

DATA CALL, LAND USE, VISUAL RESOURCES, ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES, CULTURAL RESOURCES

	RESOURCE	RESPONSE
1	GENERAL	
1.1	Has the “2009 SWEIS Yearbook” been issued?	No. Use the 2008 SWEIS Yearbook as the most recent, approved data.
1.2	Has the “2009 SWEIS MAP 2010 Annual Report” been issued?	Copy provided.
2	AIR QUALITY	
	No requests.	
3	HUMAN HEALTH	
	No requests.	
4	SOCIOECONOMICS	
4.1	Provide an update of total employment, including a breakdown of which counties LANL employees reside.	<p>13,474 total work force population of which 9,349 are LANS employees with 4,556 living within Los Alamos County and 4,793 employees living outside Los Alamos County in counties; Rio Arriba, Bernalillo, Lincoln, Santa Fe, Valencia, Sandoval, Eddy, Taos, McKinley, San Miguel, Catron, Mora, Cibola, Dona Ana, Torrance, San Juan, Grant, and Socorro. (May 2010 data - additional detailed data exist, but it is OOU) The county breakout only includes LANS employees. Santa Fe, Rio Arriba and Sandoval counties comprise the vast majority of the employees living outside of Los Alamos.</p> <p>For LANS employees, provide estimates for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49 % living in Los Alamos County % living in Santa Fe County % living in Rio Arriba County % living in Sandoval County % elsewhere <p>Can data be provided for the ~4,125 non-LANS employees with respect to % living in Los Alamos County</p>

		<p>% living in Santa Fe County % living in Rio Arriba County % living in Sandoval County % elsewhere</p>
4.2	Provide the percentage of site employment by the industrial activities most commonly performed onsite (Scientific Research and Development, Environmental and Other Technical Consulting Services, Construction, and Security).	Sorting the Laboratory Divisions into five industrial activities groupings of Science Research and Development, Environmental and Other Technical Consulting Services, Support Services, Construction, and Security the employment percentage breakout is: Science 54%, Environmental 5%, Support 20%, Construction (project management...) 16% and Security 5%. These numbers are based on the total employee data base of 19,525 active employees. Active employees include regular, new hires, students, contract, vendors, guess/visiting scientist, part-time/casual, DOE, and anyone that came on site even for a few days and entered the system to do work. The 13,474 employee total is full time regular employees. The break out also assumes everyone within a given division is doing work or 'industrial activities' that match with the division's site work or mission.
4.3	Provide updates to the LANL transportation infrastructure such as information on carpool/vanpool programs, or updates on rail infrastructure.	The carpool/vanpool programs are operated by the State of New Mexico. There are a few users at the Laboratory, but it doesn't represent a significant number. There is no rail infrastructure or service at the Laboratory. However, the Park and Ride All Aboard regional bus service that serves the Laboratory does connect to the Rail Runner State of New Mexico rail in Santa Fe. The Park and Ride delivers 300 riders per day or 72,000 per year to Los Alamos (300 riders x 2 both ways x 240 workdays = 144,000 trips/ridership per year to and from Los Alamos). The Los Alamos Transit (Atomic City) provides service to and from the Laboratory and throughout Los Alamos County. For October 2009 through September 2010 daily ridership has averaged 1,722 (total ridership = 433,819/total days operated = 252).
5	WASTE MANAGEMENT	Use data from most recent 2008 SWEIS Yearbooks
6	TRANSPORTATION	
6.1	Provide data on existing traffic on Pajarito Road. If this data is not available is information available on the number of persons working in buildings adjoining	Yes. See the 2008 CMRR Traffic Study and the 2010 Pajarito Road Closure traffic Study. July 2010 traffic counts showed 7988 vehicles per 24 hours count passing TA 55 on Pajarito Road. Detailed breakdown data is available. Population numbers on 11/9/2010; TA 59 – 254, TA 64 – 516, TA 48 – 351, TA 55 – 807, TA 50 – 673, TA

