at least 3,000 persons.
[b] NMED, 2010c
[c] Artesia, 2010
[d] Carlsbad, 2010
[e] Hobbs, 2010
[f] Lovington, 2010

3.9.6 Community Services

3.9.6.1 Education

Table 3-32 summarizes information about public school districts and schools in the ROI. Lea County has 5 public school districts, with 36 schools for early childhood education (Age 3) through Grade 12. The total enrollment in the county public schools was 12,588 students in 2008 (NCES, 2010a). There are also three private schools in the county with a total 2008 enrollment of 111 students (NCES, 2010b). In addition, there are two colleges in the county, both in Hobbs. New Mexico Junior College had a 2009 enrollment of 2,300 and University of the Southwest had an enrollment of 528, with an undergraduate enrollment of 317 (NCES, 2010c).

Table 3-32. Public School Districts in the ROI, 2008

County	Schools	Number of Schools in District	Number of Students
Lea County	Eunice Municipal Schools	3	589
	Hobbs Municipal Schools	17	8,038
	Jal Public Schools	3	405
	Lovington Public Schools	10	3,247
	Tatum Municipal Schools	3	309
Eddy County	Carlsbad Municipal Schools	15	3,581
	Artesia Public Schools	10	6,058
	Loving Municipal Schools	3	620

Source: NCES, 2010a

Eddy County has 28 schools in 3 public school districts with a 2008 enrollment of 10,259 students (NCES, 2010a). There is also a private school in Carlsbad with a 2008 enrollment of 68 students (NCES, 2010b). New Mexico State University has a campus in Carlsbad with an enrollment of 2,050 (NCES, 2010c).

3.9.6.2 Fire Protection

In 2010, there were 468 active career and volunteer firefighters in the ROI (USFA, 2010). Twenty fire departments, operating out of 37 fire stations, are in the ROI (USFA, 2010). The proposed IIFP site would be within the jurisdiction of the City of Hobbs Fire Department (HFD, 2010), which is staffed with 70 career firefighters (USFA, 2010). Lea County and Eddy County have mutual aid agreements among all the municipal and independent fire departments to assist with additional response services (HFD, 2010; LPD, 2010). Table 3-33 provides information about fire protection in the ROI.

Table 3-33. Fire Protection in the ROI, 2010

County	2009 County Population[a]	Active Firefighters 2010[b]	Ratio of Residents to Active Firefighters, 2010	Number of Fire Stations, 2010[b]
Lea	60,232	176	342	9
Eddy	52,706	292	181	28
ROI Total	112,938	468	241	37

Sources:
[a] USCB, 2010a; [b] USFA, 2010

3.9.6.3 Law Enforcement

In 2009, there were 89 county and 196 municipal law enforcement officers serving the two ROI counties (FBI, 2009a; FBI, 2009b; LPD, 2010). Law enforcement services in the ROI are provided by the Lea County and Eddy County Sheriff Departments and the Artesia, Carlsbad, Eunice, Hobbs, Jal, Lovington, and Tatum municipal police departments (FBI, 2009a; FBI, 2009b). Hope and Loving also maintain police departments (LPD, 2010). The Lea County Sheriff's Department has jurisdiction in the unincorporated portion of Lea County, including the proposed site (HFD, 2010; LPD, 2010). The New Mexico State Police could provide a second level of response to any sheriff or police department via existing mutual aid agreements (HFD, 2010; LPD, 2010). Table 3-34 provides information about law enforcement in the ROI.

3.9.6.4 Hospitals and Physicians

Lea County has two general medical and surgical hospitals. The Lea Regional Medical Center in Hobbs is the closest hospital to the proposed site. It has 214 staffed beds (AHA, 2007). Nor-Lea General Hospital, in Lovington, has 12 staffed beds (AHA, 2007). Eddy County also has two general medical and surgical hospitals. The Carlsbad Medical Center has 127 staffed beds and the Artesia General Hospital, in Artesia, has 20 staffed beds (AHA, 2007). The ROI has 146 practicing physicians; 69 physicians in Lea County representing 24 specialties and 77 physicians representing 25 specialties in Eddy County (AMA, 2010). Both Lea County and Eddy County are considered to be medically underserved areas (HRSA, Undated).

Table 3-34. Law Enforcement in ROI Counties and Incorporated Places, 2009

County/City[a,e]	Population 2009[a,e]	Law Enforcement Officers 2009[b,c]	Ratio of residents-to-Law Enforcement Officers, 2009
Lea County	--	43	--
Eunice	2,809	7	--
Hobbs	30,838	70	--
Jal	2,074	5	--
Lovington	10,108	23	--
Tatum	767	3	--
Lea County Totals	**60,232**	**151**	**399**
Eddy County[b]	--	46	--
Artesia	11,338	33	--
Carlsbad	26,259	50	--
Hope[d]	109	1[d]	--
Loving[d]	1,366	4[d]	--
Eddy County Totals	**52,706**	**134**	**393**

Sources:
[a] USCB, 2010a
[b] FBI, 2009a
[c] FBI, 2009b
[d] LPD, 2010
[e] USCB, 2010d

3.10 Traffic and Transportation

3.10.1 Roadways

Figure 3-26 shows the major highways near the proposed IIFP site. The site is approximately 1.6 km (1 mi) north of US 62/180 and immediately east of NM 483, in close proximity to the intersection of the two roadways.

From the east, US 62/180 crosses into New Mexico from Texas approximately 29 km (18 mi) from the IIFP site, runs through the City of Hobbs, intersects NM 483 at the IIFP site, and continues to Carlsbad, NM. Near the proposed IIFP site, US 62/180 is called Carlsbad Highway and is a 4-lane divided highway that provides access to the proposed site from the east and west.

NM 483 is a 2-lane north-south highway that connects Lovington, New Mexico to US 62/180. East of the proposed site north-south roadways NM 8 and NM 18 provide access to US 62/180 from Eunice, New Mexico and several unincorporated areas. NM 132 provides access to US 62/180 in Hobbs from points in Texas. NM 529 is an east-west roadway that intersects US62/180 just west of the proposed IIFP site (Figure 3-26).

Table 3-35 provides annual average daily traffic (AADT) data for the roadways in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP site (Figure 3-26). These roadways are used as trucking routes. The numbers in the left column correspond to the numbered locations on Figure 3-26.

Table 3-35. AADT Volumes for Roadways that Access the Proposed IIFP Site

	Roadway	Location	AADT	Year
1	US 62/180	NM 8 Junction	7,868[a]	2008
2	NM 483	US 62/180 Junction	955[b]	2008
3	NM 132	US 18/NM 218 Junction	4,604[b]	2008
4	NM 8	0.256-mi South of US 62/180	1,302[b]	2008
5	NM 18	US 62/180 Junction	12,407[a]	2007
6	NM 176	NM 8 Junction	2,124[a]	2008
7	NM 529	West of US 62/180 Junction	2,393[b]	2008

Source: NMDOT, 2009

[a] The AADT was derived from recent coverage counts.

[b] The AADT was derived using an Annual Growth Factor, generalized from coverage counts within the traffic segment and updated with loop and growth factors.

3.10.2 Railroads

The Texas-New Mexico Railroad is an active rail line through Hobbs, New Mexico, approximately 16.2 km (10 mi) east of the proposed IIFP site. It is a shortline railroad operating between Monahans, Texas and Lovington, New Mexico. The rail line is predominantly used for freight transport associated with the oil and gas industry, and typical freight includes chemicals, minerals, construction aggregate, industrial waste, and scrap. There is a freight dock and warehouse in the Hobbs area. Train frequency is daily six days per week (IPH, 2010).


Roosevelt
Cochran
Hockley
Levelland
Chaves
Brownfield
Terry
Yoakum
Lovington
Denver City
Artesia
Hobbs
Seminole
Gaines
Eddy
Section 27
Eunice
Carlsbad
Lea
Andrews
Andrews
New Mexico
Texas
Culberson
Loving
Winkler
Ector
Odessa
Kermit
Reeves
Legend
AADT Locations
Section 27 of T018SR036E
50-Mile Radius of Section 27
Urban Area
County Boundary
State Boundary
Major Highways
Limited Access
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
N
W
E
S
0 5 10 20 30
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 3-26 AADT Location Map

3.10.3 Airports

The Lea County Regional (Hobbs) Airport is approximately 13 km (8 mi) from the proposed IIFP site just northwest of the Hobbs city limits. The airport currently supports only general aviation, but may support domestic flights in the future (AIRNAV, 2010). Two additional airports are in Lea County: The Lea County-Zip Franklin Memorial Airport is 5 km (3 mi) west of Lovington (approximately 26 km [16 mi] from the IIFP site) and the Lea County-Jal Airport is 6 km (3.7 mi) northeast of Jal (approximately 64 km [40 mi] from the IIFP site). These airports support general aviation operations (AIRNAV, 2010).

3.11 Noise

The definition of noise is "unwanted or disturbing sound." Sound measurements are described in terms of frequencies and intensities. The decibel (dB) is used to describe the sound pressure level. The A-scale on a sound level meter best approximates the audible frequency response of the human ear, and is commonly used in noise measurements. Sound pressure levels measured on the A-scale of a sound meter are abbreviated dB(A). In noise measurements, sound pressure levels are typically averaged over a given length of time, because instantaneous levels can vary widely.

The intensity of sound decreases with increasing distance from the source. Typically, sound levels for a point source will decrease by 6 dB(A) for each doubling of distance. This may vary depending on the terrain, topographical features, and frequency of the noise source.

Generally, sound level changes of 3 dB(A) are barely perceptible, while a change of 5 dB(A) is readily noticeable by most people. A 10 dB(A) increase is usually perceived as a doubling of loudness, and conversely, noise is perceived to be reduced by one-half when a sound level is reduced by 10 dB(A).

Sound levels can vary for indoor and outdoor noise sources. For example, a jet flying overhead at 1,000' will produce a sound level of 100 dB(A), the same as an inside subway train. A typical outdoor commercial area is equivalent to a normal speech conversation indoors, at 65 dB(A), and a quiet rural nighttime environment will mimic an empty concert hall, at 25 dB(A).

3.11.1 Noise Level Standards

Noise level standards are established by Federal agencies including the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (24 CFR 51), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, 1974), Federal Highway Administration (23 CFR 772), and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) (29 CFR 1910).

Neither the city of Hobbs, Lea County, nor New Mexico have ordinances or regulations governing noise. There are no Native American Tribes within 10 km (6 mi) of the proposed site. Therefore, the facility is not subject to state, tribal, or local noise ordinances.

The EPA has defined a goal of 55 dB(A) for average day-night sound levels in outdoor spaces (EPA 1974). OSHA standards prescribe the maximum noise levels that employees can be exposed to within a facility. For an 8-hour work period, sound levels must remain below 90dB(A) or noise abatement measures must be taken, in order to comply with OSHA [29 CFR

1910.95(b)(2)]. HUD guidelines are that noise levels at 65 dB(A) or below are acceptable in a residential setting in normal situations.

3.11.2 Noise Receptors in the Vicinity of the Proposed Facility

The determination of noise impacts is based on the relationship between the ambient noise levels and the established noise abatement criteria for the project area. Noise sensitive areas are created to represent common noise environments within the same activity category, and are represented by receptors, which represent a discrete or representative location within the noise sensitive area. Activity categories include land uses such as residences, hotels, motels, active sport areas, schools, places of worship, hospitals, parks and others. No noise sensitive areas are within 10 km (6 mi) of the site, based on a review of aerial photographs.

The nearest commercial facilities are Xcel Energy's Cunningham Generating Station, approximately 1.6 km (1 mi) west of the proposed site, Xcel Energy's Maddox Generating Station approximately 3.7 km (2.3 mi) east of the proposed site, and the Colorado Energy Station approximately 2.4 km (1.5 mi) northeast of the proposed site. The nearest residence is approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi) northwest of the site. No recreational facilities are within 10 km (6 mi) of the proposed site.

3.11.3 Noise in the Vicinity of the Proposed Facility

Noise sources in the vicinity of the site include ambient noise from the natural setting, highway noise from NM 483, and occasional noise associated with the overhead and underground utilities. The noise from the proposed facility would be associated with construction and operation activities and associated employee traffic. During operations, intermittent noise could be expected from delivery/disposal of the depleted uranium cylinders and other materials, commuting workers' vehicles, and operating equipment such as forklifts. Noise levels near the closed-loop cooling towers could be relatively high, but otherwise, most noise sources would be within buildings and would not be audible outside. Baseline ambient noise levels are the basis for comparison with predicted noise levels from construction and operation. It is typical in this type of topography and setting for background ambient noise levels to be between 50 and 60 dB(A).

Noise levels at uranium deconversion facilities in Paducah, KY and Piketon, OH would be comparable. DOE reported estimated or actual noise levels for those facilities (during operation) to range from 40 to 46 dB(A) at the closest receptors, which are residences approximately 1.6 km (1 m) from the proposed facility; similar to the distance to sensitive receptors at the proposed site (DOE, 2004a; DOE 2004b).

3.12 Public and Occupational Health

This section describes the natural and manmade sources of radiation and chemicals and the levels of exposure that may occur in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP facility.

3.12.1 Background Radiological Exposure

Figure 3-27 depicts the major sources of background radiation in the United States. As shown on Figure 3-27, humans are exposed to ionizing radiation from both natural and manmade sources. In the United States, each source contributes on average approximately one-half of an individual's total annual radiation dose. The total annual exposure to individuals from both

natural and manmade sources of radioactivity is approximately 6.2 millisieverts (620 millirem) (NCRP, 2009).

A major proportion of natural radiation comes from naturally occurring airborne sources such as radon and thoron (an isotope of radon). The proposed IIFP site is in an area characterized by radon concentrations of 2 to 4 picocuries per liter (pCi/L) and is defined as of moderate radon potential. Moderate radon potential indicates that one-third to one-half of the structures have more than 0.148 becquerel per liter (Bq/L) or 4 pCi/L of indoor radon. In May 2004, direct background radiation was measured by the NMED Radiation Control Bureau to be 8 to 10 microrad per hour, which corresponds to 0.70 to 0.88 millisieverts (mSv) (70 to 88 millirem [mrem]) per year. The measured range falls within the average annual direct background radiation for the United States (NRC, 2005). Additionally cosmic radiation, which primarily consists of positively charged ions from protons to larger nuclei from sources outside our solar system, is continuously penetrating the earth's atmosphere, adding to the overall amount of natural background exposure each individual receives. As shown on Figure 3-27, the total contribution from natural background radiation to each individual is approximately 3.1 mSv (310 mrem) (NCRP, 2009).

Manmade sources include x-rays for medical purposes and consumer products such as smoke detectors. The National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) released a report, Ionizing Radiation Exposure of the Population of the United States, (NCRP Report No. 160; NCRP 2009) in 2009 that updated the findings of the previously issued NCRP Report No. 93 (NCRP, 1987). The 2009 NCRP report found significant increases in radiation exposures related to medical procedures and treatments. The approximate doses to individuals for medical procedures such as x-rays comprise approximately 48 percent of the total dose received by individuals living in the United States (NCRP, 2009). Natural sources include cosmic sources, radionuclides within a person's body, radionuclides in soils, and radon and thoron inhalation.

DOE established radiological monitoring programs in southeastern New Mexico prior to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant project to determine the level of background radiation. DOE estimated an annual dose in southeastern New Mexico of approximately 0.65 mSv (65 millirem) from atmospheric particulate matter, ambient radiation, soil, surface water and sediment, groundwater, and biota (NRC, 2005). These doses are within expected ranges and do not indicate any unexpected environmental concentrations in the area. Based on natural and manmade sources, residents living near the proposed IIFP facility could be expected to receive, on average, an annual dose of approximately 6.2 mSv (620 millirem).

3.12.2 Background Chemical Characteristics

The 16-ha (40-ac) area that would contain the proposed facility is undeveloped land. There is no known past activity on this land that would make its background chemical characteristics different than other undeveloped land. No site-specific chemical data are available.

Figure 3-27. Major Sources and Levels In The Vicinity of the Proposed FEP/DUP Background Radiation Exposure



Source: data are from NCRP, 2009. Data for this table have been used with permission of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, (http://NCRPpublications.org).

3.13 References

(AHA, 2007) American Hospital Association. 2007. AHA Guide, America's Directory of Hospitals and Health Care System.

(AIRNAV, 2010) AirNav, LLC. 2010. Lea County Airports. Available at http://www.airnav.com/airport. Accessed on September 21, 2010.

(AMA, 2010) American Medical Association. 2010. Physician-Related Data Resource, Lea County New Mexico and Eddy County New Mexico. Available at http://www.ama-assn.org/. Accessed August 26, 2010.

(Anderson, Undated) Anderson, H. A. "Hat Ranch," Handbook of Texas Online. Available at http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/aph04. Accessed November 20, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 112710277.

(Artesia, 2010) City of Artesia Water and Wastewater Department. 2010. Personal Communication between M. Stroud, (City of Artesia Water and Wastewater Department) and P. Baxter (TtNUS). September 28, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112840402.

(BBER, 2008) University of New Mexico, Bureau of Business and Economic Research. 2008. Population Projections for New Mexico and Counties. Released August 2008. Available at http://bber.unm.edu/demo/table1.htm. Accessed September 16, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430027.

(BEA, 2010) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. 2010. Total Employment, "Table CA25N Total Employment by Industry, New Mexico, Lea County New Mexico, and Eddy County New Mexico, 2008," Updated August 9, 2010. Available at http://bea.gov/regional/reis/action.cfm. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430029.

(BEA, 2011a) U.S. Dept of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. 2011. "Table CA25N Total Full-Time and Part-Time Employment by NAICS Industry, Lea County and Eddy County, New Mexico, 2001" Updated April 21, 2011. Available at http://bea/gov/regional/reid/action/cfm. Accessed May 31, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML 1212710284.

(BEA, 2011b) U.S. Dept of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. 2011. "Table CA25N Total Full-Time and Part-Time Employment by NAICS Industry, Eddy County New Mexico, 2001" Updated April 21, 2011. Available at http://bea/gov/regional/reid/action/cfm. Accessed May 31, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML 1212710284.

(BLM, 2007) U.S. Bureau of Land Management. 2007. Visual Resource Inventory. April 30, 2007. ADAMS Accession No. ML 112710288.

(BLM, 2008) U.S. Bureau of Land Management. 2008. Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment, BLM NM/PL-08-05-1610. Pecos District Office, Roswell, New Mexico. April. Available at http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/nm/field_offices/roswell/rfo_planning/special_status_species.Par.34868.File.dat/pdf_sss_rod_rmpa_May_2008.pdf. Accessed August 11, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090063.

(BLM, 2010) U.S. Bureau of Land Management. 2010. Lesser Prairie Chicken Corridor. Roswell Field Office. Available at http://www.blm.gov/nm/st/en/fo/Roswell_Field_Office/lpc_corridor.html. Accessed August 16, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090065.

(BLS, 2010a) U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS), 2001 to 2010, New Mexico, Lea County and Eddy County New Mexico. Available at http://data.bls.gov/. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430031.

(BLS, 2010b) U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey, USA. Available at http://data.bls.gov/. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430033.

(Carlsbad, 2010) City of Carlsbad Waste Water Treatment Plant. 2010. Personal Communication between A. Sena (City of Carlsbad Waste Water Treatment Superintendent) and P. Baxter (TtNUS). November 17, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112840422

(Carter, 2010) Carter, P.S. 2010. Criteria for disturbing soils on the site classified at Farmland of Statewide Importance. Personal Communication between P. Carter (District Conservationist, NRCS, NM) and Krista Dearing (TtNUS) on August 16, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112840429.

(CCS, 2006) Center for Climate Studies. 2006. Appendix D: New Mexico Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reference Case Projections, 1990 – 2020. Prepared for the New Mexico Environment Department. November, 2006. ADAMS Accession No. ML1127103003.

(Center for Biological Diversity, 2002) Center for Biological Diversity. 2002. Petition to List the Sand Dune Lizard, *Sceloporus arenicolus,* as a Threatened or Endangered Species Under the U. S. Endangered Species Act. Available at http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/species/reptiles/dunes_sagebrush_lizard/pdfs/petition.pdf. Accessed October 24, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710308.

(CEQ, 1997) Council on Environmental Quality. 1997. Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act. December 1997. Executive Office of the President. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430030.

(CFC, Undated) Central Flyway Council. Undated. "The Central Flyway." Available at http://central.flyways.us/. Accessed August 17, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090070.

(City of Albuquerque, 2011) City of Albuquerque. 2011. "Industrial Revenue Bonds Explained." Available at http://www.cabq.gov/econdev/irbs.html. Accessed March 21, 2011.

(Clampitt, 2008) Clampitt, M. A. 2008. Hobbs and Lea County (Images of America: New Mexico). Arcadia Publishing.

(Crone and Wheeler, 2000) Crone, A.J. and R. L. Wheeler, R.L. 2000. Data for Quaternary Faults, Liquefaction Features, and Possible Tectonic Features in the Central and Eastern United States, East of the Rocky Mountain Front. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 00-0260. Available at http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2000/ofr-00-0260/ofr-00-0260.pdf. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080519.

(CRS, 2007) Congressional Research Service. 2007. CRS Report for Congress State Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Comparison and Analysis. Jonathan Ramseur. Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress. December 5, 2007. Available at http://opencrs.com/document/RL34272/. Accessed March 22, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710313.

(Daras, 2009) Daras, S. 2009. Cultural Resource Survey of 640 acres for the Arkansas Junction Site, Lea County, New Mexico. 2009 Report No. 1224. Prepared for New Mexico State Land Office by Lone Mountain Archeological Services, Inc. 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML113120204.

(Dick-Peddie, 1993) Dick-Peddie, W. 1993. New Mexico Vegetation Past, Present, and Future. University of New Mexico Press. 1993.

(DOE 2004a) U.S. Department of Energy. 2004. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Construction and Operation of a Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility at the

Paducah, Kentucky Site, DOE/EIS-0359. Washington, D,C., June 2004. ADAMS Accession No. ML ML051030392.

(DOE 2004b) U.S. Department of Energy. 2004. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Construction and Operation of a Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility at the Portsmouth Ohio Site, DOE/EIS-0360. Washington, D.C. June 2004. ADAMS Accession No. 050380334.

(DOE, 2006) U.S. Department of Energy, 2006. Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Contact Handled (CH) Waste Documented Safety Analysis, DOE/WIPP-95-2065 Rev. 10, Washington, D.C., November, 2006. Available at http://www.energy.ca.gov/nuclear/yucca/documents/AG-155-2007-005754.pdf. Accessed August 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080100.

(eBird, 2011) Audubon and Cornell Lab of Ornithology. 2011. Bird Observations for Lea County, New Mexico. Available at http://ebird.org/ebird/GuideMe?step=saveChoices&getLocations=counties&parentState=US-NM&bMonth=01&bYear=1900&eMonth=12&eYear=2010&reportType=location&counties=US-NM-025&continue.x=36&continue.y=4&continue=Continue. Accessed January 20, 2011.

(ECP, 2008) Eddy County Comprehensive Plan, 2008. Eddy County Comprehensive Plan, October. Available at http://www.co.eddy.nm.us/, http://www.co.eddy.nm.us/EddyCty-FinalRPT10-08.pdf. Accessed August 31, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430034.

(Eddy County, 2007) Eddy County, New Mexico. 2007. Eddy County, New Mexico. County Treasurer. 2007. Available at http://www.co.eddy.nm.us/treasurer.html. Accessed August 31, 2010.

(eHOW) eHOW. Undated. “FEMA Flood Zone Definitions. Available at http://www.ehow.com/about_5043095_fema-flood-zone-definitions.html/ Accessed October 29, 2010.

(EPA, 1974) U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1974. Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety," EPA/ONAC 550/9-74-004. March 1974. Available at http://www.nonoise.org/library/levels74/levels74.htm. Accessed on December 13, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML110110692.

(EPA, 2009a) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2009. Lea County, New Mexico Emissions by Category Report - Criteria Air Pollutants, Texas. Washington, D.C., January 10, 2009. Available at http://www.epa.gov/oar/data/geosel.html. Accessed on May 31, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML1112710378.

(EPA, 2009b) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2009. County Air Quality Report – Criteria Air Pollutants for Eddy, Lea, and Sandoval Counties, New Mexico, and El Paso County, Texas. Washington, D.C. January, 10, 2009. Available at http://www.epa.gov/oar/data/geosel.html. Accessed on May 31, 2011.

(EPA, 2010a) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2010. Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2008. Executive Summary. April 15, 2010. Available at http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/usgginv_archive.html. Accessed March 10, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710366.

(EPA, 2010b) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2010. "Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS)." Available at http://oaspub.epa.gov/enviro/sdw_form_v2.create_page?state_abbr=NM. Accessed August 26, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 103430026.

(Fahlquist, 2003) Fahlquist, L. 2003. Ground-Water Quality of the Southern High Plains Aquifer, Texas and New Mexico. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 03-345. Available at http://co.water.usgs.gov/nawqa/hpgw/reports/ofr03_345.pdf. Accessed July 28, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080521.

(FBI, 2009a) Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2009. Uniform Crime Report, "Table 80: Full-time Law Enforcement Employees, by State, by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Counties, 2009." Available at http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430037.

(FBI, 2009b) Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2009. Uniform Crime Report, "Table 78: Full-time Law Enforcement Employees, by State, by Cities, 2008." Available at http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430041.

(Gerald, 1974) Gerald, R.E. 1974. Aboriginal Use and Occupation by Tigua, Manso, and Suma Indians. Garland Publishing. 1974.

(GL Environmental, 2010a). GL Environmental, Inc. 2010. 2010 Soil and Vegetation Characterization Report. Prepared for International Isotopes Fluorine Products. ADAMS Accession No. ML112140543.

(GL Environmental, 2010b) GL Environmental, Inc. 2010. Existing Groundwater Condition in Section 27, Range 18 South, Township 36 East. Prepared for International Isotopes Fluorine Products. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720073.

(GL Environmental,. 2010c) GL Environmental, Inc. 2010. 2010 Soil and Vegetation Survey Report. Prepared for International Isotopes Fluorine Products. November 29, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720310.

(GL Environmental, 2010d) GL Environmental, Inc. 2010. Status and Habitat of the Dune Sagebrush Lizard at the Proposed Site for the International Isotopes Fluorine Products Facility in Lead County, New Mexico. Prepared for International Isotopes Fluorine Products. November 11, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720311.

(Hart and McAda, 1985) Hart, D.L. and D. P. McAda, 1985. Geohydrology of the High Plains Aquifer in Southeastern New Mexico. U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas 679. Available at http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/#search:basic/query=HA-679/page=1/page_size=25:0. Accessed August 9, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080964.

(Hat Ranch, 2010) Hat Ranch. 2010. "Ranch History." Hat Ranch Quarter Horses, http://www.hatranchquarterhorses.com/history.html .Accessed December 12, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710379.

(HFD, 2010) City of Hobbs Fire Department. 2010. Fire Protection and Law Enforcement in Hobbs and New Mexico. Personal Communication between C. Allen (Hobbs Fire Department) and P. Baxter (TtNUS), September 1, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112840437.

(Hickerson, 1994) Hickerson, N.P. 1994. The Jumanos: Hunters and Traders of the South Plains. University of Texas Press. 1994.

(Hobbs, 2010) City of Hobbs. 2010. Personal communication between L. Wilson (City of Hobbs City Hall) and P. Baxter (TtNUS). September 28 - 30, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112840425.

(Hobbs Country Club, 2010) Hobbs Country Club. 2010. Available at http://www.hobbscountryclub.com/golf/proto/hobbscountryclub/ directions/directions.htm. Accessed November 11, 2010.

(Hobbs Motorsports Park, 2010) Hobbs Motorsports Park. 2010. Available at http://www.hobbsmotorsportspark.com/general/contact.htm. Accessed November 11, 2010.

(HRSA, Undated) U. S. Department of Health and Human Resources, Health Resources and Services Administration. Undated. Medically Underserved Areas by State and County. Available at http://muafind.hrsa.gov/. Accessed August 27, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430043.

(Hunt, 1977) Hunt, C.B. 1977. Surficial Geology of Southeast New Mexico. New Mexico Bureau of Mines & Mineral Resources, Geologic Map 41. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080523.

(ICC, 1979) U.S. Indian Claims Commission. 1979. "U.S. Indian Claims Commission, August 13, 1946-September 30, 1978: Final Report and Map (Indian Land Areas Judicially Established, 1978)."U.S. Government Printing Office. 1979. Available at http://www.nps.gov/history/nagpra/ DOCUMENTS/ClaimsMAP.HTM and http://www.nps.gov/history/nagpra/DOCUMENTS/ JUDICIAL.PDF. Accessed August 15, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080097.

(IIFP, 2009) International Isotopes Fluorine Products. Inc. 2009. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Environmental Report, Revision A, ER-IFP-001. December 27, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML100630503.

(IIFP, 2011) International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc. 2011. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Official Responses to Environmental Report RAIs, Revision A. March 31, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML110970481.

(INIS, 2011) International Isotopes, Inc. 2011. "International Isotopes Inc. Provides an Update Summary on the Progress of the Uranium Deconversion and Fluorine Extraction Processing Facility" Press Release. Idaho Falls, ID, February 7, 2011. Available at http://www.intisoid.com/ wp-content/uploads/2010/08/INISAnnouncesContinuedProgress TowardstheLicensingand-Construction.pdf. Accessed March 28, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710381.

(IPCC, 2007) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Summary for Policy Makers in: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen. M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. Available at http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/spm.html. Accessed October 24, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710385.

(IPH, 2010) Iowa Pacific Holdings, LLC 2010. Texas-New Mexico Railroad. Available at http://www.iowapacific.net/texas-new-mexico-railroad.html. Accessed on September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 103430159.

(Kelley, 1986) Kelley, J.C. 1986. Jumano and Patarabueye: Relations at La Junta de los Rios. University of Michigan, Museum of Anthropology. Anthropological Papers No. 77.

(Lea County, 2009) Lea County, New Mexico. 2009. "2009 Tax Levies, Lea County, New Mexico." Available at http://www.leacounty.net/. Accessed August 31, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430051.

(Leedshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000) Leedshill-Herkenhoff, Inc., John Shomaker & Associates, Inc., and Montgomery and Andrews. 2000. Region 16: Lea County Regional Water Plan. Prepared for the Lea County Water User's Association. Available at http://www.ose.state.nm.us/isc_regional_plans16.html. Accessed July 25, 2010.

(Limburg, 2009) Limburg, E. 2009. Recent and Potential Volcanism of New Mexico. April 16, 2009. Available at http://dspace.nmt.edu/dspace/handle/10136/296. Accessed August 16, 2010.

(Lin and Sanford, 2000) Lin, K., and A.R., Sanford. 2000. Some Characteristics of a Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Map for New Mexico. July 2000. New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology Geophysics Open-File Report 92. Available at http://www.ees.nmt.edu/Geop/nmquakes/R92/R92.HTM. Accessed August 15, 2010

(Lovington, 2010) City of Lovington Wastewater Treatment Plant. 2010. Personal Communication between M. De La Cruz (City of Lovington Wastewater Treatment Plant) and P. Baxter (TtNUS). September 30, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112840439.

(LPD, 2010) Lovington Police Department. 2010. "Law Enforcement in Hope, Lovington, New Mexico and Mutual Aid Agreements." Personal Communication between Chief M.Bird (Loving Police Department) and P Baxter (TtNUS). September 1, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112840414.

(Machette, et al., 1998) Machette, M.N., Personius, S.F., Kelson, K.I., Haller, K.M., and R.L. Dart. 1998. Map of Quaternary Faults and Folds in New Mexico and Adjacent Areas. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 98-521, (Revised 2000). ADAMS Accession No. ML103080536.

(Main, 1992) Main, R. 1992. Limited Testing at Maljamar Lea County, New Mexico. Archaeological Notes 78. Prepared for Museum of New Mexico, Office of Archaeological Studies. Santa Fe, NM. 1992.

(McAda, 1984) McAda, D.P. 1984. Projected Water-Level Declines in the Ogallala Aquifer in Lea County, New Mexico. U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 84 4062. Available at http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/#search:basic/query=water%20resources%20investigation%20report%2084-4062/page=1/page_size=25:0. Accessed July 28, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080967.

(McCoy and Perry, 2004) McCoy, A.M., and R.L. Perry. 2004. Second Draft, Lea County Deep Aquifer Study. Prepared for Lea County Water Users Association. John Shomaker & Associates, Inc. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080447.

(McGuire et al., 2003) McGuire, V.L., M. R. Johnson, R. L. Schieffer, J. S. Stanton, S. K. Sebree, and I. M. Verstraeten. 2003. Water Storage and Approaches to Groundwater Management, High Plains Aquifer, 2000 Circular 1243. U.S. Geological Survey. Available at http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/#search:basic/query=circular%201243/page=1/page_size=25:0. Accessed July 29, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080969.

(McLemore, et. al., 2007) McLemore, V., T., Hoffman, G.K., Mansell, M., Jones, G. R., Krueger, C.B., and M. Wilks. 2007. Mining Districts in New Mexico. July 2007. New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources Open File Report 494. Available at http://geoinfo.nmt.edu/publications/openfile/downloads/OFR400-499/476-499/494/494_CDROM/NMMD_10July07_fin.pdf. Accessed July 25, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080540.

(Merlan, 2010) Merlan, Thomas. 2010. Historic Homesteads and Ranches in New Mexico: A Historic Context. State of New Mexico, Historic Preservation Division. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710390.

(Musharrafieh and Chudnoff, 1999) Musharrafieh, G., and M. Chudnoff. 1999. Numerical Simulation of Groundwater Flow for Water Rights Administration in the Lea County Underground Water Basin New Mexico, Technical Report 99-1. Prepared for the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer. January 1999. Available at http://www.ose.state.nm.us/publications_library_hydrologyrpts.html. Accessed July 27, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080980.

(NatureServe, 2009) NatureServe. 2009. International Ecological Classification Standard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications. NatureServe Central Databases. Arlington, Va. Available at http://www.natureserve.org/getData/vegData/nsDescriptions.pdf. Accessed August 17, 2010.

(NCDC, 2010) National Climatic Data Center. 2010. Storm Events – Lea County, New Mexico. Available at http://www4.ncdc.noaa.gov/cgi-win/wwcgi.dll?wwevent~storms. Accessed August 24 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080177.

(NCES, 2008) National Center for Education Statistics. 2008. Search for Public School Districts - District Name: Hobbs Municipal Schools. Available at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch/. Accessed March 10, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710441.

(NCES, 2009) National Center for Education Statistics. 2009. Finance 2008-2009. Institution: New Mexico Junior College (187903). Available at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/Default.aspx. Accessed March 10, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710447.

(NCES, 2010a) National Center for Education Statistics. 2010. Search for Public School Districts, Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico. Available at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch/. Accessed August 30, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430054.

(NCES, 2010b) National Center for Education Statistics. 2010. Search for Private Schools, Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico. Available at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch/. Accessed August 31, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430061.

(NCES, 2010c) National Center for Education Statistics. 2010. College Navigator. Available at http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/. Accessed August 30, 2010 – September 1, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430065.

(NCRP, 1987) National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. 1987. Ionizing Radiation Exposure of the Population of the United States. NCRP Report No. 93. September 1, 1987.

(NCRP, 2009) National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements. 2009. Ionizing Radiation Exposure of the Population of the United States. NCRP Report No. 160, Bethesda, MD. March 3, 2009.

(Nicholson and Clebsch, 1961) Nicholson, A. and A. Clebsch. 1961. Geology and Ground-Water Conditions in Southern Lea County, New Mexico. New Mexico Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources Ground-Water Report 6. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080877.

(NMBGMR, 2003) New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources. 2003. Geologic Map of New Mexico. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080881.

(NMBGMR, 2010) New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources, 2010. Physiographic Map of New Mexico. Available at http://geoinfo.nmt.edu/tour/. Accessed March 7, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710476.

(NMDOT, 2009) New Mexico Department of Transportation. Consolidated Highway Database (CHDB). Website no longer accessible. Accessed April 10, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML112860287.

(NMED, 2010a) New Mexico Environment Department. 2010. Inventory of New Mexico Greenhouse Gas Emissions: 2000 – 2007. Prepared by the New Mexico Environment Department. March 15, 2010. Available at http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/cc/documents/GHGInventoryUpdate3_15_10.pdf. Accessed March 11, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710489.

(NMED, 2010b) New Mexico Environment Department. 2010. "RE: FOIA Request." Personal Communication between M. Huber (New Mexico Environment Department) and N. Hill (TtNUS). September 22, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112850086.

(NMED, 2010c) New Mexico Environment Department, Ground Water Quality Bureau. 2010. Ground Water Regulated Facilities, List of Current Discharge Permits, updated 07/29/2010. Available at http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/gwb/NMED-GWQB-Permits.htm. Accessed August 31, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710484.

(NMEMNRD, 2010a) New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources Department. 2009 Annual Report. Available at http://www.emnrd.state.nm.us/main/documents/EMNRD2009AnnualReportWeb.pdf. Accessed July 28, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080893.

