

---

**TRANSPORTATION EXTERNAL  
COORDINATION WORKING GROUP  
EVALUATION**

---

**Judith A. Bradbury and Kristi M. Branch**

**September 1996**

**Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy  
Office of Environmental Management,  
Office of Transportation Emergency Management and  
Analytical Services  
under Contract DE-ACO6-76RLO 1830**

**TTP No. RL-327001**

**Pacific Northwest National Laboratory  
Richland, Washington 99352**

## DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor Battelle Memorial Institute, nor any of their employees, makes **any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.** Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or Battelle Memorial Institute. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY  
*operated by*  
BATTELLE  
*for the*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
*under Contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830*

Printed in the United States of America

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the  
Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831;  
prices available from (615) 576-8401.

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service,  
U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161



This document was printed on recycled paper.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of an evaluation of the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG). The evaluation is based on interviews with a variety of participants in the group. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide feedback to DOE and TEC/WG participants about the value and achievements of the TEC/WG and information they could use to correct problems, plan next steps, and improve the usefulness and effectiveness of the Working Group.

### **Background**

The TEC/WG includes State, Tribal, and local officials, and representatives of industry and professional groups with responsibilities for safety and emergency preparedness aspects of DOE radioactive materials transportation. It was formed by a Memorandum of Understanding, signed by the two sponsoring DOE offices, the Office of Environmental Management (EM) and the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) in January 1992. The original objective was to engage the various representatives in resolving common transportation issues and to focus and coordinate DOE transportation program efforts.

Since the TEC/WG's inception, several changes have combined to affect the structure and scope of the TEC/WG tasks and associated DOE needs. Membership has changed and expanded, the nature of the issues has evolved, and, more recently, changes are occurring in DOE organizational structure and budget. These recent changes include stringent budget cuts that require streamlining, restructuring, and a more intensive effort to coordinate the various transportation program activities across DOE offices. In this new environment, DOE wished to ensure the continued effectiveness of the TEC/WG in contributing to the solution of program issues.

### **Methods**

Following a review of the evaluation literature, a review of the Charter, and initial discussions with DOE Headquarters staff in EM and OCRWM, the evaluation staff worked with TEC/WG participants to identify, clarify, and develop agreement on the TEC/WG goals on which the evaluation would be based. A brainstorming session was held during a regularly scheduled TEC/WG meeting, and a subcommittee of TEC/WG volunteers subsequently helped further refine the goals and conceptual framework for the evaluation. The evaluation staff drafted an interview protocol that tapped participants' assessment of the extent to which the working group was achieving its goals and obtained feedback on achievements, problems, and possible approaches to improving the TEC process. Interviews were conducted with 31 TEC/WG members and long-term participants, using the interview protocol included in Appendix C. The protocol was designed to include both numerical ratings, on a scale of one to ten, and qualitative comments.

A sample of DOE representatives was also included in the evaluation interviews; however, this report includes only non-DOE participants' responses.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Overall Value**

*The TEC/WG is considered worthwhile and of high value to the participants and their organizations. There is strong support for the TEC/WG to continue.*

The overall conclusion of the evaluation is that the TEC/WG is considered a worthwhile effort that adds value and is important to the participants and their organizations. Out of a possible score of 10.0, the overall value of the TEC/WG was rated 7.7, with no score lower than a 6.0. The TEC/WG is widely seen as serving an important function and operating in an effective way, receiving average scores of 7.6 for pertinence of charter and purpose and 7.1 for effectiveness in organization, process, and procedures.

Widespread support for the TEC/WG was expressed by participants. Almost all viewed it as a good use of DOE funds and saw a continuing need either for the TEC/WG or for a similar interaction mechanism. Criticism primarily reflected frustration that TEC/WG was not achieving its full potential and a desire to improve its effectiveness in enabling DOE, the participants, and their organizations to address issues affecting transportation safety and efficiency.

### **Performance Goals for the TEC/WG**

Six performance goals, reflecting the DOE sponsor's and participants' aspirations for TEC/WG, served as the cornerstone of the evaluation:

- Address the important issues and problems concerning emergency preparedness and the safe and secure transport of DOE radioactive materials and shipments
- Exchange information and improve coordination among appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations with responsibility for DOE transportation activities
- Identify, characterize, and reach closure on priority transportation emergency preparedness and coordination issues
- Enhance overall DOE transportation program organization, coordination, and implementation (consistency, safety, efficiency, cost effectiveness, application of lessons learned)

- Enhance participant organizations' ability to carry out transportation emergency preparedness and safety responsibilities related to DOE radioactive materials shipments
- Resolve institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system (remove barriers to the safe, acceptable transport of DOE radioactive shipments).

*The evaluation found that the:*

- *TEC/WG is doing very well (average score of 7 or more) in achieving its goals of (a) addressing important issues and problems; (b) exchanging information; and (c) identifying and characterizing priority issues.*
- *TEC/WG is doing fairly well (average score between 6 and 7) in achieving its goals of (a) improving coordination; (b) enhancing the overall DOE program; (c) enhancing the participant organizations' ability to carry out their responsibilities; and (d) resolving institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system.*
- *TEC/WG is doing less well (average score below 5) in reaching closure on priority issues.*

### **Key Achievements**

*Comments made in response to questions about the six performance goals as well as direct questions about TEC/WG achievements indicate that participants feel that the TEC/WG has resulted in many positive outcomes.*

The most valued achievements of the TEC/WG fall into seven broad categories:

- Dialogue and communication
- Product development and program impact
- Relationships, interactions, and networking
- Better understanding and increased trust of DOE
- Increased understanding by and coordination within DOE
- Increased understanding and awareness of other organizations' viewpoints
- Provision of information.

The most frequently mentioned achievements concerned dialogue and communication and product development and program impact, reflecting the value participants placed on

discussion, information exchange, relationships, and making a substantive contribution to the resolution of transportation issues. Those surveyed valued access to the network of participants and the information exchanged at TEC/WG meetings as significantly increasing the ability of the participating organizations to see the big picture and to fulfill their transportation responsibilities effectively. Appreciation for the opportunity to exchange information, build relationships, establish trust, and develop awareness and understanding of one another's perspectives was broadly expressed. Participants placed high value on products and program impact and expressed a strong desire for greater emphasis on this category of achievements in the future.

### **Factors Contributing to TEC/WG Effectiveness**

*Among the many factors identified as important to the TEC/WG's success and effectiveness, participants particularly emphasized the leadership, commitment, and competence of key DOE staff, whom they identified as critical to the continued existence and effectiveness of the TEC/WG.*

They also commended the effective participation and constructive behavior of the representatives. The meeting structure and process, particularly the advance preparations, information dissemination and breakout sessions; the effort DOE expended in the preparation and dissemination of information; and DOE's provision of funding were also identified as factors key to the effectiveness of the TEC/WG. The infrequency of meetings and the size and diversity of membership were identified as important constraints affecting the group's ability to focus on the issues.

### **Areas Needing Attention/Improvement**

*With few exceptions, participants' criticisms of the TEC/WG focused on areas that were seen as limiting TEC/WG's ability to achieve its full potential.*

Viewpoints about problems and potential solutions reflected the priorities, interests, and responsibilities of the organizations being represented: the diversity of the interests and responsibilities of the participating organizations was reflected in the diversity of viewpoints about which problems were the most pressing and what actions would best remedy the problem. For example, although many participants recommended some change in the composition of the TEC/WG, there was little agreement among the participants about the specific nature of that change — some felt that the group was too large and that efforts should be made to reduce it, others felt that the group needed to be expanded to include representatives from additional organizations, and still others felt that participants' roles needed to be changed (that other Federal agencies with responsibility for transportation — U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) — needed to play a more central role). There were similar differences in viewpoints about the importance of consensus as a focus and goal for TEC/WG interactions.

*There was widespread agreement that it was time for the TEC/WG to "move on" and to focus more time and effort addressing key issues such as routing, training, and rail transport.*

Although participants felt that an important, continuing function of the TEC/WG was to identify, characterize, and exchange information on issues, there was a strong call for modification of the emphasis and structure of the TEC/WG to enable participants to “dig in” to issues and to “get to work” to formulate solutions. This represents a rising awareness that DOE is not, and should not be, responsible for solving *all* the important transportation safety problems and that the TEC/WG can serve as a forum for the representatives of the participating agencies to coordinate and focus their efforts to address transportation issues *within each organization’s scope of responsibility*. To accomplish this goal, a number of participants recommended that the TEC/WG establish a subcommittee or working group structure.

Other frequently stated recommendations centered around a need for better feedback mechanisms, both from DOE to the TEC/WG and from the participating organizations to DOE; a need for greater continuity of membership and attendance; and a need to address issues of focus and prioritization. A variety of recommendations were made about how to improve the TEC/WG meetings themselves, including ways to ensure all members’ active participation. Particular concern was expressed about the OCRWM program and its interaction with the TEC/WG, which was seen as less open and less effective than EM in using the TEC/WG to address transportation issues.

### **Next Steps**

The evaluation suggests the following next steps:

- Develop a strategy to improve communication from the TEC/WG (to other levels and components of DOE and to the membership of the participating organizations) and feedback to the TEC/WG (from key components of DOE and from the participating organizations)
- Initiate the formation of working groups or subcommittees
- Given the issues that need to be addressed, re-evaluate the membership of the TEC/WG, recognizing that any change of membership or roles should be discussed with TEC/WG representatives
- Re-examine the processes and procedures for TEC/WG meetings and information exchange in light of the evaluation comments and identify ways to streamline and improve them
- Discuss TEC/WG’s role in resolving issues and the issue of consensus

- Discuss OCRWM's role in relation to DOE program changes and budget restrictions and the concerns expressed in the evaluation.

Table 1 presents a brief summary of the evaluation findings and recommendations for responding to them.

## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Overall Value/Goals	Status based on Evaluation	Recommendations
Value of the TEC/WG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly valued</li> <li>• Valuable for information exchange and participation <i>per se</i> that provides:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- credibility</li> <li>- legitimacy</li> <li>- relationships</li> <li>- accountability</li> <li>- expert input</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Appreciation for DOE commitment and individual EM staff efforts</li> </ul>	Continue with the TEC/WG
Goal 1: Address important issues	High score: Agreement that goal is being achieved, but concern that once identified, issues are not dealt with and some issues need more attention	Establish subcommittees to focus on members' priority issues (routing, operations, rail, training)
Goal 2: Exchange information	High score: External communication very good; internal DOE communication not so good	Continue to work on internal DOE communication and coordination across programs
Goal 3: Identify/reach closure on priority issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify, high score: Doing good job (though paperwork needs streamlining)</li> <li>• Closure, low score: Doing poor job — issues "drag on"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss possible ways to streamline at next TEC/WG meeting</li> <li>• Establish subcommittees</li> <li>• Move on to next stage of addressing issues</li> </ul>
Goal 4: Enhance overall DOE transportation organization, coordination, implementation	Fairly high score: 25% high rating 25% did not know 33% need DOE feedback/saw no evidence of impact	Develop systematic DOE feedback mechanisms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- one-pagers</li> <li>- specific feedback item on agenda for TEC/WG meetings</li> <li>- provide feedback on evaluation at next TEC/WG meeting</li> </ul>

<p>Goal 5: Enhance member organizations' abilities to carry out transportation responsibilities</p>	<p>Fairly high score: Information especially useful for short-term needs - knowing what is coming up is very helpful</p>	<p>Continue good information exchange, but - increase emphasis on long-term planning efforts - discuss member communication mechanisms at next TEC/WG meeting</p>
<p>Goal 6: Resolve institutional/coordination issues</p>	<p>Fair score: Progress has been made; more is needed; more focus on products and outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shift focus from issue identification to working on issues (see 3 above)</li> <li>• Discuss role of the TEC/WG in resolving issues</li> </ul>
<p>Other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation - mixed views: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- additional groups may be needed</li> <li>- need to clarify membership size, though providing diversity, makes effectiveness difficult</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Meeting format - differing views: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- more interactive format</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Role of OCRWM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review list of organizations</li> <li>• Discuss meeting format and representation at TEC/WG meeting</li> <li>• Co-chairs discuss OCRWM's role</li> </ul>

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors wish to thank TEC/WG members and participants who participated in the interviews and provided many thoughtful comments and suggestions. Special thanks are owed to volunteers who served on a subcommittee to provide input on the early conceptual framework and refine the statement of goals that formed the basis for the evaluation; and to two of these volunteers, Chris Wentz and Gordon Veerman, who also helped pilot test the interview protocol, prior to widescale use.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	iii
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	xi
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>2.0 BACKGROUND</b> .....	1
<b>3.0 METHOD</b> .....	3
3.1 Review of the Literature .....	3
3.2 Initial Interviews with DOE Managers and Involved Staff .....	4
3.3 Identification of TEC/WG Goals .....	4
3.4 Evaluation Design .....	5
3.5 Evaluation Implementation .....	6
<b>4.0 FINDINGS</b> .....	6
4.1 Value of the TEC/WG .....	9
4.2 Purpose of the TEC/WG .....	12
4.3 Rating of the TEC/WG on Four Factors .....	14
4.4 Achievement of Performance Goals .....	17
4.5 Most Valuable Achievements of the TEC/WG .....	24
4.6 Factors Contributing to TEC/WG Effectiveness .....	26
4.7 Changes that Would Increase Effectiveness .....	27
4.8 Prioritization .....	29
4.9 Representatives' Actions to Increase the Effectiveness of the TEC/WG .....	31
4.10 Communication with Organizations .....	32
<b>5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	33
5.1 Overall Value .....	33
5.2 Performance Goals for the TEC/WG .....	33
5.3 Key Achievements .....	34
5.4 Factors Contributing to TEC/WG Effectiveness .....	35
5.5 Areas Needing Attention/Improvement .....	35
5.6 Next Steps .....	36
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	39

**Appendix A: TEC/WG Charter . . . . . A-1**  
**Appendix B: TEC/WG Organizational Membership . . . . . B-1**  
**Appendix C: Interview Protocol . . . . . C-1**  
**Appendix D: Participant Comments . . . . . D-1**

**TABLES**

Table 1. Summary of Ratings . . . . . 7  
Table 2. Summary of Findings and Recommendations . . . . . 37

# TRANSPORTATION EXTERNAL COORDINATION WORKING GROUP EVALUATION

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of an evaluation of the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) conducted by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) for the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE)'s Office of Environmental Management (EM), Office of Transportation, Emergency Management and Analytical Services. The evaluation is based on interviews with members and long-term participants in the TEC/WG.

The evaluation was *formative* in design, i.e., designed to adapt and improve the operations of the group to DOE's changing needs. Specifically, the purposes of the evaluation were to

- Provide feedback to DOE and TEC/WG participants about the value and achievements of the TEC/WG
- Identify where and how to correct problems
- Plan next steps and improve the usefulness and effectiveness of the TEC/WG.

In keeping with the open and participatory nature of the TEC/WG activity, the evaluation was designed and implemented in close consultation with TEC/WG members and with representatives of the various DOE offices that now participate in the group. A principal focus of the evaluation was to implement a process that, in itself, would facilitate awareness of and attention to issues affecting the effectiveness of the group and involve the participants in efforts to improve the group's performance.

