

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
**Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a
Consolidated Interim Storage Facility for Spent Nuclear Fuel in Andrews
County, Texas**



**Public Comment Meeting
October 15, 2020 Webinar**

Webinar access:

<https://usnrc.webex.com>

Event number: 199 551 6533

Event password: ISPDEIS

Telephone access

Phone number: 888-989-9268

Passcode: 5300047

AUDIO FOR THE MEETING IS THROUGH THE TELEPHONE LINE

**U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a
Consolidated Interim Storage Facility (CISF) for Spent Nuclear Fuel
in Andrews County, Texas**



**Public Comment Meetings
Webinars – October 1, 6, 8, and 15, 2020**

Thursday, October 1, 2020 – 4pm MT / 5pm CT / 6pm ET
Webinar

Event address: <https://usnrc.webex.com/>

Event number: 199 125 5213

Event password: ISPDEIS

Telephone access

Phone number: 888-989-9268

Passcode: 5300047

Tuesday, October 6, 2020 – 12pm MT / 1pm CT / 2pm ET
Webinar

Event address: <https://usnrc.webex.com/>

Event number: 199 740 4202

Event password: ISPDEIS

Telephone access

Phone number: 888-989-9268

Passcode: 5300047

Thursday, October 8, 2020 – 4pm MT / 5pm CT / 6pm ET
Webinar

Event address: <https://usnrc.webex.com/>

Event number: 199 619 8948

Event password: ISPDEIS

Telephone access

Phone number: 888-989-9268

Passcode: 5300047

Thursday, October 15, 2020 – 9am MT / 10am CT / 11am ET
Webinar

Event address: <https://usnrc.webex.com/>

Event number: 199 551 6533

Event password: ISPDEIS

Telephone access

Phone number: 888-989-9268

Passcode: 5300047

AUDIO FOR ALL MEETINGS WILL BE THROUGH THE TELEPHONE LINE

Members of the Media

Please contact
David McIntyre
NRC's Public Affairs Officer
David.McIntyre@nrc.gov

Spanish Language Staff and Slides

Spanish language slides are available at
<https://www.nrc.gov/waste/spent-fuel-storage/cis/waste-control-specialist.html>

Native Spanish speaking staff available during today's meeting

Welcoming Remarks

Meeting Overview

- **NRC's Review Process**
 - Safety Review
 - Environmental Review
- **Overview of Interim Storage Partners' License Application**
- **Public Scoping Comments and Concerns**
- **NRC's Environmental Review Results**
- **Information Resources and Ways to Comment**
- **Public Comment**

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

To receive comments on the
Draft Environmental Impact
Statement (EIS) for ISP's
Consolidated Interim Storage
Facility (CISF) License Application

The NRC's Review Process for CISF License Applications

The NRC's CISF Review Process

- Evaluate the application and determine whether a license should be issued
- Not to promote ISP's proposal or the Consolidated Interim Storage Facility (CISF) concept
- Safety and Environmental Review of ISP's application
 - Safety Review: Determine whether ISP can safely construct and operate the CISF at the proposed site
 - Environmental Review: Evaluate the environmental impacts of building and operating the CISF at the proposed site


NRC's Decision Process for CISF Reviews

AEA – Atomic Energy Act


- Regulations must be met for licensing
- 10 Code of Federal Regulations Part 72

NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act


- Disclosure of environmental impacts
- NRC impact levels



NRC's CISF Safety Review




NRC's CISF Environmental Review




Summary of ISP's License Application for its Proposed CISF for Spent Nuclear Fuel

ISP's Proposed CISF



Source: Modified from National Enrichment Facility Environmental Report, December 2003,


ISP's Proposed CISF



ISP's Proposed CISF



Dry Storage of Spent Fuel



Phases and Stages

- ISP's proposed action is Phase 1 or 5000 MTUs
- EIS evaluates potentially impacts of up to 8 PHASES
 - Note that the safety review evaluates Phase 1 storage facility and any other facilities that are important to safety (i.e. transfer building components)
- EIS evaluates 3 STAGES of the project
 - Construction, Operation, and Decommissioning
- Phase 1 includes construction of rail sidetrack and additional supporting facilities

Public Scoping Comments

Scoping Process

- Scoping Periods
 - November 16, 2016 – April 28, 2017 and September 4, 2018 – November 19, 2018
 - Webinars from Rockville, MD and in-person meetings held in Andrews, TX and Hobbs, NM
- Comments –
 - 29,430 pieces of comment correspondence
 - Approximately 3,200 unique scoping comments
- Scoping comment report
 - <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML1916/ML19161A150.pdf>

Scoping Comments

- Transportation
 - Safety/Accidents
 - Radiation dose to citizens near the rail line
- Geology
 - Induced seismicity
- Water Resources
 - Located near surface beneath WCS site
 - Contamination of Ogallala Aquifer
- Location and Land Use
 - Co-located with other waste storage activities at WCS site
- Socioeconomics
 - Greater impact on New Mexico due to site's border location
- Environmental Justice
 - Disproportionate on Hispanic population
- Out of Scope – Safety Issues
 - Cask and canister design
 - Monitoring
 - Handling

