


Free Executive Summary



Going the Distance? The Safe Transport of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste in the United States

Committee on Transportation of Radioactive Waste,
National Research Council

ISBN: 978-0-309-10004-5, 339 pages, 6 x 9, hardback (2006)

This free executive summary is provided by the National Academies as part of our mission to educate the world on issues of science, engineering, and health. If you are interested in reading the full book, please visit us online at <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11538.html>. You may browse and search the full, authoritative version for free; you may also purchase a print or electronic version of the book. If you have questions or just want more information about the books published by the National Academies Press, please contact our customer service department toll-free at 888-624-8373.

This new report from the National Research Council's Nuclear and Radiation Studies Board (NRSB) and the Transportation Research Board reviews the risks and technical and societal concerns for the transport of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the United States. Shipments are expected to increase as the U.S. Department of Energy opens a repository for spent fuel and high-level waste at Yucca Mountain, and the commercial nuclear industry considers constructing a facility in Utah for temporary storage of spent fuel from some of its nuclear waste plants. The report concludes that there are no fundamental technical barriers to the safe transport of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive and the radiological risks of transport are well understood and generally low. However, there are a number of challenges that must be addressed before large-quantity shipping programs can be implemented successfully. Among these are managing "social" risks. The report does not provide an examination of the security of shipments against malevolent acts but recommends that such an examination be carried out.

This executive summary plus thousands more available at www.nap.edu.

Copyright © National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved. Unless otherwise indicated, all materials in this PDF file are copyrighted by the National Academy of Sciences. Distribution or copying is strictly prohibited without permission of the National Academies Press <http://www.nap.edu/permissions/>. Permission is granted for this material to be posted on a secure password-protected Web site. The content may not be posted on a public Web site.

Summary¹

This study was initiated by the National Academies to meet what it perceived to be a national need for an independent, objective, and authoritative analysis of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste transportation in the United States in light of

- The federal government's program to construct and operate a repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, to permanently dispose of the nation's spent fuel and high-level waste; and
- The commercial nuclear industry's program to construct and operate a facility in Utah for the temporary (interim) storage of spent fuel from some of its power reactors.

As this study was being completed, the federal government initiated another program to assess the feasibility of developing an integrated facility to receive, store, and recycle commercial spent fuel. If executed, these programs could involve the shipment of large quantities² of spent fuel and

¹This summary provides a brief overview of the findings and recommendations in this report. A more detailed summary of the findings and recommendations is presented in the next chapter.

²This report identifies two general types of transportation programs, *small-quantity shipping programs* and *large-quantity shipping programs*. While there is no precise quantity demarcation between these two program types, the former involve shipment on the order of tens of metric tons of spent fuel or high-level waste, while the latter involve shipment on the order of hundreds to thousands of metric tons.

high-level waste over the nation's railways and roadways for periods of several decades.

The Committee on Transportation of Radioactive Waste (hereafter referred to as the committee; see Appendix A) was appointed by the National Academies to carry out this study. The original objectives of this study were to examine the risks and identify key current and future technical and societal concerns for the transport of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the United States. After this study was under way, its scope was expanded to include a congressionally requested and U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) sponsored examination of the procedures used by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) for selecting routes for transporting research reactor spent fuel between its facilities in the United States. This report provides background information on spent fuel and high-level waste transportation (Chapter 1) and the committee's findings and recommendations with respect to the original study charge (Chapters 2, 3, and 5) and the expanded study charge (Chapter 4).

This report does not examine the security³ risks for spent fuel and high-level waste transportation because of an inability to access classified and otherwise restricted information. It also does not examine the viability of temporary storage or permanent disposal sites for spent fuel and high-level waste, or the risk trade-offs involved in transporting spent fuel and high-level waste to centralized interim storage or permanent disposal sites versus leaving them in place at current storage sites. The committee operated within the constraints of federal policy decisions that have set the nation on a clear path to transport spent fuel and high-level waste for permanent disposal. The intent of this study is to improve understanding of the issues associated with the transportation of spent fuel and high-level waste regardless of their ultimate destination.