The report is organized into 5 sections. Section 2 outlines the background of the working group and describes the context in which the evaluation took place. Section 3 discusses the methods used in designing and implementing the evaluation, including the involvement of TEC/WG participants in identifying the goals, the topics to be addressed in the evaluation, the development of the interview protocol, and implementation and analysis of the evaluation. Section 4 presents the findings and Section 5 provides conclusions and recommendations. Four Appendices are provided: Appendix A includes a copy of the TEC/WG Charter, Appendix B provides a listing of TEC/WG member organizations, Appendix C includes the interview protocol, and Appendix D provides a detailed list of participants' comments.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

The TEC/WG Working Group includes State, Tribal, and local officials, and representatives of industry and professional groups with responsibilities for safety and emergency preparedness aspects of DOE radioactive materials transportation. It was formed by a

Memorandum of Understanding, signed by the two sponsoring DOE offices, the Office of Environmental Management (EM) and the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) in January 1992. The original objective was to engage the various representatives in resolving common transportation issues and to focus and coordinate DOE transportation program efforts. DOE articulated these goals for the TEC/WG in its Charter (see Appendix A).

TEC/WG membership is based on organizations rather than individuals. A list of currently participating organizations is included in Appendix B. Representatives of these organizations serve the TEC/WG in three broad categories: (1) to represent their constituent organizations; (2) to participate actively and consistently in TEC/WG activities; and (3) to report back and discuss TEC/WG's activities with their respective organizations.

Meetings of the TEC/WG, lasting for two full days, are held twice each year in different locations; nine meetings have been held since the Memorandum of Understanding was established. The meetings typically are structured to include opening and closing plenary sessions and a series of breakout groups for discussion. In the course of the meetings, members obtain updated information on DOE transportation plans and activities, identify and discuss issues of concern to their constituencies, provide input to DOE on possible ways to address concerns, review and comment on documents that DOE has produced or is planning to produce, and track how DOE has incorporated their input into the planning process.

At the first meeting of the TEC/WG in New Orleans in April 1992, members developed a list of over 100 objectives and activities for DOE transportation and emergency response programs to consider. The group agreed to track the status of objectives and DOE's response to them in a *TEC/WG Task Plan*, a working document that is continually updated. The *Work Plan* groups these tasks under seven topic areas: general planning; safe routine transportation; inspection and enforcement; emergency management; training; technical assistance; and public information and communication.

In the intervening time, the group has grown significantly and its focus has expanded. Participation has expanded to include several DOE offices in addition to EM and OCRWM, and new organizations have been added as members. All TEC/WG meetings are open to the public, and approximately half of attendees at recent meetings have been interested persons not listed on the membership roll. These persons participate fully in the meeting presentations and discussions.

Since the TEC/WG's inception, therefore, several changes have combined to affect the structure and scope of the TEC/WG tasks and associated DOE needs. Membership has changed and expanded, the nature of the issues has evolved, and, more recently, changes are occurring in DOE organizational structure and budget. These recent changes include stringent budget cuts that require streamlining, restructuring and a more intensive effort to coordinate the various transportation program activities across DOE offices.

This context formed the background against which the evaluation was developed and implemented. Essentially, DOE wished to ensure the effectiveness of the group in contributing to the solution of program issues and to assess whether its original goals for the TEC/WG were being met. A particular concern was to identify ways to increase active participation by all members and to examine possible opportunities for improving the future operation of the group.

### **3.0 METHOD**

Evaluation of the TEC/WG was designed and conducted according to the following steps:

- Review of the evaluation literature
- Initial interviews with DOE EM and OCRWM Office Managers and involved staff
- Identification of TEC/WG goals
- Evaluation design
- Evaluation implementation.

#### **3.1 Review of the Literature**

As a first step in the evaluation, PNNL staff reviewed key issues highlighted in the literature. Two issues, in particular, guided the subsequent design and implementation.

- The need to design an evaluation strategy that would yield information that is helpful to (and usable by) both program implementors and decision makers (Rosener, 1981; Alkin, 1990).

The evaluation effort, throughout, focused on developing information that would assist the TEC/WG and DOE in identifying where and how the group could work more effectively. In addition, by involving TEC/WG members in the process, the evaluation team sought to enhance awareness and understanding among all participants of the goals and objectives of the TEC/WG and the contributions of each to the effectiveness of the group.

- The importance of grounding an evaluation on mutually understood and agreed-upon goals (Nay et al., 1976; Nay and Kay, 1982).

In general, evaluations assess whether or not programs or policies are achieving their goals and purposes. Frequently, however, these goals are stated broadly or are poorly understood. A major, initial task, therefore, was to develop clarity and agreement on performance goals that were consistent with the objectives established in the Charter.

### **3.2 Initial Interviews with DOE Managers and Involved Staff**

The evaluators held individual discussions and an initial small group meeting with Headquarters EM and OCRWM managers and staff to confirm DOE's program needs and goals and to discuss the proposed evaluation approach. Interviews were also conducted at a later time with several other DOE participants to assess their views on the effectiveness of the TEC/WG and to identify where they saw opportunities for improved operation of the group.

### **3.3 Identification of TEC/WG Goals**

Identification of TEC/WG goals, against which the evaluation was designed and conducted, was undertaken in an iterative process. As discussed above, the process was designed to engage all TEC/WG participants in discussion and clarification of program goals and the responsibilities of TEC/WG membership. The process began with a review of the TEC/WG Charter and the initial discussions with DOE Headquarters staff, and built upon discussions with TEC/WG participants during a regularly scheduled TEC/WG meeting held in San Antonio in January 1996.

During one of the breakout sessions at the January 1996 meeting, the evaluators briefed participants on the purpose and proposed approach, and solicited their input on the goals of the TEC/WG. During this session, attendees brainstormed the goals, the actions necessary to achieve those goals, and barriers to their achievement. The results of these discussions formed the basis for the first draft of the conceptual framework of goals and associated responsibilities of the various participants in contributing to their achievement.

During the TEC/WG meeting, also, volunteers were sought to participate in a subcommittee to provide additional assistance in helping to refine the goals. These volunteers provided substantial input into the final statement of the six TEC/WG goals that formed the core of the evaluation design:

- Goal 1: Address the important issues and problems concerning emergency preparedness and the safe and secure transport of DOE radioactive materials shipments.
- Goal 2: Exchange information and improve coordination among appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations with responsibility for DOE transportation activities.
- Goal 3: Identify, characterize, and reach closure on priority transportation emergency preparedness and coordination issues.
- Goal 4: Enhance DOE transportation program organization, coordination, and implementation (consistency, safety, efficiency, cost effectiveness, application of lessons learned).

- Goal 5: Enhance participant organizations' ability to carry out transportation emergency preparedness and safety responsibilities related to DOE radioactive materials shipments.
- Goal 6: Resolve institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system (remove barriers to the safe, acceptable transport of DOE radioactive shipments).

### **3.4 Evaluation Design**

The evaluation methodology was designed to gather information from TEC/WG members and long-term participants, using the interview protocol included in Appendix C. The protocol was designed to include both numerical ratings, on a scale of one to ten, and qualitative comments. It was divided into six sections (questions were not necessarily asked in this sequence):

- Questions that asked participants to rate the overall value of the TEC/WG, including the value to their own organization and to DOE, and their assessment of whether or not the TEC/WG was a good use of DOE funds.
- Questions related to the purpose of the TEC/WG. The initial questions were designed to tap participants' individual expectations and their assessment of DOE's expectations for the TEC/WG.
- Questions that sought participants' assessment of the TEC/WG on four, key factors that framed the TEC/WG goals: effectiveness in organization, process, and procedures; productivity in terms of products and achievements; impact on DOE transportation programs and transportation emergency preparedness, safety, and acceptability; and pertinence of the charter and purpose.
- Questions that sought participants' assessment of the TEC/WG on the six specific performance goals, listed above.
- Questions that asked participants to identify the three most valuable achievements of the TEC/WG and what had contributed to those achievements. Participants were also asked what three changes would most increase the effectiveness of the working group and whether communication within the participating organizations needed improvement.
- Questions related to the prioritization of issues for discussion at the TEC/WG, in particular whether participants thought that this was an appropriate focus for the group, what the priority issues were for their organization, and how DOE and the TEC/WG could most effectively conduct issue prioritization.

### **3.5 Evaluation Implementation**

#### **Selection of persons to be interviewed**

Interviews were conducted with all TEC/WG members, with the exception of one member who was unable to schedule an interview and new members who had not yet attended a meeting. Interviews were also conducted with several persons who were long-term participants at the meetings. In all, 31 interviews were conducted with non-DOE participants.

#### **Conduct of the interviews**

Pilot interviews were conducted with two members to refine the interview protocol prior to widescale implementation. These and subsequent interviews were conducted by telephone. The discussions were informal and participants were encouraged to provide qualitative comments as well as numerical ratings, where appropriate. Respondents' comments were noted as they were made, but interviews were not taped. To the extent possible, the key points on the comments were recorded in the respondents' own words, although sometimes in abbreviated form. The average interview lasted about three-quarters of an hour.

#### **Data analysis**

Responses were divided into numerical ratings and qualitative comments. Several measures were calculated for the numerical ratings: mean (arithmetic average), median (middle value), mode (most frequently occurring value), and range of scores. Qualitative comments were recorded, analyzed, and grouped into categories. Throughout the report, quotation marks are used to indicate comments made by participants. These comments may not reflect exact quotes, since not every word was recorded. A detailed list of qualitative comments, as recorded by the interviewers, is included in Appendix D.

### **4.0 FINDINGS**

This section presents results for each component of the interviews according to the sequence of topics listed in Section 3.4: value of the TEC/WG; purpose; ratings on four factors; ratings on achievement of the six performance goals; TEC/WG achievements; changes to improve effectiveness; communication within participating organizations; and prioritization of issues. A summary of the numerical ratings is presented in Table 1, next page. Scores are presented in terms of mean, median, mode, and range.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Mean score is the arithmetic average; median score is the midpoint of the distribution, i.e., the value of the middle case in a rank-ordered set of individual scores; mode represents the most frequent response or score; and range represents the numeric extent of high and low scores.

**Table 1.  
Summary of Ratings**

Question	Scores <sup>1</sup>				
	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	N <sup>2</sup>
<b><i>Value of the TEC/WG</i></b>					
Overall Value of the TEC/WG	7.7	7	7	6-10	24
Value of the TEC/WG to your organization	7.0	8	7	3-10	31
Value of the TEC/WG to DOE	6.9	7.5	9	1-19	27
<b><i>Rating of the TEC/WG on four factors</i></b>					
Effectiveness in organization, process, and procedures	7.1	7	8	3-10	25
Productivity in terms of products and achievements	5.1	5	5	1-8	30
Impact on DOE transportation programs and transportation emergency preparedness, safety, and acceptability	5.5	5.8	7	1-9	29
Pertinence of charter and purpose	7.6	8	8	3-10	22
<b><i>Achievement of performance goals</i></b>					
Address the important issues and problems concerning emergency preparedness and the safe and secure transport of DOE radioactive materials and shipments	7.0	7	8	2-9	27
Exchange information among appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations with responsibility for DOE transportation activities	7.1	8	8	1-9	30

Question	Scores <sup>1</sup>				
	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	N <sup>2</sup>
Improve coordination among appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations with responsibility for DOE transportation activities	6.5	7	7	1-9	29
Identify and characterize priority on transportation emergency preparedness and coordination issues	7.4	8	8	4-10	30
Reach closure on priority transportation emergency preparedness and coordination issues	4.6	4.8	5.0	1-7	28
Enhance overall DOE program organization, coordination, and implementation	6.5	7	7	1-9	22
Enhance participant organizations' ability to carry out transportation emergency preparedness and safety responsibilities related to DOE radioactive materials	6.2	7	8	1-9	28
Resolve institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system	6.2	6	5	2-9	27

<sup>1</sup> On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is low and 10 is high.

<sup>2</sup> N = number of interviewees providing a score out of a sample of 31 people.

The numerical ratings shown in Table 1 are repeated in each subsection below, where appropriate, accompanied by an interpretive discussion of the associated qualitative comments. A detailed listing of individual comments is provided in Appendix D for each of these findings.

#### **4.1 Value of the TEC/WG**

Questions concerning the value of the TEC/WG included a general assessment of participants' overall rating, questions concerning the overall value of the group to their organization and to DOE, and an assessment of whether or not the TEC/WG was a good use of DOE funds.

Survey findings, throughout, should be interpreted in light of participants' rating of the overall value of the TEC/WG. It was clear that the TEC/WG and the efforts of individual DOE staff were highly valued and appreciated, and that critical comments on other items in the assessment primarily reflected frustration that the group was not meeting its full potential, as well as a desire to provide constructive suggestions for improvement.

##### **Overall value**

Mean score:	7.7
Median:	7
Mode:	7
Range:	6-10

Ratings on overall value were the highest of all ratings. Out of a possible score of 10.0, the overall value of the TEC/WG was rated 7.7, with no score below a 6.0. The TEC/WG is widely seen as serving an important function and of great value to the member organizations. Members' high ratings for the TEC/WG are also confirmed by the overwhelming number who responded affirmatively to the question "Is the TEC/WG a good use of DOE funds?" Only one person responded "no" while only two persons who responded "yes" expressed reservations. (One person queried whether it was productive to have TEC/WG meetings when there was a legislative stalemate over OCRWM's mission and another queried whether it was useful to have so many people present at the meetings if issues of concern to a particular organization were rarely raised.)

Almost all participants also saw a continuing need for the group — at least, until shipping of high-level waste begins. Even after that, many envisaged the need for some established mechanism for interaction to ensure coordination and resolution of concerns and issues that would likely arise.

## Value of the TEC/WG to you/your organization

Mean score:	7
Median:	8
Mode:	7
Range:	3-10

Again, these scores indicated that participants clearly valued the TEC/WG. Numerical ratings were high (several persons rated it a "10") and verbal comments were predominantly positive. Over one half provided very positive comments. While two persons specifically mentioned the value of addressing issues, the majority of positive comments reflected appreciation for the opportunity to communicate/interact with DOE and other stakeholders and recognition that this contributed to greater understanding.

Among the many positive comments, participants highlighted how valuable it was to have a "major forum" to express their views and interact with DOE, the value of making contacts and "meeting grass-roots people I wouldn't normally talk to," and of the information and networking, which helped them to "see the big picture clearly and understand what DOE is trying to do." Significantly, participants emphasized the value of the process *per se* and its contribution to trust and understanding of others' (stakeholders' and well as DOE's) perspectives. For example,

The most valuable aspect is the information. We know more about the railroads and other stakeholder concerns. Opportunity to give and receive information.

I would hate TEC/WG to end because it serves as an important interface — removes distrust. DOE shows that they are really trying.

Our organization is very glad there is a group addressing issues. Not so much because we are looking for impact, but because we feel participation is very important.

It is really important — almost a 10. Important to be involved in it.

Only one person was skeptical of the TEC/WG's value, commenting that he had provided a low rating because of the lack of a specific timetable for planning (caused by the legislative stalemate over the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA)). In addition, two persons were critical of their own organizations, and one emphasized that the value of TEC/WG was dependent on whether the input was heeded. Another praised "DOE people who are making a great effort — the cesium and nitric acid shipments resulted in high levels of trust and mutual appreciation," but added that "OCRWM is oblivious. Also, I'm tired of hearing DOE complain about the budget!" Others who provided more qualified comments primarily expressed the feeling that the TEC/WG was of value, but was not achieving its full potential. One person concluded:

Could be improved, but good; TEC/WG is good because it forces people who are busy to focus on important issues. But we could achieve more...