(NMEMNRD, 2010b) New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources Department. 2010. New Mexico Oil & Gas Wells. Available at http://mapserve.nmt.edu/Website/NMOG/viewer.htm. Accessed August 12, 2010.

(NMGF, 2008a) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2008. "2007-2008 Pronghorn Antelope Hunter Harvest Report." New Mexico Dept. of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, NM.

Available at http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/recreation/hunting/harvest/documents/07-08PronghornAntelopeHarvestReportv2.pdf. Accessed August 17, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090074.

(NMGF, 2008b) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2008. "New Mexico's Quail: Biology, Distribution, and Management Recommendations." New Mexico Dept. of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, NM. Available on line at http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/publications/documents/QuailHabitat.pdf. Accessed August 17, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090080.

(NMGF, 2009) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2009. "New Mexico Pronghorn Management." Presentation to the New Mexico State Game Commission. Available at http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/commission/presentations/documents/PronghornManagement.pdf. Accessed August 17, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090060

(NMGF, 2010a) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2010. New Mexico Deer Harvest Survey Report for the 2009-2010 Season. Available at http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/recreation/hunting/harvest/documents/2009-2010_ DeerHarvestReport.pdf. Accessed October 14, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090088.

(NMGF, 2010b) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2010. Biota Information System of New Mexico Database Query for Lea County. Available at http://www.bison-m.org/reports.aspx?rtype=13&category=&county='025',&gapveg=&habitat=&landuse=&otherdist=&statenm=&status='101','102','105','106','107','112','201','202','215'. Accessed August 17, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090102.

(NMGF, 2010c) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 2010. "Biota Information System of New Mexico." Available at http://www.bison-m.org/speciesbooklet.aspx. Accessed October 14, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090099.

(NMGF, Undated 1) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. Undated. Green Meadows Lake NM State Wildlife Area. Available at http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/conservation/wildlife_management_areas/documents/GreenMeadowLk.pdf. Accessed August 9, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090353.

(NMGF, Undated 2) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. Undated. Prairie Chicken Wildlife Areas. Available at http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/recreation/gain/documents/maps/PCAs.pdf. Accessed August 13, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090360.

(NMHPD, 2001) New Mexico Historic Preservation Division. 2001. Office of Cultural Affairs. New Mexico Historic Preservation: A Plan for 2002-2006. Santa Fe, NM. Available at http://www.nmhistoricpreservation.org/plan/2002-2006plan.pdf. Accessed July 25, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080080.

(NMHPD 2005) New Mexico Historic Preservation Division, Department of Cultural Affairs. August 15, 2005. New Mexico Register, Volume XVI, Number 15. Title 4, Cultural Resources; Chapter 10, Cultural Properties and Historic Preservation; Part 15, Standards for Survey and Inventory. Santa Fe, NM. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710497.

(NMHPD, 2011) New Mexico Historic Preservation Division. New Mexico's Rich Cultural Heritage: Listed State and National Register Properties. Santa Fe, NM. 2011. Available at

http://www.nmhistoricpreservation.org/documents/PropertiesByCounty.pdf.Accessed April 26, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710469.

(NMMA, Undated) New Mexico Museum of Art. Undated. "Growing New Mexico: History: Ranching." New Mexico Art Tells New Mexico History. Available at http://www.nmartmuseum.org/online/nmhistory/growing-new-mexico/ranching/history-ranching.html. Accessed July 8, 2011.

(NMOSE, 2008) New Mexico Office of the State Engineer. 2008. New Mexico Water Use by Categories, 2005, Technical Report 52. Available at http://www.ose.state.nm.us/PDF/Publications/Library/TechnicalReports/TechReport-052.pdf. Accessed July 25, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080984.

(NMOSE, 2009) New Mexico Office of the State Engineer. 2009. Proposed Lea County Underground Water Basin Guidelines for Review of Water Right Applications. Adopted May 25, 2009. Accessed July 29, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080986.

(NMOSE, 2010) New Mexico Office of State Engineer. 2010. Lea County Wells with Well Logs. Available at http://nmwrrs.ose.state.nm.us/nmwrrs/index.html. Accessed July 29, 2010.

(NMOSE, 2011) New Mexico Office of the State Engineer. Underground Water Basin Map in New Mexico. 2011. Available at ttp://www.ose.state.nm.us/PDF/Maps/underground_water.pdf. Accessed June 5, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710537.

(NMRPTC, 1999) New Mexico Rare Plant Technical Council. 1999. New Mexico Rare Plants. Albuquerque, New Mexico: New Mexico Rare Plants Home Page. Available at http://nmrareplants.unm.edu (Latest update: July 22, 2010). Accessed on July 26, 2010.

(NMT, 2010) New Mexico Tech Institute of Mining and Technology. 2010. New Mexico Oil and Gas. Available at http:// mapserve.nmt.edu/Website/NMOG/viewer.htm. Accessed August 12, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710538.

(NMTRD, 2010a) New Mexico Taxation and Revenue Department. 2010. FYI-350. For Your Information. Corporate Income Tax and Corporate Franchise Tax. Rev. 7/10. Available at http://www.tax.newmexico.gov/. Accessed August 31, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430069.

(NMTRD, 2010b) New Mexico Taxation and Revenue Department. 2010. Personal Income Tax. Available at http://www.tax.newmexico.gov/All-Taxes/Pages/Personal-Income-Tax.aspx. Accessed August 31, 2010.

(NMTRD, 2011) New Mexico Taxation and Revenue Department. 2011. “Gross Receipts Tax.” Available at http://www.tax.newmexico.gov/All-Taxes/Pages/Gross-Receipts-Tax.aspx. Accessed March 31, 2011.

(NMWQCC, 2002) New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission. 2002. “Water Quality and Water Pollution in New Mexico.” A report prepared for submission to the Congress of the United States by the State of New Mexico pursuant to Section 305(b) of the Federal Clean Water Act. Santa Fe. NMED/SWQ-02/1. Available at http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/swqb/305b/2002/2002_305b_Report-Introduction.pdf. Accessed October 11, 2011.

(NPS, Undated) National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior. Undated. "Indian Reservations in the Continental United States," Available at http://www.nps.gov/. Accessed September 2, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430075.

(NRC, 2003) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2003. Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with NMSS Programs. Final Report. NUREG-1748. August 2003. Division of Waste Management, Washington, D.C. ADAMS Accession No. ML ML032450279.

(NRC, 2005) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2005. Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed National Enrichment Facility in Lea County, New Mexico. Final Report. NUREG 1790. June 2005. ADAMS Accession No's. ML051730238 (v1) and ML051730292 (v2).

(NRCS, 2010) U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service. 2010. Custom Soil Resource Report for Lea County, New Mexico. August 16, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080906.

(Ocotillo Park Golf Course, 2010) Ocotillo Park Golf Course. 2010. Ocotillo Park website, Directions. Available at http://home.valornet.com/lyle/location.htm. Accessed November 11, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710544.

(Pfeil, et al., 2001) Pfeil, J.P., A.J. Leavitt, M. E. Wilks, S. Azevedo, L. Hemenway, K. Glesener, and J.M. Baker. 2001. Mines, Mills and Quarries in New Mexico. Mining and Minerals Division, New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources Department and New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080933.

(Rothman and Holder, 1998) Rothman, H. K. and D. Holder. 1998. Promise Beheld and the Limits of Place: A Historic Resource Study of Carlsbad Caverns and Guadalupe Mountains National Parks and the Surrounding Areas. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, DC. 1998. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080082.

(Sanford, et. al., 2002) Sanford, A.R., K. Lin, I. Tsai, I., and L.H. Jaksha. 2002. Earthquake Catalogs for New Mexico and Bordering Areas: 1969-1998. New Mexico Bureau of Geology and Mineral Resources, Circular 210.

(Sanford, et. al., 2006) Sanford, A., T. Mayeau, J. Schlue, R. Aster, and L. Jaksha. 2006. Earthquake Catalogs for New Mexico and Bordering Area II: 1999-2004. November 2006. In New Mexico Geology, Volume 28, Number 4.

(Scholle, 2000) Scholle, P. 2000. An Introduction and Virtual Geologic Field Trip to the Permian Reef Complex, Guadalupe and Delaware Mountains, New Mexico-West Texas. Available at http://geoinfo.nmt.edu/staff/scholle/guadalupe.html. Accessed July 27, 2010.

(SORA, 2011) SORA. 2011. Lesser Prairie-Chicken Survey on the International Isotope Flourine Products Project Site-2011. Prepared for International Isotopes, Inc., May 24, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720317.

(Stephens & Assoc., 2009) Stephens & Associates, Inc. 2009. Preliminary 40-Year Water Plan, City of Hobbs, New Mexico. October 30, 2009. Prepared for City of Hobbs, New Mexico. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080960.

(Stokes and Stokes, 1996) Stokes, D.W. and L.Q. Stokes. 1996. Stokes Field Guide to Birds. Little, Brown, and Company. Boston.

(Sublett and Peery, 2009) L. Sublett and R. Peery. 2009. 40-Year Development Plan, Lea County, New Mexico. John Shomaker & Associate, Inc. July 2, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710546.

(Tillery, 2008) Tillery, A., 2008. Current (2004 – 2007) Conditions and Changes in Groundwater Levels from Predevelopment to 2007, Southern High Plain Aquifer, Southeast New Mexico-Lea County Underground Water Basin. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Map 3044. Available at http://pubs.usgs.gov/sim/3044. Accessed July 28, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080935.

(TPWD, 2007) Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. 2007. Migratory Flyways of North America: Central Flyway. Available at http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/huntwild/wild/birding/migration/flyways/central/. Accessed August 16, 2010.

(USACE, 2011) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2011. Approved Jurisdictional Determination Form. SPA-2011-00030-LCO. 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710549.

(USCB, 2000a) U. S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Summary File 1 for New Mexico: Census 2000.* Available at http://www2.census.gov/census_2000/datasets/Summary_File_1/New_Mexico/. Accessed July 23, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710551.

(USCB, 2000b) U. S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Summary File 1 for Texas: Census 2000.* Available at http://www2.census.gov/census_2000/datasets/Summary_File_1/Texas/. Accessed July 23, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710551.

(USCB, 2000c) U. S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Summary File 3 for New Mexico: Census 2000.* Available at http://www2.census.gov/census_2000/datasets/Summary_File_3/New_Mexico/. Accessed July 23, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710554.

(USCB, 2000d) U. S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Summary File 3 for Texas: Census 2000.* Available at http://www2.census.gov/census_2000/datasets/Summary_File_1/Texas/. Accessed July 23, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710554.

(USCB, 2000e) U. S. Census Bureau. 2000. P92. Poverty Status in 1999 of Households by Household Type by Age of Householder. Detailed Tables. Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) Sample Data. Available at http://factfinder.census.gov/. Accessed July 26, 2010.

(USCB, 2000f) U. S. Census Bureau. 2000. P3. Race and P4. Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino by Race (Total Population). Detailed Tables. Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data. Available at http://factfinder.census.gov/. Accessed September 7, 2010.

(USCB, 2010a) U. S. Census Bureau. 2010. State and County Quick Facts, "Lea County and Eddy County New Mexico." Revised August 16. Available at http://quickfacts.census.gov/. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430121.

(USCB, 2010b) U. S. Census Bureau. 2010. American Fact Finder, "Fact Sheet, Lea County New Mexico, Eddy County New Mexico, Hobbs New Mexico, and Carlsbad New Mexico,"

Revised August 16. Available at http://factfinder.census.gov. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430104.

(USCB, 2010c) U. S. Census Bureau. 2010. Population Estimates, Vintage 2009, "Table 1. Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Counties of New Mexico: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2009." Available at http://www.census.gov/. Accessed August 26, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 103430109.

(USCB, 2010d) U. S. Census Bureau. 2010. Population Estimates, Vintage 2009, "Table 4. Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of New Mexico: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2009." Available at http://www.census.gov/. Accessed August 26, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 103430116.

(USCB, 2010e) U. S. Census Bureau. 2010. American Fact Finder, "Fact Sheet: 2006 – 2008. American Community Survey 3-Yar Estimates." Available at http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ADPTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=05000US35025&-qr_no. Accessed August 29, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430131.

(USCB, 2010f) U. S. Census Bureau. 2010. State and County Quick Facts, "New Mexico and Lea County, New Mexico," Revised August 16. Available at http://quickfacts.census.gov/. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430126.

(USDA, 2004) U. S. Department of Agriculture. 2004. Assessment of Grassland Ecosystem Conditions in the Southwestern United States. Volume 1. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-135-vol. 1. Fort Collins, CO. Available at http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr135_1.pdf'. Accessed on July 27, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090363.

(USDA, 2007) U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2007. 2007 Census of Agriculture. Table 7: Hired Farm Labor. Available at http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/. Accessed August 30, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430132.

(USFA, 2010) U. S. Fire Administration. 2010. National Fire Department Census, New Mexico. Available at http://www.usfa.dhs.gov/. Accessed September 21, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103430147.

(USFWS, 2008) United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Black-footed Ferret (Mustela nigripes) 5-year Status Review: Summary and Evaluation. South Dakota Field Office, Pierre, South Dakota. Available at http://www.fws.gov/ecos/ajax/docs/five_year_review/doc2364.pdf. Accessed October 24, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710563.

(USFWS, 2010a) United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. FWS Critical Habitat for Threatened and Endangered Species Mapper. Available at http://criticalhabitat.fws.gov/crithab/. Accessed January 19, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710570.

(USFWS, 2010b) United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office, "Listed and Sensitive Species in Lea County." New Mexico Ecological Service Field Office. Available at http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/NewMexico/SBC_view.cfm?spcnty=Lea. Accessed on August 9, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090370.

(USFWS, 2010c) United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. Consultation Response Letter regarding Federal Endangered, Threatened. Proposed, and Candidate Species and Species of Concern in New Mexico. New Mexico Ecological Services Field Office, Albuquerque, New Mexico. August, 10, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML102370576.

(USFWS, 2010d) United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for Dunes Sagebrush Lizard, 75 FR 239, pages 77801 – 77817. December 14, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710578.

(USGS, 2005a) U.S. Geological Survey. 2005. USGS Mineral Resources On-Line Spatial Database. Available at http://tin.er.usgs.gov/mrds/find-mrds.php. Accessed August 11, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080936.

(USGS, 2005b) U.S. Geological Survey. USGS National Gap Analysis Program. Digital Animal-Habitat Models for the Southwestern United States. Version 1.0, 200. Center for Applied Spatial Ecology, New Mexico Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, New Mexico State University. Available at http://fws-nmcfwru.nmsu.edu/swregap/habitatreview/ Review.asp. Accessed on October 15, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090472.

(USGS, 2010a) United States Geological Survey. National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) Program. High Plains Regional Ground Water (HPGW) Study. Available at http://co.water.usgs.gov/nawqa/hpgw/HPGW_home.html. Accessed August 15, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080991.

(USGS, 2010b) U.S. Geological Survey. National Biological Information Infrastructure, Gap Analysis Program (GAP). February 2010. National Land Cover, Version 1. 2010. Available at http://www.nbii.gov/portal/server.pt/community/maps_and_data/1850. Accessed on October 15, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103090471.

(UTPB, 2010) University of Texas of the Permian Basin. 2010. Graph and Data on the Permian Basin Oil Production and Reserves. Available at http://ceed.utpb.edu/energy-resources/petroleum-library/permian-basin-statistics/graphs-and-data-on-permian-basin-oil-production-and-reserves/. Accessed August 17, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080937.

(WRCC, 2010) Western Regional Climate Center. 2005. Climate Summary of New Mexico, Hobbs New Mexico". Available at http://wrcc.dri.edu/narratives/NEWMEXICO.htm. Accessed August 18 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080182.

(Yarger, 2009) Yarger, F. 2009. Seismic Probability in Lea County, NM: A Brief Analysis, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, New Mexico Center for Energy Policy. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080942.

(Zimbelman and Johnston, 2001) Zimbelman, J.R. and A.K. Johnston. 2001. Improved Topography of the Carrizozo Lava Flow: Implications for Emplacement Conditions. In Volcanology in New Mexico. New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science. Bulletin 18. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080947.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This chapter describes the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility. Section 4.1 addresses both construction and operations impacts from the proposed action. Plant decommissioning at the termination of the license is included as part of the proposed action. Cumulative impacts of the proposed action and past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are presented in Section 4.2. The no-action alternative is discussed in Section 4.3.

4.1 Proposed Action

As defined in Chapter 2 of this draft EIS, the proposed action is to construct, operate, and decommission a chemical plant for the deconversion of commercially generated DUF_6 inventories into depleted uranium oxide and other deconversion products.

The impacts discussions are organized by the subject areas described in Chapter 3, "Description of the Affected Environment." NRC staff significance criteria, SMALL, MODERATE, and LARGE, are used throughout the analyses. These are defined as follows (NRC, 2003):

SMALL: The environmental effects would not be detectable or are so minor that they would neither destabilize, nor noticeably alter any, important attribute of the resource.

MODERATE: The environmental effects would be sufficient to noticeably alter, but not destabilize, important attributes of the resource.

LARGE: The environmental effects would be clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

Section 4.1.1 addresses environmental impacts of construction and Section 4.1.2 addresses environmental impacts of operations.

4.1.1 Environmental Impacts of Construction

The impacts of construction on each of the major resource areas described in Chapter 3 are presented in this Section. Impacts of preconstruction activities (defined and identified in Chapter 2) are evaluated as cumulative impacts in Section 4.2.

4.1.1.1 Land Use

Impacts on land use result from commitment of the land for the proposed use and therefore, its potential exclusion from other possible uses. Land use impacts occur when the presence of a project would limit possible future land uses near the proposed project. For example, land use impacts could occur if the project restricts future access to mineral resources.

The current land uses on the proposed 259-ha (640-ac) site are cattle grazing, and access to and maintenance of utility rights-of-way and monitoring wells. The proposed site is not subject to local or county zoning, land use planning, or associated review process requirements, and there are no potential conflicts of land use plans, policies, or controls (Appendix A). The conversion of 16 ha (40 ac) of the 259-ha (640-ac) site from its current land use to the

proposed facility without disturbing the remaining 240 ha (600 ac) would not conflict with any existing Federal, State, local, or Tribal land uses or restrict current or planned mineral resources exploitation (Appendix A).

Construction of the proposed IIFP facility would modify the current land use by restricting cattle grazing on the entire 259-ha (640-ac) site. Currently, approximately 93 percent of land in Lea County is used as range land for grazing (approximately 1.0-million ha [2.6-million ac]). Restricting grazing on the 259-ha (640-ac) site would result in a loss of 0.02 percent of the land available for grazing. The proposed facility footprint was selected by IIFP to avoid, to the extent possible, existing utility rights-of-way so that the change in land use would not limit access to or maintenance of the rights-of-way. In addition, it is not likely that any of Xcel Energy's Cunningham Station's monitoring wells (CU-6, CU-8, and CU-9) in Section 27 (the proposed IIFP site) would be affected by the construction of the facility or the associated infrastructure such as the access road. NRC staff expects the remainder of the proposed IIFP site (Section 27) to be left in its present condition, largely undeveloped for the duration of the facility's operation and decommissioning.

Consequently, the NRC staff finds that the impacts to land use from the construction of the facility within the 259-ha (640-ac) site would be SMALL, due to the abundance of other nearby grazing land and the ability to continue to access utility rights-of-way.

4.1.1.2 Historic and Cultural Resources

This section describes the potential environmental impacts on historic and cultural resources resulting from construction of the proposed IIFP facility. As Chapter 3 states, historic and cultural resources include archaeological sites, historic structures, and places of cultural importance to groups for maintaining their heritage. Cultural resources are nonrenewable; that is, once altered, the information contained in cultural resources cannot be recovered. NRC staff identified separate Areas of Potential Effect (APEs) for archaeology and architecture; and for construction versus operations. For construction impacts, the APE for archaeology is considered to include the 16-ha (40-ac) IIFP facility, approach road, and parking lot where disturbance would occur. For construction impacts, the APE for historic architectural resources, would include the IIFP facility (limits of disturbance), and any areas where noise or construction activity would be heard or visible.

NRC staff identified no historic properties, districts, resources or significant culturally important or archaeological sites within the cultural resources APE during files research at the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office (NM SHPO), and tribal consultation. The field survey conducted by IIFP's archaeological consultant also identified no significant cultural resources although it found three isolated artifact occurrences – a brown chert San Jose projectile point fragment, a gray quartzite hammerstone, and three glass vessel fragments. The artifacts were recorded with the SHPO, but are not National Register-eligible as determined by the archaeological consultant for the State Land Office.

As discussed in Section 3.3.4, on October 14, 2010, the New Mexico Trust Land Archaeologist in the office of the State of New Mexico Commissioner of Public Lands recommended a finding of no effect to historic properties, districts, resources or significant historic/precontact archaeological sites because the cultural resource survey found no significant cultural resources in the proposed IIFP site, and no historic properties have been identified within the APE. The NM SHPO concurred with this determination on October 25, 2010 (Appendix B).

NRC staff also consulted with Native American Tribes which were identified from a list maintained by the NM SHPO, consistent with the NHPA Section 106. The NRC staff received three responses (Appendix B). On July 13, 2010, the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo stated that the Pueblo believes the project will not adversely affect traditional, religious, or culturally significant sites, but requested consultation should human remains or artifacts regulated by the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act* be discovered. On June 15, 2011, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Comanche Tribe noted that he had no comments on the project. On July 13, 2011, the Shawnee Tribe's Tribal Historic Preservation Department concurred that no known historic properties would be impacted by the project, but also requested consultation if archaeological materials are encountered during construction or operation of the facility.

Based on the history of the region, its lack of permanent surface water, and the results of previous investigations, no significant archaeological, cultural, or historic resources are present on the site. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts to historic properties, districts, resources or significant historic/precontact archaeological sites during construction would be SMALL.

4.1.1.3 Visual Resources

As discussed in Section 3.4, the scenic value of the proposed IIFP site is low ("least valued") and is further diminished by the presence, within 5 km (3 mi), of four industrial facilities, three of which are visible from the proposed site. Consequently, the NRC staff concludes that the impacts to visual resources during construction would be SMALL.

4.1.1.4 Climatology, Meteorology, and Air Quality

4.1.1.4.1 Greenhouse Gases

This section presents an assessment of the effect of construction of the proposed IIFP facility on the concentration of CO_2 and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

During construction, air emissions would come from (1) construction vehicles and equipment, (2) personal vehicles of the construction workforce, (3) delivery vehicles bringing materials and equipment to the proposed site, and (4) vehicles transporting construction-related wastes from the proposed site to area landfills and treatment/disposal facilities.

NRC staff used NONROAD (EPA, 2005) and MOVES (EPA, 2009a) computer models to calculate the estimated emissions for construction vehicles and equipment at 1,320 metric tons (1,455 tons) of CO_2 equivalent emissions (Table 4-1). During construction, an estimated 140 workers would commute to and from the proposed site with an assumed average (round-trip) distance of 64 km (40 mi) daily for 250 days per year (IIFP, 2011b). This is based on the assumption that the workforce would live in the nearby population centers of Hobbs, Lovington, and Carlsbad, New Mexico. A weighted average of the distance to each population center and the 2000 population was used to determine average daily trip distance (IIFP, 2011a). Over the 12-month construction period, the workforce commuting distance would be 2,253,082 km (1,400,000 mi). It was also estimated that over the course of the construction period, there would be 20 truck deliveries each day each traveling 64 km (40 mi). The EPA MOVES (EPA, 2009a) was used to calculate estimated CO_2 equivalents from all anticipated construction traffic as 790 metric tons (871 tons) (Table 4-2).

Finally, onsite storage and dispensing of fuels during construction would result in minor greenhouse gas emissions; however, because neither the specific volume nor the chemical speciation's of these evaporative losses are known, resulting greenhouse gas emissions have not been estimated.

Total CO_2 emissions expected during the 12-month construction period are 2,110 metric tons (2,326 tons); 1,320 metric tons (1,455 tons) from construction equipment and 790 metric tons (871 tons) from workforce commuting and deliveries. Using calendar year 2000 as a reference point (the latest year for which New Mexico greenhouse gas emission data are available), and as shown in Table 3-1, total net CO_2 emissions for New Mexico for the year 2000 were 62 million metric tons (68 million tons) of CO_2 equivalents. For the United States for that same year, total net CO_2 emissions were 5,977 million metric tons (6,588 million tons) (EPA, 2010a). By comparison, during the 12 months of construction, the proposed IIFP facility CO_2 emissions are projected to be 2,110 metric tons (2,326 tons) or 0.003 percent of New Mexico's statewide output and 0.00004 percent of the projected nationwide CO_2 emissions for the same period. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts from the construction of the proposed IIFP facility from the emissions of CO_2 and other greenhouse gases would be SMALL.

Table 4-1. CO_2 Emissions from Construction Equipment

Activity	Annual CO_2 Emissions	
	(ton)	(MT)
Construction Equipment	1,455	1,320

MT = metric ton

Table 4-2. Emissions from Workforce Commuting and Delivery Activities During Construction

Activity	Total Distances for 12 months		Annual CO_2 Emissions	
	(mi)	(km)	(ton)	(MT)
Commuting traffic (workforce)	1,400,000	2,300,000	660	599
Delivery Truck traffic	200,000	320,000	211	191
Total for workforce commuting and deliveries	1,600,000	2,600,000	871	790

MT = metric ton

4.1.1.4.2 Air Quality

Air quality impacts from the operation of construction equipment during facility construction were evaluated based on the construction schedules and parameters provided by IIFP.

Impacts to ambient air resources would occur from the construction of the proposed IIFP facility. As discussed in more detail below, the impacts would not be significant. Because the proposed IIFP site is located in an air quality control region that is designated as attainment with Federal and state ambient air quality standards, a General Conformity evaluation is not required.

Construction of the proposed project would produce criteria pollutants (i.e., CO, NO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, SO_2, lead, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs), an ozone precursor) and hazardous

air pollutants (HAPs) emissions from construction equipment, delivery vehicles, commuter vehicles, and onsite refueling activities. Particulate emissions in the form of fugitive dust from soil transfers, land grading, and vehicle and equipment travel on unpaved roads would also be generated.

The NRC staff used emission factors to estimate annual emissions from the construction of the proposed IIFP facility. Emission factors for highway vehicles (i.e., worker commute vehicles and delivery vehicles) were determined using the EPA MOVES Model (EPA, 2009a). Emission factors for non-road vehicles (including construction engines and equipment) were determined using the EPA NONROAD model (EPA, 2005). Emission factors for all other sources associated with construction were obtained from the EPA document AP-42, "Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors" (EPA, 1995a).

Emissions from each type of non-road equipment are a function of equipment-specific factors, including engine horsepower, load factor, and hours of operation. IIFP estimated that the construction project would be completed in approximately 12 months based on the assumption that construction would occur 10-hrs per day, 5 days per week, and would involve conventional construction equipment (e.g., dozers, graders, excavators, dump trucks, lifts). IIFP compiled a list of construction equipment that identifies for each month of construction, the quantity and average monthly hours of operation for each piece of equipment (See Table 4-3).

Emissions from highway vehicles (i.e., worker commute vehicles and delivery vehicles) are a function of the vehicle-specific factors, including type of vehicle and age, fuel type, and vehicle miles traveled. The NRC staff used Lea County, New Mexico-specific default values for vehicle type, age, and fuel type to determine highway vehicle emission factors. IIFP estimated that over the 12-month construction period, 140 workers would commute to and from the proposed site an average daily trip distance of 64 km (40 mi) for 250 days each year; and delivery trucks would make 20 delivery trips per day (at an average round trip distance of 64 km [40 mi]) to transport materials and equipment and remove wastes (IIFP, 2011a).

Fugitive dust generated during land clearing and soil transfer operations is dependent on a number of factors including silt and moisture content of the soil, wind speed, and disturbed area. To estimate fugitive dust emissions, IIFP used the EPA emission factor of 1.2 tons/acre/month of activity (EPA, 1995a). This emission factor represents total suspended particulates (i.e., particles less than 30 microns in diameter). IIFP assumed that the emission factor would drop to 0.3 tons/acre/month after the first month of construction, when the majority of earth moving activities would be complete. Multiplication factors of 0.15 and 0.075 were used to adjust the emission factor for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, respectively. IIFP also assumed that water would be applied to disturbed areas. This would reduce fugitive dust emissions by about 50 percent (IIFP, 2011a).

Small quantities of VOCs and HAPs emissions would be released from the refueling and onsite maintenance of construction equipment. Diesel fuel would be stored on site during construction and would be hand pumped into construction equipment and support vehicles. Annual VOCs and HAPs fugitive emissions are a function of diesel fuel consumption.

Table 4-3. Construction Equipment and Hours of Operation by Type and Month

Equipment	Max HP	Month 1		Month 2		Month 3		Month 4		Month 5		Month 6		Month 7		Month 8		Month 9		Month 10		Month 11		Month 12	
		No.	Hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr	No.	hr
Tractor/ backhoe	150	2	160	1	80	1	80	1	80	1	80	1	80	1	80	1	80	1	80	1	80	1	80	1	80
Grader	400	1	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Excavator	500	1	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dump Truck	300	2	160	2	160	2	160	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100
Dozer	400	1	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	160	1	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Compressor	325	1	80	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160
Concrete Pump	125	0	0	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160
Crane	175	0	0	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160	1	160
Fuel Truck	250	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Water Truck	250	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Forklifts	200	1	50	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160
Flatbed, 2-ton	200	1	80	1	80	1	80	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160
Generator	33	0	0	1	80	1	80	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160	2	160
Welder	50	1	30	2	60	2	60	5	160	5	160	5	160	5	160	3	160	3	160	3	160	3	160	3	160

Source: IIFP, 2011a
No. = number

The estimated maximum annual pollutant emissions from construction activities are presented in Table 4-4. Actual construction emissions are expected to be less, because conservative assumptions used in the modeling of construction activities tend to overestimate impacts. The applicant's environmental report described Best Management Practices (BMPs) they would use to reduce impacts to various resources at the proposed IIFP site, including those to minimize the impacts of construction activities on air quality. These BMPs are described in Chapter 5, Mitigation Measures and Commitments.

Table 4-4. Estimated Maximum Annual Emissions from Construction of the IIFP Facility

Source	CO metric tons (tons)	NO_2 metric tons (tons)	$PM_{2.5}$ metric tons (tons)	PM_{10} metric tons (tons)	SO_2 metric tons (tons)	VOC metric tons (tons)	HAP metric tons (tons)
Construction Equipment	4.00	8.55	0.639	0.660	0.268	0.778	-----
	(4.41)	(9.43)	(0.705)	(0.727)	(0.295)	(0.858)	-----
Delivery Vehicles	2.05	0.926	0.0394	0.0476	0.00224	0.174	0.174
	(2.26)	(1.02)	(0.0434)	(0.0524)	(0.00247)	(0.192)	(0.192)
Personal Vehicles	10.9	1.46	0.0266	0.0494	0.0116	1.03	1.03
	(12.1)	(1.61)	(0.0293	(0.0545)	(0.0128)	(1.14)	(1.14)
Fugitive Emissions	-----	-----	3.67	7.35	-----	0.00161	0.0016
			(4.05)	(8.10)		(0.00177)	(0.00177)
Total	17.7	10.9	4.38	8.11	0.282	1.99	1.21
	18.7	(12.1)	(4.83)	(8.93)	0.31	(2.19)	(1.33)

Source: See Appendix C
CO = carbon monoxide
NO_2 = nitrogen dioxide
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
SO_2 – sulfur dioxide
VOC = volatile organic compounds
HAP = hazardous air pollutants

To estimate the impact to local air quality, the NRC staff compared the anticipated criteria pollutant and VOCs emissions from the proposed IIFP construction activities to baseline emissions from Lea County, New Mexico. As shown in Table 4-5, emissions from the proposed construction activities at the IIFP site would represent a very small portion of the annual criteria pollutant emissions in Lea County.

NRC staff used EPA's SCREEN3 model (EPA 1995b) to estimate the maximum concentrations of pollutants at the proposed IIFP site property line that would be associated with construction activities. As shown in Table 4-6, the estimated incremental increases in ambient background concentrations due to the proposed construction activities would be above the National NAAQS for NO_2, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} emissions. HAPs and VOCs are not included in Table 4-6 because there are no regulatory metrics for comparison (HAPs and VOCs emissions are regulated by source controls and permit requirements).

Table 4-5. Comparison of Maximum Annual Emissions from Construction of the IIFP Facility to Lea County Baseline Conditions

Source	CO metric tons (tons)	NO_2 metric tons (tons)	$PM_{2.5}$ metric tons (tons)	PM_{10} metric tons (tons)	SO_2 metric tons (tons)	VOC metric tons (tons)
Site Construction	17.0 (18.70)	10.90 (12.10)	4.38 (4.83)	8.11 (8.93)	0.28 (0.31)	1.99 (2.19)
Lea County Baseline (a)	21,244 (23,417)	27,119 (29,894)	2,892 (3,188)	25,048 (27,611)	7,334 (8,084)	4,436 (4,890)
Net Increase over Baseline	0.080%	0.040%	0.151%	0.032%	0.004%	0.045%

Source: EPA, 2009b
Source: See Appendix C
CO = carbon monoxide
NO_2 = nitrogen dioxide
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
SO_2 – sulfur dioxide
VOC = volatile organic compounds
HAP = hazardous air pollutants

Table 4-6. Comparison of Predicted Maximum Downwind Concentrations Due to Construction Activities to NAAQS

Pollutant	Averaging Time	NAAQS $\mu g/m^3$	Incremental Concentration Increase $\mu g/m^3$	Incremental Concentration Increase as Percentage of NAAQS
CO	1-hr	10,000	116	1.2%
	8-hr	40,000	81.3	0.20%
NO_2	1-hr	100	269	269%
	Annual	188	26.9	14%
$PM_{2.5}$	24-hr	35	142	406%
	Annual	15	35.5	237%
PM_{10}	24-hr	150	277	185%
SO_2	1-hr	200	8.5	4.3%
	3-hr	1,300	7.7	0.6%

Source: See Appendix C

As discussed above, the estimated emissions during construction of the proposed IIFP facility represent a very small fraction of the current emissions in Lea County. Because conservative assumptions that tend to overestimate impacts were used to produce these estimates, actual emissions from the construction activities are expected to be lower. Pollutant emissions from construction activities have the potential to change the existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP facility. Overall, the construction impacts would be localized and short-term. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the air quality impacts resulting from the construction of the proposed IIFP facility would be MODERATE for NO_2, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} emissions and SMALL for CO, and SO_2 emissions. BMPs identified by the applicant to use during construction to reduce impacts to air quality are described in Chapter 5, Mitigation

Measures and Commitments. The NRC staff finds that the BMPs committed to by IIFP for the proposed facility would be sufficient to maintain impacts as MODERATE to SMALL.

4.1.1.5 Geology, Minerals, and Soil

Section 3.6 describes the geology, minerals, and soils at the proposed IIFP site. Alluvium and/or caliche would be removed during site preparation. If the materials are of the appropriate quality they would be used for roads or facility foundations at the site. The existing caliche pit described in Section 3.6.3 could be a source of caliche for site roads. Impact to topography and bedrock would be limited to clearing and excavating areas for facility and road construction. These impacts would be largely limited to the 16-ha (40-ac) facility, with the exception of the roadway construction that would extend beyond the facility, through the 259-ha (640-ac) site, to NM 483.

The proposed IIFP site has been explored for oil and gas and caliche. The site has very limited leasable, locatable, or marketable mineral resources. Therefore, the proposed IIFP construction activities would not result in loss of mineral resources.

As discussed in Section 3.6.2, the site is in an area of limited seismic and volcanic activity (Crone and Wheeler, 2000; Machette et al. 2000; Yarger, 2009), and the statistical probability of risk of earthquake damage is very low. Because excavation depth is limited to near-surface geology, construction activities are not expected to cause seismic or fault-related impacts.

Soil erosion due to stormwater runoff and wind erosion must be managed during construction. As described in Section 3.6.4, the proposed site does not contain any prime farmland; therefore, prime farmland would not be impacted. During construction, BMPs would be employed to limit soil loss and mitigate any impacts. These would include:

- Soil stabilization (e.g. temporary and permanent seeding),
- Structural controls (e.g. hay bales and sediment fences), and
- Management practices (e.g. construction sequencing, materials delivery sequencing, and physical delineation of disturbed areas).

Construction excavation would be limited to near-surface geology at the 16-ha (40-ac) facility, and would result in minimal loss of mineral resources. BMPs identified in the applicant's environmental report would be used to limit soil loss. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the BMPs committed to by IIFP would be sufficient to ensure that construction impacts of the proposed IIFP facility to geology, minerals, and soil would be SMALL.

4.1.1.6 Water Resources

This section discusses the potential impacts of construction of the proposed IIFP facility on water resources.