A brief summary of the committee's findings and recommendations is presented below. Readers are strongly encouraged to examine the full text of the findings and recommendations in the referenced sections of this report for additional details.

- The committee could identify no fundamental technical barriers to the safe⁴ transport of spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the United States. However, there are a number of social and institutional

³*Security* refers to measures taken to protect spent fuel and high-level waste against sabotage, attacks, and theft while it is in transport.

⁴*Safety* refers to measures taken to protect spent fuel and high-level waste during transport operations from failure, damage, human error, and other inadvertent acts.

challenges to the successful⁵ initial implementation of large-quantity shipping programs that will require expeditious resolution (see Section 3.2 and Section 5.1). The challenges of sustained implementation should not be underestimated.

- Malevolent acts against spent fuel and high-level waste shipments are a major technical and societal concern, but the committee was unable to perform an in-depth examination of transportation security because of information constraints. The committee recommends that an independent examination of the security of spent fuel and high-level waste transportation be carried out prior to the commencement of large-quantity shipments to a federal repository or to interim storage (see Section 5.1).

- Transportation packages⁶ play a crucial role in transportation safety by providing a robust barrier to the release of radiation and radioactive material. Current international standards and U.S. regulations are adequate to ensure package containment effectiveness over a wide range of transport conditions. However, recently published work suggests that there may be a very small number of extreme accident conditions involving very long duration fires that could compromise package containment effectiveness. The committee recommends that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC) undertake additional analyses of very long duration fire scenarios that bound expected real-world accident conditions as outlined in Section 2.5. Based on the results of these investigations, the USNRC should implement operational controls and restrictions on spent fuel and high-level waste shipments as necessary to reduce the chances that such conditions might be encountered in service.

- The committee strongly endorses the use of full-scale testing to determine how packages will perform under both regulatory and credible extraregulatory⁷ conditions. The committee recommends that full-scale package testing continue to be used as part of integrated analytical, computer simulation, scale-model, and testing programs to validate package performance. Full-scale testing of packages to deliberately cause their destruction should not be required as part of this integrated analysis or for compliance demonstrations (Section 2.5).

- This report provides quantitative health and safety risk comparisons for both normal transport conditions and accidents (Section 3.3). The

⁵The committee defines *success* in terms of the program's ability, under existing statutes, regulations, agreements, and budgets, to transport spent fuel and high-level waste in a safe, secure, timely, and publicly acceptable manner.

⁶Containers used for the transport of spent fuel or high-level waste, whether loaded or empty.

⁷That is, under conditions that exceed those embodied in current regulatory requirements.

radiological health and safety risks associated with the transportation of spent fuel and high-level waste are well understood and are generally low, with the possible exception of risks from releases in extreme accidents involving very long duration, fully engulfing fires. The likelihood of such extreme accidents appears to be very small, however, and their occurrence and consequences can be reduced further through relatively simple operational controls and restrictions. The committee recommends that transportation planners and managers undertake detailed surveys of transportation routes to identify and mitigate the potential hazards that could lead to or exacerbate extreme accidents involving very long duration, fully engulfing fires (see Section 3.4).

- The social risks⁸ of spent fuel and high-level waste transportation pose important challenges to the successful initial implementation of programs for transporting spent fuel and high-level waste in the United States. Transportation implementers should take early and proactive steps to establish formal mechanisms for gathering high-quality and diverse advice about social risks and their management on an ongoing basis using the steps recommended in Section 3.4.

The committee also provides several recommendations for improving current and future programs to transport spent fuel and high-level waste to a federal repository or to interim storage. Although these recommendations are directed at DOE and DOT, they would also apply to programs for shipping commercial spent fuel to private storage.

- DOE's procedures for selecting routes within the United States for shipments of foreign research reactor spent fuel appear on the whole to be adequate and reasonable. DOT routing regulations are a satisfactory means of ensuring safe transportation, provided that the shipper actively and systematically consults with the states and tribes along potential routes and that states follow the route designation procedures prescribed by the department. The committee recommends that DOT take steps to ensure that states that designate routes for shipment of spent nuclear fuel rigorously comply with regulatory requirements that such designations be supported by sound risk assessments (see Section 4.4).