### **Value of the TEC/WG to DOE**

Mean score:	6.9
Median:	7.5
Mode:	9
Range:	1-9

As shown above, numerical ratings on the value of the TEC/WG to DOE were only slightly lower than those for the value to members' organizations. However, several participants declined to give a score and many expressed reluctance or uneasiness about speaking for DOE. A few participants gave an unqualified high rating, observing that "TEC/WG helps eliminate controversy and allows DOE to do a better job," "It is especially valuable for DOE not to stand alone, but to have input from many experts in the field," "Very important," "EM, rather than OCRWM is reaping the benefit because they are actually shipping," and that "In the beginning, it was primarily trust-building, but now they are getting a lot of useful information." However, most comments were qualified.

Two participants expressed a somewhat skeptical viewpoint, observing that the TEC/WG primarily fulfilled a requirement for public interaction, that the information exchange was only one way, and that DOE was essentially looking for the appearance of regular contact with many key stakeholders. Others expressed uncertainty about whether and how effectively TEC/WG input was used by upper management. The following examples illustrate the types of comments made to this question:

Information they are trying to obtain will be very beneficial to them, but the real issue is whether this information is actually used — what happens within DOE and the managers who actually make decisions?

Valuable if they listen. But it's up to them what they do with the information.

To those in DOE with a sense of connection to the outside world, TEC/WG is as valuable as to the members. I sense a shift over the years, though not all of DOE is as responsive as those who support TEC/WG.

Question mark. Still a question mark. For EM-76, it has been good, and for some others, O.K., though I don't know how to rate on a scale. Out of RL we're getting a lot more cooperation and credibility when we talk to them, but the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL) and Nevada are just now hearing.

Problem is that most of DOE doesn't realize its value. EM has created a wide audience from all over the country that managers could use to discuss some of the most incendiary issues. The real key is whether DOE top management realizes TEC/WG's importance.

## **4.2 Purpose of the TEC/WG**

Participants were asked to respond to several questions related to the purpose of the TEC/WG: (1) What do you see as the purpose of the TEC/WG? (2) What do you think DOE wants to achieve? (3) What do you (your organization) want to achieve? (4) How well do you think the TEC/WG has achieved these goals? The presentation of findings in this section groups participants' responses into general categories; a more detailed listing of comments is included in Appendix D.

### **Purpose of the TEC/WG**

Participants envisaged a variety of purposes for the TEC/WG. Most frequently mentioned purposes were to

- Obtain input and incorporate stakeholder concerns into DOE transportation decisions — to "give guidance from our organizations' view of what would be safe from the perspective of our little world"
- Provide a mechanism for communication and information exchange
- Build relationships and trust — "give members confidence that DOE will have the integrity to do something about members' feedback"
- Work on issues and solve problems — "really help DOE transportation programs"
- Develop standards and coordinated transportation planning and implementation.

Other purposes, mentioned by only a few participants, were to develop consensus, enhance public perceptions and acceptability, keep DOE accountable, and ensure compatibility between State, Tribal, and Federal regulations. One person observed, with regret, that the purpose of the TEC/WG appeared to be evolving more toward emergency response and that he would like the group to "maintain some focus on safe operations."

### **DOE's aspirations for the TEC/WG**

Again, participants cited a variety of purposes, covering similar categories as for the previous question. However, responses were concentrated more clearly on one purpose, i.e., to resolve

institutional issues and enhance public acceptability. Typical responses were that DOE wished to

Ensure success in shipping, avoid hot water

Work cooperatively to avoid lawsuits and have transportation run smoothly

Balance decisions with the needs and concerns of people impacted by them — reduce controversy

Gain acceptance for high level waste shipments

Ensure legitimacy.

### **Participants' aspirations**

Responses to this question indicated that participants had three primary aspirations. Communication and information exchange were most frequently mentioned (slightly over one-third of the responses fell into this category); providing input and working on issues/solving problems received the next most frequent mention. Participants also cited a variety of other purposes, more specifically related to the interests and concerns of their constituencies. These included, for example, "Recognition of Tribal governments as viable players with jurisdiction," "Be sure decisions do not have an adverse impact on the railroads," and "See that the needs of local emergency responders are addressed." Three participants expressed a lack of certainty about their intended role and TEC/WG activities.

Examples of participants' purposes related to communication and information exchange include

Advanced information on initiatives, information sharing, and understanding of the reasons behind initiatives

Information from the really critical people in this area — police, fire, emergency responders.

### **Achievement of purpose**

Participants' assessment of whether the TEC/WG was actually accomplishing its purpose were mixed. Slightly under one-third gave very positive assessments, with comments such as, "In the past three years, we have seen a positive transition in coordination efforts among the different participants," "I myself am absolutely achieving what I want (forum for communication and confidence that DOE will have integrity to do something about it)," and "DOE has done fairly well in terms of coordination; the Western Governors' Association (WGA) has done well, e.g., cesium campaign protocols."

The largest number, comprising slightly over one third of respondents, gave qualified ratings indicating that the group was "moving in the right direction" but had further to go; that the purpose was being achieved for EM but not for OCRWM; or expressing concern about the long term viability of the group, i.e., "Once the leading EM individuals leave, will TEC/WG still be pushed?"

The remainder were almost equally divided between those who were uncertain and those who believed that the TEC/WG had not achieved participants' goals. Answers here ranged from, "Not sure for DOE," "Unclear given budget cuts," to "Neither party has achieved their goals." Reasons given for non-achievement included the need for smaller working groups, a greater consensus orientation, and slippage of the repository schedule.

### 4.3 Rating of the TEC/WG on Four Factors

#### Effectiveness in organization, process, and procedures

Mean score:	7.1
Median:	7
Mode:	8
Range:	3-10

Overall, both the numerical rating and comments on this factor were very positive. A majority of participants believed that DOE had "done a good job" — that the right infrastructure was in place, representation was good, information was well organized, and meeting format/procedures were very good. Several participants noted a demonstrable improvement over time. The breakout sessions were identified as being especially effective. Views of the *Resource Notebook* were mixed: two participants found it to be very beneficial in providing a means of tracking what had happened; two participants found it confusing and overly complex, especially the Roman numerals, detailed workplans, and revision notations.

Critical comments reflected concern that the potential of the working group was not being realized. Several participants were critical that the group was "caught up in too much minutiae — there is too much focus on documentation and paperwork," and that it is "difficult to assimilate everything and to know where we are." A few participants commented that the group could be more effective if it were more collaborative in approach. As one member said, "DOE has put the right infrastructure in place by creating a forum where stakeholder dialogue can take place. The problem is that it is a one-way mechanism of communication." Another member noted that, while the information exchange had gone well, the group is too large to work effectively on issues as a whole body and that some subgrouping was needed. One member was critical of the blurring of membership status ("It's not clear who members are vs. who just shows up") and felt that the random assignment of members to breakout groups was not effective; in his view, participants should choose their own discussion topic and group in order to enhance focused discussion.

## Productivity in terms of products and achievements

Mean score:	5.1
Median:	5
Mode:	5
Range:	1-8

As shown above, numerical ratings on this factor were low relative to other scores. Comments were similarly more critical overall. While a few participants expressed positive views, the majority were critical. Participants who expressed more positive views observed, for example, that they were "impressed with the productivity despite budget cuts." Several cautioned that "It takes time, but the important things do get done in the end," "There has been a drastic improvement since the DOE reorganization and also, it has taken a few years to see results," and "We have produced some useful definitions and the safe transportation products are especially important; more needs to be done, but the conflict in TEC/WG reflects the conflict in the larger society."

Critical comments primarily reflected frustration that the initiative was not reaching its full potential and that the group could achieve more if structured differently. Several participants, for example, voiced concerns that "there is talk but not actions; nothing concrete or specific ever develops," "constant slippage of milestones occurs," and that the TEC/WG seems to "come up with the same issues and doesn't work on action plans to resolve and get closure."

One participant emphasized that the products of the TEC/WG should be "DOE decisions that result from our input. But this is not happening!" In his view, "The product suffers because of a lack of consensus building; DOE is not willing (and may not be able) to adopt a consensus approach." Others, who felt that the TEC/WG was not very productive because of the size of the group, recommended the use of subcommittees or task groups to focus on a few issues. For example,

We seem to produce more internal products, especially re process. Not sure how useful these are outside of TEC/WG. I'd like to see more policy briefs — background issues, possible solutions, with small task groups of TEC/WG/DOE. We get bogged down in process and procedures.

We're caught up in the minutiae of things. Should work together to identify 3 or 4 issues that are important to get done and then work on those. Waste of time reviewing items.

We're not getting the full benefit. No opportunity to hammer through the issues...Training is the best example [of what should be done] — task group gets down to the guts of things then brings it back to the larger group.

**Impact on DOE transportation programs and transportation emergency preparedness, safety, and acceptability**

Mean score:	5.5
Median:	5.8
Mode:	7
Range:	1-9

On this factor also, numerical ratings were low relative to other scores and comments less positive overall, although scores ranged as high as 9.0. In general, responses reflected uncertainty. A significant proportion of participants said that they did not know whether an impact had occurred. As one member observed, "It is difficult to evaluate. The real goal is to make DOE change internally and we cannot see this." Some participants sensed that "an important culture change was occurring" but that it was "too early to say" or that "DOE is a big organization and it takes time for things to get through." Several felt that it would be helpful if DOE communicated to members how TEC/WG input had affected decisions. As he explained, "It's not clear there has been an impact. It would help if DOE would tell us, e.g., draw up a one-pager identifying just how TEC/WG has changed things."

Almost half of the participants, however, expressed clearly positive or clearly critical views, with almost twice as many critical as positive comments. Those who expressed positive views pointed out that, because of the TEC/WG, "DOE is more aware of concerns out there," is "no longer operating in a vacuum," and "is really trying to listen and implement things." In addition, effective coordination of the cesium and nitric acid shipments were identified here and throughout the discussions as examples of positive TEC/WG impact.

Criticisms focused on the lack of evidence of impact, that Headquarters "is unable to control Field Offices who do what they want," or that the impact could be seen in EM but not in OCRWM. One person, for example, noted "a disconnect between issues and policy," another that he had "not seen any impact and it has not been communicated." Another, critical of OCRWM, emphasized that "It's too early to tell. There has been a bigger impact on EM than on OCRWM. OCRWM is not coming to the table to ask for input — they're coming but they don't really want input." Yet another stated, "I hope [there is an impact]. I do see it for EM (e.g., the nitric acid shipments). But OCRWM is in disarray and hasn't got it together."

**Pertinence of charter and purpose**

Mean score:	7.6
Median:	8
Mode:	8
Range:	3-10

The numerical ratings on this factor were among the highest of all items in the evaluation, although over a quarter of the participants did not provide a score and, significantly, approximately one fifth of all participants acknowledged that they had not read or could not remember the charter. Comments, generally, reflected strong support for the process as a "great philosophy" and an important and useful approach that was "focussing on the right issues," and was "headed in the right direction." Only a few reservations were expressed, specifically that "the intention is good but the design is somewhat flawed," that the discussions were dominated by a focus on emergency response and inadequate attention to inspection and enforcement issues; and that, while the mission statement was "fine" the key lay in interpretation. As the latter person asked, "Is it DOE leading everyone or is it everyone working/cooperating together?"

#### **4.4 Achievement of Performance Goals**

As discussed in Section 3.3, TEC/WG members had previously assisted in identifying six performance goals to serve as the basis for the evaluation. Two of these six goals were subsequently divided into two subgoals as a result of responses to an early pilot of the interview protocol. This subdivision is noted under the pertinent sections.

##### **Goal One: Address the important issues and problems concerning emergency preparedness and the safe and secure transport of DOE radioactive materials and shipments**

Mean Score:	7
Median:	7
Mode:	8
Range:	2-9

Overall, participants appeared to agree that the important issues and problems were being addressed. Just over half of the participants added no comments to their numerical ratings; however, almost all of these persons gave higher than average ratings, indicating that their lack of comment reflected satisfaction with the TEC/WG's performance on this goal. Among those providing comments, several specifically mentioned that they thought issues were being addressed. One person emphasized that the basic problem, which was outside of TEC/WG control, was continued on-site storage that was adding to utility costs and posing safety concerns.

About one third of those interviewed were critical of TEC/WG's performance on this goal, primarily because of dissatisfaction with how issues, once identified, were being dealt with. Two persons were critical of the lack of a consensus process to identify and/or address the issues, another believed that there was a disconnect between issues and policy, and yet another that "DOE was too concerned about legalities to do anything of substance." The majority of those who were critical expressed reservations about complete achievement on this measure; these comments, in general, reflected a feeling that the TEC/WG was "getting there" but that

they were "not yet there." For example, there was uncertainty about whether issues were prioritized adequately, and, in particular, whether anything was being done about them; as one member observed, "Issues are addressed, but not resolved — issues have been brought up — that was encouraging in the beginning, but they are talked about but not resolved."

Specific issues that were mentioned as needing more attention included medical emergency issues; routing; training, equipment, and 180(c); and the planning process in general. One person observed that it was "mostly OCRWM issues that have not been adequately addressed."

**Goal Two: Exchange information and improve coordination among appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations with responsibility for DOE transportation activities.**

This goal was subdivided into two components, in response to participants' comments on initial discussions.

**Exchange information:**

Mean score:	7.1
Median:	8
Mode:	8
Range:	1-9

**Improve coordination:**

Mean score:	6.5
Median:	7
Mode:	7
Range:	1-9

As shown above, numerical ratings were slightly higher for exchanging information; however, many participants did not distinguish between exchanging information and improving coordination. More comments were made about information exchange than about improved coordination.

Exchange information

The majority of these comments were very positive, reflecting participants' appreciation for DOE's "excellent job" in "creating the opportunity for exchanging information," and in being "willing to share information," and "being more upfront about what they have to deal with." There was particular praise for DOE's prompt distribution of information and for getting people talking "who normally wouldn't." As one person noted, "This is what TEC/WG does really well — lots of good information exchange." Another summarized his evaluation as follows:

Very useful, DOE providing information about its structures, programs, how they function and the same holds true for giving DOE an idea of what the important issues are for member organizations.

A primary criticism related to information exchange was the extent of internal DOE communication. Several persons expressed concern that, while there had been a "vast improvement" with external organizations, "internally things have not improved substantially." As one person emphasized, "In our working relationship, there has been very little communication within DOE that we can observe — it would be better if TEC/WG were communicated more widely within DOE."

Other criticisms were that the exchange of information, especially written information, has been slow; that turnover is high — too many new people (DOE and others) present at each meeting; that too much intra-DOE talk occurs; that more focus and representation is needed on medical preparedness and health effects; and that "There is too much exchange of information — TEC/WG does a good job of sharing information, but to what end?" One member observed that communication problems within his own organization made it difficult to achieve this TEC/WG goal.

#### Improve coordination

Comments on coordination, though much less extensive, in general paralleled those on information exchange. Examples of positive comments were that "again, DOE has done an excellent job of creating an opportunity," that "I have been pleased... at TEC/WG, I meet with and coordinate with a lot of people I would not otherwise. It has really helped me." One person observed that coordination and information were linked: "TEC/WG has improved coordination. TEC/WG discussions and reports improved coordination in nitric acid and cesium shipments and helped with needed contacts and relationships."

Critical comments again primarily focused on coordination problems internal to DOE. One participant emphasized that this is "a major challenge for DOE, especially where there are a lot of mindsets to change"; another observed that the goal "has been achieved for outside organizations to a greater extent than for DOE internally." Two persons noted especially the need to include DOE transportation managers, commenting that

DOE regional and area offices responsible for transportation are still not at the table...They are the ones doing the transportation and they're not here.

#### **Goal Three: Identify, characterize, and reach closure on priority transportation emergency preparedness and coordination issues.**

This goal was also subdivided into two components, in response to comments from survey participants.