Results of NRC's Environmental Review

Impact Significance Levels

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


Impact Evaluation

Transportation analysis

- Increase in traffic levels from workers and construction vehicles
- Evaluated spent fuel movement for Phase 1 (425 shipments) and for full buildout (3,400 shipments) using modeling
- Radiological dose rates to the public and workers along the rail route, from incident-free and accident conditions

Transportation impacts

- Minor increase in traffic along local roads around proposed site
- Dose of 1.9 mrem from 3,400 shipments to a person 30 meters from rail line.
- No accidental release of canistered fuel under the most severe impacts studied.



Impact Evaluation

Ground Water analysis

- Shallowest confined ground water lies about 225 feet below the CISF site
- Isolated pockets of limited saturation found about 90-100 feet below the CISF site
- CISF site is about 1 mile, at closest approach, to SW of SW limits of Ogallala Aquifer

Ground Water impacts

- Potable water supplied from City of Eunice, NM's water wells
- CISF construction would not affect ground water due to depth to ground water
- CISF operation would not affect ground water due to facility design and depth to ground water

Geology analysis

- Evaporites about 1500 feet below the CISF site
- No sinkholes near the CISF site
- Largest recorded earthquake near CISF site is 1992 magnitude 5.0 earthquake about 18 mi away

Geology impacts

- Surficial excavation of soils during construction
- CISF site in area of low seismic risk
- Subsidence and sinkholes not likely due to depth to evaporite deposits below the CISF site

Impact Evaluation

Socioeconomics analysis

- Primarily associated with workers who might move
- Resources available to the community
- Economic growth and tax revenues generated
- Demand on public services, schools and housing

Socioeconomics impacts

- Estimated maximum of 110 workers on site (50 construction workers, 60 regular workers)
- Impacts to a 3-county area (Andrews, Gaines, and Lea counties)
- Noticeable increase in population growth and in local revenues

Environmental Justice

- Analysis of the human health and environmental impacts on low-income and minority populations
- 109 block groups that fall completely or partially within the 50-mile radius of the proposed CISF project area.
- Identify disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations
- NRC analysis does not find means or pathways for disproportionate effects on minority or low-income populations
- No disproportionate impacts on minority or low-income populations

Impact Evaluation

Facility Location/Land Use analysis

- Location proposed by ISP
- Within larger WCS-owned property
- Active oil & gas extraction in the region surrounding the WCS property
- Nearest permanent resident is about 4 miles west of the proposed CISF site

Facility Location/Land Use impacts

- Access restrictions to WCS property and CISF site
- Approximately 330 acres disturbed by CISF construction
- Activities outside the CISF site would not be affected (e.g., grazing, oil & gas extraction)
- After CISF decommissioning, CISF infrastructure may remain or be removed

Results of NRC's Environmental Review

RESOURCE	IMPACT EVALUATION (construction, operation and decommission/reclamation stages)
Land Use	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Transportation	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Geology and Soils	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Surface Water	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Groundwater	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Ecology	SMALL to MODERATE – Proposed Action** SMALL to MODERATE – Additional Phases** ** until vegetation has been reestablished
Air Quality	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases

Results of NRC's Environmental Review

RESOURCE	IMPACT EVALUATION (construction, operation and decommission/reclamation stages)
Noise	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Historic and Cultural	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Visual and Scenic	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Socioeconomic	SMALL to MODERATE* *on population growth and beneficial on local finances
Environmental Justice	There would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to either minority or low-income populations
Public and Occupational Health	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases
Waste Management	SMALL – Proposed Action SMALL – Additional Phases

Information Resources

- Draft Environmental Impact Statement
 - <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML2012/ML20122A220.pdf>
- Reader's guide
 - <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML2012/ML20121A016.pdf>
 - <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML2013/ML20136A148.pdf> (Spanish)
- Application material and NRC project website
 - <https://www.nrc.gov/waste/spent-fuel-storage/cis/waste-control-specialist.html>

How to Comment

- **Oral Comments tonight**
- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <https://www.regulations.gov/> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2016-0231**. Address questions about NRC docket IDs to Jennifer Borges; telephone: 301-287-9127; e-mail: Jennifer.Borges@nrc.gov.
- **Mail comments to:** Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWFN-7-A60M, ATTN: Program Management, Announcements and Editing Staff, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.
- **E-mail comments to:** WCS_CISF_EIS@nrc.gov

SUBMIT COMMENTS BY NOVEMBER 3, 2020

NOTE : The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC posts all comment submissions at <https://www.regulations.gov> and enters all comment submissions into ADAMS, the NRC's document filing system.

Public Comments on the Draft EIS