- The committee strongly endorses DOE's decisions to ship spent fuel and high-level waste to the federal repository by mostly rail using dedicated trains. The committee recommends that DOE fully implement

⁸Social risks arise from both *social processes*, which influence peoples' interactions and shape their communities, and *perceptions*, which influence peoples' behaviors, whether or not such perceptions are an accurate picture of reality.

these decisions by completing construction of the Nevada rail spur and making other necessary arrangements before commencing the large-quantity shipment of spent fuel and high-level waste to the federal repository. DOE should also examine the feasibility of further reducing its needs for cross-country truck shipments of spent fuel (see Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.3).

- DOE should identify and make public its suite of preferred highway and rail routes for transporting spent fuel and high-level waste to a federal repository as soon as practicable to support state, tribal, and local planning, especially for emergency responder preparedness. DOE should follow the practices of its foreign research reactor spent fuel transport program (see Chapter 4) of involving states and tribes in these route selections (see Section 5.2.2).

- DOE should negotiate with commercial spent fuel owners to ship older fuel first to a federal repository or to federal interim storage. Should these negotiations prove to be ineffective, Congress should consider legislative remedies. Within the context of its current contracts with commercial spent fuel owners, DOE should initiate transport to the federal repository through a pilot program involving relatively short, logistically simple movements of older fuel from closed reactors to demonstrate its ability to carry out its responsibilities in a safe and operationally effective manner (see Section 5.2.4).

- DOE should begin immediately to execute its emergency responder preparedness responsibilities defined in Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act using the innovative steps recommended in Section 5.2.5.

- DOE, the Department of Homeland Security, DOT, and USNRC should promptly complete the job of developing, applying, and disclosing consistent, reasonable, and understandable criteria for protecting sensitive information about spent fuel and high-level waste shipments. They should also commit to the open sharing of information that does not require such protection and should facilitate timely access to such information, for example, by posting it on readily accessible Web sites (see Section 5.2.6).

- The Secretary of Energy and the U.S. Congress should examine options for changing the organizational structure of DOE's program for transporting spent fuel and high-level waste to a federal repository to increase its chances for success. The following three alternative organizational structures, which are representative of progressively greater organizational change, should be examined: (1) a quasi-independent DOE office reporting directly to upper-level DOE management; (2) a quasi-government corporation; or (3) a fully private organization operated by the commercial nuclear industry (see Section 5.3).

GOING THE DISTANCE?

THE SAFE TRANSPORT OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL
AND HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE IN THE
UNITED STATES

Committee on Transportation of Radioactive Waste

Nuclear and Radiation Studies Board
Transportation Research Board

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS
Washington, D.C.
www.nap.edu

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS 500 Fifth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20001

NOTICE: The project that is the subject of this report was approved by the Governing Board of the National Research Council, whose members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The members of the committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competences and with regard for appropriate balance.

Support for this study was provided by the U.S. Department of Energy (Grant No. DE-FG28-02RW12177), U.S. Department of Transportation (Order No. DTRS56-02-P-70041 and Contract No. DTPH56-05-C-0002), Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Cooperative Agreement No. NRC-02-02-014), Electric Power Research Institute (Cooperative Agreement No. EP-P9056/C4563), National Cooperative Highway Research Program, and the National Academy of Sciences. All opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of these agencies and organizations.

International Standard Book Number 0-309-10004-6 (Book)

International Standard Book Number 0-309-65316-9 (PDF)

Library of Congress Control Number 200697629

Additional copies of this report are available from:

National Academies Press

500 Fifth Street, N.W.

Lockbox 285

Washington, DC 20055

800-624-6242

202-334-3313 (in the Washington Metropolitan Area)

<http://www.nap.edu>

Cover design by Van Nguyen.