**Identify and characterize:**

Mean score:	7.4
Median:	8
Mode:	8
Range:	4-10

**Reach closure:**

Mean score:	4.6
Median:	4.8
Mode:	5
Range:	1-7

The two components of this goal were rated very differently by most participants. As shown above, numerical ratings for identifying and characterizing issues were high, while ratings for reaching closure were much lower. Comments were similarly much more positive for the former and primarily critical for the latter.

Identify and characterize issues

Almost twice as many respondents provided positive as critical comments in relation to identifying and characterizing issues. In addition, of the participants who gave ratings without adding comments (slightly over half), ratings were almost always higher than the average — an indication that lack of comments on this issue reflected satisfaction with TEC/WG performance on the goal. One person observed that "most issues have been raised and discussed"; another praised the inclusion of railroads over the past few years, since there are so many issues that involve them. Another summarized his views as follows:

Doing a good job here; excellent job. Stakeholders have an excellent idea of what the issues are; they have been doing a good job, especially with addressing training and training requirements.

More critical comments related to overly complex processes and procedures, inadequacy of issue prioritization, and concern that OCRWM was not engaged. One person, for example, complained that the TEC/WG is "bogged down in process, procedures, and semantics and doesn't see things in terms of operations." Another person commented that there was a need to prioritize issues in terms of "what would be the most bang for the buck," but that this is difficult to do with a group that meets only twice a year. One person expressed concern that "OCRWM is not 'in' the process, not listening — maybe not the right people, or people who are there don't know that times have changed."

## Reach closure

Numerical ratings on this goal were the lowest in the evaluation. Comments were also almost uniformly very critical, although one member observed that "It takes longer to reach closure — it's not as easy as identifying issues, but TEC/WG is working at it," and another pointed to the difficulty of maintaining continuity, given the many new participants at meetings and the opportunity to meet only twice per year. Criticism centered primarily on the slowness of the process and the need for restructuring the way that the TEC/WG operates. Several persons were strongly critical that "It always takes so long; the same issues seem to drag on and on," and that "We never seem to get to closure, e.g., we've been waiting for a definitive decision on routing even though States already know what the routes are — DOE seems to be holding back and I don't know why. States won't be ready if the Monitored Retrievable Storage facility (MRS) is built soon." Several, echoing suggestions made in response to other items included in the discussion, pointed to the need for a different structure — for a reorientation towards a consensus organization or the establishment of subcommittees or task groups to focus on selected issues.

### **Goal Four: Enhance overall DOE transportation organization, coordination, and implementation (consistency, safety, efficiency, cost effectiveness, application of lessons learned).**

Mean score:	6.2
Median:	7
Mode:	8
Range:	1-9

Numerical ratings were about average; however, over one-quarter of respondents declined to provide a score, and uncertain comments predominated for this goal. Only one-quarter of the participants gave positive comments or gave no comments, but rated performance higher than average. Almost one-quarter of TEC/WG participants said that they did not know whether this goal was being achieved. Approximately one-third were doubtful or felt that little or no impact was occurring.

Those who provided positive comments along with their numerical rating praised DOE for establishing a "good infrastructure" and pointed to the "cultural shifts" taking place, the "great changes in the way DOE is operating," and the fact that "people are talking who previously didn't." Production of "guidance documents that apply across programs" and actual behavior in recent shipping campaigns were also noted as evidence that DOE is "moving in the right direction." One person observed,

In EM, they are desperately trying [to do well], and the nitric acid shipments show how well they did. Spent fuel shipments weren't so good, but there were extenuating circumstances. It's difficult to change entrenched behavior and attitudes.

Among those who were doubtful or could see no impact, primary concerns were whether TEC/WG discussions were having an impact outside of the meetings and that more feedback was needed from DOE. Several pointed to the fragmentation and size of DOE: "DOE is very fragmented and I'm not sure if TEC/WG discussions move up and get implemented," and "The difficulty is getting word to the larger DOE organization outside of TEC/WG." One person complained that "We need more people here who actually do the work," and another person emphasized,

Coordination is improving but implementation is weak. We need feedback from DOE, e.g., have the transportation managers come and talk about the *Program Manager's Guide to Transportation* — tell us where it helped, where it didn't help.

**Goal Five: Enhance participant organizations' ability to carry out transportation emergency preparedness and safety responsibilities related to DOE radioactive materials shipments.**

Mean score:	6.2
Median:	6
Mode:	5
Range:	2-9

In general, participants agreed that the TEC/WG had enhanced their organizations' ability to carry out transportation responsibilities. One-third of the comments were very positive, while only a few critical or qualified comments were provided. One respondent stated that his response was qualified because of communication problems within his own organization that prevented change from occurring.

Positive comments indicated that participants especially appreciated the information that they were able to provide to their respective organizations. Several persons emphasized, "We find that DOE keeps us in the loop on what is going on. It is a big advantage to know what is on the agenda and what is coming down the road," and "The information we take back from TEC/WG has helped give some of our members a more pragmatic approach."

Critical or more qualified comments primarily reflected participants' concern that the TEC/WG had not been of practical help to their organization — that "[railroad] issues were raised but not resolved," that "we got a grant to do something, but I don't think there has been a lot generated that has done an emergency responder much good," and that the TEC/WG produced "ideas but no plan of action (I'd like to see something more concrete in terms of policy and have concrete planning activities take place, e.g., similar to the subcommittee on training which really did something)." One person pointed out that it would take time before a difference could be seen ("Not until shipments are underway and emergency response is activated.") Another observed:

The goal begs the question of whether DOE is focusing on short or long-term strategies. The short-term strategy of giving information to contacts is good. But I see no evidence of joint work on long-term strategies (planning, resource allocation, reducing risk)."

**Goal Six: Resolve institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system (remove barriers to the safe, acceptable transport of DOE radioactive shipments).**

Mean score:	6
Median:	7
Mode:	5
Range:	1-9

In terms of numerical ratings, this goal received the second lowest score. There were a few clearly positive comments; however, the majority indicated mixed evaluations of TEC/WG's performance on this goal and, indeed, mixed views about what should be done to improve performance. In general, comments reflected a belief that progress had been made but that further progress was needed.

Positive comments primarily indicated appreciation for the relationship-building facilitated by the TEC/WG, that "there is a lot to deal with" and it is an "on-going process." One person's comments epitomized the general feeling expressed in positive evaluations:

Dealing with stakeholders helps DOE and stakeholders drop prejudices about DOE and each other; the ability to work with DOE — competent professionals, concerned, trying to help improve things — has helped.

More typical comments, however, were that the TEC/WG was "good, but not as good as it should have been," and that there is "still a way to go." Participants expressed a variety of concerns about what should be changed, or focused on more intensively. Examples cited included 180(c); railroad issues; whether the people at TEC/WG were the right people (e.g., "Will [OCRWM individual] be responsible for shipping?"); the need to include representatives from other Federal agencies to ensure discussion across Federal agencies; the need to include environmental groups, particularly when industry was represented; stakeholders who were "parochial" and unwilling to compromise; variation in achievement across DOE ("Headquarters, high; area and site offices, just beginning; OCRWM is about to blow it completely"); and the need for a consensus orientation and focus on issue resolution as opposed to issue raising.

## 4.5 Most Valuable Achievements of the TEC/WG<sup>2</sup>

As described below, participants praised a variety of TEC/WG achievements:

(1) opportunities for dialogue; (2) product development and program impact; (3) relationship-building; (4) better understanding and increased trust of DOE; (5) increased understanding by and coordination within DOE; (6) increased understanding and awareness of other organizations' viewpoints; and (7) provision of information.

### Opportunities for dialogue

Identified as a primary achievement of the TEC/WG, the success of the working group in “creating ongoing dialogue on important transportation topics and bringing together concerned stakeholders to facilitate communication both with DOE and among stakeholder groups,” and “the opportunity to gain information and have a forum to exchange and communicate with other interest groups — more than any document or product...” was widely praised. The TEC/WG was seen as successful in “serving as a conduit for getting a very broad perspective on issues,” and DOE was credited with having “identified a wide range of stakeholders that have a vested interest in transportation and established a good structure that provides opportunities for them to come together and interact.”

### Product development and program impact

Products and impact on transportation programs were identified almost as frequently as opportunities for dialogue as a primary achievement of the TEC/WG. Among the specific products identified as TEC/WG achievements were the following (with participants' comments):

- Training: Helped survival of the Radiological Emergency Response and Operations (RERO) training, which is not available elsewhere and is extremely valuable; addressing training requirements regarding emergency response; training exercise they are going through.
- Planning: Developed decent plans, especially on the highways (though progress on emergency response has not been so good); beginning the planning process of how to respond to an emergency; the *Program Manager's Guide to Transportation Planning*; task orders, which appear to be getting worked on.
- Research: Hank Jenkins-Smith's studies — really useful for us at the local level to get feedback on what perceptions are so we can deal with them better.

---

<sup>2</sup>This section and subsequent sections of the report highlight a few comments that provide examples of the much more extensive list of achievements that were identified under each category. A detailed listing is included in Appendix D.

Tools: Glossary which is a great reference (have installed it on my computer and made it a part of our State plan); the *Resource Notebook*, which I use for so many things; arriving at uniform/working definitions.

Inspection: Streamlining the inspection program.

Programs: Actually having proven the results in enhanced safety protocols in recent shipping campaigns; cesium campaign demonstrates the direct benefit — DOE followed their *Program Manager's Guide for Transportation Planning* for talking and listening to people/addressing concerns and explaining why not, where they could not; participation of stakeholders in forming 180(c) policy.

### **Relationships/interactions and networking**

Opportunities to develop relationships, make contacts, and interact with representatives from other organizations were also identified as important achievements. The ability to “develop working relationships so that people know who to contact if needed,” to get to “know people with expertise whom we can call, ”and the “opportunity to interact with transporters, especially railroads, with whom Tribes have historically had a poor relationship...” providing the hope that “interaction will result in railroads’ willingness to discuss/negotiate and enable us to work together to solve problems,” are illustrative of the comments made about the value of relationships/interactions and networking.

### **Increased understanding**

Many participants identified the increased understanding that developed as a result of TEC/WG as one of its most valuable achievements. Three particular aspects of increased understanding were noted: (1) increased understanding and trust of DOE by the participants and their organizations; (2) increased influence by the participants and their organizations on DOE and an accompanying increase in coordination and understanding by DOE; and (3) increased awareness and understanding by participants and participating organizations of one another’s viewpoints and capabilities.

The following comments illustrate how the first of these three aspects of increased understanding was characterized by participants: TEC/WG helps “representatives of national organizations get a better understanding of how DOE is prepared (or not prepared) to ship”; “Through TEC/WG, organizations have an avenue to learn about future shipments, who are the contacts, what is needed as well as to provide input on notification procedures”; “Among the TEC/WG group itself, there is a better feeling and view of the DOE transportation program in general and .... heightened awareness of the lengths that DOE goes in terms of the campaigns, planning, procedures, etc.”; “An achievement has been the rebuilding of stakeholder trust.”

## **Information exchange**

The provision and exchange of information was identified as another valued achievement of the TEC/WG. The TEC/WG was credited with helping participants keep “abreast of developments in the field,” bringing “information to the organizations that need to know...,” and supporting “information exchange among all members and DOE.” This information exchange was also seen as useful in helping participants develop a clearer picture about the role and approach of other organizations.

### **4.6 Factors Contributing to TEC/WG Effectiveness**

Participants expressed general agreement about the factors contributing to the effectiveness of the TEC/WG: (1) The characteristics and performance of DOE leaders and staff, (2) the composition of the group, (3) the behavior of participants, and the (4) meeting structure and process.

#### **The characteristics and performance of DOE leaders and staff**

The commitment, attitude, and hard work of DOE’s TEC/WG leaders and staff were cited by an overwhelming majority of those interviewed as being a key factor in the TEC/WG’s effectiveness: participants frequently commended the performance of specific individuals. Particularly, the “integrity and responsiveness of DOE personnel, who always respond to my telephone calls...are easy to work with, are really concerned and trying to help improve transportation”; the “open-mindedness and caring on DOE’s part”; the “commitment”; “caliber”; “dedication”; “hard work”; and the “efforts and genuine concern from DOE” were attributes noted as important, beneficial characteristics of the DOE leaders and staff.

#### **Composition of the Working Group**

The composition of the Working Group, specifically the diversity of the group and viewpoints represented, was identified as another key factor contributing to TEC/WG effectiveness. TEC/WG management was praised for bringing together the “right people” and for getting “practitioners together — key people representing diverse interests...,” which was acknowledged as requiring a “real commitment on the part of DOE.” Some criticisms were expressed, however. One participant emphasized the need to include FEMA, DOT, and NRC “in the running of the TEC/WG, not just as occasional visitors”; and another commented that “New groups (e.g., Nuclear Energy Institute) should not have been brought in without discussion with the group.”

#### **Behavior of Working Group participants**

The open-minded attitude and behavior of working group participants themselves were identified as a third factor contributing to TEC/WG effectiveness. The TEC/WG’s dependence upon “stakeholder dedication — people showing up” and the “cooperativeness and

patience of stakeholders” was acknowledged. The “value placed on speaking to the point and presence of participants who sincerely were trying to use their time to get something constructive done” were noted as important factors, as was the “openness of sharing information; DOE’s and the whole group’s willingness to listen to what the stakeholders have to say.” One participant summed it up as the “attitude of personnel involved — everyone has a good attitude of working together. DOE set the stage and now this positive attitude is demonstrated among most of the members also.”

### **Meeting structure and process**

Several aspects of the meeting arrangements were identified as contributing to the effectiveness of the TEC/WG. More frequently mentioned aspects were the process, structure, logistics, preparation of information, and provision of funding. Having the opportunity for everyone “to present and discuss their issues and concerns” and avoiding having the discussion “dominated by one point of view” were noted, as was the importance of the “meeting support mechanism,” the “purposefulness in procedures and moving the discussion along,” the “work that goes into the meetings and preparing information,” and “having funding to allow us to attend.” The practices of “getting information out promptly,” providing “good briefing materials,” and having the “breakout sessions followed by the plenary session” were also identified as contributing factors.

### **4.7 Changes that Would Increase Effectiveness**

Participants identified a variety of changes that they felt would increase the effectiveness of the TEC/WG. In descending order of frequency, participants recommended changes in (1) representation, composition, and continuity of membership; (2) meeting format; (3) formation of subcommittees; (4) feedback from DOE; (5) DOE actions, preparation, and presentation; (6) communication; and (7) focus/prioritization.

#### **Representation, composition, and continuity of membership**

The composition of the TEC/WG was the primary aspect that a number of participants agreed needed change. A majority of the comments identified additional stakeholder groups whom they felt should be represented; others were more general in nature, e.g., recommending consistent attendance and involvement of current members and concern about problems with lack of continuity in attendance.

Specific groups who were identified for inclusion were smaller railroads; all of DOE transportation interests; a broad range of DOE personnel from different departments; other Federal players (NRC, DOT, FEMA) to ensure a "more coordinated approach...and look at a problem from a systems perspective"; increased Tribal participation (and funding); environmental groups; contingency planners; more health effects and health professionals (someone from the American Medical Association, radiobiologists, and epidemiologists); local

counties; and local fire fighters who could provide input from providers closest to the response.

### **Meeting format**

Participants recommended a variety of changes to the format of meetings, some reflecting divergent views among participants. Changes that were recommended by more than one participant were

Include more time for interaction, either by cutting back on the plenary session to allow for another breakout session or by making plenaries more interactive

Improve facilitation in some of the breakouts

Modify the seating (it says something about orientation)...sit in a circle or horseshoe rather than auditorium style which emphasizes "I'm here, you're there."