	Pajarito Road.	35 – 715, TA 63 – 123, TA 52 – 128, TA 66 – 35, TA 46 – 568, TA 51 – 55, TA 54 – 215, TA 18 - 33
6.2	Is data available on pavement thickness and the construction of Pajarito Road?	Yes. Pajarito Road varies along its length from TA 3 to White Rock in both its width and paving section with turning lanes and variable shoulders. However, the road is typically 24 feet wide providing two 12 lanes for traffic with 2 foot shoulders providing a 28 foot cross section. Most of the road is graded out with drainage courses along the side banks of the road. The finish road is typically covered with a 4 inch asphalt surface that sits on an 8 inch base course. Most of the length of Pajarito Road from TA 63 to White Rock was re-paved in October 2010.
6.3	Is there data available on the traffic capacity at and current use of the access control points at each end of Pajarito Road?	Yes. See the 2008 CMRR Traffic Study and the 2010 Pajarito Road Closure traffic Study. Current traffic counts for the Pajarito Road VAPs are 1075 veh/hr traveling west (White Rock VAP) and 1720 veh/hr traveling east (TA 59 VAP). The outbound lanes are free flow. Capacity is based on 8sec per vehicle per lane or 450 vehicles per hour per lane to stop and have their badge(s) checked. With four booth/lanes at the Pajarito Road VAPs that allows for 1800 vehicles per hour. The practical reality may be faster. The limit is the queuing of vehicles backing up onto the public roads East Jemez, Diamond or State Route 4. That queuing length drove the number of lanes provided at each VAP and impacts the number of lanes opened by security at various times throughout the day. A slower per vehicle rate was used for the queuing estimates to allow for some margin of error, nevertheless, short 15 minute queuing traffic backups are typical. As the numbers indicate there is surplus capacity, although at peak morning traffic queuing does at times backup to public roads.
7	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	
	No requests.	
8	LAND RESOURCES	
8.1	<i>Land Use</i>	
8.1.1	Have there been any recent major fires that have impacted the site?	No fires since 2000
8.1.2	Land transfer status – Is the program still slated to be complete by 2012? How much land has been turned over to date? Have there been any major changes in the program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program is slated to be complete by 2012. No major changes to the program. • All lands are to be conveyed or transferred by November 2012. • 17 tracts have been conveyed or transferred. • 6 tracts have been withdrawn due to mission or clean-up work.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11 tracts remain (7 County, 1 Pueblo of San Ildefonso, 3 NM DOT)
8.1.3	What is the current size of LANL?	39.73 square miles contiguous (41.15 square miles including Rendija Canyon)
8.1.4	How much of LANL is developed?	One hundred percent of the Laboratory land is developed in that it supports buildings, roads, parking, utilities, security zones, or safety buffers. About twenty percent of the Laboratory is developed with facilities (buildings, roads, parking, and utilities). It is important to note the Laboratory opportunities and constraints mapping identifies only about thirty percent is developable from physical and environmental limitations.
8.1.5	Has the 2000 LANL Comprehensive Site Plan been updated?	The Long Range Development Plan, LRDP, is currently being written but is not completed. Since the CSP 2000-01 a number of Area Development Plans, ADP, covering most all of the Laboratory have been completed including: the Core ADP (TA3) - twice, LANSCE (TA 53), Water Canyon (TA 15 and area), Anchor Range (TA 16 and area) twice, Sigma Mesa (TA 60), TA 21, West Pajarito Corridor (TA 59 thru TA 63), and East Pajarito Corridor (TA 46 thru TA 54). Finally three sub-elements to the CSP have been developed including; a Transportation Plan 2005 for the Laboratory, Site and Architectural Guidelines (urban development) and the LANL Sustainable Design Guide.
8.1.6	Provide the size in acres of the TAs involved in the proposed project (Based on the October 2010 CMRR Project Overview During Construction, the TAs appear to be 5, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 63, 64, and 66).	TA 5 – 824.2 acres, TA 46 – 258.4 acres, TA 48 – 116.0 acres, TA 50 – 61.6 acres, TA 51 – 148.7 acres, TA 52 – 69.2 acres, TA 54 – 847.9 acres, TA 55 – 92.7 acres, TA 63 – 50.2 acres, TA 64 – 48.7 acres, TA 66 – 46.7 acres, potential TA’s for contractor parking, spoils and utilities TA 72 – 1192.3 acres, TA 36 – 2778.5 acres, TA 3 – 357.1 acres, TA 59 – 43.6 acres, and TA 58 – 199.9 acres.
8.2	<i>Visual Resources</i>	
8.2.1	Has forest thinning continued; thus, continuing to present a more open park-like appearance. How much has been thinned in addition to that reported in the LANL SWEIS (since 2006).	
8.2.2	Has any aspect of the site significantly changed the viewshed? For example, have any tall or highly visible structures been removed or built since the LANL SWEIS was published?	TA 21 has had a number of buildings demolished in the last two years. The view shed from the town site has therefore been changed – to a more positive view in most folk’s opinion. The Laboratory has demolished 1.4 million square feet since 2002 (through FY2011) and built 700 thousand new square feet since then. Among the new buildings is the eight floor tall NSSB building in the heart of TA 3. It was intended to be the landmark building and is visible from most locations throughout the town site. The