4.1.1.6.1 Groundwater

As discussed in Section 3.7.1.2, the site is within the Lea County underground water basin (UWB). The Ogallala aquifer is the primary water supply source in the Lea County UWB, and is proposed as the water supply source for the proposed IIFP project. The aquifer is encountered at a depth of approximately 9.1 m (30 ft) beneath the proposed site (GL Environmental, 2010).

Excavation through the dense caliche at the site could be required for sewer systems, roads, pads, and building foundations. Excavation depths are not expected to exceed the depth to groundwater (GL Environmental, 2010; IIFP, 2009a).

4.1.1.6.1.1 Groundwater Use

As discussed in Section 3.7.1.2, all the groundwater wells in the site vicinity obtain water from the Ogallala aquifer. The closest domestic groundwater supply well is (L-07469) approximately 1.6 km (1 mi) northwest of the proposed site (IIFP, 2011a). The well depth is 48.8 m (160 ft) and the depth to water is 21.3 m (70 ft) (NMOSE, 2010).

No municipal water line runs near the proposed site. The construction activities for the facility would require relatively low volumes of water. Up to two groundwater production wells would be installed in the Ogallala aquifer to supply all the water for the proposed facility. One of these production wells would be installed on the site by Lea County prior to the property transfer. This well would be designed to meet the production needs for both proposed Phase 1 and 2 operations. This well would be drilled to a depth estimated to be between 61 to 76.2 m (200 to 250 ft) below ground surface with an estimated pumping capacity of 1,325 L/min (350 gpm). A second production well may be needed during IIFP operations for emergency preparedness purposes. This well, if required, would be installed by IIFP during construction. If the second production well is installed, it would be located to minimize interference with the first production well (INIS, 2011). All new monitoring and production wells installed at the site would be installed in accordance with the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer and Lea County Water Users Association regulations.

IIFP states that during construction, water use is projected to equal 3,600 L/day (960 gpd) on average, and 12,500 L/day (3,300 gpd) maximum (IIFP, 2011a). Groundwater may be used during construction for personal use, construction activities, and dust suppression. Groundwater pumped from the site well would be a consumptive loss because the groundwater would either be consumed or evaporated. For more information on groundwater appropriations and use restrictions refer to Section 4.1.2.6.1.

As discussed in Section 3.7.1.2.1, because current pumping is in excess of the Ogallala's recharge rate, the aquifer has experienced significant drawdown in the last several decades. In 2009, the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer (NM OSE) prepared guidelines on the procedures for processing water rights applications filed with the Lea County UWB. The NM OSE developed administrative guidelines in order to promote the orderly development of water resources in the Lea County UWB, while meeting statutory obligations regarding existing water rights, availability of unappropriated water, conservation of water with the State, and public welfare of the State through a 40-year planning period beginning on January 1, 2005 and ending on January 1, 2045.

On March 10, 2009, the NM OSE issued an order closing the Lea County UWB to the filing of groundwater applications (NMOSE, 2009a). In 1999, in order to meet the projected groundwater demands of Lea County, 138 applications were filed by the Lea County Water Users Association to appropriate 6,389 ha-m (51,797 ac-ft) per year of groundwater, which was essentially all the unappropriated groundwater in the Lea County UWB (Leadshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

A portion of the applications to appropriate groundwater, totaling 4,215.2 ha-m (34,173 ac-ft) per year, have been assigned to Lea County during (at least) the 40-year planning period to allow

the County to hold the subject water rights unused until the rights can be put to beneficial use at projects currently under construction, select future projects, and homes and businesses in unincorporated areas. The proposed IIFP site has been included in Lea County's 40-Year Water Development Plan as an area of proposed development where up to 21.6 ha-m (175 ac-ft) per year of the Lea County's water rights would be put to beneficial use. The estimated quantity of additional groundwater that Lea County would need by the end of the 40-yr planning period for all projects that currently exist, are being constructed, or have a high likelihood of being constructed in the near future is 1,173.5 ha-m (9,514 ac-ft) per year (Leadshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

Groundwater rights for the facility would be obtained from the Lea County unallocated water rights under State Engineer Office Water Right File No. L-04719-A for industrial water use. The proposed facility would obtain a joint Lea County and New Mexico Office of State Engineer (NM OSE) Water Rights Agreement for 6.2 ha-m (50 ac-ft) per year (far less than the 21.6 ha-m [175 ac-ft] per year estimation in the Lea County Water Development Plan). The site would use approximately 0.5 percent of the estimated annual 40-year planning period groundwater demand of 9,514 ac-ft per year for Lea County, and only 0.15 percent of the 4,215.2 ha-m (34,173 ac-ft) per year of unappropriated water rights that have been assigned to Lea County.

The proposed site production well(s) could be the sole source of water during construction; or the applicant could use water from tanker trucks. Groundwater from onsite wells, or tankers filled from the Hobbs city water system, would be required during Phase 1 construction, mostly for dust suppression, fill compaction, and concrete formation. Unlike preconstruction, where water is assumed to be brought in on tanker trucks, IIFP may have operating wells at some point during construction. This water is not anticipated to be recycled and reused like plant process water during operations (discussed in Section 4.1.2.6.1), however the volumes required during construction would be less than a third of the volumes required during operations. Regardless if water comes from onsite wells or from the Hobbs municipal system via tanker trucks, the water use is accounted for in, and consistent with, Lea County's water use plan. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that groundwater use impacts during construction would be SMALL.

4.1.1.6.1.2 Groundwater Quality

The Ogallala aquifer beneath the site is unconfined, and is recharged by natural precipitation that percolates to the groundwater table. As a consequence, any contaminants (e.g., diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, antifreeze, or lubricants) spilled during construction and not controlled by spill control measures could affect the unconfined aquifer, although migration of contaminants would be slowed by the approximately 9.1-m (30-ft) thick indurated caliche layer that overlies the aquifer at the site (GL Environmental, 2010).

Any spills of diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, antifreeze, or lubricants during construction would be cleaned up quickly in accordance with the proposed facility's Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan, to prevent the contaminant from entering the groundwater.

All construction activities would comply with the site's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit to discharge stormwater associated with construction and the associated stormwater pollution prevention plan. Surface water flow from rain events would be directed to the site's proposed catch basins.

During construction activities, portable sanitary facilities would be used until a permanent sanitary waste treatment facility is functional. The waste collected from these temporary facilities would be disposed of offsite by a licensed sanitary waste disposal contractor. No process waste effluent will be generated during this construction phase.

Therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts to groundwater quality due to construction-related activities would be SMALL.

4.1.1.6.2 Surface Water

As discussed in Section 3.7.2, no permanent surface water, including jurisdictional waters, is present on the proposed IIFP site. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts to surface water quality or quantity due to construction-related activities would be SMALL.

4.1.1.7 Ecological Resources

This section discusses the potential impacts of construction of the proposed IIFP facility on ecological resources. Most of the potential ecological disturbances due to habitat loss from land clearing of the proposed IIFP site would occur during preconstruction, and thus is evaluated as a cumulative impact. Other potential ecological disturbances could include: noise and vibrations from heavy equipment and traffic, fugitive dust, and the presence of construction personnel. Approximately 16 ha (40 ac) of land would be affected by construction, which represents less than 10 percent of the total 259 ha (640 ac) site. Leaving a majority of the site undisturbed would allow mobile resident wildlife within the disturbed areas an opportunity to relocate to the undisturbed areas. These undisturbed areas are expected to be left undisturbed for the life of the proposed facility. Some wildlife may suffer stresses or mortality during construction. Human encounters with some wildlife could increase due to loss of habitat. No construction facilities or equipment would be 61 m (200 ft) high or taller, so no aviation safety lights will be required (FAA, 1992). Security lighting will be directed downward, and construction will not require night shifts so night-migrating and nocturnal animals would not be affected.

As described in Section 3.7.2, there are no wetlands or permanent stream systems, and therefore no riparian habitat within the facility footprint.

As described in Section 3.8, no Federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species are likely to be found on the site as their preferred habitats are not found on the site. No unique or critical habitats occur on the site. No threatened or endangered species are known from the site or in the vicinity. No commercially or recreationally important species use the habitat at the site exclusively.

Maintenance practices such as the use of chemical herbicides, roadway maintenance, and clearing practices could be employed during construction. Land clearing would destroy the Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie and Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub vegetation communities within the 16 ha (40 ac) facility footprint. However, neither of these vegetation communities provides unique habitat in the area and the impacted area of 16 ha (40 ac) constitutes a small fraction of these vegetation communities in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP site (see Figure 3-19). Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the loss of 16 ha (40 acres) of either habitat type would have a SMALL impact on native vegetation in the vicinity of proposed action.

During construction, the presence of humans, the presence of construction equipment and associated noise and vibrations, and general construction activities could result in animals currently using the property, such as birds, foxes and other small mammals, to avoid the construction area. Many other species, such as rodents, and some reptiles, are small, have limited mobility, occur in habitats that provide concealment, or spend at least a portion of their lives underground. During site clearing and grading activities, it is likely that some individuals of these species will not survive the construction activities. Rodents and larger mammals and reptiles may be killed along access roads by vehicles moving to and from the site. There are many square miles of undeveloped land surrounding the IIFP site (i.e., Section 27) which have native vegetation and habitats suitable for native species. As discussed in Section 3.8.3 the species of wildlife present or that could be present are typical of those found in the habitat in the surrounding area. Because the area surrounding the proposed IIFP site is largely undeveloped (see Section 3.2), there is sufficient suitable habitat in the vicinity of the project to support displaced animals. Therefore the NRC staff finds that impacts to ecological resources from construction of the proposed facility would be SMALL.

4.1.1.8 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice

This section analyzes the potential social and economic (socioeconomic) impacts associated with construction of the proposed IIFP facility. As discussed in Section 3.9, most socioeconomic impacts would occur within a two-county area (Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico), where the majority of the construction workforce would live and spend their wages. These two counties comprise the socioeconomic Region of Interest (ROI) in these analyses which are based on IIFP's estimate of a peak of 140 construction workers (IIFP, 2011a). Construction would begin in 2012 and be completed in 2013. Wage and salary spending would have a small positive economic benefit in the ROI, and expenditures associated with materials, equipment, and supplies would produce local and State tax revenue. The migration of workers and their families into the area would slightly increase the population of the ROI and affect housing availability and community services such as education, fire protection, law enforcement, medical resources, and the availability of public utilities.

The major factor influencing socioeconomic impacts of construction is the number of construction workers who would relocate to the area with their families. An NRC staff study, Migration and Residential Location of Workers at Nuclear Power Plant Construction Sites (BMI, 1981) evaluated behaviors and characteristics of construction workers at nuclear power plant construction sites. It provides a methodology for estimating in-migrating workforce sizes and residential distribution patterns at nuclear power plant construction sites. There is no evidence that the fundamental nuclear construction workforce characteristics and behaviors have changed appreciably since the study's publication. The proposed IIFP facility is a nuclear fuel cycle facility, and, as such would require construction methods, quality control, and safety procedures similar to those used for constructing nuclear power plants. Therefore, the current analysis assumed that the construction behaviors and characteristics identified in the BMI study would be a fair representation of the expected IIFP construction workforce, and therefore the worker migration patterns and family characteristics described in the BMI study remain valid assumptions. The BMI study indicates the following construction worker characteristics:

- Between 15-35 percent of the construction workforce would migrate into the ROI.
- Approximately 70 percent of in-migrating construction workers are likely to bring families (this may be an overestimate for a construction job with a duration of one year, however, to be conservative, the NRC staff maintained this assumption).

- Average family size of a construction worker is 3.25 persons.
- Average number of school-aged children per construction worker family is 0.8.
- Approximately 50 percent of the in-migrating construction workforce will remain in the ROI following construction.

IIFP anticipates the peak number of construction workers would be 140. In 2008, construction and mining employment provided more than 28 percent of all non-farm employment in the ROI. They are two of the largest employment sectors in the ROI. Because of the presence of workers with construction experience, the NRC staff estimates that 80 percent of the total construction workforce would already reside within the ROI and 20 percent would migrate into the ROI. An estimate of 20 percent in-migrants is within the range of the in-migrating construction workforce identified in the BMI study when there is already an existing, viable construction workforce within the ROI. Table 4-7 depicts workforce in-migration, family, and workforce retention characteristics based on the BMI study and the maximum workforce for the construction of the proposed IIFP facility. These projections are used throughout this analysis.

4.1.1.8.1 Population

As presented in Section 3.9.1.2, the population within the ROI was 112,938 persons in 2009. Construction of the proposed IIFP facility would directly employ a maximum of 140 people, of which 80 percent would be ROI residents. The other 20 percent (28 workers) would migrate into the socioeconomic ROI (Table 4-7). Of the 28 employees that would migrate into the ROI, 70 percent (20 workers) would bring their families (Table 4-7). Eight construction workers would not bring families. Using an average family size of 3.25 from the BMI study, the total construction workforce in-migration would result in 72 new residents (Table 4-7) in the two-county ROI. An increase of 72 residents would result in a 0.06 percent increase in the ROI population.

4.1.1.8.2 Employment and Income

Workers already residing in the ROI would fill 80 percent of the construction jobs or 112 jobs (see Table 4-7). These workers represent 0.2 percent of the June 2010 labor force within the ROI. If all 112 of the jobs were filled by unemployed workers, the unemployment rate in the ROI would decrease by 0.2 percent. The remaining 28 jobs would be filled by workers migrating into the ROI (Table 4-7). The in-migrating workers would increase the labor force by 0.05 percent.

The U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), Economic and Statistics Division uses an economic model called RIMS II, which incorporates buying and selling linkages among regional industries and uses a multiplier specific to an industry to estimate the economic impact within the region. The multiplier is the number of times the final increase in consumption exceeds the initial dollar spent. In this analysis, the NRC staff uses the multiplier for the construction industry in the ROI to estimate the number of indirect jobs that would result from the in-migration associated with the construction of the proposed IIFP facility. Indirect jobs are often non-technical and non-professional positions in the retail and service sectors. The 12 indirect jobs that would be created (Table 4-8) would likely be filled by ROI residents. If all 12 jobs were filled by unemployed workers, those workers would represent 0.3 percent of the unemployed labor force in June 2010.

Table 4-7. Assumptions for Workforce Characterization during Peak Construction Period

Workforce characterization	
Peak number of workers on site during construction [1]	140
Workforce migration	
Percent of construction workers migrating into ROI [2]	20%
Total number of construction workers migrating into ROI during construction peak [3]	28
Families	
Percent of construction workers who bring families [2]	70%
Percent of construction workers who do not bring families [3]	30%
Average construction worker family size (worker, spouse, children) [2]	3.25
Number of construction workers who would move into ROI and bring families	20
Post-construction workforce retention	
Number of construction workers who would move into ROI and would not bring families	8
Number of construction worker family members who would move into ROI	44
Total number of workers and family members migrating into ROI (new population in ROI)	72
School-age children	
Number of school-age children per family [2]	0.8
Number of school-age children in ROI	16
Percent of in-migrating workers that would leave ROI, post-construction [2]	50%
Number of in-migrating workers that would leave ROI, post-construction	14
Total number of in-migrating workers and family members that would leave ROI, post-construction	36
Number of school-age children of in-migrating workers that would leave ROI, post-construction	8

Source:
[1] IIFP, 2011a
[2] BMI, 1981
[3] See Appendix D
Note: there are slight variations in the calculations due to rounding,

Table 4-8. Direct and Indirect Employment

Construction workforce peak (Table 4-7)	140
Number of construction workers who migrate into ROI (20 percent of construction workforce peak) (Table 4-7)	28
Employment multiplier for construction in ROI (BEA, 2010)	0.4324
Indirect jobs resulting from in-migrating construction workers (i.e., 28x0.4324=12)	12

Expenditures for goods and services to support construction activities would occur both inside and outside the ROI. Approximately $70 million to $94 million in capital costs would be spent for construction (IIFP, 2009a). Also, construction workers would spend a portion of their

earnings on goods and services within the ROI. Construction worker wages are estimated to average $32,700 annually (IIFP, 2011a).

The NRC staff finds that due to the size of the available workforce in the ROI, the effect of construction on employment and income within the ROI would be SMALL and beneficial.

4.1.1.8.3 Taxes

Construction-related activities, purchases, and workforce expenditures would generate several types of taxes, including individual income taxes, gross receipts taxes, and property taxes. Increased tax collections are viewed as a benefit to the State of New Mexico, Lea County, the Hobbs Municipal School District, the New Mexico Junior College, the communities in Lea County, and other locales where plant-related spending would occur.

Income Taxes

New Mexico imposes a tax on the net income of every resident and nonresident employed or engaged in business in or from the State or deriving any income from any property or employment within the State. The rates vary depending upon filing status and income (Section 3.9.3). Construction wages would be taxed as income and the NRC staff finds that those tax payments would have a SMALL, beneficial impact.

IIFP would not pay corporate income tax during construction.

Gross Receipts Taxes

New Mexico has a gross receipts tax structure instead of a sales tax structure. Like sales taxes, gross receipts taxes are generated by the purchase of goods and services. The gross receipts tax rate varies throughout the state from 5.125 percent to 8.6875 (Section 3.9.3).

IIFP estimates (in 2009 dollars) that construction capital costs would be between $70 million and $94 million. Some portion of those expenditures would occur within the ROI and adjacent counties. The expenditures would generate gross receipts tax revenues for both the counties and New Mexico (IIFP, 2009a). The NRC staff finds that these revenues would be SMALL and beneficial. Because IIFP would have an industrial revenue bond with Lea County, some expenditure would be exempt from gross receipts taxes.

Regional spending on goods and services by the construction workforce would generate gross receipts tax revenues for Lea County and Eddy County municipalities, the two counties, New Mexico, and other locales where spending occurs. The NRC staff finds that this increase in gross receipt taxes would create a SMALL, beneficial impact.

Property Taxes

Property taxes in Lea County are derived using property assessment values (33.3 percent of appraised values) and the tax rates of the taxing entities. The annual payment in lieu of tax (PILT) to the Hobbs Municipal School District is based on a tax rate of $7.60 per $1,000 of assessed value (IIFP, 2011a). The annual PILT to the New Mexico Junior College is based on a tax rate of $4.30 per $1,000 of assessed value (IIFP, 2011a). Based on the estimated assessed value of the IIFP land and attachments to the land and on the equipment and materials, the estimated PILTs during the construction would be $261,000 in 2012 and

$293,400 in 2013 (IIFP, 2011a). According to Table 3-28, the Hobbs Municipal School District's total 2007-2008 revenues were about $71 million and the New Mexico Junior College's total 2008-2009 revenues were about $37 million. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the property tax impact of construction would be SMALL (less than 1 percent of the school revenues in all cases) but nonetheless, beneficial.

4.1.1.8.4 Housing

In 2008, 5,823 vacant housing units were within the ROI (Section 3.9.4). Construction would result in an influx of approximately 28 construction workers (Table 4-7), all of whom would need housing. Housing the 28 in-migrating construction workers would require 0.5 percent of the vacant housing units within the ROI. The in-migrating workers would not adversely affect the existing housing inventory. In addition, the ROI has temporary housing in hotel/motel rooms available for short-term leasing and areas available for trailers and recreational vehicles that some workers may elect to live in.

Because the existing vacant housing inventory would be sufficient to accommodate the expected population increase associated with the proposed IIFP construction project, the NRC staff finds that the impact of construction on housing would be SMALL.

4.1.1.8.5 Public Utilities

Public Water

All onsite potable, process, and fire water needed during the construction of the IIFP facility would be provided by one or two wells installed in the Ogallala aquifer (IIFP, 2009a). During construction, 72 people (Table 4-7) would relocate to the ROI and likely find housing within an area that is served by a public water utility. The major public water suppliers in the ROI serve 88,643 people (Table 3-30) and most have excess capacity. The in-migration during construction would result in a 0.08 percent increase in people who rely on the ROI's public water supply. The NRC staff finds that the impact of construction on public water supplies would be SMALL, because the excess capacity of water suppliers in the ROI is sufficient to support the in-migrating workforce. The construction site would not be connected to a public water supply.

Public Wastewater

There would be no onsite disposal of any solid or liquid waste during construction of the IIFP facility. The proposed IIFP site would not be connected to any public wastewater or sewage system (IIFP, 2011a). All wastes generated during construction, including sanitary wastes, would be shipped offsite for disposal. During construction, 72 people (Table 4-7) would relocate to the ROI and likely find housing within areas that are served by a public wastewater system. The major public wastewater treatment facilities in the ROI serve approximately 78,917 people (Table 3-31) and all have excess capacity. Construction in-migration would result in a 0.09 percent increase in people who rely on the ROI's public wastewater systems. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the impact of construction on public wastewater would be SMALL.

4.1.1.8.6 Community Services

Education

In 2008, there were 8 public school districts, containing 64 schools, educating 22,847 students in the ROI (Section 3.9.6.1). Construction would result in an influx of approximately 28 construction workers, 20 of whom would bring their families (Table 4-7). Each in-migrating family is estimated to have 0.8 school-aged children (Table 4-7); therefore, 16 children could require public school during construction (Table 4-7). The new student enrollment resulting from construction would represent an increase of 0.07 percent in the 2008 enrollment in the ROI. The increase in public school enrollment would be less than 1 percent of total enrollment and would be essentially undetectable. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the impact of construction on education would be SMALL.

Fire Protection

The in migrating workforce would increase the population in the ROI less than 0.1 percent (Section 4.1.1.8.1) and would result in filling 0.5 percent of the available housing. Therefore, there would not be a detectable increase in the demand for fire protection. Existing fire protection personnel, facilities, and equipment would be sufficient to support the population increase. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the impact of construction would be SMALL.

Law Enforcement

The in migrating workforce would increase the ROI population less than 0.1 percent (Section 4.1.1.8.1) and would not change the ability of existing law enforcement services to meet the needs of the population. Existing law enforcement personnel, facilities, and equipment would be sufficient to support the population increase; therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the impact of construction of the proposed IIFP facility would be SMALL.

Hospitals and Physicians

An ROI population increase of less than 0.1 percent (Section 4.1.1.8.1) would not measurably increase the demand for hospital and physician services. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the impact of construction on hospitals and physician services would be SMALL.

4.1.1.8.7 Environmental Justice

Environmental Justice refers to a Federal executive order that directs all Federal agencies, including the NRC, to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. Section 3.9.1.2 defines and identifies the minority and low-income populations within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the proposed IIFP site. There are 96 block groups that fall completely or partially within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the proposed site. Of the 96 block groups, 1 has a significant African American population, 15 have significant “some other race” populations, 32 have significant Hispanic populations, and 10 have significant low-income populations. The locations of these block groups are shown on Figures 3-22, 3-23, 3-24 and 3-25. The following discussion summarizes project impacts on the general population and addresses whether or not minority and low-income populations would experience disproportionately high and adverse impacts. The primary resource areas that could be affected by construction are soil, groundwater quality, groundwater quantity, air quality, ecology, and socioeconomics.

- Land Use – The primary land use on the proposed IIFP site is cattle grazing. Less than 10 percent of the 259-ha (640-ac) site area would be disturbed during construction, and cattle grazing would not be permitted on the site. Construction would not conflict with any existing Federal, State, local, or Indian Tribe land use plans, or planned development in the area. The NRC staff finds that the land use impacts resulting from construction and conversion from agricultural (grazing) land use to industrial use would be SMALL due to the abundance of other nearby grazing land (Section 4.1.1.1 Land Use).

- Soils – The largest potential for impacts on soils during construction would result from clearing and grading, which loosens soil and increases the potential for erosion by wind and water. BMPs would be implemented during construction to limit soil loss. The NRC staff finds that the construction impacts on soils would be SMALL and confined to the site (Section 4.1.1.5 Geology, Minerals, and Soils).

- Groundwater quality – Groundwater beneath the proposed IIFP site is unconfined and recharged by natural precipitation, therefore, uncontrolled spills during construction could temporarily and locally affect the aquifer. However, a site-specific Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan would be developed with procedures to manage spills. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts on groundwater quality would be SMALL, localized, and temporary (Section 4.1.1.6 Water Resources).

- Groundwater quantity – No municipal water line runs near the proposed IIFP facility. Water brought in tanker trucks from Hobbs, or one or two wells onsite would supply all of the water for the construction activities. Average and peak site water requirements for construction are expected to be approximately 6.05 L/min (1.6 gpm) and 20.5 L/min (5.42 gpm), respectively. Because the IIFP site is not located in a critical management area (CMA, the legal drawdown limit for any wells on the property would be on average 0.06 m/yr (0.20 ft/yr). It is unlikely that the two wells would ever exceed the Lea County Underground Water Basin drawdown limit (Section 4.1.2.6 Water Resources). Therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts to groundwater quantity would be SMALL.

- Air quality – Section 4.1.1.4 reports that site boundary concentrations of some criteria air pollutants would be higher than the NAAQS. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that Phase 1 construction impacts to air quality would be SMALL to MODERATE and localized.

- Ecology – Approximately 16 ha (40 ac) of land would be disturbed, which represents less than 10 percent of the total 259 ha (640 ac) site. Construction would destroy or displace local wildlife. No impacts to rare or unique habitats, threatened or endangered species, or commercially or recreationally valuable species would result from construction. The NRC staff finds that potential impacts to ecological resources during construction would be SMALL and localized (Section 4.1.1.7 Ecological Resources), based on the small area that would be impacted, compared to the available comparable habitat within the region.

- Socioeconomics – Construction would require a maximum of 140 workers, 28 of whom would migrate into the ROI, 20 of whom would bring families. The potential in-migrating population would increase the population within the ROI by 0.1 percent. The NRC staff concludes that this small increase in the population within the ROI would have a SMALL impact on employment, taxes, housing, community services, and public utilities (Section 4.1.1.8 Socioeconomics).

The NRC staff concludes that the impacts of construction on each of these resource areas would be SMALL (SMALL to MODERATE for air quality) and localized. Furthermore, the

nearest minority or low-income population meeting the NRC definition is 22.5 km (14 mi) from the proposed site. Therefore, because potential impacts to all resource area impacts would be SMALL or MODERATE and localized, and the identified minority and low-income populations are not in close proximity to the proposed site, the NRC staff finds that impacts would not be disproportionately high and adverse for any populations in the region, including minority or low-income populations.

4.1.1.9 Traffic and Transportation

This section identifies the traffic and transportation impacts within the region during construction. The transportation mode for personnel, construction equipment, and materials deliveries would be exclusively by roadways to the proposed IIFP site. There are no plans to extend the railroad in Hobbs to transport goods or materials to the proposed site. Although routine rail freight and air freight is expected to be used for shipping materials or equipment to the region, this freight would be offloaded elsewhere and arrive at the site on trucks.

The principal highway routes that would handle this traffic include NM 483, which borders the site to the west, and US 62/180, which provides an east-west route to the nearest population centers. All traffic would access the site via NM 483, and most traffic would use US 62/180 to NM 483 to access the site. Some portion of the workforce may access the site from the north, using NM 83 to access NM 483 north of the site. At the junction of NM 483 and US 62/180, traffic would go east to Hobbs, Eunice and other Lea County municipalities or southwest to Eddy County. After the intersection of NM 483 and US 62/180 traffic associated with the site would be increasingly dispersed.

Peak construction would use 140 workers (IIFP, 2011b). Therefore, if each employee commutes alone, there would be an increase of 140 vehicles on NM 483. IIFP estimated 20 delivery or waste disposal trucks each day, for an additional 40 additional trips during one construction shift.

The Highway Capacity Manual 2000 (TRB 2000) indicates that the capacity of a two-lane highway is 1,700 passenger cars per hour for a single direction and 3,400 passenger cars per hour for both directions. The annual average daily traffic count (AADT) on NM 483, a two-lane highway, at the intersection of US 62/180 in 2008 was 955 vehicles per day (NMDOT, 2009). If all the vehicles on NM 483 in one day used the road in a single hour, and if the construction workforce used the road to access the site during that same hour, a maximum of 1,095 vehicles would be on the road. This is less than the design capacity of a two-lane highway. Traffic impacts on NM 483 due to 20 truck trips per shift would have a smaller impact than the scenario described here. The maximum construction traffic on US62/180, which is a four-lane highway, also would have a smaller impact that that of the scenario analyzed here. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to traffic from construction would be SMALL.

The potential for traffic accidents increases with increased traffic. Assuming that the majority of the workers and trucks would travel from Hobbs (a distance of 23.3 km [14.5 mi]) and Lovington (24.9 km [15.5 mi]), and a small percentage would come from Carlsbad (80 km [50 mi]), the NRC staff estimates an average one-way commute distance of 32 km (20 mi). Delivery trucks would travel an average round trip distance of 80 km (50 mi). A 64-km (40-mi) daily commute by 140 commuting workers and an 80-km (50-mi) commute by 20 truck results in 10,600 km (6,600 mi) traveled each day for 250 work days per year during the peak construction period. In New Mexico in 2010, vehicle accidents resulted in 51.73 injuries and 1.73 fatal accidents per 160 million vehicle-km (100 million vehicle-mi) (UNM, 2010). Based on these rates, statistically,

there would be one injury (risk of less than 0.85 injury crashes per year) and no fatalities (risk of less than 0.03 fatal crashes per year) as a result of the construction traffic.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to traffic due to construction would be temporary and SMALL.

4.1.1.10 Noise

As discussed in Section 3.11, noise from the construction of the proposed facility would be restricted to daylight hours, temporary, and attenuated with distance. Four industrial facilities are within 5 km (3.1 mi) of the site. The nearest residence is approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi) northwest of the site and there are no recreational facilities within 8.0 km (5.0 mi) of the proposed site. Because the construction equipment noise will attenuate within a short distance of the proposed IIFP site, the nearest residence and other land uses would not be adversely affected by construction noise. The NRC staff finds that impacts due to noise would be SMALL, based on the distances to surrounding residences and recreational areas and the rate at which noise is attenuated with distance.

4.1.1.11 Public and Occupational Health Impacts

This section analyzes the potential impacts on public and occupational health from the proposed IIFP facility construction. The analysis is divided into two main sections: nonradiological impacts and radiological impacts.

The proposed action involves a major construction activity with the potential for industrial accidents, material-handling accidents, and construction accidents that could result in temporary injuries, long-term injuries and/or disabilities, and fatalities.

The number of potential fatal and nonfatal occupational injuries from construction of the proposed IIFP facility were estimated based on injury rate data from the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. As shown in Table 4-9, six nonfatal injuries and less than one fatality are expected during construction. Additionally, because of the commitment that IIFP is making to a safe design basis for facilities and programs, its safety culture, and adherence to the Integrated Safety Management System program and procedures, the occupational injury rates during construction of the proposed IIFP facility could be better than the industry average. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to human health from occupational injuries during construction would be SMALL.

Table 4-9. Nonfatal/Fatal Occupational Injuries Projected for IIFP Facility Construction

Category	Injury Rate	Expected Occurrences[1]
Nonfatal Injuries	4.3 injuries per 100 workers per year[2]	6.0
Fatal Injuries	9.7 fatalities per 100,000 workers per year[3]	less than 1 (1.4×10^{-2})

[1] Expected occurrences are based on an average of 140 workers during the construction of the facility for 12 months (IIFP, 2011a).
[2] The expected nonfatal injury rate (total recordable cases) is from BLS (2010a).
[3] The fatal injury rate is from BLS (2010b).

In addition to the potential occupational injuries that could result during construction, impacts to the public from air pollutants have been considered. Air pollutants would be generated by the internal combustion engines used in heavy equipment. As discussed in Section 4.1.1.4, the

estimated air quality impacts from the air emissions during construction for the proposed IIFP facility would not measurably change the existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP facility. As a result, the NRC staff finds that the impacts to human health from air pollutants would be SMALL.

4.1.1.12 Waste Management

Construction of the proposed IIFP facility would generate waste materials that would be collected and transported offsite for recycling or disposal. Refuse and construction debris typical of industrial construction projects would be the predominant wastes generated during the construction phase (IIFP, 2011a). IIFP conservatively assumes that small quantities of low level radioactive wastes are also expected to be generated during the construction phase. This is because IIFP plans to install previously-used process vessels and standard unit operations equipment shipped from the decommissioned Sequoyah uranium conversion facility in Gore, Oklahoma, to the proposed IIFP facility (IIFP, 2011a; IIFP, 2011b). Because this equipment has been used for processing of radioactive materials, refuse and construction debris from its transport and installation could be disposed of as LLW as a precaution.

The anticipated construction wastes include paper, plastic, cardboard, packaging materials, wood scraps, metal scraps, roofing and insulation scraps, masonry and ceramic materials, and empty paint and coating containers. Small quantities of organic solvent-based residuals remaining from application of specialty paints, architectural coatings, sealants, and adhesives, and wastes from certain other materials that are used for construction may be required to be managed as hazardous waste. The specific compositions and quantities for these construction waste types would depend on the final facility design (IIFP, 2011a). Tables 4-10 through 4-12 provide the estimated annual quantities of solid, hazardous, and LLW currently anticipated by IIFP to be generated during construction, respectively.

The general design/build contractor selected for the proposed IIFP facility would have responsibility for the day-to-day supervision of onsite waste collection and storage and for arranging for removal of these wastes from the IIFP site. Good work practices would be used to collect and sort the wastes for recycling or disposal (e.g., using designated roll-off containers and collection areas for different types of wastes). Solid (nonhazardous, nonradioactive) wastes would be transported offsite to an approved local landfill. Hazardous waste generated throughout the construction phase would be temporarily stored onsite and then shipped to an offsite facility appropriate for handling the waste composition, in accordance with established recycling and hazardous waste management programs. Any radiological waste would be shipped offsite to licensed LLW disposal facilities (IIFP, 2011a). The management of stormwater at the proposed IIFP facility is discussed in Section 4.1.1.6.

The proposed IIFP facility would be located in the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) district comprising Chaves, Eddy, Lincoln, and Lea Counties. At present disposal rates, the remaining disposal life of the three permitted solid waste landfills (Roswell Municipal Landfill, Sand Point Landfill, and Lea County Landfill) in that district ranges from 16 years to 63 years (NMED, 2009). This district also has an “industrial waste only” landfill, Lea Land, Inc. Industrial Landfill, with an anticipated remaining disposal life of more than 100 years (NMED, 2009). Nonhazardous wastes from the proposed IIFP facility would likely be transported to the Lea County landfill for disposal. The landfill accepts residential, commercial, private and public waste material from generators within a 161-km (100-mi) radius. The landfill is operated by the Solid Waste Authority of Lea County under NMED Permit # Stormwater Management

Table 4-10. Solid Waste Generation - Construction

Waste Type	Estimated Annual Amount
Air filters (vehicle)	23 – 45 kg (50 – 100 lbs)
Cardboard / packing	140 – 230 kg (300 – 500 lbs)
Fiber drums	140 – 230 kg (300 – 500 lbs)
Total	300 – 500 kg (650 – 1,100 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-11. Hazardous Waste Generation - Construction

Waste Type	Estimated Annual Amount
Adhesives, resins, caulking residues	45 – 90 kg (100 – 200 lbs)
Lead (batteries)	45 –110 kg (100 – 250 lbs)
Oil filters	45 – 90 kg (100 – 200 lbs)
Paints, thinners, solvents, organic residues	45 – 230 kg (100 – 500 lbs)
Pesticides	45 – 68 kg (100 – 150 lbs)
Petroleum products, oils, lubricants residues	45 – 230 kg (100 – 500 lbs)
Total	270 – 820 kg (600 – 1,800 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-12. Low Level Radioactive Waste Generation - Construction

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Scrap metal	1,800 – 2,700 kg (4,000 – 6,000 lbs)
Spent blasting sand	45 kg (100 lbs)
Wood trash (pallets)	450 – 680 kg (1,000 – 1,500 lbs)
Total	2,300 – 3,400 kg (5,100 – 7,600 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

(SWM) -13030. The Lea County landfill receives approximately 74,800 metric tons (82,500 tons) annually (NMED, 2009). Nonhazardous waste generated from the proposed IIFP construction activities would result in a negligible increase (less than 0.5 metric ton or 0.0007 percent) in the waste that the Lea County landfill receives annually from all other sources. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the solid waste management impacts resulting from construction of the IIFP facility would be SMALL.

Hazardous wastes generated during construction would be packaged and shipped offsite to licensed hazardous waste treatment and disposal facilities in accordance with Federal and State regulations (IIFP, 2011a). The projected annual hazardous waste generation would likely classify the proposed IIFP facility as small quantity generator (over 100 kg/mo [220 lb/mo] but less than 1,000 kg/mo [2,200 lb/mo]) during construction. Hazardous waste generators in New Mexico accounted for 978,000 metric tons (1,079,000 tons) of hazardous waste in 2009, with all but 3,700 metric tons (4,084 tons) originating at one facility operated by the Navajo Refining Company (EPA, 2010b). Less than 0.9 metric tons (1 ton) per year of hazardous wastes would be expected from construction of the proposed IIFP facility. The IIFP facility would, during construction, be one of the smaller hazardous waste generators in New Mexico and would contribute less than 0.00009 percent to the overall hazardous waste generated in the State. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the quantity of construction-generated hazardous waste material would result in SMALL impacts that could be managed effectively.