### **Formation of subcommittees**

A third, frequently mentioned recommendation was to establish subcommittees (smaller working groups or task forces) that would allow members to focus on specific issues and report back to the larger group. This recommendation also surfaced in other parts of the discussion in addition to the specific question on recommended changes. Several participants spoke highly of their recent experience with the training subcommittee and recommended this be used as a model. One participant summed up the general feeling on this issue:

Work together on subcommittees, really learning from one another...Put the stakeholders to work by breaking into smaller working groups focusing on specific issues. Currently, there are a lot of gifted people sitting on their hands and unable to put their knowledge to work.

### **Feedback from DOE**

Another change recommended frequently, and with emphasis, at various points in the interview was that DOE should provide more feedback on how and where TEC/WG input was used and what impact the TEC/WG had on DOE. Participants wanted more feedback from DOE on "where TEC/WG helped," specifying "this is what we heard and this is what we've done as a result....especially what happened in DOE overall with our input." They requested that DOE "report back to TEC/WG about impact on the broader DOE structure — a system of measures," and suggested that DOE provide a short, written summary "spelling out very concisely 'this is what DOE did as a result of the last TEC/WG meeting.'" Concrete demonstrations that DOE valued the TEC/WG were sought, such as having a high DOE official (such as the Secretary) attend a TEC/WG meeting, or "having transportation managers tell us how they actually used the *Program Manager's Guide to Transportation Planning* — what was useful, what wasn't, did it make a difference, what value it was to them."

## **DOE actions, preparation, and presentation**

Participants offered a variety of relatively specific comments about how DOE could modify its actions, preparation, and presentations to increase its effectiveness and the effectiveness of the TEC/WG. These recommendations ranged from suggesting that “DOE should avoid getting in the habit of talking among themselves about policy issues/budget problems” and showing “too much whining and disagreement” to observing that DOE should “avoid being too closure-oriented on task plans” and calling for “more communication within DOE — at the meeting but most especially beyond the meeting within the overall DOE organization” and suggesting that “DOE try to cut down on different DOE groups and streamline DOE internally” perhaps by meeting “among themselves to coordinate internally.” Comments also included recommendations about changes that should not be made, for example, admonishing DOE to “maintain commitment to cooperative agreement groups, which are the backbone of the TEC/WG.”

### **Communication**

Participants also offered a variety of suggestions about how communication could be improved. Simplification, reduction of paperwork, and better organization of pre-meeting material was recommended. The need for a “short, simple, concise one-pager that highlights issues/successes” and the value of getting the *Resource Notebook* in better shape were noted. To counteract the impact of the large size of the group, a recommendation was made that participants needed more informal interaction, such as going to dinner together.

### **Focus/prioritization**

Participants made a number of suggestions about how the TEC/WG could achieve greater, more effective focus and more productive discussions. These included recommendations to “take another stab at prioritization” and to make an effort to determine “how to work together” to reach closure on 3-4 key issues. Included in these comments were some recommendations for specific activities/approaches, for example, to “Define some scenarios (practical, worst-case scenarios) that must be dealt with ...and saying ‘what would you do to deal with them; ’” and to “have more technical (health) discussions.”

## **4.8 Prioritization**

### **Views of prioritization**

Almost all participants agreed that prioritization constituted an important focus for the TEC/WG. There was some minor disagreement as to whether this had been accomplished effectively; however, comments on this question included evaluations such as “good,” “essential,” “key in a variety of ways,” “gives a point of direction and moves the entire system forward.” More broadly, prioritization is “where TEC could be most useful.....TEC is not

only a technical group, but a group for building relationships and credibility — mutual support — where you can support each other in different contexts."

An important concept, stemming not from the immediate question but from the discussion of subcommittees, was that the TEC/WG is of value not simply for addressing DOE issues, but also for the organizations themselves: specifically, the TEC/WG can be a key mechanism to help the various organizations coordinate and address their own radioactive transportation material issues and responsibilities. As one participant observed

Prioritization should involve a dual role. Participating organizations should have some organizational leadership within TEC where we could highlight issues that are concerns for *us* and prioritize them for review and presentation — dialogue with respect to agendas.

Several participants cautioned that "the issue is not prioritization but how to go about issues identification" and that there was a need to address everyone's priority issues. For example, prioritizing by means of a majority vote may overlook issues that are important to a particular group; the composition of the group could lead to putting the priorities of the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) or Indian tribes at the bottom of the list. There was almost uniform agreement among participants that the priority issues for their organization had persisted over time, albeit with "some fine-tuning."

### **Priority issues**

A wide range of issues were identified as priorities, reflecting the varied responsibilities and interests of the participating organizations. The priority issues included, in descending order of frequency of mention,

- Routing, specifically the need for defined routes in order to address 180(c) training needs
- Increased capability/preparedness, both collective and individual
- Operational safety, including mode of transport, instrumentation and equipment, inspection and enforcement, escorts, bad weather/safe parking
- Rail shipments, including routing, cask and rail car design and safety, rail security, speed limits, escorts, and the use of dedicated trains
- Training, both general and specific, including the source of funding
- Notification and tracking, including advance notification and emergency notification
- Funding, including 180(c)

- The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), including application of lessons learned, "WIPP as a standard," for consistency across DOE programs
- Other, including general planning issues, ensuring/working toward compatibility of State and Tribal with Federal regulations, and issues of relationship and interaction (for example, Tribal issues, public awareness and acceptance).

#### **4.9 Representatives' Actions to Increase the Effectiveness of the TEC/WG**

The majority of participants emphasized the need for members' *active* participation in TEC/WG meetings if the TEC/WG is to be effective; only one participant expressed the view that the TEC/WG was "DOE's organization" and that he was therefore unsure if the individual representative bore any responsibility for the group's effectiveness. A few participants also identified actions that DOE might take to increase effectiveness.

Approximately one-third of the responses showed that participants viewed their responsibilities, generally, as "being prepared before TEC/WG, meeting beforehand with members of our own constituencies to discuss hot topics, and, after TEC/WG, relaying information/having a dialogue with constituency members."

Other interpretations of active participation included

Consistently participate to ensure continuity that would enhance substantive progress

Stay for the final plenary session to provide an opportunity to clarify issues and re-address important issues together

Interact more closely both informally and on subcommittees — developing real contacts and relationships would benefit DOE also

Speak up. Exercise leadership — request clarification if needed and give feedback. Also, emphasize to DOE that a feedback loop is needed; do not hesitate to tell DOE that TEC/WG participants need to hear back from them on what happened to our input.

Work outside TEC/WG meetings (subcommittees might stimulate more productivity).

Suggestions for DOE were to

Be responsive (without burdensome procedures) and give feedback

Provide continuity of DOE representatives and consistency of message

Be forthcoming and listen

Be more open to consensus

Provide a base level of financial support for members' attendance

Make decisions and inform members.

#### **4.10 Communication with Organizations**

Participants were asked whether they thought that communication to and from the participating organizations needed to be improved, and, if so, how this could be accomplished. Between one third and one half responded that they had no communication problem with their own organizations, although a few of these persons thought that other organizations had problems. Approximately one third acknowledged problems with their own organizations. Problems were primarily identified for national organizations, where, as one member said, "We are a national organization, an aggregate with different individual interests." A few members, acknowledging that communication was the individual members' responsibility, observed that either they, individually, needed to do a better job or that members, generally, needed to improve their performance. Several interpreted the communication issue as a DOE responsibility, commenting that the problem was lack of feedback from DOE or that the meeting summaries needed to be more succinct. One person observed that the problem had been that the issues discussed at the TEC/WG did not seem important to her organization.

When asked how communication could be improved, respondents provided few ideas. Over one-third responded that they were unsure. A common response was that members should exchange ideas with others during the TEC/WG meetings. As one member stated, "I'm looking for suggestions! This would be a useful topic to discuss at TEC/WG."

Other suggestions were that

- Members interested in the same issues should work together (one person recommended that State members get together and write a generic letter to their Governors)
- Organizations should be asked to prepare position papers on some of the issues, to force more attention within the organization.

#### **5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

The evaluation of the TEC/WG demonstrated widespread support among participants who were surveyed. Many offered constructive criticisms intended to improve the group's effectiveness.

## 5.1 Overall Value

*The TEC/WG is considered worthwhile and of high value to the participants and their organizations. There is strong support for the group to continue.*

The overall conclusion of the evaluation is that the TEC/WG is considered a worthwhile effort that adds value and is important to the participants and their organizations. Out of a possible score of 10.0, the overall value of the TEC/WG was rated 7.7, with no score lower than a 6.0. The TEC/WG is widely seen as serving an important function and operating in an effective way, receiving average scores of 7.6 for pertinence of charter and purpose and 7.1 for effectiveness in organization, process, and procedures.

Widespread support for the TEC/WG was expressed by participants. Almost all participants viewed it as a good use of DOE funds and saw a continuing need for either TEC/WG or a similar interaction mechanism. Criticism primarily reflected frustration that TEC/WG was not achieving its true potential and emphasized a desire to improve its effectiveness in enabling DOE, the participants, and their organizations to address issues affecting transportation safety and efficiency.

## 5.2 Performance Goals for the TEC/WG

Six performance goals reflecting DOE sponsor's and participants' aspirations for TEC/WG served as the cornerstone of the evaluation:

- Address the important issues and problems concerning emergency preparedness and the safe and secure transport of DOE radioactive materials and shipments
- Exchange information and improve coordination among appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations with responsibility for DOE transportation activities
- Identify, characterize, and reach closure on priority transportation emergency preparedness and coordination issues
- Enhance overall DOE transportation program organization, coordination, and implementation (consistency, safety, efficiency, cost effectiveness, application of lessons learned)
- Enhance participant organizations' ability to carry out transportation emergency preparedness and safety responsibilities related to DOE radioactive materials shipments
- Resolve institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system (remove barriers to the safe, acceptable transport of DOE radioactive shipments).

*The evaluation found that the*

- *TEC/WG is doing very well (average score of 7.0 or more) in achieving its goals of (a) addressing important issues and problems; (b) exchanging information; and (c) identifying and characterizing priority issues.*
- *TEC/WG is doing fairly well (average score between 6 and 7) in achieving its goals of (a) improving coordination; (b) enhancing the overall DOE program; (c) enhancing the participant organizations' ability to carry out their responsibilities; and (d) resolving institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system.*
- *TEC/WG is doing less well (average score below 5.0) in reaching closure on priority issues (part of the third goal).*

### **5.3 Key Achievements**

*Comments made in response to questions about the six performance goals as well as direct questions about TEC/WG achievements indicate that participants feel that TEC/WG has resulted in many positive outcomes.*

The most valued achievements of the TEC/WG fall into seven broad categories:

- Dialogue and communication
- Product development and program impact
- Relationships, interactions, and networking
- Better understanding and increased trust of DOE
- Increased understanding by and coordination within DOE
- Increased understanding and awareness of other organizations' viewpoints
- Provision of information.

The most frequently mentioned achievements concerned dialogue and communication and product development and program impact, reflecting the value participants placed on discussion, information exchange, relationships, and making a substantive contribution to the resolution of transportation issues. Those surveyed valued access to the network of participants and the information exchanged at TEC/WG meetings as significantly increasing the ability of the participating organizations to see the big picture and to fulfill their transportation responsibilities effectively. Appreciation for the opportunity to exchange information, build relationships, establish trust, and develop awareness and understanding of

one another's perspectives was broadly expressed. Participants placed high value on products and program impact and expressed a strong desire for greater emphasis on this category of achievements in the future.

#### **5.4 Factors Contributing to TEC/WG Effectiveness**

*Among the many factors identified as important to TEC/WG's success and effectiveness, participants particularly emphasized the leadership, commitment, and competence of key DOE staff, whom they identified as critical to the continued existence and effectiveness of the TEC/WG.*

They also commended the effective participation and constructive behavior of the representatives. The meeting structure and process, particularly the advance preparations, information dissemination and breakout sessions; the effort DOE expended in the preparation and dissemination of information; and the provision of funding by DOE were also identified as factors key to the effectiveness of the TEC/WG. The infrequency of meetings and the size and diversity of membership were identified as important constraints.

#### **5.5 Areas Needing Attention/Improvement**

*With few exceptions, participants' criticisms of the TEC/WG focused on areas that were seen as limiting TEC/WG's ability to achieve its full potential.*

Viewpoints about problems and potential solutions reflected the priorities, interests, and responsibilities of the organizations being represented: the diversity of the interests and responsibilities of the participating organizations was reflected in the diversity of viewpoints about which problems were the most pressing and what actions would best remedy the problem. For example, although many participants recommended some change in the composition of the TEC/WG, there was little agreement among the participants about the specific nature of that change — some felt that the group was too large and that efforts should be made to reduce it, others felt that the group needed to be expanded to include representatives from additional organizations, and still others felt that participant's roles needed to be changed (that the other Federal agencies with responsibility for transportation — DOT, NRC, FEMA — needed to play a more central role in the TEC/WG). There were similar differences in viewpoints about the importance of consensus as a focus and goal for TEC/WG interactions.

*There was widespread agreement that it was time for the TEC/WG to move on and to focus more time and effort addressing key issues such as routing, training, and rail transport.*

Although participants felt that an important, continuing function of the TEC/WG was to identify, characterize, and exchange information on issues, there was a strong call for modification of the emphasis and structure of the TEC/WG to enable participants to “dig in” to issues and to “get to work” to formulate solutions. This represents a rising awareness that

DOE is not, and should not be, responsible for solving all the important transportation safety problems and that the TEC/WG can serve as a forum for the representatives of the participating agencies to coordinate and focus their efforts to address transportation issues within their organization's scope of responsibility. To accomplish this goal, a number of participants recommended that the TEC/WG establish a subcommittee or working group structure.

Other frequently stated recommendations centered around a need for better feedback mechanisms, both from DOE to the TEC/WG, and from the participating organizations to DOE; a need for greater continuity of membership and attendance; and a need to address issues of focus and prioritization. Various recommendations were made about how to improve the TEC/WG meetings themselves, including ways to ensure all members' active participation. Particular concern was expressed about the OCRWM program and its interaction with the TEC/WG, which was seen as less open and less effective than EM in using the TEC/WG to address transportation issues.

## **5.6 Next Steps**

The evaluation suggests the following next steps:

- Develop a strategy to improve communication from the TEC/WG (to other levels and components of DOE and to the membership of the participating organizations) and feedback to the TEC/WG (from key components of DOE and from the participating organizations)
- Initiate the formation of smaller working groups or subcommittees
- Given the issues that need to be addressed, re-evaluate membership of the TEC/WG, recognizing that any change of membership or roles should be discussed with TEC/WG representatives
- Re-examine the processes and procedures for TEC/WG meetings and information exchange in light of the evaluation comments and identify ways to streamline and improve them
- Discuss TEC/WG's role in resolving issues and the issue of consensus
- Discuss OCRWM's role in relation to DOE program changes and budget restrictions and the concerns expressed in the evaluation.

Table 2, next page, presents a brief summary of the evaluation findings and recommendations for responding to them.