		other major building is the new RULAB building at TA 55. It is visible from a number of locations throughout the Laboratory and is the key visible structure along Pajarito Road. The old administration building (TA3-43) SM 43 is in the process of being demolished and its removal will improve the view shed of the Laboratory from the town site.
9	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	
	No request.	
10	WATER RESOURCES	
10.1	Is there an estimated amount/volume/percentage of effluents from sanitary sewage, industrial water treatment plants, and cooling tower blowdown that “enter some canyons at rates sufficient to maintain surface flows for varying distances (from 2003 CMRR FEIS, Section 3.6.1, Surface Water, page 3-26)?	<p>The extent that surface water flows are maintained in any canyon from any type of source, including effluents, is SO site specific. It’s a function of bedrock geology, amount and variations in alluvial fill, antecedent moisture conditions, etc. Therefore, I do not believe there is any way to quantify a value that addresses that question.</p> <p>I agree with Danny. I do not believe that quantification of sanitary/industrial/CT inputs, and correlation with distance of surface flow is possible, as there are simply too many variables for which to account and it’s an incredibly complex system to examine/study.</p> <p>In the meantime, here is the link to the LASO NEPA webpage where you can download the new Sanitary Effluent Reclamation Facility EA because it contains much good background information about outfall reductions.</p>
11	NOISE	
	No request.	
12	ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES	
12.1	<i>Terrestrial Resources</i>	
12.1.1	Have the vegetation zones at LANL changed? That is, has SWEIS Figure 4-25 been updated?	Same, they have not been updated.
12.1.2	Is the 1998 Habitat Management Plan (LALP-98-112) still current?	LA-UR 00-4747 it is still current.
12.1.3	Has the pine bark beetle infestation	There are no data available on this at LANL but this paper may of use:

	continued? If not when did it end?	Breshears et. al. 2005 Regional vegetation die-off in response to global-change-type drought. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 102(42):15144-15148.
12.2	<i>Wetlands/Aquatic Resources</i>	
12.2.1	Is the 2005 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers report “Wetlands Delineation Report: Los Alamos National Laboratory” the latest site-wide wetland delineation report?	Yes
12.2.2	Does any aquatic habitat exist within affected TAs (i.e., TAs-5, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 63, 64, and 66) (e.g., ponds, permanent streams)?	There are no ponds or permanent streams in this area. There are wetlands in middle (TA-55 and 35) and upper Mortandad Canyon (TA-3 and 60).
12.3	<i>Threatened and Endangered Species</i>	
12.3.1	Is the list of threatened and endangered species of LANL found in DOE/EA-1736 (Table 3-2, page 45) considered current?	The Mexican spotted owl, southwestern willow flycatcher, and black-footed ferret are correct for federal species. However, not all of the other sensitive species at LANL are included on this list. A list of State-listed sensitive species at LANL is attached.
12.3.2	Provide a copy of the latest LANL Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat Management Plan	HMP is still the current HMP and it is available by CD. I have a copy of the CD for you.
12.3.3	Provide current maps of Areas of Environmental Interest for site protected species especially as they are relevant to the affected TAs (i.e., TAs-05, -46, -48, -50, -52, -55, and -63)?	Official use only information for protection of the resource.
13	CULTURAL RESOURCES	
13.1	Is “A Plan for the Management of the Cultural Heritage at LANL” (LA-UR-04-8964) current or is a later version available?	This is the current document and is being implemented.
13.2	What is the latest tally of archaeological, historic, and traditional cultural properties found on the site (the tally in DOE/EA-1736 [page 49] is from 2005).	1736 is the current reported number of sites identified at LANL.
13.3	Provide the latest cultural resources GIS data base (similar to that which SAIC used to prepare the LANL SWEIS)?	Official use only information for protection of the resource.