Radiological waste generated during construction, due to the use of previously-used radiological processing equipment, would be shipped offsite to licensed LLW disposal facilities (IIFP, 2011a). As shown in Table 4-12, up to 3.4 metric tons (3.8 tons) per year of LLW could be sent for disposal. That corresponds to approximately 22.5 drums per year. This LLW volume represents 0.008 percent of the annual commercial waste volume currently received at the Energy*Solutions* facility in Clive, Utah (NRC, 2010). All LLW generated will be Class A wastes as defined by 10 CFR 61.55 (IIFP, 2009a). The Clive facility accepts the majority of the United States' Class A LLW (as detailed in 10 C.F.R. § 61.55, Waste Classification, enforced by NRC) and is estimated to have capacity to accept this waste at current volume levels for more than 20 years (GAO, 2004). Thus, the NRC staff finds that the quantity of construction-generated LLW would result in SMALL impacts to LLW disposal capacity.

4.1.2 Environmental Impacts of Operation

The impacts of operations of the facility described in Chapter 2 on each of the major resource areas described in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment) are presented in this section. Impacts of the proposed Phase 2 facility activities identified in Chapter 2 are evaluated as cumulative impacts in Section 4.2.

4.1.2.1 Land Use

This section describes the potential impacts on land use during operation of the proposed IIFP facility.

During operations the primary current land use at the site, which is cattle grazing, would be eliminated by a fence surrounding the entire 259-ha (640-ac) site. Except for the 16-ha (40-ac) facility footprint, the remainder of the site (240 ha or 600 ac) would be remain undeveloped for the duration of the license. Operation of the proposed IIFP facility would be consistent with the industrial nature of land in the vicinity which supports four energy production facilities (Xcel Energy's Cunningham Station and Maddox Station, Colorado Energy Station, and the DCP Midstream Linam Ranch Plant). The proposed IIFP facility and retention of the remaining portion of the site as undeveloped land would not conflict with any existing Federal, State, local, or Native American tribal land use plans. The use of land for the facility would not interfere with any planned development in the area (Appendix A). The facility's location within Section 27 was selected to avoid, to the extent possible, utility rights-of-way, and operation of the facility will not prohibit access to the rights-of-way for maintenance. None of the Cunningham Station's monitoring wells in Section 27 would be affected by the operation of the facility

(GL Environmental, 2010). Because many square miles around the facility have similar habitat, and because the industrial nature of the facility would be consistent with local land use, the NRC staff concludes that land use impacts associated with operation of the proposed facility would be SMALL.

4.1.2.2 Historic and Cultural Resources

This section describes the potential environmental impacts on historic and cultural resources resulting from operation of the proposed IIFP facility. Impacts to historic or cultural resources would most likely occur during ground-disturbing activities associated with construction. Therefore, because operations would not require additional land disturbance, the NRC staff concludes that any impacts to historic properties, districts, resources or significant historic/precontact archaeological sites during facility operation would be SMALL.

4.1.2.3 Visual Resources

This section discusses the potential visual and scenic impacts that could result from operation of the proposed IIFP facility. Visual impacts could occur as a result of tall or massive structures being imposed on a landscape, or if plumes visible from a long distance were emitted from a facility.

The tallest proposed building would be 21.3 m (70 ft) high and emission stacks would be less than 30.5 m (100 ft) tall (IIFP, 2009a); well under the 61-m (200-ft) threshold that requires lights for aviation safety (FAA, 1992). The facility will not be visible from any recreational or historic facilities, and will not degrade the existing viewscape which includes four other industrial facilities. In addition, security lighting would be directed downward to minimize light pollution (IIFP, 2009a), therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to visual resources would be SMALL.

4.1.2.4 Climate, Meteorology and Air Quality

4.1.2.4.1 Greenhouse Gases

This section presents an assessment of the effect operation of the proposed IIFP facility could have on the concentrations of CO_2 and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

During operation, greenhouse gas emissions would result from workforce commuting, deliveries of feedstock and consumable materials to the proposed facility, return of empty feedstock containers to their points of origin, transfer of wastes to designated offsite disposal facilities and operation of a gas-fired boiler. An incidental amount of greenhouse gas emissions would result from the onsite storage and dispensing of fossil fuels to support operations, but is not evaluated here.

A workforce of 140 is assumed to commute a round-trip distance of 64 km (40 mi), assuming 250 round trips per year and taking no credit for carpooling or busing. Annually, the workforce would commute approximately 2,200,000 km (1,400,000 mi).

Deliveries and returns of DUF_6 cylinders and waste shipments are estimated at 2,650 round trips per year. Thus, an average of approximately 10 truck round trips would occur daily during a 5-day work week. The DUF_6 feed materials for the facility would be transported by 18-wheeled trucks via highway only and are expected to come from several facilities across the

country: the URENCO USA facility approximately 53 km (33 mi) away; Global Laser Enrichment 2,600 km (1,616 mi) away; and the Eagle Rock Enrichment Facility approximately 1,796 km (1,116 mi) away. Waste from the IIFP facility would likely be transported to one of several disposal facilities. One low-level waste disposal facility is the Energy*Solutions* facility in Clive, Utah approximately 1,572 km (977 mi) from the IIFP site. Hazardous and mixed low-level radioactive wastes could be disposed at Waste Control Specialists which is approximately 61 km (38 mi) from the IIFP facility. Because it is difficult to anticipate the proportion of shipments among the DUF_6 feed materials suppliers and waste disposal sites, an average of the distances to the five facilities was used to establish a conservative scenario with respect to GHG emissions. An average roundtrip distance of 2,433 km (1,512 mi) was assumed. The resulting annual travel distance is 6,447,450 km (4,006,800 mi). Table 4-13 shows the estimated total transportation-related CO_2 emission associated with proposed IIFP facility operations. The total CO_2 emissions expected during IIFP facility operations from commuting of the operational workforce, deliveries of feedstock to the proposed facility, return of empty feedstock containers to their points of origin and delivery of operational wastes to designated offsite disposal facilities are 4,433 metric tons (4,886 tons) per year. NRC staff estimated these levels based on modeling summarized and presented in Appendix C (Air Emissions) of this draft EIS.

Table 4-13. Annual Transportation-Related CO_2 Emissions During IIFP Facility Operations

Activity	Total Workers	RT Distance		Working Days/ Year	Total Distances per Year		Annual CO_2 Emissions	
		(mi)	(km)		(mi)	(km)	(ton)	(MT)
Commuting traffic	140	40	64	250	1,400,000	2,300,000	660	599
Operational deliveries and waste removal shipments	N/A	1,512	2,433	N/A	4,000,000	6,400,000	4,226	3,833
Subtotal of CO_2 emissions as a result of transportation related impacts from IIFP facility operations	–	–	–	–	–	–	4,886	4,433

The proposed IIFP facility would also require a gas-fired boiler (the facility would install two boilers for redundancy, but only one at a time would operate). The estimated emissions of CO_2 equivalents from the boilers are 1,345 metric tons (1,483 tons) per year (IIFP, 2009a). Therefore, the total CO_2 emissions expected from facility operations are 5,778 metric tons (6,369 tons) per year.

Using calendar year 2000 as a reference point (the latest year for which New Mexico GHG emission data are available), and as shown in Table 3-1, total net CO_2 emissions for New Mexico for the year 2000 were 62 million metric tons (68 million tons) of CO_2 equivalents. For the United States for that same year, total net CO_2 emissions were 5,977 million metric tons (6,588 million tons) (EPA, 2010a). By comparison, during any typical year of IIFP facility

operation, CO_2 emissions are projected to be 5,778 metric tons (6,369 tons), approximately 0.009 percent of the New Mexico statewide output or 0.0001 percent of the nationwide emissions for calendar year 2000. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts from the operation of the proposed IIFP facility from the emissions of CO_2 and other greenhouse gases would be SMALL.

4.1.2.4.2 Air Quality

Air quality would be affected during operation of the proposed uranium deconversion facility. As discussed in more detail below, the impact levels would not be significant.

4.1.2.4.2.1 Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Operation of the proposed project would produce criteria pollutant (i.e., CO, NO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, SO_2, and VOC, an ozone precursor) emissions from natural-gas fired boilers, an emergency diesel generator, a fire-water pump, a hydrogen generator, and commuter/delivery vehicles.

IIFP used emission factors obtained from the EPA document AP-42, “Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors” (EPA, 1995a) to estimate emissions from the natural gas boilers, emergency diesel generator, and fire water pump. Emissions from each equipment type are a function of equipment-specific factors, including engine horsepower, load factor, and hours of operation. During operations one boiler would operate continuously, providing 3000 pounds of steam per hour for the heating and autoclave feed systems. The diesel generator and fire water pump are assumed to be operated for emergency and testing purposes only (IIFP, 2011c). IIFP used equipment manufacturer data to estimate emissions from the hydrogen generator. Operation of the hydrogen generator would be on demand (IIFP, 2011a). Title V of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments requires facilities defined as "major stationary sources" to obtain a Title V operating permit. A major stationary source is any facility that has the potential to emit more than 100 tons of any criteria pollutant per year. As shown in Table 4-14, emissions resulting from operations at the proposed IIFP facility would be well below the 100 tons per year threshold. Therefore, the proposed project would not require a Title V operating permit.

NRC staff used emission factors to estimate annual criteria pollutant emissions from highway vehicles (i.e., worker commute vehicles and delivery vehicles). The emission factors were determined using the EPA MOVES Model (EPA, 2009a). Emissions from highway vehicles (i.e., worker commute vehicles and delivery and waste transport vehicles) are a function of the vehicle-specific factors, including type of vehicle and age, fuel type, and vehicle miles traveled. NRC staff used Lea County, New Mexico-specific default values for vehicle type, age, and fuel type to determine highway vehicle emission factors. IIFP estimates that during operations 140 workers would commute to and from the proposed site, an average daily trip distance of 64 km (40 mi), for 250 days each year. Delivery and waste transport trucks (presumed to be diesel-fueled, long-haul semi-trailer trucks averaging 10 mpg) would make on average, 10 trips per day (at an average round-trip distance of 2,433 km [1,512 mi]) to transport materials and remove wastes. Table 4-15 shows the estimated annual emissions as a result of a commuting workforce and material transport.

To estimate the impact to local air quality, NRC staff compared the total anticipated direct (facility) and indirect (highway vehicle) criteria pollutant and VOC emissions from the proposed IIFP facility to baseline emissions from Lea County, New Mexico. As shown in Table 4-16, emissions from the proposed project would represent a very small portion of the annual criteria

Table 4-14 Estimated Maximum Annual Criteria Pollutant Emissions from Phase 1 Operation of the IIFP Facility

Source	CO metric tons (tons)	NO_2 metric tons (tons)	$PM_{2.5}$ metric tons (tons)	PM_{10} metric tons (tons)	SO_2 metric tons (tons)	VOC metric tons (tons)
Boilers	0.93 (1.03)	1.09 (1.20)	0.08 (0.09)	0.08 (0.09)	0.01 (0.01)	0.06 (0.07)
Generators	0.032 (0.035)	0.149 (0.164)	0.011 (0.012)	0.011 (0.012)	0.010 (0.011)	0.00308 (0.00340)
Firewater Pump	0.003 (0.003)	0.013 (0.014)	8.98×10^{-4} (9.9×10^{-4})	9.0×10^{-4} (9.9×10^{-4})	8.4×10^{-4} (9.3×10^{-4})	2.63×10^{-4} (2.90×10^{-4})
Hydrogen Generator	0.21 (0.23)	0.02 (0.02)	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Total	1.18 (1.30)	1.27 (1.40)	0.093 (0.103)	0.093 (0.103)	0.020 (0.022)	0.067 (0.074)

Source: IIFP, 2011b

Table 4-15. Estimated Maximum Annual Criteria Pollutant Emissions from Highway Vehicles during Phase 1 Operation of the IIFP Facility

Source	CO metric tons (tons)	NO_2 metric tons (tons)	$PM_{2.5}$ metric tons (tons)	PM_{10} metric tons (tons)	SO_2 metric tons (tons)	VOC metric tons (tons)
Commuter Vehicles	10.9 (12.1)	1.46 (1.61)	0.0266 0.(0293)	0.0495 0.(0545)	0.0116 (0.0128)	1.03 (1.14)
Delivery Vehicles	41.0 (45.2)	18.6 (20.5)	0.789 (0.870)	0.953 (1.05)	0.0449 (0.0495)	3.50 (3.85)
Total	51.9 (57.3)	20.0 (22.1)	0.816 (0.899)	1.00 (1.10)	0.0565 (0.0623)	4.53 (4.99)

Source: IIFP, 2011b

Table 4-16. Comparison of Maximum Annual Emissions from Phase 1 Operations to Lea County Baseline Conditions

Source	CO metric tons (tons)	NO_2 metric tons (tons)	$PM_{2.5}$ metric tons (tons)	PM_{10} metric tons (tons)	SO_2 metric tons (tons)	VOC metric tons (tons)
Operations	53.1 (58.6)	21.3 (23.5)	0.908 (1.00)	1.09 (1.21)	0.0774 (0.0853)	4.60 (5.06)
Lea County Baseline[a]	21,244 (23,417)	27,119 (29,894)	2,892 (3,188)	25,048 (27,611)	7,334 (8,084)	4,436 (4,890)
Net Increase over Baseline	0.25%	0.079%	0.031%	0.0044%	0.0011%	0.10%

[a] Source: EPA, 2009b

pollutant emissions in Lea County. Because conservative assumptions that tend to overestimate impacts were used, actual emissions from operations would be less.

IIFP used EPA's SCREEN3 model (EPA, 1995b) to estimate the maximum concentrations of pollutants at the IIFP site property line that would be associated with operations. As shown in Table 4-17, the estimated incremental increases in ambient background concentrations due to the proposed operations would be below allowable PSD Class II increments and well below the National NAAQS. VOCs are not included in Table 4-17 because there are no regulatory metrics for comparison (VOC emissions are regulated by source controls and permit requirements).

Table 4-17. Predicted Property Boundary Concentrations Due to Phase 1 Operations, NAAQS and Allowable Class II PSD Increments

Pollutant	Averaging Time	NAAQS ($\mu g/m^3$)	Allowable Class II PSD Increment ($\mu g/m^3$)	Incremental Concentration Increase ($\mu g/m^3$)	Incremental Concentration Increase as Percentage of NAAQS
CO	1-hr	10,000	NA	5.8	0.06%
	8-hr	40,000	NA	4.1	0.010%
NO_2	Annual	100	25	0.059	0.6%
$PM_{2.5}$	24-hr	35	9	0.17	0.5%
	Annual	15	4	0.042	0.3%
PM_{10}	24-hr	150	8	0.17	0.11%
SO_2	1-hr	200	NA	0.096	0.05%
	3-hr	1,300	512	0.086	0.007%

Source: IIFP, 2011a; EPA, 2009a

4.1.2.4.2.2 Nonradioactive Process Effluents

Radioactive and nonradioactive gaseous effluents would be generated during operation of the proposed IIFP facility (IIFP, 2011a). Radioactive gaseous effluents are addressed in Section 4.1.2.11.

IIFP estimated annual nonradioactive process emissions for operation (IIFP, 2011a). Nonradioactive gaseous effluents would include HF, SiF_4, BF_3 CaF_2, calcium hydroxide [$Ca(OH_2)$], and B_2O_3. Gaseous effluents from the DU_6 to DU_4, SiF_4 and BF_3 processes (comprised mostly of nitrogen, air, some relatively low amounts of the product gases and other trace fluorides) would undergo treatment in the plant KOH scrubbing system to remove approximately 99.9 percent of the fluoride components before being released to the atmosphere via a monitored stack (IIFP, 2011a). The plant KOH scrubbing system is described in Section 2.1.6.4.1.

The nonradioactive process annual emissions are shown in Table 4-18. The combined estimated annual fluoride releases, including HF (52.6 kg [116 lb]), SiF_4 (3.7 kg [8.2 lb]), BF_3 (64.1 kg [141 lb]), and CaF_2 (3.55 kg [7.82 lb]), are 124 kg (273 lbs). The annual total expressed as an hourly rate is 0.014 kg/hr (0.031 lb/hr). This pound per hour rate is well below the New Mexico threshold of 0.167 lb/hr for fluoride emissions.

Table 4-18. Annual Nonradioactive Gaseous Emissions from the Operation of the Proposed IIFP Facility

Emission	Estimated Releases Total Emissions							
	Plant KOH Scrubbing System Stack	DUF_4 Dust Collector Stack	FEP Dust Collector	DUF_4 Vacuum Transfer Dust Collector	CaF_2 Dust Collector	Lime Silo Dust Collector	B_2O_3 Silo	Total Emission
	kg/yr (lb/yr)							
HF	3.03 (6.69)	41.54 (91.59)	0.35 (0.77)	7.77 (17.13)	-	-	-	52.6 (116.18)
SiF_4	0.0 (0.01)	-	3.71 (8.19)	-	-	-	-	3.7 (8.20)
BF_3	1.28 (2.83)	-	62.48 (137.75)	-	-	-	-	64 (140.58)
U	-	0.03 (0.07)	0.03 (0.06)	0.25 (0.55)	-	-	-	0.31 (0.68)
CaF_2	-	-	-	-	3.55 (7.82)	-	-	3.55 (7.82)
$Ca(OH)_2$	-	-	-	-	-	60.78 (134.00)	-	60.78 (134.00)
B_2O_3	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.93 (10.87)	4.93 (10.87)
Totals	4.50 (9.93)	41.58 (91.66)	66.57 (146.77)	8.02 (17.68)	3.55 (7.82)	60.78 (134.00)	4.93 (10.87)	189.75 (418.33)

Source: IIFP, 2011a.

4.1.2.4.2.3 Summary

As discussed above, the estimated criteria pollutant emissions for Phase 1 operation of the proposed IIFP facility represent a very small fraction of the current emissions in Lea County. Because conservative assumptions that tend to overestimate impacts were used, actual emissions from operations would be less. In addition, pollutant emissions, including nonradioactive process effluents, would not change the existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the IIFP facility. The NRC staff, therefore, concludes that air quality impacts during operation of the proposed IIFP facility would be SMALL to MODERATE.

4.1.2.5 Geology, Minerals, and Soil

No impact to the underlying bedrock, mineral resources, or soil is expected during facility operations. As discussed in Section 3.6.2, the site is in an area of limited seismic and volcanic activity, therefore, the statistical probability of fault rupture near the site is very low and the NRC staff finds that any associated impact due to seismic activity would be SMALL. Additionally, operation of the proposed IIFP facility is not expected to cause seismic or fault-related impacts.

Seismic risks to the facility would be mitigated by incorporation of seismic criteria in the facility design to prevent spills or releases to the environment (IIFP, 2009a).

Consequently, the NRC staff concludes that impacts of operation of the proposed IIFP facility to geology, minerals, seismicity, and soils are expected to be SMALL, and that impacts to the facility from any seismic activity would be SMALL.

4.1.2.6 Water Resources

All facility water systems – for potable, process and fire protection water -- would use groundwater. Groundwater pumped from the site well(s) would be a consumptive use because the groundwater would either be consumed or evaporated.

4.1.2.6.1 Groundwater Use

As discussed in Section 4.1.1.6.1.1, groundwater would be supplied from up to two onsite production wells. These wells would meet an estimated operations demand from 7.9 L/min (2.1 gpm) to 11.8 L/min (3.1 gpm) (normal) up to 26.3 L/min (6.95 gpm) (maximum). The operation of the facility would require relatively low volumes of water because it would recycle process water and re-circulate cooling water. The project is projected to use less than 38,000 L (10,000 gal) of groundwater per day (IIFP, 2011a).

As discussed in Section 3.7.1.2.1, because current pumping is in excess of the Ogallala's recharge rate, the aquifer has experienced significant drawdown in the last several decades. In 2009, the NM OSE prepared guidelines on the procedures for processing water rights applications filed with the Lea County UWB. The NM OSE developed administrative guidelines in order to promote the orderly development of water resources in the Lea County UWB, while meeting statutory obligations regarding existing water rights, availability of unappropriated water, conservation of water with the State, and public welfare of the State through a 40-year planning period beginning on January 1, 2005 and ending on January 1, 2045.

On March 10, 2009, the NM OSE issued an order closing the Lea County UWB to the filing of groundwater applications (NMOSE, 2009a). In 1999, in order to meet the projected groundwater demands of Lea County, 138 applications were filed by the Lea County Water Users Association to appropriate 6,389 ha-m (51,797 ac-ft) per year of groundwater, which was essentially all the unappropriated groundwater in the Lea County UWB (Leadshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

A portion of the applications to appropriate groundwater, totaling 4,215.2 ha-m (34,173 ac-ft) per year, have been assigned to Lea County during (at least) the 40-year planning period to allow the County to hold the subject water rights unused until the rights can be put to beneficial use at projects currently under construction, select future projects, and homes and businesses in unincorporated areas. The proposed IIFP site has been included in Lea County's 40-Year Water Development Plan as an area of proposed development where up to 21.6 ha-m (175 ac-ft) per year of the Lea County's water rights would be put to beneficial use. The estimated quantity of groundwater that Lea County would need by the end of the 40-year planning period for all projects that currently exist, are being constructed, or have a high likelihood of being constructed in the near future is 1,173.5 ha-m (9,514 ac-ft) per year (Leadshill-Herkenhoff et al., 2000).

Groundwater rights for the facility would be obtained from the Lea County unallocated water rights under State Engineer Office Water Right File No. L-04719-A, for industrial water use. The proposed facility would obtain a joint Lea County and New Mexico Office of State Engineer Water Rights Agreement for 6.2 ha-m (50 ac-ft) per year (far less than the 21.6 ha-m [175 ac-ft] per year estimation in the Lea County Water Development Plan).

Operation of the proposed IIFP facility would use approximately 0.50 percent of the estimated additional annual 40-year planning period groundwater demand of 1,173.5 ha-m (9,514 ac-ft) per year for Lea County, and only 0.15 percent of the 4,215.2 ha-m (34,173 ac-ft) per year of unappropriated water rights that have been assigned to Lea County.

As part of NM OSE's guidelines on the procedures for processing water rights applications filed with the Lea County UWB, the basin was divided into blocks corresponding to township and range. No permits were granted to appropriate water in a block unless one-third or more of the original groundwater storage in the block would be available at the end of the 40-year period. Blocks with an estimated saturated thickness of 16.8 m (55 ft) or less by 2045 are designated a CMA. The proposed IIFP site is not located in a CMA.

For wells installed in a non-CMA, the Lea County Water Users Association recommends a drawdown limit of 2.4 m (7.9 ft) over 40 years, or 0.06 m/yr (0.20 ft/yr). Groundwater model simulations run by the NM OSE Hydrology Bureau to provide estimated drawdowns for a range of pumping scenarios in different hydraulic conductivity zones indicates that using a high hydraulic conductivity value for the Ogallala aquifer of 12.5 to 18.3 m (41 to 60 ft) per day for a single well pumping 6.2 ha-m (50 ac-ft) per year in an area of the aquifer with a saturated thickness of 61 m (200 ft) results in an estimated drawdown of 0.11 m (0.36 ft) in 40 years (NMOSE, 2009b). Considering that (1) the permeability of the Ogallala aquifer is quite variable (ranging as low as 0.61 m [2 ft/day]), and (2) the two site wells would never independently pump 6.2 ha-m (50 ac-ft) per year, a drawdown of 0.11 m (0.36 ft) in 40 years is very conservative. It is highly unlikely that the wells would ever exceed the Lea County Water Users Association drawdown limit of 2.4 m (8 ft) over 40 years.

The NRC staff finds that adverse impacts on groundwater quantity (availability) due to pumping from the site's potential of two production wells during operation would be SMALL based on the following findings:

- The proposed IIFP site has been included in Lea County's 40-Year Water Development Plan as an area of proposed development where up to 21.6 ha-m (175 ac-ft) of the Lea County's water rights would be put to beneficial use.
- Groundwater rights for the proposed facility would be obtained from the Lea County unallocated water rights under State Engineer Office Water Right File No. L-04719-A for industrial water use. The facility would obtain a joint Lea County and New Mexico Office of State Engineer Water Rights Agreement for 6.2 ha-m (50 ac-ft) per year (far less than the 21.6 ha-m [175 ac-ft] per year estimation in the Lea County Water Development Plan).
- Operation of the proposed facility would use approximately 5 percent of the estimated annual 40-year planning period groundwater demand of 1,173.5 ha-m (9,514 ac-ft) per year for Lea County, and only 0.15 percent of the 4,215.2 ha-m (34,173 ac-ft) per year of unappropriated water rights that have been assigned to Lea County.

- Based on comparing the site wells to the most conservative NM OSE groundwater model scenario, it is highly unlikely that the wells would ever exceed the Lea County Water Users Association drawdown limit of 2.4 m (8 ft) over 40 years.
- The site production wells would be installed in accordance with all NM OSE and Lea County Water Users Association well permit regulations.

4.1.2.6.2 Groundwater Quality

During IIFP operation, stormwater from the site would be collected in two runoff retention/evaporation basins. No wastes from facility process systems would be discharged to stormwater. In addition, stormwater discharges during facility operation would be controlled by a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Water discharged from the site sanitary waste treatment system would meet required concentrations of all contaminants stipulated in any permit or license required for that activity, including 10 CFR 20 and a Groundwater Discharge Permit/Liquid Waste Permit (IIFP, 2011a). An application for the Groundwater Discharge Permit has been submitted by IIFP to the NMED Groundwater Quality Bureau, which has issued a conceptual groundwater monitoring plan that is subject to change as more information becomes available during the discharge permit application process. NMED will require that total dissolved solids, sulfate, chloride, nitrate as nitrogen, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, fluoride, and isotopic uranium be monitored quarterly (IIFP 2011a).

Treated process water from the sanitary waste treatment system would be used for irrigation at the facility. Because of high evaporation rates, and the presence of the 9.1-m (30-ft) indurate caliche unit that underlies the site, the irrigation water is not expected to migrate to groundwater. There would be no onsite disposal of solid, hazardous, radioactive, or mixed waste at the proposed IIFP site.

The existing groundwater monitoring program at the site would be supplemented with the installation of at least four additional monitoring wells. Three of these monitoring wells are proposed to be located hydraulically downgradient (south) from the DUF_6 Cylinder Storage Pad, the Cylinder Pad Stormwater Retention Basin, and the Stormwater Retention/Evaporation Basin. The fourth monitoring well is proposed hydraulically upgradient (north) from the primary production facility, just within the site's security fence (IIFP, 2011a). The wells would be installed per the requirements of the NMED and sampled quarterly.

Any spills of chemicals, diesel fuel, or other contaminants during operations would be cleaned up quickly in accordance with the proposed facility's Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan, to prevent a pathway for the contaminant to enter the groundwater, thereby mitigating impacts to groundwater such that any inadvertent releases would result in localized and temporary impacts. Due to limited liquid effluent discharge from the facility operations (which would be treated prior to discharge as necessary); the lack of groundwater in the caliche, sand and gravel layer above the Ogallala aquifer; the quarterly groundwater monitoring plan; permanent waste disposal off site; the proposed facility's Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan; and the 9.1-m (30-ft) depth to groundwater (GL Environmental, 2010) at the proposed IIFP site, the NRC staff concludes that the impacts to groundwater quality from operations would be SMALL.

4.1.2.6.3 Surface Water

As discussed in Section 3.7.2, no permanent surface water or jurisdictional waters are present on the proposed IIFP site and, therefore, the operation of the proposed facility would not affect surface water.

4.1.2.7 Ecological Resources

No additional land beyond the approximately 16 ha (40 ac) footprint would be disturbed during operations. The remaining portion of the IIFP site is expected to be left undeveloped for the duration of the license.

Maintenance practices such as the use of chemical herbicides and roadway maintenance would be implemented during plant operation (IIFP, 2009a).

The tallest proposed building would be 21.3 m (70 ft) high and emission stacks would be less than 30.5 m (100 ft) tall (IIFP, 2009a); well under the 61 m (200 ft) threshold that requires lights for aviation safety (FAA, 1992). Security lighting and equipment would be directed downward to help to minimize light pollution and reduce the potential for adverse impacts to wildlife (IIFP, 2009a). This minimization of lights, which attract nocturnal insects and their predator species, and the low height of the structures, reduce the potential for adverse impacts on night-migrating birds.

No unique or critical habitats or threatened or endangered species occur on the site or in the vicinity. Commercially and recreationally important species would not be adversely affected by plant operations. The NRC staff finds that adverse impacts during operations to ecological resources would be SMALL.

4.1.2.8 Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice

This section provides analyses of the socioeconomic impacts associated with operation of the proposed IIFP facility. Phase 1 operation would begin during the fourth quarter of 2013; after Phase 2 is completed, Phase 1 and Phase 2 operate concurrently. Wage and salary spending and expenditures associated with materials, equipment, and supplies would produce income and employment and local and State tax revenue, while the in migration of workers and their families into the area would affect the availability of housing, public utilities and community services such as education, fire protection, law enforcement and medical resources. Socioeconomic impacts of the proposed IIFP would occur within the two-county ROI (Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico), where the operations workforce will likely live and spend most of their incomes.

These analyses are based on the peak number of workers (140) employed at the IIFP facility for Phase 1 operation (IIFP, 2011a). The location of the IIFP facility was selected in part because local colleges and universities have existing training programs in partnership with the nearby URENCO USA centrifuge facility. These institutions, particularly the New Mexico Junior College, have the capability and are committed to provide training to ensure a skilled nuclear workforce (IIFP, 2009a). The New Mexico Junior College Workforce Training Program is designed to offer training requested by area employers, including specialized training for the nuclear service industry. Enrollment in the Workforce Training Program has increased to over 4,251 total trainees through 2009 (NMJC, 2011). Therefore, this analysis assumes that 80 percent of the IIFP worker force would be filled by residents within the ROI. Table 4-19

depicts the workforce in-migration, based on the assumption that 80 percent of the operation employees would be current ROI residents and that each in-migrating operation employee would move his family into the ROI. These projections are used throughout this analysis.

Table 4-19. Assumptions for Workforce Characterization During Phase 1 Operation

Workforce characterization	
Peak number of workers onsite during Phase 1 operation [1]	140
Workforce migration	
Percent of operation workforce migrating into ROI	20%
Number of workers migrating into ROI during peak operation [2]	28
Families	
Percent of operation workers who bring families [2]	100%
Average New Mexico family size (2009) [3]	3.23
Number of operation workers who would move into ROI and bring families [2]	28
Number of In-migrating workers' family members [2]	62
Number of operation workers and family members migrating into ROI (new population in ROI) [2]	90
School-age children	
Number of school-age children per family [4]	0.8
Number of school-age children migrating into ROI [2]	22

Source:
[1] IIFP, 2011a
[2] For supporting analyses, see Appendix D
[3] USCB, 2010a
[4] BMI, 1981. This study is an analysis of nuclear construction workforces, however, it included information about nuclear plant non-construction workers [i.e., managers, engineers, supervisors, clerical, security, and medical personnel who were on the site during construction].

4.1.2.8.1 Population

As shown in Section 3.9.1.2, the population within the ROI was 112,938 in 2009. The IIFP Phase 1 operation would employ 140 people, of which 80 percent would be current ROI residents. The other 20 percent of the operations workforce (28 workers) and their families would migrate into the ROI (see Table 4-19). Using the 2009 New Mexico average family size of 3.23, the in-migration would result in 90 new residents (Table 4-19). An increase of 90 residents would result in less than a 0.1 percent increase in the 2009 population of the ROI.

4.1.2.8.2 Employment and Income

Approximately 80 percent, or 112, of the IIFP Phase 1 operation positions (140 x 0.8 = 112 jobs) would be filled by people currently residing in the ROI (Table 4-19). Those 112 workers would represent 0.2 percent of the June 2010 ROI labor force. If all 112 of these jobs were filled by unemployed workers in the ROI, the unemployment rate would decrease by 0.2 percent. Approximately 20 percent of the IIFP Phase 1 operation positions (28 jobs) would be filled by people migrating into the ROI from outside the region (Table 4-19). The in-migrating workers would represent 0.2 percent of the June 2010 labor force.

The in-migration of 28 workers would create indirect jobs within the ROI because of the multiplier effect (described in Section 4.1.1.8.2). In this analysis, the NRC staff used the BEA direct effect employment multiplier for the "All Other Basic Inorganic Chemical Manufacturing" classification to estimate the number of indirect jobs that would be created as a result of the in-migration of the project-related workers. Table 4-20 provides information about direct and indirect employment for Phase 1 operation. Indirect jobs are often non-technical, non-professional positions in the retail and service sectors and would likely be filled by unemployed workers already residing in the ROI. The 51 indirect jobs represent 1.3 percent of the unemployed labor force in June 2010.

Table 4-20. Direct and Indirect Employment during IIFP Phase 1 Operation

Phase 1 operations workforce peak (Table 4-19)	140
Number of Phase 1 operations workers who migrate into ROI (20 percent of operation workforce peak) (Table 4-19)	28
Employment multiplier for Phase 1 operations workers (indirect portion only) (BEA, 2010)	1.8173
Indirect jobs resulting from in-migrating Phase 1 operations workers (See Appendix D)	51

The regional economy would benefit from the capital investment expenditures and recurring costs associated with the operation of the IIFP facility. IIFP has provided estimates for some of these costs. The payroll associated with Phase 1 would be between $7,900,000 and $9,100,000 annually (IIFP, 2009a). IIFP employees and indirect workers would spend earnings on goods and services with the ROI. Additional costs associated with operations include replacement capital; waste disposal; insurance premiums and taxes; utilities; and maintenance materials and supplies. These expenditures would range from $17,315,000 to $23,727,000 annually.

The NRC staff finds that due to the size of the available workforce in the ROI, the effect of IIFP Phase 1 operations on employment and income within the ROI would be SMALL and beneficial.

4.1.2.8.3 Taxes

Phase 1 operations-related wages and purchases would generate several types of taxes, including corporate income taxes, individual income taxes, gross receipts taxes, and property taxes. Increased tax collections are viewed as a benefit to the State of New Mexico, Lea and Eddy Counties, the Hobbs Municipal School District, the New Mexico Junior College, the communities in Lea and Eddy Counties, and other locales where plant-related spending would occur.

Income and Gross Receipts Taxes

IIFP has estimated the income and gross receipts tax impacts of Phase 1 operation in Table 4-21. The NRC staff finds that the increase in tax revenues to the State and county would be SMALL and beneficial.

Table 4-21. Estimated Gross Receipts and Income Tax Payments to New Mexico and Lea County for the Phase 1 Operation Period, 2009 Dollars[a]

	New Mexico	Lea County
Gross Receipts Tax		
High Estimate	$118,100,000	$8,800,000
Low Estimate	$87,100,000	$6,500,000
NM Corporate Income Tax[b]		
High Estimate	$77,200,000	None[c]
Low Estimate	$57,100,000	None[c]

Source: IIFP, 2011a
[a] Tax values based on 2009 tax rates
[b] Based on average annual earnings for the Phase 1 increment
[c] Allocation would be made to the State of New Mexico

In addition to IIFP's corporate income and gross receipts tax payments, plant employees would pay State individual income and State and county gross receipts taxes. The NRC staff finds that these tax payments would have a SMALL, beneficial impact on New Mexico's and the counties' income tax revenues. Regional spending on goods and services by IIFP employees would generate gross receipts tax revenues for Lea and Eddy County municipalities, Lea and Eddy Counties, New Mexico, and other locales. The NRC staff finds that these additional tax revenues would create a SMALL, beneficial impact

Property Taxes

As stated in Sections 3.9.3, International Isotopes, Incorporated, the parent corporation of IIFP, has an IRB agreement with Lea County and is generally exempt from property taxes. However, two taxing entities are not part of the IRB agreement. For Phase 1 operation, IIFP would pay an amount in lieu of property tax to the Hobbs Municipal School District and to the New Mexico Junior College. Table 3-28 presents total revenue data for the Hobbs Municipal School District and the New Mexico Junior College, IIFP's estimated average annual tax payments to those schools, and those payments as a percentage of the schools' revenues. As shown in Table 3-28, the Hobbs Municipal School District's total 2007-2008 revenues were about $71 million and the New Mexico Junior College's total 2008-2009 revenues were about $37 million. IIFP's payments would represent a very small percentage of the school district and college's revenues. The NRC staff finds that the impact of the payment in lieu of taxes to each jurisdiction would be SMALL, and beneficial.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that operation of the proposed IIFP facility would have a SMALL beneficial impact on tax revenues.

4.1.2.8.4 Housing

In 2008, about 46,971 housing units were in the ROI, and 5,823 of them were vacant (Section 3.9.4). The Phase 1 operation of the IIFP facility would result in an influx of approximately 28 workers (Table 4-19), all of whom would need housing. Housing the 28 in-migrating workers would require 0.5 percent of the vacant housing units within the ROI. The in-migrating workers would not exhaust the existing housing inventory.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that operation of the proposed IIFP facility on the existing housing inventory would be SMALL.