**Table 2.**  
**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

<b>Overall Value/Goals</b>	<b>Status based on Evaluation</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Value of the TEC/WG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly valued</li> <li>• Valuable for information exchange and participation <i>per se</i> that provides:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- credibility</li> <li>- legitimacy</li> <li>- relationships</li> <li>- accountability</li> <li>- expert input</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Appreciation for DOE commitment and individual EM staff efforts</li> </ul>	Continue with the TEC/WG
Goal 1: Address important issues	High score: Agreement that goal is being achieved, but concern that once identified, issues not dealt with and some issues need more attention	Establish subcommittees to focus on members' priority issues (routing, operations, rail, training)
Goal 2: Exchange information	High score: External communication very good; internal DOE communication not so good	Continue to work on internal DOE communication and coordination across programs
Goal 3: Identify/reach closure on priority issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify, high score: Doing good job (though paperwork needs streamlining)</li> <li>• Closure, low score: Doing poor job — issues "drag on"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss possible ways to streamline at next TEC/WG meeting</li> <li>• Establish subcommittees</li> <li>• Move on to next stage of addressing issues</li> </ul>
Goal 4: Enhance overall DOE transportation organization, coordination, implementation	Fairly high score: 25% high rating 25% did not know 33% need DOE feedback/saw no evidence of impact	Develop systematic DOE feedback mechanisms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- one-pagers</li> <li>- specific feedback item on each TEC/WG meeting agenda</li> <li>- provide feedback on evaluation at next TEC/WG meeting</li> </ul>

<p>Goal 5: Enhance member organizations' abilities to carry out transportation responsibilities</p>	<p>Fairly high score: Information especially useful for short-term needs - knowing what is coming up is very helpful</p>	<p>Continue good information exchange, but - increase emphasis on long-term planning efforts - discuss member communication mechanisms at next TEC/WG meeting</p>
<p>Goal 6: Resolve institutional/coordination issues</p>	<p>Fair score: Progress has been made; more is needed; more focus on products and outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shift focus from issue identification to working on issues (see 3 above)</li> <li>• Discuss role of the TEC/WG in resolving issues</li> </ul>
<p>Other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation - mixed views: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- additional groups may be needed</li> <li>- need to clarify membership size, though providing diversity, makes effectiveness difficult</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Meeting format - differing views <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- more interactive format</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Role of OCRWM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review list of organizations</li> <li>• Discuss meeting format and representation at TEC/WG meeting</li> <li>• Co-chairs discuss OCRWM's role</li> </ul>

## REFERENCES

- Alkin, M.C. 1990. *Debates on Evaluation*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, California.
- Nay, J.N. and P. Kay. 1982. *Government Oversight and Evaluability Assessment*. Lexington, Kentucky.
- Nay, J.N., J.W. Scanlon, R.E. Schmidt, and J.S. Wholey. 1976. "If You Don't Care Where You Get To, Then It Doesn't Matter Which Way You Go." In Abt, c.c., ed., *The Evaluation of Social Programs*, Sage Publications, Beverley Hills, California.
- Rosener, J.B. 1981. "User-Oriented Evaluation: A New Way to View Citizen Participation." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences* 17(4):583-596.

**APPENDIX A**  
**TEC/WG Charter**



## CHARTER

### MISSION

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) is one of several external coordination mechanisms established by DOE to implement parts of the Transportation Management Team, the Emergency Management Team, the Liaison and Communications (L&C) Program and the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program (RW). The DOE TEC/WG serves as a mechanism to help provide continuing and improved coordination between appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations having a responsibility for DOE transportation activities.

### OBJECTIVES

Through the TEC/WG, DOE interacts with representatives of organizations at the state, tribal, and local levels who are working cooperatively with DOE, to obtain input for program needs assessment, development and management, and to enhance their capability to carry out transportation emergency preparedness and safety activities specifically related to radioactive materials shipments.

With the overall objective of developing a consolidated, multi-year set of goals and plans of action, DOE and the state, tribal, local government, and industry members address the following issues.

- review funding and training requirements under Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, (including emergency response and safe routine transport);
- promote the functional integration of DOE emergency preparedness activities with the overall DOE transportation system;
- identify emergency response, planning, training, and exercise needs of responders;
- identify areas for DOE to coordinate activities with state, tribal, and local jurisdictions and industry and with other federal agencies and identify areas for DOE-specific initiative; and
- develop recommendations for providing technical assistance.

## **ORGANIZATION**

The TEC/WG chairperson coordinates the participation of appropriate DOE and contractor representatives and staff support. Participants are officially designated representatives of the organizations invited by DOE to become members of TEC/WG. DOE will request industry liaison participation as appropriate and will coordinate with other federal agencies through existing mechanisms such as the National Response Team and the Federal Radiological Preparedness Coordination Committee.

Members are divided into topical committees as needed.

## **RESPONSIBILITIES**

The TEC/WG chairperson and other DOE participants are responsible for providing feedback from the Working Group to various DOE elements such as the TEPP Steering Committee and the Internal Coordination Working Group. These DOE elements--which include DOE programmatic staff in transportation, emergency management, and public involvement--may be asked to provide specific comments and recommendations.

Members attend periodic meetings (approximately two each year) to review issues, exchange information, and identify program needs. They network back to their member organizations to exchange information and materials from the meetings and to seek further input. They are also available for occasional phone discussions with DOE program managers.

For continuity, members attend meetings themselves rather than send alternates, although alternates are preferred to no representation at all from the organizations.

## **MEMBERSHIP**

A list of participating organizations follows. TEC/WG members are those who have responsibility for transportation and emergency management planning activities as well as those who are responsible for implementation of response activities.

## **MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS**

**APPENDIX B**

**TEC/WG Member Organizations**

**TRANSPORTATION EXTERNAL COORDINATION WORKING GROUP  
CURRENT MEMBERSHIP**

AFL-CIO, Transportation Trades Department  
American Association of Port Authorities  
American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials  
American College of Emergency Physicians  
American Nuclear Society  
Association of American Railroads  
Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance  
Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors  
Contractor Traffic Management Association  
Cooperative Hazardous Materials Enforcement Development  
Council of Energy Resource Tribes  
Council of State Governments-Eastern Regional Conference  
Council of State Governments-Midwestern Office  
Emergency Nurses Association  
Hazardous Materials Advisory Council  
International Association of Fire Chiefs  
International Association of Fire Fighters  
International City/County Management Association  
Intertribal Transportation Association  
League of Women Voters  
National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians  
National Association of Chiefs of Police  
National Association of Counties  
National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners  
National Conference of State Legislatures  
National Conference of State Transportation Specialists  
National Congress of American Indians  
National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management  
National Emergency Management Association  
National Governors' Association  
National League of Cities  
National Tribal Environmental Council  
Nuclear Energy Institute  
Southern States Energy Board  
Training Resources and Data Exchange (Associate member)  
Transportation Research Board  
Urban Energy & Transportation Corporation (Associate member)  
Western Governors' Association  
Western Interstate Energy Board

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Interview Protocol**

**PRELIMINARY DRAFT INTERVIEW GUIDE**

**Introduction Statement:** This is xxx from Battelle PNNL calling to talk with you as part of the effort to evaluate the effectiveness of the TEC/WG. Judith Holm has asked us to help her conduct this evaluation that will provide information to DOE and all the TEC/WG participants about what is working well and what might make the TEC/WG more effective. We have about XX questions to ask you.

**Name (of Respondent):**

**Phone Number:**

**Organization:**

**Number of TEC/WG meetings attended:**

**A. Purpose of the TEC/WG**

- 1. 1a. What do you see as the purpose of the TEC/WG?
- 1b. What do you think DOE wants to achieve with the TEC/WG?
- 1c. What do you want to achieve with the TEC/WG?
- 1d. How well do you think they have achieved these goals?

**B. Rating of TEC/WG on the four factors.**

[Introduction describing the factors and process of developing them.]

First we would like to get your assessment of the TEC/WG on four factors that have been identified as important to participants' judgments about the effectiveness and value of the TEC/WG. On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is low and 10 is high, how would you rate the TEC/WG on the following factors?

- 2. Effectiveness in organization, process, and procedures. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
- 3. Productivity in terms of products and achievements. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 4. Impact on DOE transportation programs and transportation emergency preparedness, safety, and acceptability. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 5. Pertinence of charter and purpose, i.e., is the mission appropriate.  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |

**C. Achievement of Goals**

Next we would like to get your assessment of the TEC/WG performance on more specific performance goals. On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is low and 10 is high, how well do you think the TEC/WG has achieved the following goals?

- |   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| 6. Address the important issues and problems concerning emergency preparedness and the safe and secure transport of DOE radioactive materials shipments.                                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 7. Exchange information and improve coordination among appropriate DOE elements, other levels of government, and outside organizations with responsibility for DOE transportation activities. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 8. Identify, characterize, and reach closure on priority transportation emergency preparedness and coordination issues.   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |

Identify/Characterize

Reach Closure

- |   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| 9. Enhance overall DOE transportation program organization, coordination, and implementation [consistency, safety, efficiency, cost effectiveness, application of lessons learned]. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 10. Enhance participant organizations' ability to carry out transportation emergency preparedness and safety responsibilities related to DOE radioactive materials shipments.       | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 11. Resolve institutional and coordination issues across the transportation system [remove barriers to the safe, acceptable transport of DOE radioactive shipments].                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |

**D. Overall Value of the TEC/WG**

On the final questions of this type, we wanted to ask for your opinion about the overall value of the TEC/WG. On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is low and 10 is high, how do you rate:

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 12. The overall value of the TEC/WG to your organization (or your part of the organization). | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
| 13. The overall value of the TEC/WG to DOE   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |

**E. Summary**

14. From your perspective, what have been the three most valuable achievements or accomplishments of the TEC/WG?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

15. In your view, what three things have contributed most to the effectiveness of the TEC/WG?

1.

2.

3.

16. What three changes would most increase the effectiveness of the TEC/WG?

1.

2.

3.

17. One of DOE's priorities for the TEC/WG is to prioritize issues based on input from the participating organizations. How do you feel about this focus for the TEC/WG? What are the priorities of your organization?

18. What actions do you think you and representatives from the other member organizations have to take to make the TEC/WG work effectively?

19. Do think communication to and from the participating organizations needs to be improved? If so, how could be accomplished?

20. Overall, on a scale of 1 to 10, how do you rate TEC/WG?

21. When should the TEC/WG be ended?

22. Is the TEC/WG a good use of DOE funds?

Yes/No

Rating 1-10

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Participants' Comments**

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: OVERALL VALUE OF TEC/WG

### 1. Overall value of TEC/WG to your organization

#### Difficulty communicating within organization

Don't really know if [my organization] even knows about TEC/WG. I always talk at [my organization's] meetings, but never get any feedback. Our organization is divided into several departments that address specific needs of the organization — it affects some departments more than others — training and education, for example, more affected than others.

#### Valuable for communication/information exchange

- [2] Very valuable to have a way to make contacts and obtain information I would not get otherwise: very effective for communication. The meeting fulfilled my expectations about what I wanted to achieve. I really learned a lot about diverse perspectives.

TEC/WG is one of the major forums to have an opportunity to express our views to DOE and other stakeholders.

- [2] The most valuable aspect is the information. We know much more about the railroads and the concerns of other stakeholders, opportunity to give and receive information.
- [2] TEC/WG has already been of great value to us in helping us get information and do some of the networking we need to do. Also has helped me see the big picture more clearly and understand what DOE is trying to do: great value. *Resource Notebook* is especially useful; we get information at TEC/WG that is not available from other sources.

Good job of providing a forum, not so good in delivering outcomes. Good information exchange, at least in DOE.

#### DOE trying hard

- [2] DOE people involved are sincere and project the attitude that they want to hear and to the best job possible; Judith is making a heck of an effort — cesium, nitric acid, trust and mutual appreciation level is high.

I would hate TEC/WG to end because it serves as an important source of interface and removes distrust. DOE shows that they are really trying.

### Interaction/relationship

Also we are able to interact with DOE policy makers. TEC/WG is the only forum where high-level managers show they're available/concerned.

Our organization is very glad there is a group addressing issues. Not so much because we are looking for an impact, because we feel participation is very important.

Grouping of local managers and get point across.

It has value in changing the way DOE acts with the counties.

[2] It is really important — almost a 10. Important to be involved with it.

### Good but could achieve more

[2] Could be improved, but good; TEC/WG is good because it forces people who are busy to focus on important issues. But we could achieve more.

There are two perspectives — what could be and what has been. Could be of great value, but don't know if politically they can accomplish that. TEC/WG could swing a big ax and get a lot done, but not sure they are in a position to do it. Could be 8.5, performing at 6.

If looking a whether its existence is justified, it is, but should be taken into consideration with the additional comments — not even the average of all the scores that are given. Still, good things come out of it.

ENA needs to have information about precautions and safety measures and about when and how to do the training.

### Value dependent upon whether input is heeded

This assumes that our input (from railroads) is being listened to and incorporated.

### Suggestions on how to improve

TEC/WG could be a 9 or 10 if it were structured as the consensus organization that I advocate.

Low score because of my primary concern about the lack of a specific timetable that we can plan to.

But OCRWM is oblivious to this. Tired of their complaining about budget. Credibility check on what they have been doing, and as resource.

Coordination through States is a barrier — they keep money or don't communicate with others. Send someone to help people along the way with training and instruments — advisor with right information and equipment.

## 2. Overall value of TEC/WG to DOE

### Not DOE/don't know

- [6] Can't answer this. Don't know how effective/valuable we are to DOE; DOE needs to give feedback to us how TEC/WG helps. Not sure can answer for DOE; don't know, don't know, he's not in DOE. Hope it has value, listen to Judith and sounds like it does, but don't really know. Hard to say from this end. Don't know.

Question mark. Still a question mark. For Judith's organization it has been good, for some others has been ok — Don't know how to rate on scale. Out of RL we are getting a lot more cooperation and credibility when we talk to them, but INEL and Nevada, just now hearing.

### Important and valuable to DOE

- [4] I think it is valuable, as they are their main working meetings where they have an opportunity to meet many key stakeholders; Very important to DOE, also; provides good point of interaction for DOE — can't speak for DOE, but TEC/WG is probably more valuable to them than to us; very valuable because we get to vent frustrations, present concerns, etc. This kind of information from a diverse cross section must be invaluable.

For EM, the score would be an 8 and for OCRWM a 6. EM is reaping the benefit because they are actually shipping.

Especially valuable for DOE not to have to stand alone, but to have input from many experts in the field.

TEC/WG has a potential value to serve as a forum for DOE to recognize important issues related to transportation of radioactive materials.

Helps eliminate controversy and to do their job better.

More benefit to DOE than to us, to date. Ultimately it will flip-flop. Two-year period to get everyone up to same level, with only two meetings per year, everything

is slower, this is an added task to most of our jobs and work it in as have time and funding.

In the beginning, DOE was essentially trust-building but as a result of TEC/WG they are now getting a lot of useful information

#### Depends upon extent that input is heard and heeded

I hope it's high — but only if our input is listened to and incorporated; if they listen, but it is up to them what they do with the information.

- [2] Problem is that most of DOE does not realize the value. Judith has created a wide audience from all over the country that managers [could use] to discuss some of the most incendiary issues. The key is whether DOE top management realizes TEC/WG's importance. It is the right approach, but more information needs to be shared within DOE — although there have been improvements, there are still parts of DOE who should know about what happens in TEC/WG, but who don't.

Information they are trying to obtain will be very beneficial for them, but real issue is whether this information is actually used — what happens within DOE and the managers who actually make the decisions?

To those in DOE who have a sense of connection to the outside world, TEC/WG is as valuable as to the members. I sense a shift over the years, though not all DOE is as responsive as those who support TEC/WG.

#### Skeptical view

TEC/WG provides a lot of work for a lot of people, fulfills a requirement to communicate with public, focus on issues, internal communication requirement..