Copyright 2006 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering, and Medicine

The **National Academy of Sciences** is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research, dedicated to the furtherance of science and technology and to their use for the general welfare. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1863, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. Dr. Ralph J. Cicerone is president of the National Academy of Sciences.

The **National Academy of Engineering** was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research, and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Dr. Wm. A. Wulf is president of the National Academy of Engineering.

The **Institute of Medicine** was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Dr. Harvey Fineberg is president of the Institute of Medicine.

The **National Research Council** was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy's purposes of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Dr. Ralph J. Cicerone and Dr. Wm. A. Wulf are chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the National Research Council.

www.national-academies.org

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE

NEAL F. LANE, *Chair*, Rice University, Houston, Texas

THOMAS B. DEEN, *Vice Chair*, National Research Council (retired),
Stevensville, Maryland

JULIAN AGYEMAN, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts

LISA M. BENDIXEN, ICF Consulting, Lexington, Massachusetts

DENNIS C. BLEY, Buttonwood Consulting, Inc., Oakton, Virginia

HANK C. JENKINS-SMITH, Texas A&M University, College Station

MELVIN F. KANNINEN, MFK Consulting Services, San Antonio, Texas

ERNEST J. MONIZ, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge

JOHN W. POSTON, SR., Texas A&M University, College Station

LACY E. SUITER, Federal Emergency Management Agency (retired),
Alexandria, Virginia

JOSEPH M. SUSSMAN, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge

ELIZABETH TEN EYCK, ETE Consulting, Inc., Great Falls, Virginia

SETH TULER, Social & Environmental Research Institute, Greenfield,
Massachusetts

DETLOF VON WINTERFELDT, University of Southern California,
Los Angeles

THOMAS R. WARNE, Tom Warne & Associates, LLC, South Jordan,
Utah

CLIVE N. YOUNG, United Kingdom Department for Transport, London

*Board on Radioactive Waste Management Liaison*¹

NORINE E. NOONAN, College of Charleston, South Carolina

Staff

KEVIN D. CROWLEY, Study Director, Nuclear and Radiation Studies
Board

JOSEPH MORRIS, Senior Program Officer, Transportation Research
Board

DARLA J. THOMPSON, Research Associate

LAURA D. LLANOS, Senior Program Assistant

LEE FINWOOD, Intern

BRANDON JONES, Intern

¹Through February 2005, when the Board on Radioactive Waste Management was reorganized into the Nuclear and Radiation Studies Board.

NUCLEAR AND RADIATION STUDIES BOARD

RICHARD A. MESERVE, *Chair*, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D.C.
S. JAMES ADELSTEIN, *Vice Chair*, Harvard Medical School, Boston,
Massachusetts
HAROLD L. BECK, Environmental Measurements Laboratory (retired),
New York City, New York
JOEL S. BEDFORD, Colorado State University, Fort Collins
ROBERT M. BERNERO, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (retired),
Gaithersburg, Maryland
SUE B. CLARK, Washington State University, Pullman
JAMES E. CLEAVER, University of California, San Francisco
ALLEN G. CROFF, Oak Ridge National Laboratory (retired), Tennessee
DAVID E. DANIEL, University of Texas at Dallas
SARAH C. DARBY, Clinical Trial Service Unit (CTSU), Oxford,
United Kingdom
SHARON L. DUNWOODY, University of Wisconsin, Madison
RODNEY C. EWING, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
ROGER L. HAGENGRUBER, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque
DANIEL KREWSKI, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
KLAUS KÜHN, Technische Universität Clausthal, Germany
SUSAN M. LANGHORST, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
NIKOLAY P. LAVEROV, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
MILTON LEVENSON, Bechtel International (retired), Menlo Park,
California
C. CLIFTON LING, Memorial Hospital, New York City, New York
PAUL A. LOCKE, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland
WARREN F. MILLER, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque
ANDREW M. SESSLER, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,
Berkeley, California
ATSUYUKI SUZUKI, Nuclear Safety Commission of Japan, Tokyo
JOHN C. VILLFORTH, Food and Drug Law Institute (retired),
Derwood, Maryland
PAUL L. ZIEMER, Purdue University (retired), West Lafayette, Indiana