4.1.2.8.5 Public Utilities

Public Water

All onsite potable, process, and fire water needed for the operation of the IIFP Phase 1 facility would be provided by no more than two wells installed in the Ogallala aquifer. The facility will not use public water (IIFP, 2011a).

Phase 1 operation will result in 90 people migrating into the ROI (Section 4.1.2.8.1). These new residents would likely select housing within areas that rely on a public water supplier. The major public water suppliers serve approximately 88,643 people (Table 3-30) and most, if not all, have excess capacity. The 90 new residents would result in a 0.1 percent increase in customers who rely on the public water suppliers. The NRC staff finds that the impact of Phase 1 operations on public water supplies would be SMALL, because the excess capacity of water suppliers in the ROI is sufficient to support the in-migrating workforce.

Public Wastewater

The IIFP facility would not be connected to any public wastewater or sewage system (IIFP, 2011a). The project will result in 90 people migrating into the ROI. These new residents would likely elect to reside within areas that rely on a public wastewater system. The major public wastewater treatment facilities serve approximately 78,917 people (Table 3-31) and have excess capacity. The 90 new residents would result in a 0.1 percent increase in customers who rely on the public wastewater systems. Therefore, because the increase in households is a small percentage of the existing public wastewater users, and the public wastewater facilities have excess capacity, the NRC staff concludes that impact of the proposed IIFP operation on public wastewater treatment systems would be SMALL.

4.1.2.8.6 Community Services

Education

During the 2008 school year, there were 8 public school districts, containing 64 schools educating 22,847 students in the ROI (Section 3.9.6.1). The operation of the IIFP facility would result in an influx of approximately 28 employees and their families (Table 4-18). Each in-migrating family is estimated to have 0.8 school aged children (Table 4-18); therefore, 22 additional children would be eligible for public school as a result of Phase 1 operation (Table 4-18). The new student enrollment would represent an increase of 0.1 percent of the 2008 enrollment. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the impact of the proposed Phase 1 operation on education would be SMALL.

Fire Protection

As discussed in Section 4.1.2.8.1, the population increase in the ROI associated with the operation of the IIFP Phase 1 facility would be less than 0.1 percent and would result in filling 0.5 percent of the available housing. Therefore, there would not be a detectable increase in the demand for fire protection. Existing fire protection personnel, facilities, and equipment would be

sufficient to support the population increase. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impact of operation of the proposed facility on fire protection would be SMALL.

Law Enforcement

The in migrating workforce would increase the ROI population less than 0.1 percent (Section 4.2.1.8) and would not affect the ability of existing law enforcement services to meet the needs of the population. Existing law enforcement personnel, facilities, and equipment would be sufficient to support the population increase; therefore, the NRC staff finds that the impact of Phase 1 operation of would be SMALL.

Hospitals and Physicians

An ROI population increase of less than 0.1 percent (Section 4.2.1.8) would not measurably increase the demand for hospital and physician services. The NRC staff finds that the impact of operation on hospitals and physician services would be SMALL.

4.1.2.8.7 Environmental Justice

The primary environmental resources that could be affected by the operation of the proposed IIFP facility are soil, groundwater quality, groundwater quantity, air quality, ecology, socioeconomics and human health. Section 3.9.1.2 defines and identifies the minority and low-income populations within the 80 km (50-mi) radius of the proposed IIFP facility. There are 96 block groups that fall completely or partially within the 80 km (50-mi) radius. Of the 96 block groups, one has a significant African American population, 15 have significant "Some Other Races" populations, 32 have significant Hispanic populations, and 10 have significant low-income populations. Figures 3-22, 3-23, 3-24 and 3-25 locate these block groups. The following is a summary of the impacts on the resources area and addresses whether minority or low-income populations would experience disproportionately high and adverse impacts from the IIFP Phase 1 operation:

- Land Use – The NRC staff finds that operation of the facility would not affect land use beyond those impacts attributed to construction. Accordingly, the NRC staff finds that impacts to land use would be SMALL.
- Soils – The NRC staff finds that impact to soils during IIFP operation would be SMALL.
- Groundwater quality – During IIFP operation, stormwater from the site would be collected in two runoff retention/evaporation basins. No wastes from facility process systems would be discharged to stormwater. Furthermore, any stormwater discharges would be controlled by a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Treated process water would be used for irrigation at the facility but is not expected to migrate to groundwater. The NRC staff finds that effects to groundwater quality would be SMALL, localized, and temporary.
- Groundwater quantity – No municipal water line runs near the proposed IIFP facility. No more than two groundwater wells would supply all of the water for the facility. The operation of the facility would require relatively low volumes of water because it would recycle process water and re-circulate cooling water; groundwater use is estimated to be less than 37,854 (10,000 gal) per day. The proposed IIFP site has been included in Lea County's 40 Year Water Development Plan and would use approximately 5 percent of the estimates 40-year planning period demand. The NRC staff finds that it is highly

unlikely that the two wells would ever exceed the Lea County UWB drawdown limit. The NRC staff finds that impacts to groundwater quantity during operation would be SMALL.

- Air quality - The estimated criteria pollutant emissions from Phase 1 operation represent a very small fraction of the current emissions in Lea County. Pollutant emissions, including nonradioactive process effluents, would not change the existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the IIFP facility. The NRC staff finds that the air quality impacts would be SMALL to MODERATE.
- Public and Occupational Health - Operation of the IIFP facility would require shipment of DUF_6 cylinders to and from the facility and hazardous, mixed and LLW to disposal facilities. The transportation risk associated with IIFP transportation operations is 0.03 additional latent cancer fatalities (LCF) per year. The NRC staff finds that impacts from the proposed action on Public and Occupational health would be SMALL.
- Ecology – More than 90 percent of the IIFP site would be undisturbed by operations, no threatened or endangered species or critical or unique habitats occur on the site, and the site does not provide extensive habitat for any commercial or recreational species. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that operation of the IIFP facility would have a SMALL effect on ecological resources.
- Socioeconomics – Phase 1 IIFP operations would employ 140 employees, 28 of whom would migrate into the ROI with their families. The in-migrating workers and their families would increase the population within the ROI by 0.1 percent. The NRC staff concludes that these workers and their families would have a SMALL effect on housing, community services, and public utilities and a SMALL and beneficial effect on employment and taxes.

The NRC staff finds that the impacts of IIFP operation on the resources evaluated would be SMALL for most resources and SMALL to MODERATE for air quality and in some cases, beneficial. Furthermore, the nearest minority or low-income population is 22.5 km (14 mi) from the proposed facility. Therefore, because all resource area impacts are SMALL and the identified minority and low income populations are not in close proximity to the proposed site, the NRC staff finds that impacts would not be considered disproportionately high and adverse impacts to any population, including low-income or minority populations.

4.1.2.9 Traffic and Transportation

4.1.2.9.1 Traffic

Operations impacts would occur from commuting personnel and the transport of nonradiological and radiological materials to and from the proposed IIFP site. The impacts from each are discussed below.

The principal highway routes that would handle this traffic include NM 483, which borders the site to the west, and US 62/180, which provides an east-west route to the nearest population centers. All traffic would access the site via NM 483, and most traffic would use US 62/180 to NM 483 to access the site. Some portion of the workforce may access the site from the north, using NM 83 to access NM 483 north of the site. At the junction of NM 483 and US 62/180, traffic would go east to Hobbs, Eunice and other Lea County municipalities or southwest to Eddy County. After the intersection of NM 483 and US 62/180 traffic associated with the site would be increasingly dispersed.

IIFP operations would use 140 workers working three shifts per day (IIFP, 2011a) or 47 people per shift. Therefore, if each employee commutes alone, there would be an increase of 94 vehicles (47 ending a shift plus 47 starting a shift) on NM 483 for each shift change. Additionally, IIFP estimated 10 delivery or waste disposal trucks each day.

The Highway Capacity Manual 2000 (TRB 2000) indicates that the capacity of a two-lane highway is 1,700 passenger cars per hour for a single direction and 3,400 passenger cars per hour for both directions. The AADT on NM 483, a two-lane highway, at Arkansas Junction in 2008 was 955 vehicles per day (NMDOT, 2009). If all the vehicles on NM 483 in one day used the road in a single hour, including the anticipated 10 truck trips per day (IIFP, 2011a), and if two operations workforce shifts used the road to the site during that same hour, a maximum of 1,059 vehicles would be on the road. This is less than the design capacity of a two-lane highway. The impact of traffic increases due to facility operations on US 62/180, which is a four-lane highway, would be smaller than the impact on NM 483. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to traffic from operations would be SMALL.

Using the same assumptions for operations as for construction, 140 operation employees would commute approximately 2,300,000 km (1,400,000 mi) per year of facility operation. The New Mexico 2010 vehicle accident rates result in 51.73 injuries and 1.73 fatal accidents per 160 million vehicle km (100 million vehicle mi) traveled (UNM, 2010). Based on these rates, statistically there would be one injury (risk of less than 0.7 injury crashes) per year and no fatalities (risk of less than 0.02 fatal crashes) per year due to the Phase 1 operations traffic.

The transportation of nonradiological materials would include the delivery of routine supplies and equipment and the removal of nonradiological wastes (including hazardous wastes). The transport of hazardous waste is subject to EPA and DOT regulations. Nonradiological deliveries and waste removal would require an estimated 1,950 truck round-trips per year, or approximately 8 round-trips per day (IIFP, 2011a). As with the commuter traffic, the NRC staff finds that this increase in traffic volume would have a SMALL impact on the current traffic and the carrying capacity of the affected roads would not be challenged.

Assuming a round-trip distance of 113 km (70 mi), the round-trip distance to the furthest nonradiological waste disposal facility likely to be used by IIFP, these trucks would travel approximately 220,480 km (137,000 mi) per year of operation, therefore, no injuries (risk <0.07), and no fatalities (risk <0.002) would be expected per year of Phase 1 operation. The NRC staff concludes that impacts from accidents involving the shipment of nonradiological materials would be SMALL.

4.1.2.9.2 Incident-free Radiological Transportation

Operation of the proposed IIFP facility would require shipment of full DUF_6 cylinders from commercial enrichment facilities, empty DUF_6 cylinders back to the commercial enrichment facilities, DUO_2 to waste disposal facilities, and other process and miscellaneous LLW to waste disposal facilities. Data for the analysis came from IIFP (IIFP 2011a; IIFP, 2011b) unless specified otherwise. More detail on the analysis can be found in Appendix E.

Full DUF_6 Cylinders: The NRC staff selected all current or proposed U.S. commercial enrichment facilities as representative origins for shipments of DUF_6. These are (1) URENCO USA, just east of Eunice, New Mexico, (2) the GE-Hitachi Global Laser Enrichment Facility north of Wilmington, North Carolina, and (3) the AREVA Eagle Rock Enrichment Facility west of Idaho Falls, Idaho. The cylinders would be shipped one per 18-wheel truck. The radiation dose

rate at 1 m (3.28 ft) from a cylinder is 0.0046 mSv per hour (0.46 mrem per hour) (Biwer et al., 2001). There would be 293 shipments per year of full DUF_6 cylinders for Phase 1 operations.

Empty DUF_6 Cylinders: Although it is possible that some cylinders would not be shipped back to their origin, NRC staff has assumed, for purposes of analysis, that all cylinders would be returned. In the event that cylinders are not returned, they could be disposed empty as LLW or filled with DUO_2 and disposed as LLW. The returned cylinders would have a heel of less than 23 kg (50 lb) and, thus, contain radioactive material. The cylinders are conservatively assumed to be shipped one per truck, consistent with IIFP data; however, two per truck is a likely scenario. Radiation dose rates from empty cylinders are slightly higher than from full cylinders due to the concentration of uranium daughter products and loss of self-shielding. The estimated radiation dose rate 1 m (3.28 ft) from an empty cylinder is 0.01 mSv per hour (1 mrem per hour). Conservatively, there would be 293 shipments per year of empty cylinders.

DUO_2 Waste: The DUO_2 is assumed to be waste and not sold. It would be packaged into 55-gallon drums and loaded 40 per truck (subject to weight limitations). Shipment destinations selected for analysis are the Energy*Solutions* Clive, Utah facility and the WCS facility on the Texas-New Mexico border west of Andrews, Texas (immediately east of the URENCO USA facility). Less probable destinations, such as the U.S. Ecology Washington disposal facility on the Hanford Site near Richland, Washington and the Nevada National Security Site, are represented by these analyses. The radiation dose rate 1 m (3.28 ft) from a drum would be approximately 6×10^{-4} mSv per hour (0.06 mrem per hour). IIFP estimates that there would be as many as 155 DUO_2 waste shipments per year.

Process and Miscellaneous LLW: This volume of LLW would be small compared to the DUO_2 waste. The radioactivity in most of this waste would likely be less concentrated than the DUO_2 waste. There would be 31 shipments per year, each with 40 55-gal drums. The dose rate is conservatively selected to be the same as the DUO_2 shipments, 6×10^{-4} mSv per hour (0.06 mrem per hour).

NRC staff used the TRAGIS (Johnson and Michelhaugh, 2003) transportation routing computer modeling code and the RADTRAN5 (Neuhauser and Kanipe, 2003) transportation risk assessment computer modeling code to calculate radiological impacts (collective dose) to members of the public living near the transportation route, drivers and passengers sharing the highways, persons at fueling or rest stops, the truck drivers, and package handlers. Results of that analysis are provided in Table 4-22.

Assuming a scenario in which DUF_6 shipped from the enrichment facility results in the greatest collective dose and DUO_2 waste shipped to the disposal facility results in the greatest collective dose, and summing for all receptors (Appendix E), one arrives at 0.18 person-sievert per year (18 person-rem per year). This is for receipt and return of cylinders to the GLE facility in Wilmington, North Carolina and disposal of low-level waste at the Energy*Solutions* Clive, Utah facility. Multiplying the collective dose by the Interagency Steering Committee on Radiation Standards conversion factor of 6×10^{-4} latent cancer fatalities (LCFs) per person-rem (ISCORS, 2002), estimates the transportation-related latent cancer fatalities for one year of incident-free exposure as 0.01 LCF.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2010) estimated the age-adjusted cancer death rate in the U.S. was 178.4 deaths per 100,000 people in 2007. Similarly, 23.2 percent (23,200 per 100,000) of all deaths in the U.S. in 2007 were cancer related. Although these results are from two different studies and difficult to compare, both studies show

Table 4-22. Annual Collective Doses to Various Receptors from Radiological Transportation

Description	General Public		Drivers and Passengers		Persons at Stops		Truck Drivers		Package Handlers	
	Person-Sv	Person-Rem	Person-Sv	Person-Rem	Person-Sv	Person-Rem	Person-Sv	Person-Rem	Person-Sv	Person-Rem
Full DUF_6 cylinders from URENCO USA	2.3×10^{-5}	2.3×10^{-3}	2.6×10^{-4}	0.02.6	a	a	4.3×10^{-4}	0.043	3.9×10^{-3}	0.39
Full DUF_6 cylinders from GLE Facility	6.8×10^{-3}	0.68	0.07	4.7	0.075	7.5	0.029	2.9	3.9×10^{-3}	0.39
Full DUF_6 cylinders from AREVA Eagle Rock	3.9×10^{-3}	0.39	0.039	3.9	0.075	7.5	0.026	2.6	3.9×10^{-3}	0.3
Empty DUF_6 cylinders to URENCO	5.1×10^{-5}	5.1×10^{-3}	5.6×10^{-4}	0.056	a	a	9.3×10^{-4}	0.093	8.4×10^{-3}	0.84
Empty DUF_6 cylinders to GLE Facility	0.015	1.5	0.10	10	0.16	16	0.06.3	6.3	8.4×10^{-3}	0.84
Empty DUF_6 cylinders to AREVA Eagle Rock	8.5×10^{-3}	0.85	0.084	8.4	0.16	16	0.056	5.6	8.4×10^{-3}	0.84
DUO_2 and Miscellaneous LLW to Energy*Solutions*	3.0×10^{-4}	0.03	3.3×10^{-3}	0.33	5.3×10^{-3}	0.53	2.0×10^{-3}	0.20	5.8×10^{-3}	0.5
DUO_2 and Miscellaneous LLW to Waste Control Specialists	2.0×10^{-6}	2.0×10^{-4}	2.1×10^{-5}	2.1×10^{-3}	a	a	3.6×10^{-5}	3.6×10^{-3}	5.8×10^{-3}	0.5

Source: See Appendix E

[a] A stop was not assumed because the route was short

that cancer fatalities are significant in normal life. Given these cancer fatality rates, the addition of 0.01 LCF from the proposed action is considered by NRC staff to be a SMALL impact. While mitigation measures are not required, IIFP would be required by NRC regulation 10 CFR 20 to maintain all radiation doses As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA).

Estimates of radiological exposure to the workforce and public from facility operations other than radiological transport are discussed in Section 4.1.2.12.

4.1.2.10 Noise Impacts

As discussed in Section 3.11, noise from the operation of the proposed facility would be minimal, occur mostly inside the buildings, and be attenuated by distance. The proposed facility is in a relatively remote location, surrounded by other industrial facilities, and far from lands uses that could be adversely affected by increases in noise levels. Noise at the nearest residences and recreational areas would not increase due to operation of the proposed IIFP facility. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts from noise of operations would be SMALL.

4.1.2.11 Public and Occupational Health Impacts

Normal operations at the proposed IIFP facility have the potential to impact the health of workers and the public due to exposures from permitted chemical and radiological gaseous emissions and liquid effluents. Additionally, workers could be impacted from direct radiation exposures and occupational hazards. This section discusses these potential impacts. Although normal operations at the proposed IIFP facility create the potential for radiological and nonradiological impacts, plant design would incorporate features to minimize gaseous and liquid effluent releases and to keep them well below regulatory limits. These features include the following (IIFP, 2011a):

- DUF_6 cylinders would be moved only when cool and when DUF_6 is in solid form, which minimizes the risk of inadvertent release due to mishandling.
- Process off-gas from DUF_6 purification and other operations would be solidified to reclaim as much DUF_6 as possible. Remaining gases pass through high-efficiency filters and chemical absorbers, which remove HF and uranium compounds.
- Liquid and solid waste handling systems and techniques would be used to control wastes and effluent concentrations.
- Gaseous emissions would pass through pre-filters, high efficiency filters, and carbon filters, all of which greatly reduce the radioactivity in the final discharged emission to very low concentrations.
- Uranium-bearing liquid waste would be routed to the Decontamination Building for removal of uranium and the treated water would be evaporated or reused in the Decontamination Building.

10 CFR 20 Exposure Limits

The NRC exposure limits place annual restrictions on the total dose equivalent exposure (1 mSv [100 mrem]), which includes external plus internal radiation exposures, and the dose equivalent rate (0.02 mSv [2 mrem]) in any 1 hour in unrestricted areas that are accessible by members of the public who are not employees, but who may be present during the year at the facility.

Source: 10 CFR 20.1301

- Effluent paths would be monitored and sampled to assure compliance with regulatory discharge limits.

Radiological Impacts

The general public could be impacted by radiation and radioactive material from the IIFP facility via controlled releases of gas associated with the uranium process lines during routine operations and from decontamination and maintenance of equipment, or direct radiation exposure associated with transportation and storage of DUF_6 cylinders and wastes.

The radiation exposure limits for the general public have been established by the NRC in 10 CFR 20. Routine operations would be conducted to ensure that public exposure at off-site locations would be within these limits. Annual exposure to the public would be maintained \ALARA through effluent controls and monitoring.

The potential radiological impacts to the public from operations at the proposed IIFP facility are those associated with chronic exposure to low levels of radiation and not the immediate health effects associated with acute radiation exposure. The major sources of potential radiation exposure (chronic or acute) are the gaseous discharges from the plant scrubber systems for the DUF_4 and fluorine extraction processes and the dust collector scrubber system. It is estimated that the total amount of uranium released to the air from the proposed IIFP facility would be less than 0.5 kg (1.1 lb) per year. Due to the low volume of contaminated liquid waste anticipated by the applicant, no liquid effluent discharges are expected to contain radiological waste. Therefore, there would be no dose pathway and no significant radiological impact to the public or the environment from liquid effluent discharges. The radiological impacts associated with direct radiation from indoor operations are not expected to be a significant contributor to dose to the public because the low-energy gamma-rays associated with the uranium would be absorbed almost completely by the process lines, equipment, cylinders, and building structures (IIFP, 2011a). Routine radiological gaseous releases from the proposed IIFP facility are listed in Table 4-23.

Table 4-23. Estimated and Bounding Radiological Releases from the Stacks

Radionuclide	DUF_6 to DUF_4 Stack		SiF_4 and BF_3 Production Stack	
	kBq/yr	Ci/yr	kBq/yr	Ci/yr
Estimated Releases				
^{234}U	461	1.25×10^{-5}	42.2	1.14×10^{-6}
^{235}U	44.5	1.20×10^{-6}	4.08	1.10×10^{-7}
^{238}U	3,500	9.46×10^{-5}	321	8.66×10^{-6}
Total	**21,600**	**5.83×10^{-4}**	**9,490**	**2.56×10^{-4}**
Bounding Releases				
^{234}U	922	2.49×10^{-5}	84.5	2.28×10^{-6}
^{235}U	89.1	2.41×10^{-6}	8.16	2.21×10^{-7}
^{238}U	7,000	1.89×10^{-4}	641	1.73×10^{-5}
Total	**8,010**	**2.16×10^{-4}**	**734**	**1.98×10^{-5}**

Source: IIFP, 2011a
kBq = kilobecquerel (2.7×10^{-7} curies)

There are three primary exposure pathways associated with plant effluent: inhalation; direct radiation due to deposited radioactivity on the ground surface ("ground plane exposure"); and ingestion of contaminated food products. Of these three exposure pathways, inhalation exposures are expected to be the predominant pathways at site boundary locations and also at off-site locations that are relatively close to the site boundary. Because airborne concentrations decrease with the distance from the discharge point, for gaseous releases from the proposed IIFP facility, the highest off-site airborne concentrations (and, hence, the greatest radiological impacts) are expected at locations near the site boundary. Beyond those locations, the concentrations of airborne radioactive material would decrease continuously because of dispersion of the material and depletion processes.

The critical populations for determining dose impacts include the resident nearest to the proposed IIFP facility (at the northwest boundary) and the maximally exposed individual (MEI). The MEI is a hypothetical person living at the point of highest projected total uranium concentrations. The impact due to gaseous releases was evaluated for the dose from the three primary exposure pathways identified above. Because there is no pathway for contamination of drinking water, no radiological contamination of drinking water was considered in the analysis. The analysis included dose equivalent assessments for four age groups (i.e., adults, teens, children, and infants) for these pathways.

IIFP calculated doses using GENII (version 2.08), which is a dose assessment model developed for EPA for calculating radiation dose and risk from radionuclides released to the environment. Dose equivalents for the MEI and the nearest resident due to gaseous releases were calculated by pathway for the total body in adults, teens, children, and infants, and are presented in Tables 4-24 and 4-25, respectively. For the MEI, the highest committed effective dose equivalent (CEDE) from the proposed IIFP facility emissions was calculated to be 1.40×10^{-7} Sv (1.40×10^{-5} rem) per year. For the adult fulltime resident nearest to the facility, the highest CEDE from the IIFP facility was calculated to be 9.46×10^{-8} Sv (9.46×10^{-6} rem) per year.

Committed Effective Dose Equivalent (CEDE)

Committed effective dose equivalent is the sum of the products of the weighting factors applicable to each of the body organs or tissues that are irradiated and the committed dose equivalent to these organs or tissues.

Source: 10 CFR 20.1003.

In its environmental report (IIFP, 2009a), IIFP calculated direct dose rates for the MEI and the nearest resident. These doses rates were extremely small (e.g., less than 1.04×10^{-2} mSv per year [1.04 mrem per year]). The CEDE and the direct dose equivalent were totaled to determine the total effective dose equivalent (TEDE) for the MEI. The highest TEDE was determined to be 0.21 mSv per year (20.8 mrem per year), which is approximately one-fifth of the NRC exposure limit of 1 mSv (100 mrem). Doses for public receptors at other sites of interest (e.g., schools and hospitals) would be lower than those of the MEI because the airborne concentrations of uranium would be lower at these more distant locations. Therefore, NRC staff anticipates that radiological impacts to off-site receptors from routine combined effluent releases and direct radiation would to be SMALL.

Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE)

Total effective dose equivalent is the sum of the effective dose equivalent or the deep-dose equivalent (for external exposures) and the committed effective dose equivalent (for internal exposures).

Source: 10 CFR 20.1003.

Table 4-24. Annual and Committed Dose Equivalents for Exposures to the MEI from Gaseous Effluents

Source	Units	Adult EDE	Teen EDE	Child EDE	Infant EDE
Cloud Immersion	Sv	5.77×10^{-16}	5.77×10^{-16}	5.77×10^{-16}	5.77×10^{-16}
	rem	5.77×10^{-14}	5.77×10^{-14}	5.77×10^{-14}	5.77×10^{-14}
Inhalation	Sv	3.06×10^{-8}	3.67×10^{-8}	6.19×10^{-8}	1.30×10^{-7}
	rem	3.06×10^{-6}	3.76×10^{-6}	6.19×10^{-6}	1.30×10^{-5}
Ingestion	Sv	1.30×10^{-9}	1.96×10^{-9}	2.35×10^{-9}	9.79×10^{-9}
	rem	1.30×10^{-7}	1.96×10^{-7}	2.35×10^{-7}	9.79×10^{-7}
Ground Plane Exposure	Sv	2.08×10^{-10}	2.08×10^{-10}	2.08×10^{-10}	2.08×10^{-10}
	rem	2.08×10^{-8}	2.08×10^{-8}	2.08×10^{-8}	2.08×10^{-8}
Total Dose	**Sv**	**3.21×10^{-8}**	**3.88×10^{-8}**	**6.45×10^{-8}**	**1.40×10^{-7}**
	rem	**3.21×10^{-6}**	**3.88×10^{-6}**	**6.45×10^{-6}**	**1.40×10^{-5}**

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-25. Annual and Committed Dose Equivalents for Exposure to the Nearest Resident from Gaseous Effluents

Source	Units	Adult EDE	Teen EDE	Child EDE	Infant EDE
Cloud Immersion	Sv	4.40×10^{-17}	4.40×10^{-17}	4.40×10^{-17}	4.40×10^{-17}
	rem	4.40×10^{-15}	4.40×10^{-15}	4.40×10^{-15}	4.40×10^{-15}
Inhalation	Sv	2.20×10^{-8}	2.65×10^{-8}	4.44×10^{-8}	9.38×10^{-6}
	rem	2.20×10^{-6}	2.65×10^{-6}	4.44×10^{-6}	9.38×10^{-6}
Ingestion	Sv	9.91×10^{-11}	1.49×10^{-10}	1.79×10^{-10}	7.43×10^{-10}
	rem	9.91×10^{-9}	1.49×10^{-8}	1.79×10^{-8}	7.43×10^{-8}
Ground Plane Exposure	Sv	1.59×10^{-11}	1.59×10^{-11}	1.59×10^{-11}	1.59×10^{-11}
	rem	1.59×10^{-9}	1.59×10^{-9}	1.59×10^{-9}	1.59×10^{-9}
Total Dose	**Sv**	**2.21×10^{-8}**	**2.66×10^{-8}**	**4.46×10^{-8}**	**9.46×10^{-8}**
	rem	**2.21×10^{-6}**	**2.66×10^{-6}**	**4.46×10^{-6}**	**9.46×10^{-6}**

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Potential doses to the total population within an 80-km (50-mi) radius of the proposed IIFP facility were also determined. The local area population distribution was derived from U.S. Census Bureau 2000 data for counties in New Mexico and Texas (IIFP, 2011a) that fall all or in part within the 80-km (50-mi) radius of the proposed IIFP site. A standard 16-sector compass rose was centered on the IIFP site and divided into annular rings out to a distance of 80 km (50 mi) (see Figure 4-1). Using census data, significant population groups, typically towns or cities, within the 80-km (50-mi) area were identified in those sectors. Table 4-26 and Table 4-27 present the total population doses expected in units of person-sieverts and person-rem,


N
NNE
NE
ENE
E
ESE
SE
SSE
S
SSW
SW
WSW
W
WNW
NW
NNW
18
125
214
83
132
180
176
115
128
18
62
31
33
238
483
529
360
172
457
249
558
2
409
70
380
206
Roosevelt
114
Hockley
Cochran
385
82
Yoakum
Terry
Lovington
Denver City
Artesia
Chaves
Eddy
Hobbs
Seminole
Gaines
Andrews
Eunice
Lea
Carlsbad
Andrews
Ector
Odessa
Kermit
Winkler
Loving
Culberson
New Mexico
Texas
5
10
20
30
40
50
5 to 50-mile sector rings labeled on figure.
1 to 4-mile sector rings not labeled on figure.
Legend
Section 27 of T018SR036E Centroid
Sector
State Boundary
County Boundary
Urban Area
Major Highways
Highway
Major Road
New Mexico
0 5 10 20
Miles
FEP/DUP
Environmental Impact Statement
Figure 4-1 50-Mile Sectors

Table 4-26. Collective Dose Equivalents to All Ages Population (person-Sv) (gas release pathways)

Vector	0-1 mi	1-2 mi	2-3 mi	3-4 mi	4-5 mi	5-10 mi	10-20mi	20-30 mi	30-40 mi	40-50 mi	Total
E	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.82×10^{-4}	4.03×10^{-6}	9.53×10^{-6}	5.15×10^{-6}	2.01×10^{-4}
ENE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.72×10^{-5}	4.08×10^{-5}	0.00	1.16×10^{-5}	4.77×10^{-5}	9.44×10^{-5}
NE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.25×10^{-6}	3.25×10^{-6}
NNE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.54×10^{-6}	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.54×10^{-6}
N	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.55×10^{-5}	3.56×10^{-6}	3.56×10^{-6}	0.00	1.03×10^{-4}
NNW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.89×10^{-6}	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.89×10^{-6}
NW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WNW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
W	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WSW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SSW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.28×10^{-6}	3.28×10^{-6}
SSE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.68×10^{-6}	0.00	0.00	8.68×10^{-6}
SE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
ESE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.43×10^{-6}	0.00	0.00	6.05×10^{-7}	5.03×10^{-6}
Ring	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	**3.72×10^{-5}**	**3.39×10^{-4}**	**1.63×10^{-5}**	**2.47×10^{-5}**	**1.71×10^{-5}**	**4.34×10^{-4}**
Cumulative	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	**3.72×10^{-5}**	**3.76×10^{-4}**	**3.92×10^{-4}**	**4.17×10^{-4}**	**4.34×10^{-4}**	

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-27. Collective Dose Equivalents to All Ages Population (person-rem) (gas release pathways).

Vector	0-1 mi	1-2 mi	2-3 mi	3-4 mi	4-5 mi	5-10 mi	10-20 mi	20-30 mi	30-40 mi	40-50 mi	Total
E	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0182	4.03×10^{-4}	9.53×10^{-4}	5.15×10^{-4}	0.0201
ENE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.72×10^{-3}	4.08×10^{-3}	0.00	1.16×10^{-3}	4.77×10^{-4}	9.44×10^{-3}
NE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.25×10^{-4}	3.25×10^{-4}
NNE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.54×10^{-4}	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.54×10^{-4}
N	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.55×10^{-3}	3.56×10^{-4}	3.56×10^{-4}	0.00	0.0103
NNW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.89×10^{-4}	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.89×10^{-4}
NW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WNW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
W	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WSW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SSW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.28×10^{-4}	3.28×10^{-4}
SSE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.68×10^{-4}	0.00	0.00	8.68×10^{-4}
SE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
ESE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.43×10^{-4}	0.00	0.00	6.05×10^{-7}	5.03×10^{-4}
Ring	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	**3.72×10^{-3}**	**0.0339**	**1.63×10^{-3}**	**2.47×10^{-3}**	**1.71×10^{-3}**	**0.0434**
Cumulative	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	**3.72×10^{-3}**	**0.0376**	**0.0376**	**0.0417**	**0.0434**	

Source: IIFP, 2011a

respectively. As shown on those tables, the total population dose would be 4.34×10^{-4} person-Sv/yr (4.34×10^{-2} person-rem/yr). Multiplying the total population dose by the Interagency Steering Committee on Radiation Standards conversion factor of 6×10^{-4} LCFs per person-rem (ISCORS, 2002), yields approximately 2.6×10^{-5} LCFs expected in the 80-km (50-mi) population for every for one year of operation of the IIFP facility. To put this population dose into perspective, based on statistics, the proposed IIFP facility would need to operate for approximately 38,400 years to produce 1 LCF in the 80-km (50-mi) population. Therefore, NRC staff anticipates that radiological impacts to the 80-km (50-mi) population would be SMALL.

Workers at the IIFP plant would be subject to higher potential exposures than members of the public because they would be involved directly with handling uranium cylinders, uranium processes, and decontamination and maintenance of equipment. During routine operations, workers at the plant potentially could be exposed to radiation from uranium via inhalation of airborne particles and direct exposure to equipment and components containing uranic materials. The radiation protection program at the IIFP facility would require routine radiation surveys and air sampling to ensure that worker exposures are maintained ALARA. Exposure-monitoring techniques at the plant would include personal dosimeters worn by workers, personnel breathing zone air sampling, and annual whole-body counting.

Potential doses to workers were estimated based on analyses conducted for similar DUF_6 deconversion operations at the DOE Piketon (Portsmouth) Ohio and Paducah, Kentucky facilities. For those facilities, the TEDE for workers was conservatively estimated to be about 0.75 mSv per year (75 mrem per year) for involved workers in the deconversion facility. The average TEDE for workers at the cylinder yards was estimated to range from 4.3 mSv per year (430 mrem per year) to 6.9 mSv per year (690 mrem per year) (DOE, 2004a; DOE, 2004b). These doses would be well below the regulatory limit of 50 mSv (5 rem) codified in 10 CFR 20.1201.

Annual radiation exposure for an employee would be controlled, monitored, and maintained ALARA through the Radiation Protection Program at the IIFP plant. The Radiation Protection Program would comply with all applicable NRC requirements established in 10 CFR 20, Subpart B. The radiation exposure of involved workers is estimated to be well within public health standards and the NRC staff finds that radiological impacts to facility workers would be SMALL. Section 4.1.2.9.2 discusses the potential impacts to workers associated with radiological transportation.

Nonradiological Impacts

Routine nonradiological gaseous fluoride effluents from the plant are listed in Table 4-28. For Phase 1 operations, approximately 52.7 kg/yr (116 lb/yr) of HF would be released from the IIFP process stacks. Additionally, approximately 64 kg (141 lb) of BF_3 and 3.7 kg (8.2 lb) of SiF_4 would be released through the stack annually. Emissions of regulated air pollutants would come predominately from the operating natural gas-fired boiler that would be used to provide steam for the plant heating and autoclave feed systems (the facility would have two boilers for redundancy, but only one would operate at any given time. Emission data estimated for the boiler indicates that it would not emit more than 13.2 metric tons (14.5 tons) per year of any regulated air pollutants. At 100 percent power, the boiler would emit 0.93 metric tons (1.03 tons) per year of CO, and 0.11 metric tons (0.12 tons) per year of NO_x. IIFP would determine if the boilers would require an air quality permit from the State of New Mexico (IIFP, 2011a).

Table 4-28. Estimated Annual Nonradiological Gaseous Fluoride Emissions

Emission	Estimated Releases	
	DUF_6 Dust Collector Stack	SiF_4 & BF_3 Dust Collector Stack
SiF_4	N/A	3.7 kg/yr (8.19 lb/yr)
BF_3	N/A	62.5 kg/yr (137.75 lb/yr)
HF	49.3 kg/yr (108.72 lb/yr)	0.3 kg/yr (0.77 lb/yr)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Nonradiological effluents would not exceed criteria in 40 CFR 50, 59, 60, 61, 122, 129, or 141 (IIFP, 2009a). The primary chemical hazard is HF. HF is a clear, colorless, corrosive, fuming liquid with a very acrid odor. A release can form dense white vapor clouds. Both liquid and vapor can cause severe burns to all parts of the body. Exposure to skin, eyes and inhalation or ingestion can cause severe health consequences, including death.

The facility would not discharge any industrial effluents to natural surface waters or soil, and there is no plant facility tie-in to a public waste water treatment facility. All effluents would be contained on the IIFP site via collection tanks. No routine liquid effluent discharge is expected; therefore, there would be no public impact.

The NRC staff finds that impacts from routine releases (Phase 1 operations) to the public would be SMALL.

No worker exposures exceeding the OSHA Standards for Toxic and Hazardous Substances (29 CFR 1910, Subpart Z) are anticipated (IIFP, 2011a). Additionally, handling of all chemicals and wastes would be conducted in accordance with the site Environment, Health, and Safety Program which would conform to 29 CFR 1910 OSHA standards and specify the use of appropriate engineered controls, as well as personnel protective equipment, to minimize potential chemical exposures (IIFP, 2011a).