This would be DOE's rating — they're looking for appearance of regular contact with many key stakeholders — information exchange is really only one-way.

#### Miscellaneous — ways to improve

Management isn't looking for TEC/WG to be more than this. It could be of more genuine value (if consensus).

The overall value to DOE is less than for us because they have to deal with more minutiae than we — lots of other things they need to attend to as well as stakeholders to get the program going.

Score here could be higher if DOE were willing to work with people to develop a solution or policy — could have been more effective if they had worked with DOE rather than comment response approach on 180(c)

Rated this lower because DOE talks with many of the TEC/WG members at other times, also whereas there are some of the grass roots people (e.g., fire people) with whom I would not otherwise talk with.

All things considered, will keep attending and participating, and suppose people may be transposed, but it is frustrating constantly having to reeducate people about Tribal issues.

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: PURPOSE OF TEC/WG

### 1. Purpose of TEC/WG

#### Communication/information exchange

- [8] Two-way conduit of information; exchange/share information exchange; provide information; give sufficient notice of shipments.
- [5] Facilitate communication between DOE and those affected by transportation decisions; forum for communication; achieve on-going communication for OCRWM transportation decisions; forum to talk about policies and philosophies for radioactive materials; bringing a variety of people across the country into a forum.

#### Obtain input/incorporate stakeholders' concerns

- [7] Incorporate stakeholders' input into HLW transportation; provide and receive input; way of receiving input. DOE's attempt to open up the problems to stakeholders, allow for stakeholder input; allows DOE to get feedback on their activities.
- [8] Hear what concerns are, what issue are; provide input to DOE from outside on how stakeholders see things and hopefully encourage DOE to listen — it's a two-way street on how DOE should do their work; give guidance to DOE from our organization's view of what would be safe from the perspective of our little piece of the world; make transportation decisions based on an understanding of and accounting for the perspectives of the people who are affected by transportation; stakeholders play a part and give views; forum for people with concerns to express them/get them to DOE and others who make decisions re radioactive waste transport.

#### Build relationships/trust

- [3] Develop relationships; means for DOE to clean up its relationships with stakeholders which have historically not been good; avoid feeling of DOE shipments being pushed down our throats.
- [2] Enhance trust; give members confidence that DOE will have the integrity to do something about members' feedback.

### Work on issues/solve problems

- [2] Issue identification; work on issues that pertain to HLW transportation. Purpose is to determine the best avenue to take; address issues in a timely manner and really help DOE transportation programs.
- [3] Working group of stakeholders to solve SNF transportation problems; bring together stakeholders to figure out how DOE transportation would work better/be safe for every jurisdiction; way for people interested in OCRWM transportation to work together to make it happen safely, cost effectively, efficiently; collaborative efforts, e.g., training.

Provide guidelines for DOE shipping campaigns.

### Coordination

Coordination of DOE transportation effort from front-end planning and safety to coordination of the actual shipping.

Coordinate nationally the activities related to HLW shipment and disposal.

Input into standardization of shipping campaigns.

Develop standards/coordinated transportation plans and expectations for safe, uneventful movement of radmat.

### Enhance public perceptions/acceptability

Improve public perceptions of DOE.

Originally to legitimize DOE actions.

### Consensus

- [2] Build consensus; help DOE reach consensus by involving all key stakeholders in DOE's mission.

### Accountability

A means to keep DOE accountable.

### Other

Not sure.

Evolving more toward emergency response, would like to see it maintain some focus on safe operations.

Try to ensure that State and Tribal regulations are compatible with Federal regulations and work out some of discrepancies.

## 2. What DOE wants to achieve

### Resolve institutional issues/enhance public acceptability

- [6] Ensure success in shipping; avoid hot water; work cooperatively to avoid lawsuits and have transportation run smoothly; policy agreements that DOE could move forward; ease the institutional implementation of policies; balance decisions with needs and concerns of people impacted by them — reduce controversy; ensure shipments go more smoothly.
- [6] How public will respond to DOE decisions/avert problems; what issues they raise; better relationship with the public; ease public concerns about radioactive waste; gain acceptance for HLW shipments; open forum for interested parties to express concerns and DOE to formulate most amicable working relationship possible.
- [2] Legitimacy; validate DOE position; seeking feedback — to make more viable to the stakeholders and the public.

### Consensus

- [3] Develop consensus — get buy-in; build consensus/agreement.

### Communication/information exchange

- [2] Communication tool to provide outreach; show and tell to solicit reaction.
- [2] Information exchange.

More openness.

### Work on issues/solve problems

Try to get a head start.

Unify/standardize the way DOE does business.

Safe routing and proper disposition of HLW.

[4] Input and ideas on ways to achieve safe transportation.

Get expertise.

Transportation program that is workable.

Early warning system.

#### Trust/relationship building

[2] Trust in relationships with stakeholders.

Know people personally so know who to contact.

Except for OCRWM, goal is resolution of differences — put everything on the table for discussion and mutual resolution.

#### Coordination

[2] Better internal and consistent coordination within DOE.

#### Legal requirements

[2] Legal requirements/pr — meet public participation requirements of NWPA; mandated by 180(c).

#### Other

Was a goodwill gesture, but lot of different concerns, willing players and didn't have a clear idea of formal purpose.

### **3. What you want to achieve**

#### Communication/Information Exchange

[10] Exchange information from the really critical people — fire, police, emergency responders; disseminate and receive information.

Better communication.

[1] Communicate to members.

Communicate with DOE.

Opportunity for input

[2] Provide expert advice/input/feedback.

See broad transportation picture.

[2] Have input heard and implemented by DOE management; input to DOE before initiatives and processes go too far.

Provide and receive input.

Have concerns addressed/Gather specific information

Things that could potentially affect health care providers.

Advanced information on initiatives.

Understand reasoning behind initiatives.

Recognition of Tribal governments as viable players with jurisdiction.

See the needs of local emergency responders addressed so local responders are.

Information to communicate to constituents.

Gain knowledge and access to DOE/its constituents.

Be sure decisions not have an adverse impact on the railroads.

Guidance from TEC/WG on what the shipping routes will be.

Information on assistance for training and equipment.

Work on issues/solve problems

Safe transportation.

Efficient, cost effective, and safe program.

[2] Identify critical issues/discuss.

Lay out tasks and get something accomplished.

### Consensus

- [3] Consensus-seeking; participate in solutions; working together to build consensus.

### Coordination

- [2] Apply WIPP-WGA agreements to other areas.

### Uncertain

- [3] Not sure what my role is; didn't understand what was going on; getting more confusing as time rolls on.

### Enhance trust

Clarify understanding of diverse perspectives.

### Accountability

Monitor DOE activities.

## **4. How well achieving these goals**

### Achieving goals

Large measure achieving goals, though difficult to get feedback from own organization.

Process has done very well, achieving goals.

DOE and we are achieving goals fairly well.

DOE has done fairly well (goal is coordination). WGA has done well, e.g., cesium campaign protocols.

Fairly well — I support the idea of TEC/WG.

DOE has accomplished coordination — is moving that way. Judith Holm's shop is really trying.

Much better than it was a few years ago. DOE at least is listening much better than they did. Can see where States have input.

I myself am absolutely achieving what I want (forum for communication and confidence that DOE will have integrity to do something about it).

In the past three years, have seen positive transition in coordination efforts among the different participants.

#### Not achieving goals

TEC/WG has not achieved our goals, e.g., developed MPC without railroad input.

My organization has not achieved goals because date of repository keeps slipping.

Have not achieved my goal of consensus organization. Probably has achieved DOE's short-sighted goal ("show and tell," communication tool for outreach).

Neither party has achieved goals.

Would achieve goals better with smaller working group — DOE (OCRWM) doesn't receive and provide input as well as they should but tend to want to orchestrate and control meetings. Talk down to us while we talk up.

Minimal success — relationships haven't moved too far beyond where they would have been without TEC/WG.

DOE needs to keep an open mind about options.

I'm prejudiced because I think that DOE wants to improve perception rather than substance.

#### Not sure

[3] Not sure for DOE.

DOE probably frustrated because of diversity of opinion.

Not sure because only attended one meeting which I found confusing. Potentially valuable.

Hard to tell — seemed to have some momentum but now unclear given budget cuts.

Impression based on one meeting is yes, but this is too early to be definitive.

## Mixed/Qualified

EM is really trying. OCRWM doesn't know what they're doing.

Mutual expectations and role not being achieved now. OCRWM doesn't come with an open mind. They are going to do it their way — not listening, no joint effort. Other offices overall are willing to put things on the table and discuss.

We are communicating more, though I'm not sure if communications are directed to the right party (e.g., railroad concerns about 125-ton casks seem to be ignored — current talk in TEC/WG of a 150-ton cask which is way too heavy).

Biggest concern is the viability of the group — once leading EM individuals leave, will TEC/WG still be pushed?

For most part successful with all different viewpoints and good info exchange. But DOE sometimes forgets need to include Tribes along with States (e.g., one meeting ago, didn't include Tribes in inspection teams).

DOE achievements vary by campaign. Communication is going well for us, but need more Federal agencies at TEC/WG.

DOE is definitely moving in the right direction but we may find that regional differences make it very difficult to standardize training for emergency technicians.

TEC/WG has been having some impact but DOE's attitude with the Tribes is still after-the-fact (e.g., stoppage of recent shipment).

Mixed achievements — turnover of DOE personnel and intervention of interest groups have frustrated DOE.

Did well, especially at the beginning — laying out tasks and getting something accomplished got more confusing as time rolled on. *Notebook* got to be a bear to figure out. Need to go back to when we first started — progression and good tasks.

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: FOUR FACTORS

### 1. Effectiveness in organization, process, and procedures

#### Organization

Good Job:

- [6] Very organized re information — meeting procedures are good, e.g., keeping on track, chairperson does good job — breakout groups are especially good; workplans, DOE responses, meeting format; organization very good — plenary sessions good, breakouts even better, DOE people are super. The one meeting I attended seemed to show the effect of fine tuning and work devoted to make the best use of time; very process oriented — lots of organization/contractor help. Meetings well organized and good materials. Good follow-up. Done a good job.

Time well spent — get an overview of the program and Federal regulations and better handle on what tribes need to be mindful of.

- [3] Wouldn't have given such a high rating a year ago; can see problems, but have come a long way. Overall procedures have improved — especially marked improvement over the very first meeting in New Orleans — we're taking less time to accomplish more.

Qualified:

Don't see how DOE could have done it differently.

DOE has put in place right infrastructure by creating forum where stakeholder dialogue can take place. Problem is that it is a one-way mechanism of communication.

DOE controls meetings too much - talk down while we talk up. Need a more collaborative *work* group.

- [2] Too much paper. Simplify process and documentation. Need simpler way to communicate. Caught up in too much minutiae.

Limited time together — only twice per year, it is hard to get everyone together to make greater efficiencies between meetings — everyone back to regular job/busy.

Now have TEC/WG person to help. Some UETC people not most helpful.

Sometimes the bureaucratic red tape gets out of hand.

Organizations get input for what they want — this is a professional organization, should be able to deal with the "what if's" without so much concern for political implications.

Format resulted from group input — DOE responds to recommendations about organization of meetings. Sometimes hard to tell where we are. Scope and number of issues is large, so many it is hard to assimilate what happenings.

### Resource Notebook

- [3] *Resource Notebook* been very beneficial — to have records so we can actually track what happened; *Notebook* can be overwhelming. Complex task descriptions and Roman numbering confuses a lot of people and the plans are hard to use; get *Notebook* organized, it was a good idea and now it is too confusing.

### Membership/representation/size

Good Job.

- [2] Good representation; right representatives.

Qualified:

One problem is the blurring of membership status. It's not clear who are members vs. others who just show up. Second problem, random breakouts are not effective; people should choose their discussion topic and group which would allow more focused discussion.

TEC/WG should include more city and county government officials — especially those from WIPP jurisdictions.

Too big, information portion has gone well, but need to proceed to other activities.

Need some subgrouping, like training; look at EMAB as a potential — 30 people too many to work as a whole body, with date certain where dissolve. Mission oriented.

Communication is key — at meetings everyone is not there to participate; some meetings have a bias where one particular group presents a strong viewpoint and others don't necessarily get to have their say — relay back.

## 2. Productivity in terms of products and achievements

### Talk vs actions/work/consensus building

[3] Nothing concrete or specific ever develops at TEC/WG; don't see things coming out of it to achieve their goals — talk but not actions; not getting full benefit--no opportunity to really hammer through issues and bring back — training is best example, down to the guts of things, then bring back to bigger group.  
*Transportation Manager's Guide* another example.

[2] Not certain we have produced much — more discussion than action; product wise lower than productivity-productivity is higher, written is lower.

Low rating because we seem to come up with same issues and don't work on action plans to resolve and get closure.

[2] Seem to produce more internal product, especially re process. Not sure how useful these are outside of TEC/WG — would like more policy briefs — background issues, possible solutions, with small task groups of TEC/WG/DOE; get bogged down in process and procedures.

What are the products? They should be DOE decisions that result from our input. But this is not happening! The product suffers because of lack of consensus building. DOE is not willing (and may not be able) to adopt a consensus approach.

We're caught in the minutiae of things — should work together to identify 3-4 issues that are important to get done and then work on those. Waste time reviewing items.

At beginning, more productive, then a break — now more productive again, especially with training. Due to increased effort by some people at UETC and DOE — George and Judith H do good jobs.

Not too many hard products, but have tackled different tasks and activities. Good to summarize by activity/key points.

### Membership/size

Make sure have everyone at the table.

Probably not very productive because of the size of the group.

## Outcomes

Constant slippage of milestones occurs.

Procedures work good — results on 180(c) positive, though took long time.

Not as quick as I would like, but it takes time to get everyone together and they do get important things done in the end (e.g., definition of safe routine transport).

I have very low expectations here.

Have produced useful definitions and safe routine transport products have been especially important. More yet to do, but probably not possible because lack of agreement on what needs to be done — conflict in TEC/WG reflects conflict in larger society.

In some areas have done fairly well and in others haven't done what they should have — achieved a lot in pr, coordination among Federal/State/private but not sure any major goals have been accomplished.

## Focus

Not convinced that we are working on the right products or addressing the most important issues and problems.

Build on initiative taken elsewhere, e.g., WGA.

## Barriers

Some things are out of their hands. DOE can't always get approval easily, even if the DOE staff at meeting agree with it.

There has been a drastic improvement since DOE reorganization a year ago. It has taken a few years to see the results.

Again bureaucratic jingo gets to be too much. A lot of products need to be more concise; Resource notebook helpful for tracking, but no-one in field is going to read a three inch binder — need to publish a newsletter summarizing what happened in meetings.

### What are products?

The product is in getting information out.

- [2] We have some products, e.g., prospective shipments module, financial assistance to states, but progress is slow; it is the process were getting to the point of productivity is good — if forget about all the battles and work it takes to achieve that and continuing struggle to maintain that — will continue — takes a lot of work and organization.

### Concerns

Don't know what happens after meeting.

Within process set-up is very productive, but not sure meaningful in broad sense. Not sure TEC/WG is contributing to goal of transporting radmat safely and effectively.

Most concerned with lack of coordination between defense and civilian.

A couple of years ago would have rated a lot higher but DOE budget discussions have been depressing — what are we here for?

### **3. Impact on DOE transportation programs and emergency preparedness, safety, and acceptability**

#### Internal DOE change/need for feedback

Real goal is to make DOE change internally, and we cannot really see this.

Impression that it has a big impact, though don't really know.

- [2] Haven't seen any evidence of real impact, more talk than action.