Staff

KEVIN D. CROWLEY, Senior Board Director
EVAN DOUPLE, Scholar
RICK JOSTES, Senior Program Officer
MICAH D. LOWENTHAL, Senior Program Officer
BARBARA PASTINA, Senior Program Officer
JOHN R. WILEY, Senior Program Officer

CATHERINE S. BERKLEY, Financial and Administrative Officer
TONI GREENLEAF, Financial and Administrative Associate
DARLA J. THOMPSON, Research Associate
COURTNEY GIBBS, Senior Program Assistant
LAURA D. LLANOS, Senior Program Assistant
MARILI ULLOA, Senior Program Assistant
JAMES YATES, JR., Office Assistant

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

JOHN R. NJORD, *Chair*, Utah Department of Transportation,
Salt Lake City
MICHAEL D. MEYER, *Vice Chair*, Georgia Institute of Technology,
Atlanta
MICHAEL W. BEHRENS, Texas Department of Transportation, Austin
ALLEN D. BIEHLER, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation,
Harrisburg
LARRY L. BROWN, SR., Mississippi Department of Transportation,
Jackson
DEBORAH H. BUTLER, Norfolk Southern Corporation and
Subsidiaries, Atlanta, Georgia
ANNE P. CANBY, Surface Transportation Policy Project,
Washington, D.C.
JOHN L. CRAIG, Nebraska Department of Roads, Lincoln
DOUGLAS G. DUNCAN, FedEx Freight, Memphis, Tennessee
NICHOLAS J. GARBER, University of Virginia, Charlottesville
ANGELA GITTENS, HNTB Corporation, Miami, Florida
GENEVIEVE GIULIANO, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
BERNARD S. GROSECLOSE, JR., South Carolina State Ports Authority,
Charleston
SUSAN HANSON, Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts
JAMES R. HERTWIG, CSX Intermodal, Jacksonville, Florida
GLORIA JEAN JEFF, Michigan Department of Transportation, Lansing
ADIB K. KANAFANI, University of California, Berkeley
HERBERT S. LEVINSON, Herbert S. Levinson Transportation
Consultant, New Haven, Connecticut
SUE MCNEIL, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering,
University of Delaware, Newark
MICHAEL R. MORRIS, North Central Texas Council of Governments,
Arlington
CAROL A. MURRAY, New Hampshire Department of Transportation,
Concord
MICHAEL S. TOWNES, Hampton Roads Transit, Virginia
C. MICHAEL WALTON, University of Texas, Austin
LINDA S. WATSON, LYNX–Central Florida Regional Transportation
Authority, Orlando

Staff

ROBERT E. SKINNER, JR., Executive Director
STEPHEN R. GODWIN, Director, Studies and Information Services

Acknowledgments

The committee conducted an extensive information-gathering effort during this study and attempted to reach out broadly to a wide range of organizations and individuals concerned with transportation of spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste. The successful completion of this report would not have been possible without the cooperation and assistance of a very large number of organizations and individuals. The committee would especially like to thank the following organizations and individuals for providing logistical support, advice, and/or information for this study:

- The project sponsors, whose financial support made this study possible: Department of Energy (DOE), Department of Transportation (DOT), Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), National Academy of Sciences (NAS), National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP), and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC). The committee would especially like to acknowledge the following individuals from these organizations for their support of the committee's information-gathering efforts:

- DOE: Gary Lanthrum, Robin Sweeney, Jeffrey Williams, Judith Holm, Corine Macaluso, Alex Thrower, James Wade, Russ Dyer, Bill Boyle, Barry Miles, Ned Larson, Jozette Booth, Paul Detwiler, and Sue Loudner

- DOT: Dick Hannon, Richard Boyle, Michael Conroy, James Simmons, Kevin Blackwell, and Ryan Paquet