In addition to the radiological hazards associated with uranium, workers may be potentially exposed to the chemical hazards associated with uranium. UF_6 is hygroscopic (moisture absorbing) and, in contact with water, would chemically breakdown into UO_2F_2 and HF. When released to the atmosphere, gaseous UF_6 combines with humidity to form a cloud of particulate UO_2F_2 and HF fumes. The reaction is very fast and is dependent on the availability of water vapor. Consequently, an inhalation of UF_6 is typically an internal exposure to HF and UO_2F_2. In addition to the radiation dose, a worker would be subjected to two other primary toxic effects: the uranium in the uranyl complex acts as a heavy metal poison that can affect the kidneys, and the HF can cause acid bums to the skin and lungs if concentrated. Because of low specific activity values, the radiotoxicity of UF_6 and its products are smaller than their chemical toxicity (IIFP, 2011a).

Because of the containment systems for gasses used or created in the plant process, and the personal protective equipment that would be used in areas where exposure could occur, worker

exposure to in-plant gaseous releases would be minimal, and no exposures exceeding 29 CFR 1910, Subpart Z are anticipated (IIFP, 2009a). Laboratory and maintenance operations involving hazardous gaseous or respirable effluents would be conducted with ventilation control (i.e., fume hoods, local exhaust, or similar) and with the use of respiratory protection, as required. All regulated gaseous effluents would be below regulatory limits as specified by the New Mexico Air Quality Bureau (IIFP, 2011a). The NRC staff finds that impacts from routine releases within the facility (Phase 1 operations) to workers would be SMALL.

The proposed action involves a major industrial activity with the potential to cause temporary injuries, long-term injuries and/or disabilities, and even fatalities to workers. Common occupational accidents at facilities similar to the proposed IIFP plant typically involve hand and finger injuries, tripping accidents, minor burns and impacts due to striking objects or falling objects. To estimate the number of potential fatal and nonfatal occupational injuries from operation of the proposed IIFP facility, data on fatal and nonfatal occupational injuries per worker per year were collected from the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. Nonfatal and fatal occupational injury rates for the manufacturing industry were used to calculate the estimated fatal and nonfatal injuries associated with operation of the proposed IIFP facility. As shown in Table 4-29, less than four nonfatal injuries and less than one fatality are expected annually during operation of the proposed IIFP facility. The NRC staff finds that the impacts to human health from occupational injuries during operation would be SMALL.

Table 4-29. Annual Nonfatal and Fatal Occupational Injuries Projected for Operation of the IIFP Facility

Category	Injury Rate	Expected Occurrences
Nonfatal Injuries	2.3 per 100 workers[a]	3.2
Fatal Injuries	2.2 per 100,000 workers[b]	less than 1 (3.1×10^{-3})

[a] The expected nonfatal injury rate (total recordable cases) is from BLS (2010a).
[b] The fatal injury rate is from BLS (2010b).
[c] Expected occurrences are based on 140 workers during Phase 1 operations.

Worker health and safety at the proposed IIFP facility would be protected by its Chemical Safety Program, the Radiation Protection Program, and the Industrial Safety Program. These programs would comply with applicable State, NRC (10 CFR 20), and OSHA (29 CFR 1910) requirements. Work environments that present the potential for exposure to chemical, biological, or physical agents (e.g., radiation, noise, heat/cold, vibration) would be evaluated, and appropriate safety controls would be implemented and/or safety equipment would be assigned to workers. Personal protective equipment requirements would be based on the nature of the work and chemical and/or radiological hazards present and would be a key component to minimizing exposure to chemical and radiological agents. Exposure monitoring would be conducted on radiation workers to evaluate their personal exposure; if personal monitoring is not feasible, work area monitoring would be used to represent personal exposure.

The NRC staff finds that the impacts to human health from occupational injuries during operation would be SMALL.

4.1.2.12 Waste Management Impacts

Waste generation during facility operation would be minimized through reduction, reuse, and recycling, as applicable to specific waste streams. The proposed IIFP facility would incorporate waste minimization systems in its operational procedures and design with the goal of conserving

materials, recycling important compounds, and preventing the spread of contamination. Good work practices would be used to collect and sort the wastes generated during operation for recycling or disposal (e.g., using designated roll-off containers and collection areas for different types of wastes) (IIFP, 2011a).

There would be no permanent onsite disposal of any waste; only temporary storage. Wastes generated at the proposed IIFP facility would be disposed of at licensed facilities designed to accept the various waste types. The management of stormwater and wastewater at the proposed IIFP facility is discussed in Section 4.1.2.6.

Solid waste, including sanitary waste, miscellaneous trash, vehicle air filters, empty cutting oil cans, miscellaneous scrap metal, and paper would be shipped offsite for recycling or minimization, if appropriate, or transported offsite to an approved local landfill (IIFP, 2011a).

The radioactive DUO_2 waste from the deconversion process would be shipped to an offsite LLW disposal facility licensed to accept DUO_2. Other LLW, including dust collector bags, ion exchange resin, crushed contaminated drums, contaminated trash, contaminated coke, and carbon trap material, would be collected in labeled containers in each Restricted Area and transferred to the Radioactive Waste Storage Area for inspection. Waste would be volume-reduced, if appropriate, and disposed of at a licensed LLW disposal facility.

Hazardous wastes and some mixed wastes would be collected at the point of generation in approved containers, transferred to the onsite Waste Storage Area, inspected, classified, and shipped by a licensed transporter to a hazardous waste treatment or disposal facility. The majority of the projected hazardous waste is the potential waste CaF_2. As described in Section 2.1.6.4.2, the KOH regeneration process results in CaF_2 that would be packaged and stored for sale. If a market for this material is not identified, the CaF_2 would be sent to a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility. Any mixed waste would be treated in its original collection container prior to shipment for offsite disposal, or shipped directly to a mixed waste processor (IIFP, 2011a).

Tables 4-30, 4-31, and 4-32 provide information on the types and estimated annual quantities of solid, hazardous, and LLW, respectively, generated from Phase 1 operations at the proposed IIFP facility.

As described in Section 4.1.1.12, nonhazardous solid wastes from the proposed IIFP facility would likely be transported to the Lea County landfill for disposal. The Lea County landfill receives approximately 82,500 tons of solid waste annually (NMED, 2009). Nonhazardous, industrial waste generated from operation of the proposed facility (up to 46 tons per year as shown in Table 4-30) would result in an increase of approximately 0.06 percent in the waste that the Lea County Landfill receives annually from all other sources. The NRC staff finds that this quantity of nonhazardous waste material would result in SMALL impacts that could be managed effectively.

Hazardous wastes would be packaged and shipped offsite to licensed hazardous waste treatment and disposal facilities in accordance with Federal and State regulations (IIFP, 2011a). Table 4-31 shows that the quantity of hazardous waste generated by operations could be as much as 154 tons per year if a market for the CaF_2 cannot be identified. The projected annual hazardous waste generation would likely classify the proposed IIFP facility as large quantity generator (over 1,000 kg/mo [2,200 lb/mo]). As discussed in Section 4.1.1.12, hazardous waste generators in New Mexico produced 1,078,672 tons of hazardous waste in 2009 (EPA, 2010b).

The maximum IIFP generation rate would result in an increase of less than 0.02 percent in the hazardous waste generated annually in the State of New Mexico. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the quantity of operations hazardous waste material would result in SMALL impacts that could be managed effectively.

Table 4-30. Solid Waste Generation – Operations

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Clothing	45 – 90 kg (100 – 200 lbs)
Molecular sieve	140 – 230 kg (300– 500 lbs)
Municipal trash waste	27,000 – 41,000 kg (60,000 – 90,000 lbs)
Safety gear	90 – 180 kg (200 – 400 lbs)
Waste Glass	23 – 90 kg (50 – 200 lbs)
Total	27,500 – 41,400 kg (60,650 – 91,300 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-31. Hazardous Waste Generation – Operations

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Aerosol cans, paints cans, bulbs	450 – 1400 kg (1,000 – 3,000 lbs)
CaF_2[a]	90,000 – 136,000 kg (200,000 – 300,000 lbs)
Lab chemicals	90 – 180 kg (200 – 400 lbs)
Oil sorbent	900 – 2,300 kg (2,000 – 5,000 lbs)
Total[a]	92,000 – 140,000 kg (203,200 – 308,400 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

[a] Includes CaF_2 that would not be waste if sold.

Table 4-32. Low Level Radioactive Waste Generation – Operations

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Activated alumina	900 – 1,800 kg (2,000 – 4,000 lbs)
Air ventilation filters	23 – 45 kg (50 – 100 lbs)
Carbon	11,000 – 14,000 kg (25,000 – 30,000 lbs)
DUF_4 clinkers	2,300 – 4,500 kg (5,000 – 10,000 lbs)
Coke	3,600 – 5,400 kg (8,000 – 12,000 lbs)

Table 4-32. Low Level Radioactive Waste Generation – Operations (Continued)

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Crushed drums	450 – 1,400 kg (1,000 – 3,000 lbs)
Dust collector bags	230 – 1,400 kg (500 – 3,000 lbs)
Ion exchange resin	450 – 900 kg (1,000 – 2,000 lbs)
Oxide for burial (plus drums)	1,270,000 – 2,800,000 kg (2,800,000 – 6,200,000 lbs)
Radioactive waste trash	16,000 – 25,000 kg (35,000 – 55,000 lbs)
Scrap metal	1,800 – 3,600 kg (4,000 – 8,000 lbs)
Sintered metal tubes	450 – 900 kg (1,000 – 2,000 lbs)
Sodium fluoride	900 – 1,800 kg (2,000 – 4,000 lbs)
Spent blasting sand	45 – 90 kg (100 – 200 lbs)
Wood trash (pallets)	450 – 1,800 kg (1,000 – 4,000 lbs)
Total	**1,309,000 – 2,875,000 kg (2,885,650 – 6,337,300 lbs)**

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Depleted uranium is classified as Class A low level waste; however, a specific disposal site may place additional limits on concentration, volume or waste form. Disposal options, including waste form, would be determined after licensing and may change over the operating life of the facility; however, licensed LLW disposal facilities, including the U.S. Ecology site in Richland, Washington; Energy*Solutions* site in Clive, Utah, DOE's site in Area 5 of the Nevada National Security Site (formerly known as the Nevada Test Site), and the WCS facility in Andrews, Texas are potentially viable options, provided regulatory and contractual conditions can be satisfied. The U.S. Ecology facility is in the Pacific Northwest Compact, which has an agreement with Rocky Mountain Compact, of which New Mexico is a member, to dispose of waste but the U.S. Ecology facility would need a revision in the allowable total uranium inventory. Energy*Solutions* accepts shipments from all states. Shipment to the Nevada National Security Site would require DOE to accept possession of the LLW (consistent with Section 13 of the USEC Privatization Act of 1996).

The WCS facility is 42 km (26 mi) southeast of the proposed site but is currently limited to waste from the Texas Compact and therefore, would have to establish approval mechanisms for out-of-compact waste to be disposed. Furthermore, the Rocky Mountain Compact would have to approve shipment outside the compact. The analysis in this draft EIS is not intended to support selection of the LLW disposal facility for the DUO_2.

Decisions regarding the disposal location for DUO_2 and other LLW would be made based on economic and other considerations. For analysis purposes, the radioactive wastes were assumed to be shipped to the Energy*Solutions* site in Clive, Utah. As shown in Table 4-32, up to 3,170 tons per year of LLW could be sent for disposal. Most of the LLW generated

(approximately 97 percent) would be the DUO_2 produced by the deconversion process. The DUO_2 and other LLW generated would be Class A waste (IIFP, 2009a). The projected quantities of DUO_2 and other Class A LLW generated by the proposed IIFP facility operations would have little effect on the available disposal capacity for such material. The projected volume of DUO_2 waste (up to 6,200 55-gal drums or 1,300 m^3/yr) represents approximately 0.04 percent of the 3.1 million m^3 disposal volume of the Class A cell at the Clive facility (DOE, 2000). The Clive facility accepts most of the United States' Class A waste and is estimated to have capacity to accept this waste at current volume levels for more than 20 years (GAO, 2004). The NRC staff finds that the potential impact of proposed IIFP facility operations on LLW disposal capacity would be SMALL.

4.1.2.13 Impacts of Postulated Accidents

4.1.2.13.1 Facility Accidents

The operation of the proposed IIFP facility would involve risks to workers, the public, and the environment from potential accidents. The facility would be licensed under 10 CFR 40, Domestic Licensing of Source Material, and would also be subject to consideration of 10 CFR 70, Subpart H, Additional Requirements for Certain Licensees Authorized to Possess a Critical Mass of Special Nuclear Material, as part of the licensing basis for the application review of certain new source material facilities as an interim measure pending the completion of 10 CFR 40 rulemaking. NRC regulation 10 CFR 70 requires that each applicant or licensee evaluate, in an Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA), its compliance with certain performance requirements. As part of the safety review, the NRC staff would conduct a confirmatory analysis, which independently evaluates the consequences of potential accidents identified in IIFP's ISA plans. The accidents evaluated are a representative selection of the types of accidents that are possible at the proposed facility.

The analytical methods used in the NRC staff's consequence assessment are based on NRC guidance for analysis of nuclear fuel-cycle facility accidents (NRC, 1990; NRC, 1991; NRC, 1998) and regulatory guidance cited by IIFP (EPA, 1999). The consequence assessment considered the available information regarding the facility prior to final design. The NRC staff analyzed accidents involving the release of HF, the primary chemical hazard at the facility. HF is a clear, colorless, corrosive, fuming liquid. In high concentrations, a release could form dense white vapor clouds. HF releases pose a chemical risk to workers, the public, and the environment. Both direct releases of HF and releases from a byproduct reaction involving

Acute Exposure Guideline Levels (AEGLs)

AEGLs represent threshold exposure limits for the general public and are applicable to five emergency exposure periods (10 minutes, 30 minutes, 1 hour, 4 hours, and 8 hours) and are distinguished by varying degrees of severity of toxic effects. It is believed that the recommended exposure levels are applicable to the general population including infants and children, and other individuals who may be susceptible. The three AEGLs have been defined as follows:

AEGL-1 is the airborne concentration of a substance, expressed as parts per million or milligrams per cubic meter (ppm or mg/m^3) above which it is estimated that the general population, including susceptible individuals, could experience notable discomfort, irritation, or certain asymptomatic nonsensory effects. However, the effects are not disabling and are transient and reversible upon cessation of exposure.

AEGL-2 is the airborne concentration (expressed as ppm or mg/m^3) of a substance above which it is estimated that the general population, including susceptible individuals, could experience irreversible or other serious, long-lasting adverse health effects or an impaired ability to escape.

AEGL-3 is the airborne concentration (expressed as ppm or mg/m^3) of a substance above which it is estimated that the general population, including susceptible individuals, could experience life-threatening health effects or death.

other fluoride species (DUF_6, DUF_4, SiF_4 and BF_3) could pose accident risks. NRC staff also evaluated accidents involving radioactive materials (depleted uranium bound with fluoride and/or oxide) for radiation and chemical (heavy metal toxicity) impacts.

4.1.2.13.1.1 Accidents Considered

A number of potential accidents could occur at the proposed facility. The NRC staff selected, for detailed evaluation, a subset of the potential accident scenarios that is intended to encompass the range of possible accidents. The accident sequences the staff selected vary in severity from high- to low-consequence events, and include accidents initiated by natural phenomena (seismic event), operator error, and equipment failure.

The accident scenarios evaluated were as follows:

- Seismic event causing multiple process containment failures: This scenario would occur across multiple processes. The staff evaluation of acute effects was limited to cylinder breaches in the cylinder storage area which IIFP identified as resulting in high consequences. The staff evaluation of collective effects utilized an estimate of the total facility source term.
- Liquid DUF_6 cylinder drop: This scenario would include a breach and release of liquid DUF_6.
- SiF_4 release: This scenario could be caused by over-pressurization of a nitrogen loop with secondary cold trap breach.
- UF_4 collection drum spill.
- UF_4 vacuum transfer line rupture: This scenario would occur outside of the building.

IIFP's ISA attributes "likelihood categories" (highly unlikely, unlikely, or not unlikely) to each accident sequence. The staff's analysis described in this section does not include an estimate of the probability of occurrence of accidents, which, in combination with consequences, would reflect the overall risk from an accident. Instead, analyzed accidents are assumed to occur and consequences of each accident reported.

4.1.2.13.1.2 Accident Consequences

The performance requirements in 10 CFR 70, Subpart H, define acceptable levels of risk of accidents at nuclear fuel cycle facilities such as the proposed facility. The regulations in Subpart H require that IIFP reduce the risks of credible high-consequence and intermediate-consequence events, with all nuclear processes being subcritical. Table 4-33 defines the accident consequence categories used for the accident analysis. Table 4-34 defines exposure thresholds, by receptor and for intermediate- and high- consequence accidents, for each chemical species analyzed, as interpreted by IIFP. Subcritical conditions are assured because the facility would work exclusively with depleted uranium materials, and the incoming materials would be assayed to ensure this condition.

The staff evaluated the consequences of the selected accidents against the threshold values for a facility worker, a site worker 100 m (328 ft) from the release point, an individual at the site boundary, and the environment at the site boundary. Table 4-35 summarizes these results.

Table 4-33. Accident Consequence Categories

Category	Workers	Off-Site Public	Environment
Category 3 High Consequences	• Individual Radiation Dose ≥100 rem • Individual Chemical Dose = endanger life (> than AEGL-3, 10 min exposure) • 75 mg soluble uranium intake	• Individual Radiation Dose ≥25 rem • Chemical Dose = long-lasting health effects (> AEGL-2, 30 min exposure) • 30 mg soluble uranium intake	
Category 2 Intermediate Consequences	• Individual Radiation Dose ≥25 rem • Individual Chemical Dose = long-lasting health effects (>AEGL-2 but <AEGL-3, 10 min exposure)	• Individual Radiation Dose ≥5 rem • Chemical Dose = mild transient health effects (>AEGL-1 but <AEGL-2, 30 min exposure)	Radiological release >5000 times values in Table 2 of 10 CFR 20
Category 1 Low Consequences	Accidents of lower radiological and chemical exposures than Category 2	Accidents of lower radiological and chemical exposures than Category 2	Radiological releases lower than Category 2

Source: IIFP, 2009b

Table 4-34. Chemical Consequence Exposure Thresholds

Chemical	Intermediate Consequences				High Consequences			
	Worker Exposure		Public Exposure		Worker Exposure		Public Exposure	
	Level of Concern	Concentration, mg/m^3	Level of Concern	Concentration, mg/m^3	Level of Concern	Concentration, mg/m^3	Level of Concern	Concentration, mg/m^3
Hydrogen fluoride (HF)	AEGL-2 10 min	77.8	AEGL-1 30 min	0.82	AEGL-3 10 min	139	AEGL-2 30 min	28
Silicon tetrafluoride (SiF_4)	AEGL-2 10 min	27	AEGL-1 30 min	0.21	AEGL-3 10 min	81	AEGL-2 30 min	18
Boron trifluoride (BF_3)	AEGL-2 10 min	47	AEGL-1 30 min	2.5	AEGL-3 10 min	140	AEGL-2 30 min	47
Uranium hexafluoride (UF_6)	AEGL-2 10 min	28	AEGL-1 30 min	3.6	AEGL-3 10 min	216	AEGL-2 30 min	19
Uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2)	AEGL-2 10 min	28	AEGL-1 30 min	3.6	AEGL-3 10 min	216	AEGL-2 30 min	19
Uranium tetrafluoride (UF_4)	AEGL-2 10 min	28	AEGL-1 30 min	3.6	AEGL-3 10 min	216	AEGL-2 30 min	19
Uranium dioxide (UO_2)	ERPG-2 10 min	201	ERPG-1 30 min	0.68	ERPG-3 10 min	180	ERPG-2 30 min	32

Source: IIFP, 2009b

ERPG = Emergency Response Planning Guideline – Concentration values established by the American Industrial Hygiene Association that meet certain human response criteria similar to those for Acute exposure guideline levels (AEGLs).

Table 4-35. Summary of Accident Analysis Results

Receptor	Parameter	Worst Case DUF_6 Release	Seismic event causing multiple process containment failures	Fluorine Compounds Release	UF_4 Spill	Transfer Line Rupture
Worker (inside room, 10 min exposure)	HF concentration (mg/m^3)	1.34×10^6		56.5		
	UO_2F_2 concentration (mg/m^3)	5.14×10^6				
	Soluble U intake (mg)	7.94×10^5				
	Dose (rem)	686			0.052	
	SiF_4 concentration (mg/m^3)			73.5		
	UF_4 concentration (mg/m^3)				121	
Worker (outside building, 10 min exposure)	HF concentration (mg/m^3)	1.64×10^4	47.3	0.452		
	UO_2F_2 concentration (mg/m^3)	6.05×10^4	179			
	Soluble U intake (mg)	9,340	27.6			
	Dose (rem)	8.07	0.02		4.05×10^{-4}	3.48×10^{-4}
	SiF_4 concentration (mg/m^3)			0.588		
	UF_4 concentration (mg/m^3)				0.953	0.817
Public (at Site Boundary, 30 min exposure)	HF concentration (mg/m^3)	7,800	15.7	0.367		
	UO_2F_2 concentration (mg/m^3)	2.93×10^4	59.4			
	Soluble U intake (mg)	1.36×10^4	27.4			
	Dose (rem)	11.7	0.02		0.0017	3.45×10^{-4}
	SiF_4 concentration (mg/m^3)			0.478		
	UF_4 concentration (mg/m^3)				1.33	0.27

Table 4-35. Summary of Accident Analysis Results (Continued)

Receptor	Parameter	Worst Case DUF_6 Release	Seismic event causing multiple process containment failures	Fluorine Compounds Release	UF_4 Spill	Transfer Line Rupture
Environment (at Site Boundary, 24 hr avg)	Activity Concentration (uCi/mL)	$2.7\ 2 \times 10^{-7}$	4.96×10^{-10}		6.67×10^{-12}	2.17×10^{-12}
Public collective exposure	Dose (person-rem)	16.1	135		0.00317	0.00192
	LCF	0.00351	0.0297		2.63×10^{-6}	1.59×10^{-6}

Source: NRC, 2011
Note: Not all accident sequences resulted in datum for the categories listed in this table. This could be because the sequence was postulated to occur outside of a building or did not involve all the chemicals or radioactive materials listed.

The most significant accident consequences are those associated with the release of liquefied UF_6 caused by rupturing a cylinder. The facility emergency plan addresses this type of event, as well as all other lower-risk, high- and intermediate-consequence events. IIFP would reduce the likelihood of this type of event by requiring a robust cylinder design that maintains its integrity during credible drops, shocks, collisions, and thermal events, and an interlock on the autoclave which would prevent the removal of liquid or partially full cylinders during heating/feed cycles. The NRC staff concludes that through the combination of plant design, passive and active engineered controls, and administrative controls, accidents at the facility would pose an acceptably SMALL risk to workers, the environment, and the public.

NRC regulations and IIFP's operating procedures for the proposed facility would be designed to ensure that the high and intermediate accident scenarios would be highly unlikely and unlikely, respectively. The combination of responses by Items Relied on for Safety, which mitigate or prevent emergency conditions, and the implementation of emergency procedures and protective actions in accordance with the facility emergency plan would limit the consequences and reduce the likelihood of accidents that could otherwise extend beyond the proposed facility site and property boundaries.

4.1.2.13.2 Transportation Accidents

Operation of the IIFP facility would require shipment of full DUF_6 cylinders from commercial enrichment facilities, empty DUF_6 cylinders back to the commercial enrichment facilities, DUO_2 to waste disposal facilities, and other process and miscellaneous LLW to waste disposal facilities. Section 4.1.2.9.2 describes these shipments, which are summarized here in Table 4-36.

NRC staff used the TRAGIS (Johnson and Michelhaugh, 2003) transportation routing computer modeling code and the RADTRAN5 (Neuhauser and Kanipe, 2003) transportation risk assessment computer modeling code to calculate the radiological transportation dose-risk to the exposed population along the transportation route. Dose-risk is the product of dose and probability for small segments along the route and summed over the entire route. Accident frequencies were taken from Saricks and Tompkins (1999). Severity fractions and package/contents response characteristics were taken from NUREG-0170 (NRC, 1977).

Results of that analysis are provided in Table 4-37, with more details on the analysis provided in Appendix E. LCF risk is the product of dose-risk times the Interagency Steering Committee on Radiation Standards conversion factor of 6 x 10^{-4} LCFs per person-rem (ISCORS, 2002).

Table 4-36. Summary of Annual Radiological Transportation Shipments

Description	Origin	Destination	Number of Shipments	Packaging
Full DUF_6 cylinders	URENCO USA	IIFP	293	1 cylinder per truck
Full DUF_6 cylinders	GLE	IIFP	293	1 cylinder per truck
Full DUF_6 cylinders from AREVA Eagle Rock	Eagle Rock	IIFP	293	1 cylinder per truck
Empty DUF_6 cylinders	IIFP	URENCO USA	293	1 cylinder per truck
Empty DUF_6 cylinders	IIFP	GLE	293	1 cylinder per truck
Empty DUF_6 cylinders	IIFP	Eagle Rock	293	1 cylinder per truck
DUO_2	IIFP	Energy*Solutions*, Clive Facility	155	55-gal drums, 40 per truck
DUO_2	IIFP	Waste Control Specialists	155	55-gal drums, 40 per truck
Miscellaneous LLW	IIFP	Energy*Solutions*, Clive Facility	31	55-gal drums, 40 per truck
Miscellaneous LLW	IIFP	Waste Control Specialists	31	55-gal drums, 40 per truck

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-37. Annual Accident Dose-Risk and LCF-Risk from Radiological Transportation

Description	Dose-Risk (person-Sv)	Dose-Risk (person-rem)	LCF Risk
Full DUF_6 cylinders from URENCO USA	4.0×10^{-5}	0.0040	2.4×10^{-6}
Full DUF_6 cylinders from GLE Facility	0.14	14	0.0081
Full DUF_6 cylinders from AREVA Eagle Rock	0.10	10	0.0060
Empty DUF_6 cylinders to URENCO USA	1.5×10^{-7}	1.5×10^{-5}	8.7×10^{-9}
Empty DUF_6 cylinders to GLE Facility	4.9×10^{-4}	0.049	2.9×10^{-5}
Empty DUF_6 cylinders to AREVA Eagle Rock	3.7×10^{-4}	0.037	2.2×10^{-5}
DUO_2 to Energy*Solutions*, Clive	0.10	10	0.0063
DUO_2 to Waste Control Specialists	3.9×10^{-5}	0.0039	2.3×10^{-6}
Miscellaneous LLW to Energy*Solutions*, Clive	5.5×10^{-5}	0.0055 E	3.3×10^{-6}
Miscellaneous LLW to Waste Control Specialists	2.0×10^{-8}	2.0×10^{-6}	1.2×10^{-9}

Source: See Appendix E

Assuming a scenario in which DUF_6 is shipped from the enrichment facility and the DUO_2 waste is shipped to the waste disposal facility as the greatest transportation risks, one arrives at 0.24 person-sievert (24 person-rem) of accident risk annually. This is for receipt and return of cylinders to the GLE facility in Wilmington, North Carolina and disposal of low-level waste at

Energy*Solutions* Clive, Utah facility. The equivalent number of latent cancer fatalities is 0.014 LCF.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2010), there were 178.4 cancer deaths per 100,000 people in 2007 with a probability of occurrence of 100 percent. Given the high rate of cancer fatalities in the U.S. from all causes, the addition of 0.014 LCF from the risk of a radiological transportation accident from the proposed facility is considered by the NRC staff to be a SMALL impact. While mitigation measures are not required, IIFP would be required by NRC and DOT regulations to package and manage the transported waste to minimize the probability of accidental release of radioactive material.

4.1.3 Decommissioning Impacts

This section summarizes the potential environmental impacts of the decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility. Decommissioning as described in Chapter 10 of the License Application (IIFP, 2009a), would involve the decontamination of equipment and buildings and the removal and disposal of all operating fuel-cycle facility equipment. Decommissioning would be funded in accordance with a decommissioning funding plan for the proposed IIFP facility, which will be prepared by IIFP in accordance with 10 CFR 70.25(a) and NUREG-1757 (NRC, 2006).

A complete description of the actions to be taken to decommission the proposed IIFP facility at the expiration of the plant's NRC license period (if the license is granted) cannot be provided at this time. In accordance with 10 CFR 70.38, IIFP must prepare and submit a decommissioning plan (different from the decommissioning funding plan) to the NRC for review and comment at least 12 months prior to the expiration of the proposed facility's NRC license. IIFP would submit a final decommissioning plan to the NRC for review prior to the start of decommissioning. This plan would include more detail than is available at this time. All decommissioning activities would comply with the applicable Federal, State, and local regulations in effect at the time of the decontamination and decommissioning activities.

It is reasonable to expect that decommissioning would occur over the course of three years and that it would be expected to employ 40 workers for the three-year period (IIFP, 2009a).

Two possibilities exist for decommissioning the facility. One is to leave the structures and most (non-uranium-processing) support equipment in place after they are decontaminated to appropriate (unrestricted release) levels, in accordance with 10 CFR 20, for ultimate use by another industrial tenant or owner. The second is to decontaminate and raze the entire facility, restoring the site to its current use as open range land (e.g., grazing and wildlife habitat). The final disposition of the property would be determined at the time of decommissioning. The ER assumes that "…decommissioning…will involve the removal of the internal equipment, utilities, and products from the building(s); however the physical structure, associated foundations, access roads, and utility lines will likely remain intact," (IIFP, 2009a). Therefore, this section evaluates leaving structures for industrial re-use as the likely decommissioning option.

Decontamination and decommissioning of the proposed facility is described in Section 2.1.7. Regardless of the end use of the facility, decommissioning would begin with the decontamination and removal of uranium-processing equipment and other materials to be shipped offsite for licensed disposal. The number of daily truck shipments is anticipated to be similar to the average daily shipments during operations, and the total number of shipments would depend upon the volume of demolition debris and materials packaged for disposal. Radioactively-contaminated equipment and materials would be disposed of by shipping them to

a licensed treatment or disposal facility in compliance with applicable NRC and DOT requirements.

Discussions of issue- and resource-specific impacts of decommissioning include the following:

LAND USE: The chain-link perimeter security fence surrounding the facility compound could be removed following decommissioning. If decommissioning included the removal of all facilities, the land could revert to its current use for grazing and wildlife habitat. If buildings are not removed, another industry could move into the facility; and the 16 ha (40 ac) would not be available for grazing; however, the undeveloped land (240 ha, or 600 ac) could be available for grazing. Land use plans and land uses surrounding the site would be unaffected by decommissioning. The NRC staff concludes that regardless of the condition (option with structures remaining for alternate uses or option with all structures removed/site restored), the impacts to local land use due to decommissioning would be SMALL.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES: Decommissioning of the facility would not involve land disturbance which could affect historic properties, districts, resources or significant historic/precontact archaeological sites. No historic resources were identified within the cultural resources APEs and three isolated artifacts that are not NRHP-eligible were identified during the cultural resource survey. No Native American Tribes expressed concerns to the NRC regarding the project.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that any impacts to historic properties, districts, resources or significant historic/precontact archaeological sites during facility decommissioning would be SMALL.

CLIMATE, METEOROLOGY, AND AIR QUALITY: GHG emissions associated with decommissioning would result primarily from three activities: (1) the onsite consumption of fossil fuels in vehicles and equipment used to dismantle and possibly demolish existing structures or excavate buried utilities and components, (2) the transportation of waste materials and salvage materials from the proposed site to appropriate offsite disposal or recycling facilities, and (3) the commuting decommissioning workforce.

The following are conservative assumptions that can be made relative to the proposed IIFP facility decommissioning and that can be used to estimate GHG impacts associated with decommissioning activities (IIFP, 2011a):

- CO_2 emissions from shipments of DUF_6 feed materials and operational waste shipments still occurring during the initial period of decommissioning are treated as operational GHG impacts.
- Shipments of wastes or recycling materials would occur by diesel-fueled trucks averaging 23.5 liters of fuel per100 km (10 mpg).
- LLW resulting from decontamination activities would be substantially greater in volume than LLW resulting from routine IIFP facility operation.
- All non-radioactive and non-hazardous solid wastes would be delivered to the same area landfills and treatment facilities that received wastes of similar nature during IIFP facility operation. Assuming successful decontamination of the majority of IIFP facility equipment and structures, a significantly higher number of annual trips would occur throughout the 3-year decommissioning phase than would have occurred annually

during IIFP facility operation, and the resulting CO_2 emissions would be at least an order of magnitude greater than the values for such waste shipments appearing in Section 4.1.2.4.1, "Greenhouse Gases".

- All non-radioactive hazardous waste generated during IIFP facility operations would already have been transported to permitted disposal facilities. The CO_2 emissions of such deliveries would be credited to the IIFP facility operational phase. The amount of non-radioactive hazardous waste generated as a result of decommissioning is expected to be small and would likely be transported to the same disposal facilities that received similar waste during IIFP facility operation. It is further assumed that an appropriately permitted disposal facility will be located within a reasonable distance from the proposed IIFP facility, resulting in limited amounts of GHG emissions from transport.
- Except for the period at the beginning of decommissioning when some operations would still be ongoing, the decommissioning workforce would decrease from 140 to 40 employees. Therefore annual releases of CO_2 related to workforce commuting would be approximately one-third of the values shown in Table 4-13 for operations. Releases of CO_2 related to workforce commuting during the time that operations are continuing as decommissioning is beginning would be approximately one-third higher than the values shown in Table 4-13.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to climate and air quality would be SMALL.

GEOLOGY, MINERALS, AND SOIL: The general condition of the site geologic resources would not change during or after decommissioning activities. Minerals at the site and vicinity would not be affected by decommissioning. As with construction, demolition of structures and disturbed areas would be subject to BMPs to prevent adverse impacts to soils. As a final step in decommissioning, soil testing would demonstrate that site soils meet NRC, EPA, and NMED regulations and guidelines for free release. Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to geology, minerals, and soil during decommissioning would be SMALL.

WATER RESOURCES: No surface water is present on the site, so decommissioning would not affect surface water. The management of stormwater is not expected to change during or after decommissioning activities, unless the site is restored to its original open range conditions. Groundwater would be used during decommissioning for the potable water system, and decommissioning needs such as dust suppression. Water for facility processes would no longer be used; therefore, water withdrawal during decommissioning would be less than during operations.

Accordingly, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to water resources during decommissioning would be SMALL.

SOCIOECONOMICS: Decommissioning is expected to employ 40 workers over three years. The workers would be IIFP employees or work in the construction trades. All would be residents of the ROI. No workers would migrate into the area; however, some former IIFP staff could migrate out of the area. The NRC staff finds that impacts to socioeconomic resource would be SMALL. The NRC staff finds that no disproportionately high or adverse impacts would be incurred by any minority or low-income population.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION: Impacts to traffic would be similar to the impacts during construction and operations. The Phase 2 construction and operations workforces and the number of trucks transporting materials to/from the facility on a daily basis would be similar to

the number during Phase 1 construction and operation. IIFP would ensure that all transportation of materials met NRC and DOT regulations.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts to traffic and transportation would be SMALL.

NOISE: Impacts from noise during decommissioning would be very similar to impacts during construction. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts would be SMALL.

OCCUPATIONAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH: Impacts to occupational and public health would be similar to impacts during construction. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that impacts would be SMALL.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: The overall strategy for decommissioning would be to remove all radioactively contaminated materials, hazardous materials and chemicals from the site. Decommissioning programs and procedures would focus on minimizing waste volumes. For example, as described in Chapter 10 of the License Application (IIFP, 2009a), IIFP would incorporate design features that would result in minimizing the radioactive waste volumes including the following:

- A washable coating on floors and walls in the Restricted Areas, which have the potential to become radioactively contaminated during operation would lower waste volumes during decontamination and simplify the decontamination process.
- Sealed, nonporous pipe insulation in areas with higher potential to become contaminated would facilitate cleaning in event of a spill and reduce the waste volume during decommissioning.
- Tanks would have access for entry and decontamination. Design provisions would be made to allow complete draining of the wastes contained in the tanks.
- Connections in the process systems would provide access during operation and maintenance and to allow for thorough purging at plant shutdown which would remove some radioactive contamination prior to disassembly.

Decommissioning activities would include cleaning to remove radioactive and hazardous contamination that could be present on materials, equipment, and structures. Wastes produced during decommissioning would be collected, handled, and disposed of in a manner similar to that described for the wastes produced during operation. These wastes would consist of industrial trash, nonhazardous chemicals and fluids, small amounts of hazardous materials, and radioactive wastes. The radioactive waste would consist primarily of piping, tanks, hoppers, and compactable trash generated during the dismantling process.

Solid wastes would be generated by decontamination activities and by the removal of used process equipment. Decontaminated used equipment would be shipped offsite to salvage or disposal facilities, as appropriate. In the event that structures would be demolished as part of the decommissioning activities, the demolition material would be shipped offsite for disposal in permitted disposal facilities. Radioactively- contaminated equipment and materials would be shipped to a licensed treatment or disposal facility (as appropriate for the material type) or disposed of in a manner authorized by the NRC. Similarly, materials constituting hazardous wastes would be shipped to a RCRA-permitted treatment and/or disposal facility or an appropriate licensed recovery facility.

