

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2023010653

Project Title: Supplemental EIS for Enhanced Plutonium Facility Utilization at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

Lead Agency: Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration

Contact Name: Alan Chen

Email: llnlseis@nnsa.doe.gov

Phone Number: 833-778-0508

Project Location: Livermore
City

Alameda
County

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

Per the DOE NEPA Implementing Procedures, DOE/NNSA submits the draft Supplemental EIS to agency with jurisdiction through the CA State Clearinghouse for a 30-day review and comment period. The DOE/NNSA proposes an Enhanced Plutonium Facility Utilization project at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) to support NNSA mission requirements. The proposed action would continue ongoing operations as discussed in the 2023 LLNL Site Wide EIS and enhance the utilization of the LLNL Plutonium Facility to support increased mission needs. This entails: (1) enhancing utilization of the Plutonium Facility to allow an increase in Research and Development activities and a corresponding increase in the amount of fissile materials used; (2) upgrading the security categorization of the Plutonium Facility from Security Category (CAT) III to Security CAT II; (3) conducting security and other infrastructure construction activities to support Security CAT II operations in the Plutonium Facility; (4) increasing materials shipments and waste generation/shipments; (5) adding operational and security personnel to support Security CAT II operations; and (6) constructing a new office building to support additional personnel.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

The following is a summary of impacted environmental areas (No mitigative measures were identified in the SEIS):

- Land Use: 5 additional acres disturbed (an increase of 0.7% over the No-Action Alternative). Adds ~32,000 square feet of facility space (an increase of 0.36% over the No-Action Alternative).
- Air Quality: Air emissions would be below de minimis threshold values.
- Workforce: Worker population would increase by 245 (an increase of 2.2% over the No-Action Alternative).
- Infrastructure/utility: Domestic water consumption and wastewater generation showed an increased of 1.8% over the No-Action Alternative. Electrical power and natural gas consumption showed an increase of 0.36% over the No-Action Alternative
- Radiological Transportation: Number of annual radiological shipments to/from LLNL would increase from 888 to 938.
 - 2 additional routine and up to 30 additional non-routine TRU waste shipments annually.
 - 18 additional shipments of plutonium materials annually.
 - Health risks to transport crews are 0.045 Latent Cancer Fatalities and to the public are 0.018 LCF.
- Waste Management: Total low-level radioactive waste (LLW) would increase by 200 cubic meters (an increase of 2.5% over the No-Action Alternative).
- Human Health and Safety: Total low-level radioactive waste (LLW) would increase by 200 cubic meters (an increase of 2.5% over the No-Action Alternative).

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

Although the scoping process is not required for the SEIS, DOE/NNSA invited other Federal agencies, Native American Tribes, State and local governments, industry, other organizations, and members of the public to review and submit comments on the scope and alternatives of the LLNL SEIS during a 45-day scoping period. DOE/NNSA also held a virtual scoping meeting. DOE/NNSA considered all comments received in preparing this SEIS and tabulated comments and responses in Table 1-1 of the SEIS.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

The Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration, is the agency responsible for the project. No trustee agency was identified for the project.