- EPRI: John Kessler
- NAS: E. William Colglazier
- NCHRP: Crawford Jencks
- USNRC: Bill Brach, Earl Easton, Jack Guttman, Mike Mayfield, Francis (Skip) Young, Wayne Hodges, and Bernie White
- The State of Nevada (Robert Loux) and its consultants (Robert Halstead, Jim Hall, Marvin Resnikoff, and James Ballard)
- Nevada counties: Clark County (Irene Navis, Fred Dilger, and Engelbrecht von Tiesenhausen), Eureka County (Abby Johnson), Lincoln County (Kevin Phillips), and Nye County (Les Bradshaw)
- Nuclear industry: Nuclear Energy Institute (Steve Kraft and the late John Vincent); Exelon Nuclear Power Corp. (Jeffrey Benjamin, Annie Caputo, Adam Levin, and Bob Rybak); Progress Energy (Steven Edwards); Energy Resources International (Eileen Supko); Private Fuel Storage (John Parkyn); and Ron Pope (consultant)
- States and state associations: New Mexico (Anne DeLain Clark and W. Scott Field) and Utah (Bill Sinclair); the Western Governors’ Association (Doug Larson); Western Interstate Energy Board (Bill Mackie); Council of State Governments—Midwest Office (Lisa Sattler and Thor Strong); Northeast Council of State Governments (Edward Wilds); and Southern States Energy Board (Chris Wells)
- Emergency management organizations: Department of Homeland Security (Eric Tolbert, Federal Emergency Management Agency); Argonne National Laboratory (Gordon Veerman); City of Chicago Fire Department (Gene Ryan); Linn County, Iowa Emergency Management Agency (Ned Wright); and Illinois Emergency Management Agency (Tim Runyon)
- Transportation organizations: Association of American Railroads (Bob Fronczak); Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (Patrick Brady); Tri-State Motor Transit (David Bennett); Transportation Technology Center (Jon Hannafious); and Union Pacific Railroad (Sandi Covi)
- Universities and research organizations: Doug Ammerman and Ken Sorensen (Sandia National Laboratories); Bob O’Connor (National Science Foundation); Amy Goodin (University of New Mexico); Dennis Mileti (University of Colorado); Michael Lindell (Texas A&M University); James Flynn (Decision Research); Christiana Drew (University of Washington); Elaine Vaughan (University of California, Irvine); and Christopher Becker (University of Michigan)
- Other nongovernmental organizations: National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (Veronica Eady); Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force (Judy Treichel); Citizen Alert (Michele Boyd and Peggy Maze); Southwest Research and Information Center (Don Hancock); International Institute for Indigenous Resource Management (Mervyn Tano); and the Keystone Center (Janesse Brewer)

- The many other individuals who attended and offered personal comments at the committee's meetings or provided information and materials for this report

A subgroup of committee members visited Germany and the United Kingdom during the study to become better acquainted with European transportation practices and experiences (see Appendix B). The committee would especially like to acknowledge and thank the following organizations for providing logistical support and information for this trip:

- German Federal Institute for Materials Research and Testing (BAM); especially Manfred Hennecke and Thomas Böllinghaus, who arranged the committee's visit to BAM to witness a package test
 - AREVA; especially Frederic Bailly and Vincent Roland, who arranged a briefing for the committee subgroup on French transportation operations
 - British Nuclear Fuels, Ltd. (BNFL); especially Colin Boardman and Jonathan Carter, who arranged and accompanied the committee subgroup on its tour of BNFL facilities
 - Roger Evans (London Assembly), Linda Hayes (Cricklewood Against Nuclear Trains), Steve Robinson (Environment Business Management), and Patrick van den Bulck (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament) for sharing their perspectives with the committee about BNFL's transport program
 - Christopher Pecover (U.K. Department of Transport) for accompanying the committee on its visit to the United Kingdom

This report has been reviewed in draft form by individuals chosen for their diverse perspectives and technical expertise, in accordance with procedures approved by the National Research Council Report Review Committee. The purpose of this independent review is to provide candid and critical comments that will assist the institution in making the published report as sound as possible and to ensure that the report meets institutional standards for objectivity, evidence, and responsiveness to the study charge. The content of the review comments and draft manuscript remains confidential to protect the integrity of the deliberative process. We wish to thank the following individuals for their participation in the review of this report:

Mark Abkowitz, Vanderbilt University
John Ahearne, Sigma Xi and Duke University
Robert Bernero, Consultant
Sherwood Chu, Consultant
Emil Frankel, Parsons Brinckerhoff

B. John Garrick, Consultant
Richard Garwin, IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center (emeritus)
David Kocher, SENES Oak Ridge Center for Risk Assessment
Dick Meserve, Carnegie Institution of Washington
Kathleen Meyer, Keystone Scientific, Inc.
Bill Nix, Stanford University (emeritus)
Eugene Rosa, Washington State University
Frank Saccomanno, University of Waterloo
Gordon Veerman, Argonne National Laboratory
Chelsea White III, Georgia Institute of Technology

Although the reviewers listed above have provided many constructive comments and suggestions, they were not asked to endorse the conclusions or recommendations, nor did they see the final draft of the report before its release. The review of this report was overseen by Chris Whipple, ENVIRON International Corporation, and Lester Hoel, University of Virginia. Appointed by the National Research Council, they were responsible for making certain that an independent examination of this report was carried out in accordance with institutional procedures and that all review comments were carefully considered. Responsibility for the final content of this report rests entirely with the authoring committee and the National Research Council.

Finally, this report could not have been completed without the help of many National Research Council staff. The committee especially wants to acknowledge Kevin Crowley (Nuclear and Radiation Studies Board) and Joe Morris and Steve Godwin (Transportation Research Board) for their help in organizing the committee's information-gathering meetings and developing the committee's final report; Darla Thompson, Lee Finewood, and Brandon Jones (Nuclear and Radiation Studies Board) for assistance with research and writing; Laura Llanos (Nuclear and Radiation Studies Board) for handling committee logistics; and Steve Mautner and Mary Kalamaras (National Academies Press) for helping the committee better understand the audience for this report.

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| SUMMARY | 1 |
| SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 7 |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 25 |
| 1.1 Study Process, 27 | |
| 1.2 Strategy for Addressing the Study Charges, 30 | |
| 1.3 Background on Spent Fuel and High-Level Waste, 38 | |
| 2 TRANSPORTATION PACKAGE SAFETY | 55 |
| 2.1 Transportation Package Designs and Regulations, 56 | |
| 2.2 Package Performance Modeling Studies, 64 | |
| 2.3 Full-scale Package Testing Under Extreme Conditions, 81 | |
| 2.4 Critical Assessment of Package Performance, 101 | |
| 2.5 Package Performance Findings and Recommendations, 106 | |
| 3 TRANSPORTATION RISK | 109 |
| 3.1 Health and Safety Risks, 114 | |
| 3.2 Social Risks, 149 | |
| 3.3 Comparative Risk, 161 | |
| 3.4 Transportation Risks: Findings and Recommendations, 178 | |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 4 | TRANSPORT OF RESEARCH REACTOR SPENT FUEL TO INTERIM STORAGE | 183 |
| 4.1 | DOE Management of Research Reactor Spent Fuel, 184 | |
| 4.2 | Regulations Governing Selection of Routes for Shipping Spent Fuel, 192 | |
| 4.3 | Selection of Routes for Shipping Research Reactor Spent Fuel, 194 | |
| 4.4 | Responses to the Study Charge, 208 | |
| 5 | IMPROVING SPENT FUEL AND HIGH-LEVEL WASTE TRANSPORTATION IN THE UNITED STATES | 212 |
| 5.1 | Principal Findings and Recommendation, 213 | |
| 5.2 | Transportation Operations, 216 | |
| 5.3 | Organizational Structure of the Federal Transportation Program, 260 | |
| | REFERENCES | 273 |
| | APPENDIXES | |
| A | Biographical Sketches of Committee Members | 287 |
| B | List of Presentations Received at Committee Meetings | 294 |
| C | Federal Repository Transportation System | 301 |
| D | Glossary | 322 |
| E | Acronyms | 336 |