A detailed estimate of the wastes produced during decommissioning would be provided in the decommissioning plan that would be submitted to the NRC prior to initiating the decommissioning of the plant (IIFP, 2009a). Approximately 56,000,000 L (2 million ft^3) of commercial LLW were disposed of in the United States in 2008 (NRC, 2010). The estimated decommissioning LLW generation from decommissioning represents less than 1 percent of the national annual disposal volume. The LLWs from the decommissioning are expected to be Class A waste. In its analysis of LLW disposal capacity, the U.S. Government Accountability Office concluded that the availability of disposal capacity in the United States for Class A LLW is not considered to be a problem for the short or long term (GAO, 2004). The NRC staff concludes that the waste management impacts resulting from decommissioning of the IIFP facility, decontamination, disposal, and closure activities would be SMALL.

4.2 Cumulative Impacts

The CEQ regulations implementing NEPA define cumulative impacts, or effects, as "the impact on the environment which results from the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions" (40 CFR 1508.7). In the following analysis, cumulative impacts are assessed from the anticipated impacts of the proposed construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility when added to other identified projects, facilities, or activities in the region that have impacts that affect the same resources or human populations. Effects from the various sources may be direct or indirect and they may be additive or interactive. Such effects are assessed that, when on their own, may be minor, but in combination with other effects may produce a cumulative effect that is of greater concern.

To identify the activities in the region that could contribute to cumulative impacts, NRC staff defined an ROI for each resource that is expected to be affected by the proposed IIFP facility. An ROI for a particular resource is the size of the surrounding area within which impacts from multiple sources may be additive or interactive. The sizes of the ROIs may be different for various resources, and some resources may be remote from the proposed site, such as a waste disposal facility. Still others might cover large areas, such as a watershed or airshed. NUREG-1748 (NRC, 2003) states that the surrounding area of the proposed action can range from less than 1.6 km to 80 km (1 mi to 50 mi). Consistent with NUREG-1748, for the proposed IIFP facility, an ROI radius of 16 km (10 mi) was identified for the majority of resources. The exceptions include socioeconomics, for which an ROI radius of 80 km (50 mi) was identified (Section 3.9); and cultural and historic resources and visual resources, for which an ROI radius of 10 km (6 mi) was identified (Section 3.3.4). Additionally, in order to assess the potential cumulative impacts of radiological transportation, the analysis includes consideration of the URENCO USA/LES uranium enrichment facility and the DOE WIPP, both of which are more than 16 km (10 mi) from the proposed IIFP facility.

In order to identify projects or activities in the region that could contribute to cumulative effects, the NRC staff conducted Internet searches, reviewed news media (local newspapers and local television), and reviewed other relevant NEPA documents (such as the Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed National Enrichment Facility in Lea County, New Mexico [NUREG-1790; NRC, 2005a], the Final Complex Transformation Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement [DOE/EIS-0236-S4; DOE, 2008], and the Supplement Analysis for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Site-Wide Operations [DOE/EIS-0026-SA-07, DOE, 2009]). This cumulative impacts analysis included review of existing activities in the region that would affect the same resources as the proposed IIFP facility, known past impacts

on these resources, and reasonably foreseeable proposed new projects, activities, or facilities that could impact these resources. Section 4.2.1 discusses these projects or activities.

4.2.1 Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

Five other projects or actions are identified and described in this section:

1. Preconstruction activities on the proposed IIFP site that could occur prior to NRC issuing a license for construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility.
2. Construction, operation, and decommissioning of Phase 2 of the IIFP facility.
3. Construction, operation, and decommissioning of the URENCO USA/LES uranium enrichment facility (formerly known as the National Enrichment Facility) in Lea County, New Mexico.
4. Operation of the DOE WIPP near Carlsbad, New Mexico.
5. Construction and operations related to energy production facilities in the region.

4.2.1.1 Proposed IIFP Facility Preconstruction Activities

The preconstruction activities would be preparatory in nature and would not involve any radiological process or safety related equipment or systems. Required Federal and State permits would be obtained prior to the start of preconstruction, and preoperational baseline environmental samples would be collected. Preconstruction activities for the proposed IIFP project would include (IIFP, 2011a):

- Clearing land
- Site grading and erosion control
- Installing temporary fencing
- Installing main entrance roadbed and drainage to highway
- Installing construction trailer
- Preparing preliminary site roadways and gravel parking area
- Drilling water wells
- Constructing power substation and electric utility lines
- Stubbing in gas line to the meter
- Beginning administration building construction
- Beginning maintenance and stores building construction
- Beginning warehouse building construction
- Installing geothermal heating/cooling loops
- Installing firewater tanks
- Installing truck washing station

Based on the characteristics of the proposed IIFP site, major grading would not be required. Excavation would be required for sewer systems, roads, pads, and structure foundations. Less

than 10 percent of the total 259-ha (640-ac) area would be disturbed. The area of clearing would include locations of buildings, process structures, storage pads and roads. During this pre-licensing, preconstruction phase, conventional earthmoving and grading equipment would be used. The removal of very dense soil (caliche) may require the use of heavy equipment with ripping tools. Soil removal work for foundations would be controlled to minimize excavation. In addition, loose soil and/or damaged caliche would be removed prior to installation of foundations for seismically-designed structures. Temporary silt fencing and sediment straw bales would be installed around the areas of construction to entrap silt and to prevent its migration off site. Drainage trenches and ditch checks would be installed along the entrance road to prevent run-off and silt from the site moving onto NM 483 right-of-way. Site sloping, earth berms, underground drainage pipe, and wet sediment retention basins would be installed to entrap storm water run-off from construction areas (IIFP, 2011a).

The natural gas line feeding the site would be connected to an existing, nearby line. This would minimize impacts of short-term disturbances related to the placement of the tie-in line. A new electrical distribution line is proposed for providing electrical service to the IIFP facility. There are currently 115 and 230 kV transmission lines along US 62/180 and NM 483 and crossing the site. IIFP anticipates that the additional line would be erected in an existing right(s)-of-way. In conjunction with the new electrical lines serving the site, the local electrical utility company would install an independent substation within the 16-ha (40-ac) facility to ensure service (IIFP, 2011a).

The Clean Water Act NPDES requires an NPDES(s) permit for discharges to surface waters, for stormwater from construction projects and industrial pollutant discharges. This could include construction and operation of a facility such as the proposed IIFP. A Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) plan would also be implemented to prevent and, if necessary, respond to oil spills. An SPCC plan would be completed and an NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit with the General Construction Permit would be obtained by IIFP prior to the implementation of preconstruction activities (IIFP, 2011a), if necessary.

4.2.1.2 Proposed Phase 2 of the IIFP Facility

The proposed Phase 2 project would add additional deconversion capacity at the facility and a process for the direct deconversion of DUF_6 to uranium oxide. Phase 2 construction activities are proposed to begin in early 2015 and would be completed to support operations by mid-2016 and require a maximum of 180 additional workers (IIFP, 2011a).

Prior to the proposed Phase 2 expansion, IIFP would prepare and submit an amended license application to the NRC for the Phase 2 facility, including possession of up to 2,200,000 kg (4,850,120 lb) of DUF_6 (compared to the 750,000 kg [1,653,450 lb] of DUF_6 that were requested in the Phase 1 application). IIFP plans to submit a license amendment for this plant expansion in 2013 (IIFP, 2011a).

During Phase 2 construction, additions are planned for the DUF_6 Autoclave Building, the Oxide Process Building, Direct Oxide Staging Building, and the HF Distillation Annex. The entire site clearing would occur during preconstruction and Phase 1 construction. No roads would need to be added. Minor revisions during Phase 2 construction to paved or concrete areas may be required. Hence, no major earth grading or movement would be necessary, but excavation would be required for sewer and building foundations and floors and for tie-ins for water, natural gas, and utilities. Excavation for foundations would be minimized. Loose soil and/or damaged caliche would be removed prior to installation of foundations for seismically designed structures.

Approximately 20 percent more building space would be added to the existing Phase 1 facility. Considering the total 259-ha (640-ac) area, minimal soil disturbance would occur. Silt fences and straw bales would be used to control erosion and to protect undisturbed areas (IIFP, 2009a). As part of the Phase 2 plant expansion, another major stack would be added for venting filtered exhaust gas from the oxide process dust collector system. Phase 2 construction would be accomplished with an average construction crew of 150 to 180 workers (IIFP, 2011a).

Once the Phase 2 facility is operational in mid-2016, all of the fluorides in the DUF_6 could be directly converted to AHF, and SiF_4 and BF_3 would not be produced unless warranted by market conditions for these products. Despite different internal operations, many aspects of the Phase 2 operations that would give rise to potential environmental impacts would be very similar to those in Phase 1 (IIFP, 2011a). Upon completion of Phase 2, the integrated facility would have an overall total deconversion capacity of nearly 800 DUF_6 cylinders per year; about 9.8 million kg/yr (21.7 million lb/yr) of DUF_6. Nearly 2.6 million kg/yr (5.7 million lb/yr) of AHF product is projected to be produced and sold (IIFP, 2009a).

The utilities needed to support the Phase 2 facility would be the same as those for the Phase 1 facility, although there would be an increase in overall utility usage (especially electricity and steam) with the addition of the Phase 2 facility. For example, when the Phase 2 facility becomes operational, the total steam load would increase to about 2,722 to 3,629 kg/hr (6,000 to 8,000 lb/hr) compared to 1,134 to 1,588 kg/hr (2,500 to 3,500 lb/hr) for Phase 1 operations (IIFP, 2009a). At the end of its useful life, the IIFP facility would be decommissioned consistent with the decommissioning plan that is developed.

4.2.1.3 URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment Facility

In December 2003, the LES submitted a license application to the NRC to construct, operate, and decommission a facility to produce enriched U-235, up to 5 percent weight, by the gas centrifuge process. The enriched uranium would be used as fuel in commercial nuclear power plants. The NRC staff issued a Final EIS (NUREG-1790) (NRC, 2005a) and SER (NUREG-1827) (NRC, 2005b) for the facility in June 2005. In June 2006, the NRC issued LES a 30-year license to construct and operate the facility with a nominal production capacity of 3 million separative work units (SWUs) per year. On November 21, 2008, LES announced plans to expand the facility capacity to 5.7 million SWUs per year (NRC, 2010); although a license application for the facility expansion has not yet been submitted to the NRC.

The URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment facility commenced initial operations on June 11, 2010. Construction of the project will continue until the plant reaches the planned 5.7 million SWU capacity and full operations are expected in 2015 (assuming a license for the additional 2.7 million SWU is granted by the NRC). The facility is located approximately 32 km (20 mi) south of Hobbs, New Mexico, 8 km (5 mi) east of Eunice, and approximately 40 km (25 mi) south of the proposed IIFP site. DUF_6 is a waste product of the uranium enrichment process, and the URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment facility would be one of the likely DUF_6 suppliers to the IIFP facility.

This cumulative impacts analysis is based on information in the Final EIS (NUREG-1790) (NRC, 2005a).

4.2.1.4 DOE Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)

The WIPP facility is the nation's first underground repository permitted to safely and permanently dispose of transuranic radioactive waste generated by defense-related activities. Waste generated at DOE sites is shipped to the WIPP and permanently disposed in an ancient salt formation 655 m (2,150 ft) below the surface. Over the planned 35-year operational lifetime ending in 2034, the WIPP is expected to receive approximately 37,000 shipments of waste from locations across the United States (DOE, 2008). The WIPP disposal site is 42 km (26 mi) east of Carlsbad, in Eddy County in the Chihuahuan Desert of southeastern New Mexico, and approximately 87 km (54 mi) from the proposed IIFP facility site.

Transuranic Waste

Transuranic waste is waste that contains alpha-emitting radionuclides with atomic numbers greater than uranium (92) and half-lives greater than 20 years, in concentrations greater than 100 nanocuries per gram of waste.

Waste disposal operations began at the WIPP in March 1999. As of August 2010, the WIPP has received 8,812 transuranic waste shipments, totaling more than 16.1 million km (10 million mi) of transport on U.S. highways of approximately 69,240 m^3 (90,566 yd^3) of transuranic waste. Based on the most recent transuranic waste inventory data, DOE estimates that approximately 140,000 m^3 (182,779 yd^3) of transuranic waste either has been disposed of or could be eligible for disposal at the WIPP (DOE, 2010).

4.2.1.5 Regional Energy Production Facilities

As shown on Figure 3-2 and described in this section, there are four energy production facilities in the vicinity of the IIFP facility that could contribute to cumulative impacts:

1. Xcel Energy Cunningham Station
2. Xcel Energy Maddox Station
3. Colorado Energy Station
4. DCP Midstream Linam Ranch Natural Gas Processing Facility

The cumulative impacts analysis is based on information in Section 4.1 of this draft EIS, the Environmental Report submitted by IIFP (IIFP, 2009a), Official Responses to the Environmental Report Requests for Additional Information (IIFP, 2011a), and the other references identified in Section 4.2.2.

4.2.2 Cumulative Impacts to Environmental Resources

The potential cumulative impacts are presented for each resource presented in Section 4.1.

4.2.2.1 Land Use

As described in Section 3.2, the proposed IIFP facility would be located in a sparsely populated area on undeveloped land and near four power and gas industry plants. Present land uses in the vicinity include cattle grazing and oil and gas development. The preconstruction, construction, and operation of Phase 1 would disturb less than 10 percent of the total 259-ha (640-ac) site (IIFP, 2011a). Because approximately 93 percent of Lea County (approximately 1.0 million ha [2.6 million ac]) is used as range land for grazing, the impacts resulting from

restricting the current land use would be negligible due to the abundance of other nearby grazing land. There are no zoning restrictions on the property. As described in Section 4.2.1.2, during the Phase 2 expansion, no roads would be added and only minor revisions to paved or concrete areas may be required. Hence, no major earth grading and land disturbance would occur. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that cumulative impacts on land use from the preconstruction of the proposed facility, the proposed action, and Phase 2 construction, operation, and decommissioning would be SMALL.

4.2.2.2 Historic and Cultural Resources

As described in Section 3.3, an archaeological survey of the site conducted in May 2009 identified three isolated artifacts and no archaeological sites. A review of the current listings for the New Mexico State Register of Cultural Resource Properties and the National Register of Historic Places indicate no NRHP-listed or eligible historic properties within 10 km (6 mi) of the proposed site and one State-listed property just less than 10 km (6 mi) south of the IIFP site. The archaeological consultant recommended no further work based on the survey results. The NM SHPO concurred with this determination (Appendix B). Preconstruction activities at the proposed IIFP site and Phase 2 expansion, which would occur within the same footprint as the proposed action, would have no impact on historic properties, districts, resources or significant historic/precontact archaeological sites. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that cumulative impacts on historic and cultural resources from the proposed action, preconstruction of the proposed facility, and Phase 2 construction, operation, and decommissioning would be SMALL.

4.2.2.3 Visual Resources

As discussed in Section 3.4, the construction of the proposed facility would occur in a sparsely populated area with an existing low-quality viewshed. No regionally or locally important high quality views occur in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP facility. Consequently, the NRC staff concludes that cumulative impacts would be SMALL.

4.2.2.4 Climatology/Meteorology/Air Quality

4.2.2.4.1 Greenhouse Gases

Greenhouse gas emissions from construction vehicles and equipment were taken into account in the analysis for Phase 2. During the Phase 2 construction, it was assumed that the workforce of 180 would commute 2,900,000 km (1,800,000 mi) over the 1-year construction period (250 days). Over the course of the construction period, it was also estimated that there would be 20 deliveries each day each also traveling a distance of 64 km (40 mi). NRC staff used EPA MOVES to calculate the resulting CO_2 emissions associated with workforce commuting and construction deliveries during Phase 2 construction. The total CO_2 equivalent emissions, expected during the Phase 2 construction period would be 1,303 metric tons (1,435 tons), which are substantially less than those expected from the Phase 1 construction period.

Using calendar year 2000 as a reference point (the latest year for which New Mexico greenhouse gas emission data are available), and as shown in Table 3-1, total net CO_2 emissions for New Mexico for the year 2000 were 62 million metric tons (68 million tons) of CO_2 equivalents. For the United States for that same year, total net CO_2 emissions were 5,977 million metric tons (6,588 million tons) (EPA, 2010a). By comparison, during the Phase 2 construction phase, CO_2 emissions are projected to be 1,303 metric tons (1,435 tons), approximately 0.002 percent of the New Mexico statewide output or 0.00002 percent of the

nationwide emissions for calendar year 2000. Consequently, the NRC staff concludes that potential cumulative impacts on greenhouse gas emissions would be SMALL

4.2.2.4.2 Air Quality

4.2.2.4.2.1 Air Quality (pre-construction)

Air quality impacts from the operation of construction equipment and support vehicles during the preconstruction stage were evaluated based on the construction schedules and parameters provided by IIFP (IIFP, 2011a). The proposed IIFP facility site is 16 ha (40 ac).

Activities that would take place during preconstruction are described in Section 4.2.1.1. IIFP estimates preconstruction would last for a period of approximately three months, and would be followed by approximately 12 months of Phase 1 construction (IIFP, 2011b).

During preconstruction, criteria pollutants (e.g., CO, NO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and SO_2), HAPs, and VOCs would be generated by the operation of construction vehicles and equipment (operating at 10 hours a day, 5 days a week), delivery vehicles (estimated at 20 trips a day), and workforce transport vehicles (estimated at 140 trips per day) traveling to and from the site. These emissions would include (1) fugitive dust emissions from the disturbance of unpaved surfaces, (2) combustion emissions from the operation of diesel-fired vehicles and equipment, (3) tailpipe emissions from the operation of gasoline and diesel-fired commuter and delivery vehicles, and (4) fugitive HAP and VOC emissions due to evaporative losses from diesel fuel tanks and diesel fuel transfers.

The quantities of air pollutants that would be generated from preconstruction activities at the IIFP site were estimated using the equipment list and description of planned activities provided by IIFP (2011b); and emission factors from the EPA MOVES Model (EPA, 2009a), the EPA NONROAD model (EPA, 2005), and EPA AP-42 emission factors (EPA, 1995a). Air quality impacts were evaluated using the EPA SCREEN3 (EPA, 1995b) air dispersion model.

IIFP anticipates that most of the earth moving activities would take place during preconstruction. Consequently, fugitive dust emission rates would be greater during preconstruction than during the Phase 1 construction period, however, the 3-month preconstruction period is relatively short. The estimated pollutant emissions during preconstruction would represent a very small fraction of the current emissions in Lea County.

Dispersion modeling results show that air pollutant concentrations at the IIFP site boundary during preconstruction would be similar to the concentrations during Phase 1 construction (See Appendix C). The estimated incremental increases in ambient background concentrations due to the proposed preconstruction activities would be above the NAAQS for NO_2, $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} emissions. Pollutant emissions from preconstruction activities potentially could change the existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP facility temporarily. Because conservative assumptions that tend to overestimate impacts were used to produce these estimates, actual emissions from the construction activities are expected to be lower. Overall, the preconstruction impacts would be localized and short-term.

Because preconstruction and Phase 1 construction would not occur simultaneously, the impacts would not be cumulative. As discussed in Section 3.5.3, Lea County is in attainment for all criteria pollutants. The cumulative air impacts of preconstruction and other projects in the region of influence are not expected to change this attainment status. Therefore, the NRC staff

concludes that the air quality impacts resulting from the preconstruction of the proposed IIFP facility would be MODERATE for NO_2, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} emissions and SMALL for other emissions. BMPs during preconstruction and construction as described in Chapter 5, Mitigation Measures and Commitments, would reduce impacts to air quality. NRC staff considers the use of BMPs to minimize impacts to air quality as an environmental commitment. Furthermore, the NRC staff finds that the BMPs committed to by IIFP would be sufficient to ensure that pre-construction impacts of the proposed IIFP facility to air quality would be MODERATE for NO_2 and particulate emissions; and SMALL for other emissions.

4.2.2.4.2.2 Air Quality (Phase 2 Construction and Operation)

During Phase 2 construction, the process area would be expanded approximately 28 percent to add a 33.5 m x 33.5 m (110 ft x 110 ft) area next to the Phase 1 process buildings. Less than 1 percent of the 16-ha (40-ac) site area would be disturbed during the Phase 2 construction period of approximately 1 year (IIFP, 2011a).

Pollutant emissions and diesel fuel consumption attributable to Phase 2 construction activities were estimated using the equipment list and description of planned activities provided by IIFP (2011b); and emission factors from the EPA MOVES Model (EPA, 2009a), the EPA NONROAD model (EPA, 2005), and EPA AP-42 emission factors (EPA, 1995a). Air quality impacts were evaluated using the EPA SCREEN3 (EPA, 1995b) air dispersion model.

Heavy earth-moving equipment (e.g. dozers, excavators, and graders) would not be required for Phase 2 construction, so annualized Phase 2 emissions would be approximately 25 percent less than annualized Phase 1 construction emissions (See Appendix C). The estimated pollutant emissions during Phase 2 construction represent a very small fraction of the current emissions in Lea County.

Dispersion modeling results show that air pollutant concentrations at the IIFP site boundary during Phase 2 construction would be much lower than the concentrations during Phase 1 construction (See Appendix C). The estimated incremental increases in ambient background concentrations due to the proposed preconstruction activities would be above the NAAQS for NO_2 emissions over a 1-hr averaging time. All other pollutant concentrations were estimated to be below NAAQS. Pollutant emissions from Phase 2 construction activities potentially could change temporarily the existing ambient air quality in the vicinity of the IIFP facility with respect to NO_2. Because conservative assumptions that tend to overestimate impacts were used to produce these estimates, actual emissions from the construction activities are expected to be lower. Overall, the Phase 2 construction impacts would be localized and short-term.

Because Phase 2 and Phase 1 construction would not occur simultaneously, the impacts would not be cumulative. As discussed in Section 3.5.3, Lea County is in attainment for all criteria pollutants. The cumulative air impacts of Phase 2 construction and other projects in the region of influence are not expected to change this attainment status. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the air quality impacts resulting from the construction of the IIFP Phase 2 facility would be MODERATE for NO_2 emissions and SMALL for other air emissions. BMPs used during construction would reduce the impact of construction activities on air quality. These BMPs are described in Chapter 5, Mitigation Measures and Commitments. The NRC staff finds that the BMPs committed to by IIFP for the proposed facility would be sufficient to maintain impacts to air quality from Phase 2 construction as MODERATE to SMALL.

Greenhouse gas emissions from construction vehicles and equipment were taken into account in the analysis for Phase 2. During the Phase 2 construction, it was assumed that the workforce of 180 would commute 2,900,000 km (1,800,000 mi) over the 1-year construction period (250 days). Over the course of the construction period, it was also estimated that there would be 20 deliveries each day each also traveling a distance of 64 km (40 mi). NRC staff used EPA MOVES to calculate the resulting CO_2 emissions associated with workforce commuting and construction deliveries during Phase 2 construction. The total CO_2 equivalent emissions, expected during the Phase 2 construction period would be 1,303 metric tons (1,435 tons), which are substantially less than those expected from the Phase 1 construction period.

Greenhouse gas emissions from operation of the IIFP facility would be insignificant (less than 0.1 percent) when compared to the greenhouse gas emissions from the regional energy facilities. In 2008, the total CO_2 emissions from the Cunningham Station, Maddox Station, Colorado Energy Station, and DCP Midstream Linam Ranch Natural Gas Processing Facility were more than 1.3 million metric tons (1.43 million tons) (NMED, 2010).

For Phase 2 operations, criteria pollutant emissions attributable to operations are well below Title V and Class II PSD thresholds. IIFP evaluated regional impacts with SCREEN3 based on frequency-weighted site-specific meteorological data. Pollutant concentrations at the site boundary were determined to be well below the NAAQS (IIFP, 2011a). The cumulative air impacts of Phase 2 operations of the IIFP facility and other projects in the region of influence, including IIFP Phase 1 operations, are not expected to change the attainment status of Lea County. Consequently, the NRC staff concludes that potential cumulative impacts on air quality would be SMALL.

4.2.2.5 Geology, Minerals, and Soil

Preconstruction would occur within about 16 ha (40 ac) of the 259-ha (640-ac) proposed site (IIFP 2009a; IIFP 2011a); and construction, operation, and decommissioning for Phase 2 would occur within the previously disturbed 16-ha (40-ac) footprint of the Phase 1 IIFP facility. Therefore, these actions would have little or no additional impacts on geology, minerals, seismology, and soil beyond those of the proposed action.

During all preconstruction and Phase 2 construction activities, BMPs would be employed to limit soil loss and mitigate these impacts. These would include:

- Soil stabilization (e.g. temporary and permanent seeding),
- Structural controls (e.g. hay bales and sediment fences),
- Drainage trenches and ditch checks would be installed along the entrance road to prevent run-off and silt from the site onto NM 483 right-of-way, and
- Management practices (e.g. construction sequencing, materials delivery sequencing, physical delineation of disturbed areas) (IIFP, 2011a).

Once the Phase 2 facility is constructed, no additional impacts to geology, minerals, seismicity, and soil are expected. Thus, the NRC staff concludes that cumulative impacts from preconstruction of the proposed IIFP facility, the proposed action, and Phase 2 construction, operation, and decommissioning would be SMALL.

4.2.2.6 Water Resources

Preconstruction activities are not expected to require any use of on-site of groundwater. During the preconstruction period, up to two new wells would be installed, and capped at the wellheads for connections to the facility water distribution systems after possible NRC license approval. For dust control during preconstruction activities, IIFP would bring in tanker trucks of water from the City of Hobbs municipal system. The City of Hobbs groundwater allocation is included as part of Lea County's 40-Year Water Development Plan and preconstruction activities would not result in cumulative impacts to groundwater use. Site sloping, earth berms, underground drainage pipe, and wet sediment retention basins would be installed to entrap storm water run-off from construction areas. As discussed in Section 3.7.2, no permanent surface water or jurisdictional waters are present on the proposed IIFP site and, therefore, there would not be any cumulative impacts to surface water.

Approximately 3.79 m^3/day (1,000 gal/day) of groundwater would be required during Phase 2 construction, mainly for dust suppression control, fill compaction, and concrete formation. Average and peak site water requirements for Phase 2 operations are expected to be approximately 11.36 m^3/day (3,000 gal/day) and 37.85 m^3/day (10,000 gal/day), respectively.

Phase 2 facility operation would require relatively low volumes of water because it would recycle process water and re-circulate cooling water. Groundwater use during operation is projected to be less than 37,854 L (10,000 gal) per day (IIFP, 2011a), and would be below the water allotment set aside by Lea County. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that cumulative impacts to groundwater use from preconstruction of the proposed IIFP facility, the proposed action and Phase 2 construction and operation would be SMALL.

As summarized in Section 3.13.5, there are four energy production facilities in the vicinity of the proposed IIFP facility. Each of these facilities uses groundwater from the Ogallala aquifer, as would the proposed action. The Xcel Energy Cunningham Station, which is adjacent to the IIFP site, is a zero discharge plant, meaning no process waters are discharged from the plant site. The cooling water from the Cunningham Station is reused to irrigate pecan orchards. The groundwater rights and use for the four facilities were allocated prior to the development of the Lea County 40-Year Water Development Plan and, thus, are not reliant on Lea County's assigned unappropriated 4,215.2 ha-m (34,173 ac-ft) per year of water rights. In 2005, the four energy plants were factored into the Lea County annual groundwater withdrawals of 2,293,700 ha-m/yr (185,952 ac-ft/yr) (McCoy and Perry, 2004). The Lea County 40-Year Water Development Plan includes an assessment of groundwater use impacts from existing and future beneficial uses of groundwater.

The National Enrichment Facility operations are expected to use on an average approximately 87,600 million m^3 (23.1 million gal) of water annually. For the life of the facility, the National Enrichment Facility could use up to 263,000 m^3 (695 million gal) of the Ogallala waters, encompassing both construction and operations use. This constitutes a small portion, 0.004 percent, of the 60 billion m^3 (49 million ac-ft or 16 trillion gal) of Ogallala reserves in the State of New Mexico territory. Water use during decontamination and decommissioning would be less than or equal to the water consumption during operations (NRC 2005a).

As discussed in Section 4.1.2.6, Lea County has allocated up to 175 ac-ft/yr of water rights to the proposed IIFP site in their 40-year plan, which takes into account existing groundwater users. As discussed above, the IIFP site's groundwater use would be much less than this allotment. In accordance with regulations of the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer for

wells installed in a non-Critical Management Area, the two site wells are not expected to create drawdowns that exceed the limit of 2.4 m (8 ft) over 40 years, or 0.06 m/yr (0.20 ft/yr). Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the cumulative groundwater use impact related to the Lea County unappropriated water rights from the operation of the four existing energy production facilities, the National Enrichment Facility, and the activities associated with the proposed IIFP facility would be SMALL.

With respect to groundwater quality, the Xcel Energy Cunningham Station, which is the closest energy facility to the proposed IIFP Facility, operated with an unlined cooling tower and boiler cleanout pond for a number of years. The pond has recently been lined. Xcel Energy monitoring wells along the western boundary of the proposed IIFP site were installed to monitor contaminants in groundwater that potentially originated from cooling water pond and/or agricultural fields. Data since 2004 from these monitoring wells indicate that concentrations of sulfate, chloride, and total dissolved solids have exceeded New Mexico Water Quality Control Commission Standards for Groundwater (IIFP, 2011a).

During preconstruction, operations, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility, control of surface water runoff would be required by the NPDES permit. As a result, no impacts are expected to surface or groundwater bodies. Stormwater and effluent sampling would be conducted as required by the NPDES permit to protect surface water quality. In addition, site-wide groundwater levels would continue to be monitored routinely, and samples from the groundwater monitoring-well and pumping-well networks would continue to be analyzed to confirm that cumulative impacts to groundwater quality would be SMALL (IIFP, 2011a). Therefore, the NRC staff finds that groundwater quality impacts would be SMALL.

4.2.2.7 Ecological Resources

Most of the impacts to ecological resources would occur during the preconstruction activities. Land clearing would occur within the 16 ha (40 ac) facility area and would destroy the Western Great Plains Shortgrass Prairie and Apacherian-Chihuahuan Mesquite Upland Scrub vegetation communities. The amount of vegetation cleared would be limited, to the extent practicable, to the land area needed for the proposed IIFP facility's operational, security, and utility requirements (IIFP, 2011a). However, neither of these vegetation communities provides unique habitat in the area. The existing natural habitats on the proposed IIFP site and the region surrounding the proposed site have been previously impacted by domestic livestock grazing, wildfires, oil/gas pipeline rights-of-way and access roads (IIFP, 2011a). The total area to be disturbed for the facility (16 ha [40 ac]) represents less than one-tenth of the total site area. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that the loss of 16 ha (40 ac) of either habitat type, for both direct and onsite cumulative impacts, would have a SMALL impact on native vegetation in the vicinity of proposed action.

During preconstruction, an access roadway off of northbound NM 483 would be built to support construction and delivery of materials to the site during construction. Roadway preconstruction activities would have a SMALL effect on ecological resources, due to the limited amount of area involved.

Noise, dust, and air emissions associated with site clearing would be short-lived and represent only a temporary adverse impact to the biota of the IIFP site (IIFP, 2011a). Removal of the vegetation and the soil disturbance that would occur during preconstruction activities would likely destroy nesting substrates for many of the potential breeding bird species found in this area (see Table 3-17). However, the impacts are not likely to have population-level impacts to

the affected species (SORA, 2011). NMGF has suggested a minimization measure, for preconstruction to take place outside of the nesting season of migratory birds, which, if instituted, would impact few nesting activities in the affected habitat. Accordingly, preconstruction site clearing activities would have a SMALL effect on ecological resources.

Construction of Phase 2, which will occur on recently disturbed land adjacent to the Phase 1 facility, would not affect ecological resources. Accordingly, Phase 2 construction would have a SMALL effect on ecological resources.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that cumulative impacts to ecological resources would be SMALL.

4.2.2.8 Socioeconomic Resources

Preconstruction activities are assumed to begin in 2011 and to conclude prior to the end of 2011. Initially 35 and later as many as 70 workers would be involved in preconstruction activities. During preconstruction, the work force would consist of heavy equipment operators and structural crafts, most of which are expected to come from the ROI. Preconstruction activities are expected to result in impacts that would be approximately one-fourth to one-half the impacts presented in Section 4.1.8 for Phase 1 construction. As such, the NRC staff finds that there would be a correspondingly SMALL impact on housing, taxes, infrastructure and community services (IIFP, 2011a).

Phase 2 would use a construction crew of 150 to 180 workers. IIFP estimates approximately 27 workers of the construction work force are expected to move into the vicinity as new residents (15 percent of 180 workers). The increases in area population during Phase 2 construction, therefore, would be approximately the same as Phase 1 construction and the NRC staff finds that those increases would have SMALL impacts to socioeconomic resources.

The Phase 2 operations of the IIFP facility would require a maximum of 40 additional workers (IIFP, 2009). Using the same assumptions for the Phase 1 operations workforce, the NRC staff assumed that 32 workers would already reside in the area, and that 8 would in-migrate. Given the excess housing, public utilities and capacity in local schools, as described in Section 3.9, the NRC staff concludes that socioeconomic impacts from Phase 2 operations would be SMALL.

No disproportionately high or adverse impacts would occur to environmental justice populations in the ROI. The NRC staff finds that the cumulative impacts of preconstruction, the proposed action and Phase 2 construction and operation on socioeconomic resources would be SMALL.

The URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment facility is expected to employ a maximum of 210 people annually and would indirectly create an additional 173 jobs (NRC, 2005a).

Overall, the NRC staff concludes that the cumulative impacts from the proposed IIFP project and the UNENCO facility Phase 2 construction and operation are expected to be SMALL.

4.2.2.9 Traffic and Transportation

The peak preconstruction workforce is estimated to be 70 employees (INIS, 2011). The construction work force would predominantly use NM 483 and US 62/180 to access the IIFP site. The existing AADT of both of these roadways is within the general capacity of 3,400 personal cars per hour for two-lane highways. There would be an increase of a maximum

of 140 trips per day, two trips per potential employee, plus up to 40 additional trips associated with preconstruction equipment or supply deliveries (IIFP, 2009a). During preconstruction, the roadways would still operate well within their capacity. There would be no radiological transportation during preconstruction. The NRC staff finds that the impacts from increased traffic during preconstruction would be SMALL and temporary; therefore, the NRC staff concludes that no cumulative impacts would occur.

Latent Cancer Fatality (LCF)

A latent cancer fatality (LCF) is a fatality associated with acute or chronic environmental exposures to chemicals or radiation. The fatality may occur many years after the exposure.

An average construction crew of 150 to 180 workers would be required during the approximately 15-month Phase 2 construction period. Once operational, the workforce at the IIFP facility would increase from approximately 120-138 for Phase 1 operations to 145-160 for Phase 2 operations. If all the construction traffic used the access road off NM 483 this would result in a 75 percent increase during Phase 2 construction (including construction and operations traffic). The vast majority of this increase is expected to be on the 2.4 km (1.5 mi) section between the access road and US 62/180. Compared with the traffic count for the various highways from 2006 through 2008 and the transportation commuting statistics in Lea County from the 2000 census data, the impact of this temporary increase in traffic during Phase 2 construction is considered to be MODERATE for the peak construction period on NM 483. During construction of Phase 2 mitigation could include staggering the construction and operations shifts, encouraging carpooling or providing vans to transport construction workers from remote locations. Mitigation would reduce the impacts from MODERATE to SMALL.

After Phase 2 is operational, there would be a maximum of 40 additional round trips per day due to operation workers, resulting in an additional 80 vehicles on the area highways per day which would not exceed the design capacity of the roadways. The NRC staff finds that operational traffic would have a SMALL impact on the local transportation pattern.

During Phase 2 operations, the number of radiological shipments (including DUO_2 and LLW) per year would increase from 145 -155 shipments of DUO_2 (IIFP, 2011b) during Phase 1 with a total of approximately 700 radiological shipments (IIFP, 2011b) total, to 450-500 shipments of DUO_2 (IIFP, 2011b) during Phase 2 with a total of approximately 2,150 radiological shipments (IIFP, 2011b). The number of non-radiological shipments is not expected to change from 1,950 shipments. Therefore during Phase 2 operations, a total of 4,100 shipments are estimated annually or approximately 16 round trips per day. Compared with the transportation commuting statistics in Lea County from the 2000 census data and the AADT on the specific highways, the NRC staff finds that this increase in traffic from operational deliveries and waste removal would be SMALL for Phase 2 operations. One mitigation measure to be considered by IIFP is to schedule operations worker shift changes and truck shipments for off-peak traffic periods, when practical.

The URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment facility truck shipments of feed, product, and waste materials (including DUF_6) could result in 2 LCFs to the general population over the life of the facility due to vehicle emissions and fewer than 0.03 LCF due to direct radiation. All rail shipments of feed, product, waste materials, and empty cylinders were estimated to result in fewer than 0.08 LCF to the general population over the life of the facility, and 0.1 LCF from direct radiation (NRC, 2005a).

Some adverse transportation impacts are expected as a result of moving the transuranic wastes from sites across the country to the WIPP. One of the official WIPP routes is US 62/180, which runs along the southern boundary of the proposed IIFP facility site. DOE estimated that the non-radiological impacts of transportation related to WIPP operations would result in approximately one traffic fatality and less than one death from pollution health effects. Radiological impacts associated with WIPP-related accident-free transportation are expected to be much less than 1 LCF (DOE, 2009).

The radiological impacts associated with combined Phase 1 and Phase 2 operations would result in a total population dose of 1.7 person-Sv (170 person-rem) annually. Statistically, this dose could result in 0.10 LCFs annually. When combined with the radiological transportation impacts from operation of the LES (0.1 LCFs over the facility life) and radiological transportation impacts from the WIPP (less than 1 LCF annually), the NRC staff finds that the cumulative radiological impacts from transportation would be SMALL (less than 1 LCF annually) (IIFP, 2009a).

4.2.2.10 Noise

As discussed in Section 3.11.2, there are no noise sensitive receptors in close proximity to the proposed IIFP facility. The nearest commercial facility is the Xcel Energy Cunningham Generating Station, approximately 1.6 km (1 mi) west of the proposed site. The nearest residence is approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi) northwest of the site and there are no recreational facilities areas within 8.0 km (5.0 mi) of the proposed site. Because of the absence of any sensitive noise receptors, no noise impacts are anticipated during preconstruction activities and Phase 2 construction activities and no cumulative impacts would occur.

Cumulative impacts from all site noise sources would remain at or below HUD guidelines of 65 dBA Ldn (24 CFR 51), and the EPA guidelines of 55 dBA Ldn, (EPA, 1974) at the site boundary during IIFP facility construction and operation. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the cumulative noise of all site construction and operation activities, even when considered in conjunction with surrounding regional energy production facilities would have a SMALL impact and to only those receptors closest to the site boundary.

4.2.2.11 Public and Occupational Health

The preconstruction activities have the potential to cause industrial accidents, material-handling accidents, falls, etc., that could result in temporary injuries, long-term injuries and/or disabilities, and even fatalities. The proposed activities are not anticipated to be any more hazardous than the construction activities discussed in Section 4.1.1.11. The preconstruction workforce would be smaller than the construction workforce and the duration of preconstruction would be less than that of construction. Less than six nonfatal injuries and no fatalities (less than one fatality) are expected during preconstruction activities. Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that preconstruction health and safety impacts would be SMALL.

The Phase 2 construction activities have the potential to cause industrial accidents, material-handling accidents, falls, etc., that could result in temporary injuries, long-term injuries and/or disabilities, and even fatalities. The proposed activities are not anticipated to be any more hazardous than the construction activities discussed in Section 4.1.1.11. The Phase 2 construction workforce would be slightly larger than the Phase 1 construction workforce, and less than 13 nonfatal injuries and no fatalities (less than 1 fatality) are expected during Phase 2 construction activities.

Once operational, the workforce at the IIFP facility would increase from 140 for Phase 1 operations to 180 for Phase 1 and Phase 2 operations. Statistically, this would increase the potential number of both nonfatal and fatal occupational injuries by approximately 10 - 15 percent. Overall, less than seven nonfatal injuries and no fatalities (less than 1 fatality) are expected annually during the proposed operation of Phase 1 and Phase 2.

The NRC staff finds that radiological impacts associated with operation of the Phase 2 facility would be SMALL. The differential in the total population dose between the integrated Phase 1 and Phase 2 operations and Phase 1 operations alone would be an increase of 2.33×10^{-4} person-Sv/yr (2.33×10^{-2} person-rem/year). The differential in the dose to the MEI would be 1.62×10^{-8} person-Sv/yr (1.62×10^{-6} rem/yr). The differential between the two operational phases for the dose to the nearest resident would be 1.18×10^{-8} Sv/yr (1.18×10^{-6} rem/year) (IIFP, 2011a). The difference, therefore, between operational phases is very low.

The types of postulated accidents and release scenarios for the Phase 2 facility would not differ from those already addressed in Phase 1 operations because Phase 2 operations only add inventory and capacity; no new types of chemical or radiological risks would be added. As such, the types of accidents and the description of postulated accidents for the Phase 1 facility would be representative of the range of credible accidents associated with the Phase 2 facility.

Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the cumulative impacts to occupational and public health from preconstruction, the proposed action, and Phase 2 construction and operations would be SMALL.

4.2.2.12 Waste Management

As discussed in Section 4.1.1.12, the NRC staff finds that the quantities of wastes generated during construction of the proposed IIFP facility would result in SMALL impacts that could be managed effectively. Approximately 300-500 kg (650-1,100 lbs) of solid waste and 270–820 kg (600-1,800 lbs) of hazardous waste would be generated (INIS, 2011). Preconstruction activities are expected to generate waste types similar to and with volumes less than those estimated for construction (IIFP, 2011a). No radiological wastes would be generated during preconstruction.

As a point of comparison, the operation of the National Enrichment Facility would generate approximately 172,500 kg (380,400 lbs) of solid nonradioactive waste annually, including approximately 1,900 L (500 gal) of hazardous liquid wastes (NRC, 2005a). Approximately 87,000 kg (191,800 lbs) of radiological and mixed waste would be generated annually, of which approximately 50 kg (110 lbs) would be mixed waste. When added to the wastes from other waste generators, such as the National Enrichment Facility, the NRC staff finds that the impacts and cumulative impacts of disposal of hazardous and solid (nonhazardous) wastes from preconstruction activities of the proposed IIFP facility would be SMALL.

Phase 2 construction would necessitate connections to existing Phase 1 facilities and installation of additional autoclaves (IIFP, 2011b). Radiological materials would not be used in the construction of the Phase 2 facility. However, Phase 2 construction involving connections to Phase 1 facilities could result in generation of radioactive wastes. The construction waste types and volumes would be similar to those during Phase 1 construction. Tables 4-38 through 4-40 provide the estimated annual quantities of solid, hazardous, and radioactive wastes generated during Phase 2 construction.

Table 4-38. Phase 2 Construction Solid Waste Generation

Waste Type	Estimated Annual Amount
Air filters(vehicle)	23 – 45 kg (50 – 100 lbs)
Cardboard / packing	136 – 227kg (300 – 500 lbs)
Fiber drums	136 – 318 kg (300 – 700 lbs)
Total	295 – 590 kg (650 – 1,300 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-39. Phase 2 Construction Hazardous Waste Generation

Waste Type	Estimated Annual Amount
Adhesives, resins, caulking residues	54 – 109 kg (120 – 240 lbs)
Lead (batteries)	45 –113 kg (100 – 250 lbs)
Oil filters	45 – 91 kg (100 – 200 lbs)
Paints, thinners, solvents, organic residues	45 – 227 kg (100 – 500 lbs)
Pesticides	45 – 68 kg (100 – 150 lbs)
Petroleum products, oils, lubricants residues	45 – 227 kg (100 – 500 lbs)
Total	281 – 835 kg (620 – 1,840 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-40. Phase 2 Construction Radioactive Waste Generation

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Scrap metal	1,800 – 2,700 kg (4,000 – 6,000 lbs)
Spent blasting sand	45 kg (100 lbs)
Wood trash (pallets)	450 – 680 kg (1,000 – 1,500 lbs)
Total	2,300 – 3,400 kg (5,100 – 7,600 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a.

As described in Section 4.1.1.12, all construction wastes would be transferred offsite to licensed waste disposal facilities with adequate disposal capacity for the estimated volumes. Thus, it is also anticipated by NRC staff that the waste management impacts from Phase 2 construction would be SMALL.

The URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment facility commenced initial operations on June 11, 2010 and full operations are expected in 2015. Projected waste volumes from the enrichment facility operations include 173,000 kg/yr (380,400 lb/yr) of solid waste; 1,890 kg/yr (4,165 lb/yr) of hazardous and mixed waste; and 87,000 kg/yr (191,800 lb/yr) of LLW (NRC, 2005b). DUF_6 is a waste product of the uranium enrichment process, and the URENCO USA/LES Uranium

Enrichment facility would be one of the likely DUF_6 suppliers to the proposed IIFP facility. The enrichment facility will produce depleted uranium at a rate of 627 cylinders or 7,800 metric tons/yr (NRC, 2005b). During Phase 1, the proposed IIFP facility would process 266 cylinders annually of DUF_6 as feed to the deconversion process.

Solid waste from the enrichment facility would be disposed of at the Lea County Landfill along with waste from the proposed IIFP facility. The solid waste generated by the enrichment facility would potentially increase the volume of wastes received at the landfill by less than 0.03 percent (NRC, 2005b). That increase in combination with the highest IIFP annual solid waste generation rate (during Phase 1 and Phase 2 operations) would result in less than 0.1 percent change in the waste received by the Lea County Landfill. Hazardous waste generated by the enrichment facility (less than 1, 814 kg [2 tons] per year) and the proposed IIFP facility (up to 154 tons/yr during Phase 1 operations) represents less than 0.02 percent of the hazardous waste managed in the state of New Mexico (more than 1 million tons in 2009). The NRC staff finds that the combined impacts of managing the solid and hazardous wastes generated by both facilities on the available capacity would be SMALL.

In the final EIS for the URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment facility (NUREG-1790; NRC, 2005a), NRC staff considered the impacts of conversion of the DUF_6 from the enrichment process (up to 15,727 cylinders over the operating life) to depleted U_3O_8 and disposal of the resulting Class A LLW in a licensed disposal facility. The NRC staff concluded that both the environmental impacts of shallow land disposal such as the Energy*Solutions* site in Clive, Utah, and the effect on national disposal capacity for Class A LLW would be SMALL. The deconversion of DUF_6 by the proposed IIFP facility and disposal of the resulting DUO_2 as Class A LLW represents a subset of the impacts previously considered in NUREG-1790 (NRC, 2005a) (the oxide form of the converted depleted uranium waste, whether U_3O_8 or UO_2, would not materially change the consequences). Therefore, the NRC staff concludes that the cumulative effects of the management of depleted uranium wastes from the proposed IIFP facility and the URENCO USA/LES Uranium Enrichment facility would be SMALL.

The wastes from Phase 2 construction would generate much less than 1 percent of the annual wastes from the National Enrichment Facility (172,500 kg [380,400 lbs] of solid nonradioactive waste and approximately 87,000 kg [191,800 lbs] of radiological and mixed waste). Based on available capacities at hazardous, solid, and radioactive waste treatment and disposal sites, and the expectation that there would be no large developments in the Hobbs area that would cause a significant increase in municipal waste disposal volume, the NRC staff finds that the cumulative impacts from hazardous, solid, and radioactive waste generation would be SMALL.

As described in Section 4.1.2.12, the NRC staff finds that the impact of disposal of hazardous, solid, and radioactive wastes from operation of the proposed Phase 1 IIFP facility at the appropriate offsite facilities would be SMALL. Phase 2 operations would generate waste types similar to those during Phase 1 operations. The hazardous waste volumes are expected to be lower and LLW volumes higher than from the Phase 1 facility.

The cumulative LLW generation rate during combined Phase 1 and 2 operations would be about three times higher than from Phase 1 alone. Most of that increase would result from tripling the production of DUO_2. The generation rate of other LLW streams (e.g., trash, waste drums and pallets) would also increase with the expanded Phase 2 facility. Tables 4-41 through 4-43 provide the estimated annual waste quantities generated during combined Phase 1 and 2 operations, for solid, hazardous, and radioactive wastes, respectively.

The cumulative solid waste generation (up to 49,900 kg [55 tons] per year) would be 20 percent greater than during Phase 1 operations. Cumulative Phase 1 and 2 operations would result in an increase of approximately 0.07 percent in the waste that the Lea County landfill receives annually from all other sources. The NRC staff finds that this quantity of nonhazardous waste material would result in SMALL impacts that could be managed effectively.

The quantity of cumulative hazardous waste could be as much as 46,300 kg (51 tons) per year if a market for the CaF_2 cannot be identified. As discussed in Section 4.1.1.12, hazardous waste generators in New Mexico accounted for 978,554,778 kg (1,078,672 tons) of hazardous waste in 2009 (EPA, 2010b). The maximum cumulative generation rate would result in an increase of less than 0.005 percent in the hazardous waste generated in the State of New Mexico.

DUO_2 and other radiological waste would be shipped offsite to licensed disposal facilities. As shown in Table 4-43, up to 9,168,009 kg (10,106 tons) per year of LLW could be sent for disposal each year. Most of the estimated annual LLW generation (approximately 99 percent) would be the DUO_2 produced by the deconversion process. Assuming 450 kg (1,000 lbs) per oxide drum, Phase 1 and 2 operations would result in 8,700 to 20,000 drums of material being sent for disposal. This uranium oxide waste volume represents 3.1 percent to 7.2 percent of the annual commercial waste volume currently received at the Energy*Solutions* facility in Clive, Utah (NRC, 2010). The Clive facility accepts the majority of the United States' Class A waste and is estimated to have capacity to accept this waste at current volume levels for more than 20 years (GAO, 2004). The NRC staff finds that the estimated generation of depleted uranium oxide and other LLW from the Phase 2 deconversion process would result in SMALL impacts to LLW disposal capacity.

The wastes generated during cumulative Phase 1 and 2 operations would be transferred offsite to licensed waste facilities with adequate disposal capacity for the estimated volumes. Thus, the NRC staff anticipates that the waste management impacts from cumulative operations would be SMALL.

Table 4-41. Cumulative Solid Waste Generation – Phase 1 and 2 IIFP Facility

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Clothing	68 – 136 kg (150 – 300 lbs)
Molecular sieve	136 – 227 kg (300– 500 lbs)
Municipal trash waste	32,659 – 48,988 kg (72,000 – 108,000 lbs)
Safety gear	181 – 363 kg (400 – 800 lbs)
Waste Glass	34 – 136 kg (75 – 300 lbs)
Total	33,078 – 49,850 kg (72,925 – 109,900 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

Table 4-42. Cumulative Hazardous Waste Generation — Phase 1 and 2 IIFP Facility

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Aerosol cans, paints cans, bulbs	907 – 1,814 kg (2,000 – 4,000 lbs)
Calcium fluoride*	27,216 – 40,823 kg (60,000 – 90,000 lbs)
Lab chemicals	91 – 182 kg (200 – 400 lbs)
Oil sorb	1,361 – 3,175 kg (3,000 – 7,000 lbs)
Total*	29,574 – 45,994 kg (65,200 – 101,400 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a
*Includes calcium fluoride which would not be waste if sold.

Table 4-43. Cumulative Radioactive Waste Generation – Phase 1 and 2 IIFP Facility

Material	Estimated Annual Amount
Activated alumina	907 – 1,814 kg (2,000 – 4,000 lbs)
Air ventilation filters	29 – 45 kg (65 – 100 lbs)
Carbon	11,340 – 13,608 kg (25,000 – 30,000 lbs)
DUF_4 clinkers	2,268 – 4,536 kg (5,000 – 10,000 lbs)
Coke	3,629 – 5,443 kg (8,000 – 12,000 lbs)
Crushed drums	907 – 3,629 kg (2,000 – 8,000 lbs)
Dust collector bags	454 – 1,361 kg (1,000 – 3,000 lbs)
Ion exchange resin	907 – 1,814 kg (2,000 – 4,000 lbs)
Oxide for burial (plus drums)	3,946,258 – 9,071,858 kg (8,700,000 – 20,000,000 lbs)
Radioactive waste trash	31,752 – 45,359 kg (70,000 – 100,000 lbs)
Scrap metal	5,443 – 7,257 kg (12,000 – 16,000 lbs)
Sintered metal tubes	907 – 1,361 kg (2,000 – 3,000 lbs)
Sodium fluoride	907 – 1,814 kg (2,000 – 4,000 lbs)
Spent blasting sand	45 – 91 kg (100 – 200 lbs)
Wood trash (pallets)	1,361 – 5,443 kg (3,000 – 12,000 lbs)
Total	4,007,115 – 9,167,702 kg (8,834,165 – 20,211,300 lbs)

Source: IIFP, 2011a

4.3 No-Action Alternative

As presented in Section 2.2 of this draft EIS, the no-action alternative would be to not construct, operate, and decommission the proposed IIFP facility in Lea County, near Hobbs, New Mexico. As discussed in Section 2.1, IIFP expects to carry out preconstruction activities (i.e., site preparation and non-safety related construction activities) prior to issuance of a license by NRC. If NRC does not ultimately grant IIFP a license for the proposed plant, these would be activities associated with the no-action alternative.

Preconstruction would be overseen by the NMED and Lea County, pursuant to applicable permit requirements. NMED state permits would include those listed in Section 1.4, including stormwater controls, and erosion and sedimentation controls. A New Mexico Department of Transportation right-of-way permit would be required in order to construct access to NM 483. Lea County ordinances would require adherence to applicable building codes and fire code standards. There could be additional activities at the proposed site in the future under the no-action alternative that could have (adverse or beneficial) impacts on the environment and community. The impacts associated with these activities would depend on what IIFP would decide to do with the proposed site or the improvements (e.g., access roads, buildings, etc.) already constructed on the site, should the license not be granted. The conclusions presented in this section for the no-action alternative address the impacts of denying the license, but do not include the impacts of the NRC-approved preconstruction activities, which have been discussed in Section 4.2.2, Cumulative Impacts.

Under the no-action alternative, as discussed in Section 2.2.1, commercial uranium enrichment facilities would continue to store depleted uranium. DOE, which operated three gaseous diffusion plants near Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Piketon, Ohio, and Paducah, Kentucky, as part of the process of enriching uranium for civilian and defense applications, and would continue to deconvert its stockpiles of DUF_6. In the future, DOE deconversion technology and recently constructed deconversion plants at Paducah and Piketon would become available to deconvert commercial DUF_6. However, this would only occur when all of the DOE's DUF_6 stockpiles at Oak Ridge, Portsmouth, and Paducah are deconverted which is projected to take 25 years. Therefore, the no-action alternative would involve long term storage of depleted uranium at commercial enrichment facilities until such time as DOE could accept DUF_6 from facilities other than its own.

As discussed in Section 2.2.2, other alternatives, including Alternative Sites, Alternative Technologies, Overseas Shipment, Indefinite Storage, or deconversion at the commercial enrichment plants, have been dismissed for various reasons, and it is, therefore, assumed that none of those alternatives would occur. The environmental impacts of deconversion alternatives involving other sites and technologies would have impacts similar to or greater than the impacts from the Proposed Action. Alternatives involving overseas shipment would involve unreasonable shipment costs, increased potential for adverse transportation-related impacts, and potentially unacceptable risks. Indefinite storage is not practical or reasonable compared to the benefits of added commercial fluoride product and increased safety afforded by the deconversion process. Deconversion onsite at commercial uranium enrichment facilities is not feasible, considering technological and marketing advantages of using existing DOE facilities and/or the proposed IIFP facility. Therefore, the no-action alternative is limited to the Proposed Action, and its affiliated positive or adverse effects, not occurring.

The no-action alternative assumes that preconstruction occurred within the 16-ha (40-ac) facility and that fencing was erected around the 259-ha (640-ac) proposed IIFP site. Impacts from the no-action alternative to affected resources are as follows:

LAND USE: If the fencing was not removed, it would restrict cattle grazing. Other land uses in the vicinity of the site would be unaffected. A Site Redress Plan (SRP) could be required by NRC. The SRP could require the site to be restored to original grade and condition, including removal of fencing. The NRC staff finds that impacts to local land use would be SMALL, because of the amount of land adversely affected compared to the large amount of land available in the vicinity.

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES: For the same reasons as described for the proposed action, the NRC staff finds that impacts to historic and cultural resources would be SMALL and would result in no effect on historic properties, districts, resources or significant historic/precontact archaeological sites.

VISUAL RESOURCES: The existing character of the area would be altered only within the preconstruction area perimeter and access road. This disturbance would be limited to less than ten percent of the Section 27 (IIFP) site, and the NRC could require that all structures be removed. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts would be SMALL.

CLIMATE, METEOROLOGY, AND AIR QUALITY: Impacts to air quality from preconstruction activities would be small, localized, and temporary. Local and global atmospheric conditions would not be altered noticeably, and the NRC staff finds that impacts to air quality would be SMALL.

GEOLOGY, MINERALS, AND SOILS: Land disturbance from preconstruction clearing, grading, and excavation would have occurred. For reasons discussed in Section 4.2.2.5, the NRC staff finds that the impacts would be SMALL.

WATER RESOURCES: Consumptive use of water for preconstruction is anticipated (dust suppression and domestic use for workers). Water would be brought to the IIFP site by tanker trucks from the Hobbs municipal water system, which has adequate capacity. No surface water is present on the site, and so no impacts to surface water quality, including from sedimentation are expected. Water tanker trucks used for preconstruction would likely obtain water from groundwater wells within the region, near to, but not within the IIFP site. As indicated in Section 4.1.2.6.1, the NRC staff finds that impacts to surface water and groundwater would be SMALL.

ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Preconstruction would result in the loss of vegetation and terrestrial habitat. Some wildlife may be destroyed. This disturbance would be limited to less than 10 percent of the 259-ha (640-ac) site. If NRC requires an SRP, the site could be restored to near original grade and condition, including replanting or re-seeding to allow vegetation to reclaim the facility location. The NRC staff finds that impacts to ecological resources would be SMALL.

SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: Any consequences of the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the proposed IIFP facility (positive or adverse) would not occur and socioeconomic conditions in the ROI would remain unchanged. Population in the ROI would grow in accordance with current projections. The socioeconomic characteristics of the region, including housing availability, school enrollment, availability of health service resources, and law enforcement and firefighting resources, would not be affected

by the proposed action. The no-action alternative would not cause any high and adverse impacts, including to low-income and minority populations. Therefore, there would not be any environmental justice concerns. The NRC staff finds that impacts of no action on socioeconomic conditions, including those of low-income and minority populations, in the region would be SMALL.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION: There would be no increased traffic as a result of the no-action alternative. The NRC staff finds that impacts to the regional and national traffic and transportation system would be SMALL.

NOISE: Temporary, slight increases in ambient noise levels in the immediate area of the facility would occur during preconstruction, however, other than those temporary increases in local noise, the no-action alternative would not affect ambient noise levels. No changes in land use plans or traffic are expected. Therefore, based on all of these considerations, the NRC staff finds that impacts to noise would be SMALL.

PUBLIC AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH: Except for the potential for construction-related injuries during preconstruction, the no-action alternative would not affect public or occupational health. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts to public and occupational health would be SMALL.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: The no-action alternative would not be expected to cause changes in management of solid, hazardous, or mixed waste in the region. No radiologically contaminated waste would be generated during preconstruction or to meet the requirements of the SRP, and, therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts to waste management, would be SMALL.

ACCIDENTS: The no-action alternative would not cause accidents to occur within the IIFP facility. Therefore, the NRC staff finds that impacts from accidents would be SMALL.

4.4 References

(BEA, 2010) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. 2010. RIMS II Multipliers (2002/2007) Table 1.5 Total Multipliers for Output, Earnings, Employment, and Value Added by Detailed Industry IIFP Socioeconomic Site (Type II). Economic and Statistics Administration, Washington, D.C. September, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720418.

(Biwer et al., 2001) Biwer, B. M., F. A. Monette, L.A. Nieves, and N. L. Ranek. 2001. Transportation Impact Assessment for Shipment of Uranium Hexafluoride (UF_6) Cylinders from the East Tennessee Technology Park to the Portsmouth and Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plants, ANL/EAD/TM-112, Environmental Assessment Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Il. October, 2001. Available at http://web.ead.anl.gov/uranium/pdf/ANL-EAD-TM-112.pdf.

(BLS, 2010a) U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. "Workplace Injuries and Illnesses - 2009;" October 21, 2010. Available at http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/osh_10212010.pdf. Accessed on March 15, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720427.

(BLS, 2010b) U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2010. National Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries, in 2010 (preliminary results). August 19, 2010. Available at http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/cfoi.pdf. Accessed on March 3, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML 112720434.

(BMI, 1981) Battelle Memorial Institute. 1981. Migration and Residential Location of Workers at Nuclear Power Plant Construction Sites; Forecasting Methodology (Volume 1) and Profile Analysis of Worker Surveys (Volume 2), NUREG/CR-2002, PNL-3757, prepared by Pacific Northwest Laboratory for U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. April 1981. ADAMS Accession No. ML 112840173.

(CDC, 2010) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2010. "Deaths: Final Data for 2007," National Vital Statistics Reports, Volume 58, Number 19. May 20, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720451.

(Crone and Wheeler, 2000) Crone, A. J. and Wheeler, R. L. 2000. Data for Quaternary Faults, Liquefaction Features, and Possible Tectonic Features in the Central and Eastern United States, East of the Rocky Mountain Front. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 00-0260. Available at http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2000/ofr-00-0260/ofr-00-0260.pdf. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080519.

(DOE, 2000) U.S. Department of Energy. 2000. Evaluation of the Acceptability of Potential Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Products at the Envirocare Disposal Site. ORNL/TM-2000/355. December 2000. ADAMS Accession No. ML071130404

(DOE 2004a) U.S. Department of Energy. 2004. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Construction and Operation of a Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility at the Paducah, Kentucky Site, DOE/EIS-0359. Washington, D.C., June 2004. ADAMS Accession No. ML050380331.

(DOE 2004b) U.S. Department of Energy. 2004. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Construction and Operation of a Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility at the Portsmouth, Ohio Site, DOE/EIS-0360, Washington, D.C., June 2004. ADAMS Accession No. ML050380334

(DOE, 2008) U. S. Department of Energy. 2008. Final Complex Transformation Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II, Chapter 6 (DOE/EIS-0236-S4). Washington, D.C. Available at http://nepa.energy.gov/1017.htm. Accessed on August 16, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 103430383.

(DOE, 2009) U.S. Department of Energy. 2009. Supplemental Analysis for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Site-Wide Operations (DOE/EIS-0026-SA-07). Washington, D.C. Available at http://www.wipp.energy/gov/libraryseis/DOE_EIS-0026-SA-07_May_29_2009.pdf. Accessed August 16, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 103430391.

(DOE, 2010) U.S. Department of Energy. 2010. WIPP Shipment and Disposal Information. Available at http://www.wipp.energy.gov/shipments.htm. Accessed August 16, 2010 and October 29, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 103430396.

(EPA, 1974) U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1974. Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety," EPA/ONAC 550/9-74-004. March 1974. Available online at http://www.nonoise.org/library/levels74/levels74.htm. Accessed on December 13, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML110110692.

(EPA, 1995a) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1995. Compilation of Air Pollutant Emissions Factors, Fifth Edition and Supplements, AP-42. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. January 1995. . Available at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/index.html. Accessed May 18, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720457.

(EPA, 1995b) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1995. SCREEN3 Model User's Guide, EPA-454/B-95-004, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. September 1995. Available at http://www.epa.gov/ttn/scram/userg/screen/screen3d.pdf. Accessed May 18, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML071930125.

(EPA, 1999) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1999. Risk Management Program Guidance for Off-Site Consequence Analysis, EPA-550-B-99-009. Washington, D.C. April 1999. Available at http://www.epa.gov/oem/docs/chem/oca-all.pdf. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720461.

(EPA, 2005) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2005. EPA NONROAD Emissions Model User's Guide. EPA420-R-05-013, Office of Transportation and Air Quality. December 2005. Available at http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/nonrdmdl/nonrdmdl2005/420r05013.pdf. Accessed May 18, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720500 and ML112720491.

(EPA, 2009a) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2009. Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES) 2010 User Guide, EPA-420-B-09-041, Office of Transportation and Air Quality. December 2009. Available at http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/moves/420b09041.pdf. Accessed May 18, 2011.

(EPA, 2009b) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2009. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2009. County Air Quality Report – Criteria Air Pollutants for Eddy, Lea, and Sandoval Counties, New Mexico, and El Paso County, Texas. Washington, D.C., January 10, 2009. Available at http://www.epa.gov/oar/data/geosel.html. Accessed on May 31, 2011.

(EPA, 2010a) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2010. Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2008. Executive Summary. April 15, 2010. http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/usgginv_archive.html. Accessed March 10, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710366.

(EPA, 2010b) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2010. "The National Biennial RCRA Hazardous Waste Report (Based on 2009 Data)". Available at: http://www.epa.gov/wastes/inforesources/data/br09/index.htm. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720562.

(FAA, 1992) U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration. 1992. Change 2 to Obstruction Marking and Lighting. Advisory Circular. AC No. 70/7460-1H. July 15, 1992. Available online: http://wireless.fcc.gov//antenna/documentation/faadocs/7460-1H.pdf. Accessed March 2, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720574.

(GAO, 2004) U.S. Government Accountability Office. 2004. Low-Level Radioactive Waste: Disposal Availability Adequate in the Short Term, But Oversight Needed to Identify Any Future Shortfalls. Report to the Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate.GAO-04-604. June 2004. Available at http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04604.pdf. ADAMS Accession No. ML042010144.

(GL Environmental, 2010) GL Environmental, Inc. 2010. Existing Groundwater Condition in Section 27, Range 18 South, Township 36 East. Prepared for International Isotopes Fluorine Products. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720073.

(IIFP, 2009a) International Isotopes Fluorine Products. 2009. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Environmental Report. ER-IFP-001, Revision A. December 27, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML100120758.

(IIFP, 2009b) International Isotopes Fluorine Products, Inc. 2009. Fluorine Extraction Process & Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Integrated Safety Analysis Summary, Revision A. December 23, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML100630501.

(IIFP, 2011a) International Isotopes Fluorine Products. 2011. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Official Responses to Environmental Report RAIs, Revision A. March 31, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML100970481.

(IIFP, 2011b) International Isotopes Fluorine Products. 2011. Fluorine Extraction Process and Depleted Uranium De-conversion Plant (FEP/DUP) Official Responses to Talking Points Regarding the Environmental Report. May 24, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML111530402.

(INIS, 2011) International Isotopes, Inc. 2011. "International Isotopes Inc. Provides an Update Summary on the Progress of the Uranium Deconversion and Fluorine Extraction Processing Facility" Press Release. Idaho Falls, ID, February 7, 2011. Available online: http://www.intisoid.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/INISAnnouncesContinuedProgress TowardstheLicensingand-Construction.pdf. Accessed March 28, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112710381.

(ISCORS, 2002) Interagency Steering Committee on Radiation Standards. 2002. Estimating Radiation Risk from Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE). ISCORS Technical Report 2002-02, Final Report. Washington, D. C. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720579.

(Johnson and Michelhaugh, 2003) Johnson, P. E. and R. D. Michelhaugh. 2003. Transportation Routing Analysis Geographic Information System (TRAGIS) User's Manual. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee. June, 2003.

(Leedshill-Herkenhoff et.al., 2000) Leedshill-Herkenhoff, Inc., John Shomaker & Associates, Inc., and Montgomery and Andrews. 2000. Region 16: Lea County Regional Water Plan. Prepared for the Lea County Water User's Association. Available at http://www.ose.state.nm.us/isc_regional_plans16.html. Accessed July 25, 2010.

(Machette et al., 2000) Machette, M.N., Personius, S.F., Kelson, K.I., Haller, K.M., and R.L. Dart. 1998. Map of Quaternary Faults and Folds in New Mexico and Adjacent Areas. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 98-521 (Revised 2000). ADAMS Accession No. ML103080536.

(McCoy and Perry, 2004) McCoy, A.M., and R.L. Perry. 2004. Second Draft, Lea County Deep Aquifer Study. Prepared for Lea County Water Users Association. John Shomaker & Associates, Inc. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080447.

(Neuhauser and Kanipe, 2003) Neuhauser, K. S. and F. L. Kanipe. 2003. RADTRAN 5 User Guide. SAND2000-2354. Sandia National Laboratory, Albuquerque, New Mexico. July 7, 2003.

(NMDOT, 2009) New Mexico Department of Transportation. Consolidated Highway Database (CHDB). Website no longer accessible online. Accessed April, 10, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML112860287.

(NMED, 2009) New Mexico Environment Department, Solid Waste Bureau. 2009. New Mexico Solid Waste Annual Report, 2009. Available at http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/swb/documents/2009FinalAR.pdf. Accessed September 23, 2009. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720586.

(NMED, 2010) New Mexico Environment Department. 2010. Frequently Asked Questions, Proposed Greenhouse Gas Cap-and-Trade Rule, Updated June 8, 2010. Available at http://www,nmenv.state.nm.us/aqb/ghg/documents/FAQ_Rev06082010.pdf. Accessed August 17, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML 103430404.

(NMJC, 2011) New Mexico Junior College. 2011. NMJC State of the College Report. Available at http://www.nmjc.edu/assets/documents/NMJC State of the College Report 2011.pdf. Accessed March 10, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720596. (NMOSE, 2009a) New Mexico Office of the State Engineer. 2009. Lea County Underground Water Basin Guidelines for Review of Water Right Applications. Adopted September 16, 2009. Available at http://www.ose.state.nm.us/PDF/RulesRegsGuidelines/LeaCounty/ LeaCountyGuidelines-2009-09-16.pdf. Accessed July 29, 2010. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080986.

(NMOSE, 2009b) New Mexico Office of the State Engineer. 2009. Documentation of the Lea County Underground Basin Guidelines for the Review of Water Right Applications. December 1, 2009. Available at http://www.ose.state.nm.us/PDF/RulesRegsGuidelines/LeaCounty/ GuidelineBasis-LeaCo-Report-2009-12-01.pdf. Accessed March 1, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720601.

(NMOSE, 2010) New Mexico Office of State Engineer. 2010. Lea County Wells with Well Logs. Available at http://nmwrrs.ose.state.nm.us/nmwrrs/index.html. Accessed July 29, 2010.

(NRC, 1977) U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 1977. Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Transportation of Radioactive Material by Air and Other Modes, NUREG/CR-0170. Office of Standards Development. Washington, D.C. December 1977.

(NRC, 1990) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 1990. Control Room Habitability System Review Methods, NUREG/CR-5659. Division of Safety Resolution. Washington, D.C. December, 1990.

(NRC, 1991) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 1991. Chemical Toxicity of Uranium Hexafluoride Compared to Acute Effects of Radiation, Final Report, NUREG-1391. Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research. Washington, D.C. February 1991.

(NRC, 1998) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 1998. Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facility Accident Analysis Handbook, NUREG/CR-6410. Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research. Washington, D.C., March 1998.

(NRC, 2003) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2003. Environmental Review Guidance for Licensing Actions Associated with NMSS Programs, Final Report, NUREG-1748. Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. Washington, D.C., August 2003. ADAMS Accession No. ML032450279.

(NRC, 2005a) U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2005. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the National Enrichment Facility in Lea County, New Mexico NUREG-1790. Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards. Washington, D. C. June 2005. ADAMS Accession No. ML051730238 and ML051730292.

(NRC 2005b) U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2005. Safety Evaluation Report for the National Enrichment Facility in Lea County, New Mexico, Louisiana Energy Services NUREG-1827. Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards. Washington D.C. June 2005,

(NRC, 2006) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2006. Consolidated Decommissioning Guidance, NUREG-1757. Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. Washington, D.C., September 2006.

(NRC, 2010) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2010. Low-Level Waste Disposal Statistics. Available at http://www.nrc.gov/waste/llw-disposal/licensing/statistics.html. Accessed February 26, 2011.

(NRC, 2011) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 2011, "Revised Table 4-35." Personal communication between A. Malliakos, NRC and T. Harvey, et al., Straughan Environmental. August 9, 2011.

(Saricks and Tompkins, 1999) Saricks, C. L. and M. M. Tompkins. 1999. State-level Accident Rates of Surface Freight Transportation: a Re-examination, ANL/ESD/TM-150. Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois. April, 1999. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720605.

(SORA, 2011) SORA. 2011. Lesser Prairie-Chicken Survey on the International Isotopes Fluorine Products Project Site-2011. Prepared for: International Isotopes, Inc. May 24, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720317.

(TRB, 2000) Transportation Research Board. 2000. Highway Capacity Manual 2000, 3rd. Ed. National Academy of Sciences Research Council. Washington, D.C., 2000.

(UNM, 2010) University of New Mexico. 2010. Lea County Crash History for the New Mexico Traffic Safety Bureau, August 19, 2010. Available at http://www.unm.edu/~dgrint/CountyCrash History/cny0609/LeaCounty.html. Accessed March 11, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720608.

(USCB, 2010a). U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. American Factfinder. New Mexico Fact Sheet. 2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available online at http://factfinder.census.gov. Accessed April 11, 2011. ADAMS Accession No. ML112720609.

(Yarger, 2009) Yarger, F. 2009. Seismic Probability in Lea County, NM: A Brief Analysis, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, New Mexico Center for Energy Policy. ADAMS Accession No. ML103080942.