13.4	Have any paleontological resources been found onsite beyond that identified in the LANL SWEIS?	The same time frame is current – see Vierra and Schmidt 2008 and McGehee 2010.
14	INFRASTRUCTURE	
14.1	Have there been any electrical power system upgrades since the LANL SWEIS 2008 was published?	No
14.2	What is the status of the Electrical Infrastructure and Safety Upgrade Project?	Not a Utilities project. Not finalized – still in progress.
14.3	What is the current electric peak load demand (megawatts) for the LANL Site and other Los Alamos County users?	FY10 System Peak = 82.72 MW, LAC = 23.3 MW, LANL = 69.23 MW
14.4	What is the amount of energy use at LANL (megawatt hours per year) (i.e., is there anything more current than the 2008 SWEIS Yearbook)?	FY10 LANL Total Consumption = 125,177.5 MW
14.5	What is the current natural gas demand (cubic feet per year) for the LANL Site and other Los Alamos County users?	FY10 LANL Total Natural Gas Consumption = 1,104,269 DTh
14.6	Have any more facilities been metered to accurately track the natural gas usage at the site (i.e., is there anything more current than the 2008 SWEIS Yearbook)?	No
14.7	What is the current Water demand (gallons per year) for the LANL Site and Other Los Alamos County users? (Anything more current than the 2008 SWEIS Yearbook)?	FY10 Total LANL Consumption = 412,070 Kgal
14.8	Did the Los Alamos Water Supply System ever pursue the use of the San Juan-Chama Transmountain Diversion Project to secure additional water for its customers, including LANL? If not, has anything else been done to increase the current capacity?	Yes, the LA County is pursuing it, LANL is unsure what impacts this will have on the Laboratory's capacity.
14.9	What has LANL done to meet the requirements of DOE Order 430.2B to reduce	LANL has recommissioned the Sanitary Effluent Reclamation Facility and is planning to expand the facility to reuse 24% of water used compared to the FY 2007 baseline

	potable water use?	year.
14.10	Does the Sanitary Effluent Reclamation Facility meet the projections to save ~21 million gallons of water per year? What is the status/schedule of the expansion for the SERF? (The EA [DOE/EA-1736] was issued this summer)	<p>YES, regarding 21 MGY. However, there are some caveats. The SERF-E project does not yet know the volume of water that will be required to maintain the Sandia Canyon wetlands. This may impact the % of SERF-E product water able to be reused by LANL facilities. This will be a dynamic decision/process inherent with adaptive management strategies as described in the mitigating action portion of the FONSI. (Partial reuse).</p> <p>Schedule for design/build completion on SERF-E is 18 months from receipt of funds at LANL. Project funds are linked to approval of the federal budget by Congress and we are in a continuing resolution which prescribes that “new starts” for congressional line items may not initiate under continuing resolution. We simply do not know with certainty when funds will be made available to the project. However, the Integrated Project Team is moving forward with information/packages associated with being able to place project out to bid upon Snr Mgt approval to do so/receipt of funds.</p> <p>We’ve recommissioned SERF and the capacity increase project is underway. Line items is on hold due to Continuing Resolution. We’re putting interim measures in place to meet the PCB limits imposed by NMED and EPA until line item funding is available.</p>