- [2] Too early to tell, but sense an important positive cultural change in DOE with potential for impact; too early in the process — OCRWM is a 0; EM about a 5-6. OCRWM is not coming to the table asking for input — coming, but don't really want input.

Too early to say.

- [2] Not clear there has been an impact. It would be useful if DOE could tell us the impact — perhaps draw up a one-pager that succinctly identifies just how TEC/WG changed things; hasn't seen an impact, not communicated to anyone.

#### Program change

Hope there has been impact. Can see it on EM side, e.g., for nitric acid. DOE-EM used TEC/WG input. For OCRWM, cannot say — they seem to be in disarray and haven't got it together.

- [2] Can't answer, don't understand workings of DOE transportation programs — seems to take a long time to get anything resolved and get dollars out to the states for training, awareness, emergency response. Talked to [responsible manager] at last meeting and felt that they have a long way to go on this goal.

Release of FR 180(c) shows progress, but otherwise not so good, though a lot is out of their hands partly because of budget cuts.

At this point we are a long way from being finished on 180(c).

Fearful, based on experience, with the recent transportation campaign, but the field offices do what they want to anyway — no HQ control (what a way to run a business!).

#### Openness

TEC/WG has had a big impact. Before DOE was operating in a vacuum. Now they have input from people who know where it's at.

Don't know that it has done a lot, but has potential — have different points of view that could at least warn DOE about potential problems.

DOE is recognizing that it is not an island unto itself — no longer trying to make radioactive materials and issues completely separate from hazmat (which is good).

DOE is really trying to listen and implement positive things.

#### Coordination among members

The effect has been because of coordination among members and not because of consensus building.

- [2] It is not for want of trying. The problem is that DOE is a big organization and it takes a while for the message to get through. DOE is a large organization and has to bring all the players together to agree.

Need more hands-on people at the State/local level.

#### General

- [4] Has had some type of impact, increase awareness and overall concern for emergency response; lots of information coming out, so there is probably a more general awareness; positive impact across the board.

Increased confidence in different program elements. Not clear if this is getting through to the public. Some important things put on hold or not done.

People involved aren't willing to work on the issues. Disconnect between issues and policy — should be focusing on rail not highway.

State people have sometimes paid attention to need to keep pointing out the role/responsibilities of the tribes. Frustrating to have this repeatedly occur — goes back to the conveners — the Feds and trustees. Tribes still struggling; not responding with WIPP/etc. training/funding.

#### **4. Pertinence of charter and purpose**

##### Good/appropriate

- [3] Very appropriate.

TEC/WG is a wonderful process — a great philosophy.

Concept is really good, but there is still a way to go.

Good and is being accomplished even though it takes time and is two steps forward, one step back.

Seems good because DOE definitely needs the lynching pin of TEC/WG.

- [2] Definitely, attacking the problem correctly; no doubt important and useful.

- [2] Don't remember well what charter was. They are focusing on and doing the right things — headed in right direction, just taking time to get things done; don't know what it read, but if what it is doing reflect the objectives, very good.

[7] Don't remember/don't know/haven't read charter. What is mission?

Don't really know what charter is — mission statement sounds fine, but key is in the interpretation: is DOE leading everyone or is it everyone cooperating/working together? Think management just wants the former.

Not sure remember mission as originally defined; in practice, has been drifting away from medical emergency response — not enough people with knowledge about it.

Mission statement is appropriate, even more so since OCRWM has taken so many hits. Judith's group taking more responsibility for transportation planning.

Pertinent and focusing on the right issues needed.

### Problems

Privatization is an issue. Why spend time on highways if rail is what they are going to do.

Charter pretty well laid out, too many acronyms, gets too confusing — continuing and improved coordination between DOE and other elements of government, should have other participating organizations. Also dominated by emergency response, especially training subcommittee.

Question of taking what is said in TEC/WG meetings up to DOE-HQ — it is indeed important.

Being critical doesn't mean it isn't important. Without it would be worse. Key issue for the tribes is protecting and gaining recognition of their status.

Intention is good, design is somewhat flawed.

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: ACHIEVEMENT OF GOALS

### 1. Address the important issues

#### Good job

Good effort to address.

This is the most important goal and it is not totally achieved.

Key word here is address.

TEC/WG does seem to address the important issues, but the way we do it is not good. DOE doesn't come to develop consensus/work together for a solution, but to report "this is the plan."

- [2] Issues have and are being addressed. One important issue for the States is the problem of on-site storage which is adding to utility costs and could pose a risk for local areas; have done it very well.

They have addressed them very well, but not sure they have solved any problems. Most concerns have been addressed in some way.

#### Criticisms/gaps

Not sure there has been an honest effort to have a genuine consensus process to identify the important issues.

DOE is too concerned with legalities to do anything of substance.

Get into tremendous detail about regulations and don't deal with the practical issues of emergency preparedness. More impressed by process and procedures than by facts and ability to respond.

When issues brought, they address them, but not sure if prioritized or addressed what is critical. Some important issues need to be addressed within OCRWM — routes, 180(c). Mostly OCRWM issues that have not been adequately addressed. Political, hard, afraid.

Don't just want to be engaged in bureaucracy, but it is beneficial to discuss issues and get viewpoints as part of the record.

Getting there, not yet there. Training, equipment, routing need to be addressed. Not addressing some of the issues — routing is a big issue, and have not addressed it. Planning process has lots not addressed.

Need more emphasis on medical specifics.

#### Address versus resolve/take action

Addresses the issues, but not sure they have done anything about them.

Addressed but not resolved — issues have been brought up — that was encouraging in the beginning, but they are talked about but not resolved.

#### Specific issues mentioned (repeated information from above)

Some important issues need to be addressed within OCRWM — routes, 180(c). Mostly OCRWM issues that have not been adequately addressed.

Training, equipment, routing need to be addressed. Not addressing some of the issues — routing is a big issue, and have not addressed it. Planning process has lots not addressed.

Need more emphasis on medical specifics.

One important issue for the states is the problem of on-site storage which is adding to utility costs and could pose a risk for local areas.

### **2.a. Exchange information**

#### Good job

[7] DOE done an excellent job of creating opportunity for exchange of information; really good; I've seen improvement over past few meetings — DOE seems more willing to share information and more upfront about saying what they have to deal with. This is what TEC/WG does really well; lots of good information exchange — this is good; done very well, very informative. Have gotten people talking who normally wouldn't.

Very useful, DOE providing information about its structures, programs, how they function and the same holds true for giving DOE an idea of what the important issues are for the member organizations.

Have gotten information out promptly.

### Not so good job

Too much exchange of information already. TEC/WG does a good job of sharing information, but to what end?

Exchange of information, especially written information, has been slow, though it is improving.

### Internal organizational problems

Not sure whether we have achieved this goal because of internal communication problems with my own organization.

### Internal DOE communication opaque

Unclear how DOE divisions communicate with one another. We have some communication problems within our own State also.

In our working relationship, there has been very little communication within DOE that we can observe — if TEC/WG were communicated more widely within DOE, would be better. Not sure how DOE is structured, some parts of DOE still have no knowledge.

Don't know about DOE, especially civilian and defense communication.

DOE not exchanging information internally.

Difficult to say if communication occasion DOE.

Need better coordination within DOE, e.g., on CVSA project EM said would give more money, but OCRWM said "no." Who's in charge?

Internally, things have not improved substantially, but with the outside organizations, there has been a vast improvement.

### Turnover

At last meeting (Charlotte) there were a lot of new EM people and too much inter-DOE talk.

Can't blame DOE for this low score (5). We have exchanged a lot of information but there is still more to exchange. Also there are many new people at each meeting.

## Focus and composition

Good publicizing information and stakeholders have taken that information and feel they are in the loop — probably contributed to acceptance, but gone away from technical medical preparedness and health effects. Need more medical people.

Don't see coordination as different than exchange of information.

DOE regional and area offices responsible for transportation are not at the table-- this is counter to the numbers issue (too big group) — they are the ones doing the transportation and they're not here. Don't have carriers — wrong people from ATA and AAR — shipping agent.

## **2.b. Improve coordination**

### Good/improved

DOE has done excellent job of creating opportunity.

- [2] Have been pleased with the coordination; at TEC/WG I meet with and coordinate with a lot of people I would not otherwise. It has really helped me.

Would include coordination and information in same item as they go hand in hand — TEC/WG has improved coordination. TEC/WG discussions and reports improve coordination in nitric acid and cesium shipments and helped with needed contacts and relationships.

Hard to put a number on (7), hard to tell what is done with the product — there is definite potential.

### Poor

Coordination is not good except for RW and EM. Often DOE managers don't seem to know what the other is doing. Seemed to get better, but now is tapering off. Still missing many DOE transportation managers at TEC/WG.

Major challenge for DOE, especially in the Department where there are a lot of mind sets to change.

### External vs internal

Goal has been achieved for outside organizations to a greater extent than for DOE internally.

### Other issues

People are working on issues in different regions, try to come up with something that is ok to use. Product is discussion of that and some decision about how it is going to be. Have to keep coming back to what does the law say, what is extra and needed.

Breakout groups are effective — some good facilitators and some poor.

Right players there, dialogue not far enough — talk around it. Need to focus on specific issues.

### **3.a. Identify, characterize priority issues**

#### Good job

- [3] Doing good job here; excellent job. Stakeholders have an excellent idea of what the issues are; they have been doing a very good job, especially where addressing training and training requirements.

More successful than closure.

Railroads have been brought into loop past few years, which is good since there are many issues involving them.

Most issues have been raised and discussed.

They do well.

#### Poor job

They have over-identified the issues.

Bogged down in process, procedures and semantics and don't see things in terms of operations — many decisions already made (WIPP) so DOE on fixed course and can't deviate. DOE explains self.

Can identify some of the key issues, but in terms of prioritizing, haven't really done that in terms of what would get most bang for the buck, re efficiency of system. Hard with group only meeting twice per year. Somehow have to work on issue of prioritization.

OCRWM is not "in" the process, not listening — maybe not right people, or people who are there don't know that times have changed. Got to change.

### **3.b. Reach closure on priority issues**

#### Complaints/issues

Not so good here at all.

There is so much slippage in meeting milestones — not sure how to prevent slippage, perhaps the problem is that some TEC/WG representatives don't meet the deadlines for input.

Takes longer to reach closure — it's not so easy as identifying issues, but TEC/WG is working at it.

We never seem to get closure, e.g., been waiting for definitive decision on routing even though States already know what the routes are — DOE seems to be holding back and I don't know why. States won't be ready if MRS built soon.

[2] It always takes so long; the same issues seem to drag on and on, e.g., Tribal issues; the Tribes should have been brought in much sooner.

Although we identify issues, we don't close in orderly fashion — we simply close.

A lot of information has been generated, but it hasn't been distributed or shared with other groups or entities that need to know it as well as it could be. They could share or distribute within DOE better.

Not sure they have reached closure on too many of the items.

Don't know — we have action items, but is that real closure?

Close out a lot of issues, but some critical issues are still remaining.

The difficulty is getting word to the larger DOE organization outside of TEC/WG.

### Recommendations/explanations

TEC/WG needs to be oriented toward finding a consensus solution.

This is a big issue for me, we need some formal process for reaching closure as the current process is very unclear — perhaps a 2/3 vote (members only).

- [2] It is not necessarily DOE's fault that they do not get resolution because the meetings are 6-7 months apart and people are busy. Also different people attend the meetings and continuity is difficult; it is difficult to reach closure.

Difficult to reach closure with semi-annual meetings.

### Specific issues/problems

The biggest problem here is funding — we need funding for escorts, interactions and helping jurisdictions be more prepared.

Should still be addressing some issues, e.g., issues related to railroads have not been identified or addressed/closed adequately.

(Repeat) been waiting for definitive decision on routing even though States already know what the routes are — DOE seems to be holding back and I don't know why. States won't be ready if MRS built soon.

OCRWM drags both of these scores down — we talk, but nothing seems to come out. This is a consequence of the structure. We need subgroups or something like EMAB.

## **4. Enhance overall DOE program organization, coordination, and implementation**

### Don't know/can't see impact

Can't evaluate this because I can't see the exact impact on DOE policy. Other than the 180(c), impact is not clear.

Haven't seen anything affected from what has come out of TEC/WG.

- [7] Don't know.

Bogged down in details/procedures.

One problem is that we got overly structured with detailed work plans — good that we seem to be de-emphasizing these.

#### Internal DOE coordination/feedback.

DOE is very fragmented in its overall transportation program, and I'm not sure whether TEC/WG discussions to up through the organization and get implemented.

DOE seems so huge and I can't say — safety is really not an issue here.

Reason the score is not higher is that there needs to be more communication among branches of DOE — for example, if I talk with OCRWM person it is not communicated with EM.

Difficulty is getting word to the larger DOE organization outside of TEC/WG.

Coordination is improving but implementation is weak and need DOE feedback-- e.g., have transportation managers come to TEC/WG to talk about *Transportation Manager's Guide*: how useful/where can we improve safety with less effort or where do we need more effort?

Good between waste and civilian, but poor within whole of DOE.

That is more geared to more specific part of DOE and they are doing better, but needs to be spread throughout DOE more.

#### Mixed

EM good, OCRWM poor.

#### Positive

DOE has established a good infrastructure and cultural shifts are taking place.

Within EM, they are desperately trying and nitric acid shipments showed how well they did. SF shipments were not so good, but there were extenuating circumstances. Difficult to change entrenched behavior and attitudes.

We have seen great changes in the way DOE is operating and in TEC/WG itself, which became more streamlined.

Better coordination within DOE than there used to be. People are talking who previously didn't

Brings players together, so that is beneficial today. Haven't seen tangible benefits, itself.

DOE is really making an effort to implement some of the ideas.

It is much better; at least they are talking to one another.

Need people involved who actually do the work to improve efficiency — e.g., training subcommittee. Nitric acid and cesium shipments showed lessons learned. DOE consistency not good, e.g., definition of shipping campaign in *Resource Notebook* and glossary.

## **5. Enhance participant organizations' ability**

### Positive

TEC/WG has already helped after one meeting. I learned a lot and took back a lot of information which has helped me in coordinating with Tribal needs.

It has certainly helped because of the information we now have.

In our transportation committee we work closely with OCRWM — able to bring topics back and have a lively discussion.

We find that DOE keeps us in the loop, re what is going on. It is a big advantage to know what is on the agenda and know what is coming down the road.

There is a good group of the right people at TEC/WG. We can take that knowledge back home with us.

The information we take back from TEC/WG has helped give some of our members a more pragmatic approach.

Our organization has really benefitted from the 1910 120 discussion.

Has helped with 180(c) — we have received a lot of information from discussions with others at TEC/WG.

Very good outlet for that regard, gives participant organizations an opportunity to ask for additional information.

Because of training they are doing there, so they have an idea of value and usefulness of RR environment. Most don't know about the railroad environment, and it is important.

Information exchange has been good. Interaction between members has been good, need more of that — some of the area offices don't communicate with States — aren't linked into effort.

#### Uncertain/qualified

Qualified because of the internal communication problem I have with my own organization — not sure TEC/WG has made a change on our side.

Hasn't happened yet — lots of railroad issues are raised, but not too many get resolved.

Goal begs the question of whether DOE is focusing on short- or long-term strategies. Short-term strategy of giving information to contacts is good. But I see no evidence of joint work on long-term strategies (planning, resource allocation, reducing risk).

I have felt that I had nothing solid to take back to my organization (emergency nurses). Given DOE's funding shortage are we expected to make up the difference? We need to talk with DOE.

Not sure it has had any effect — it has made them more aware, but not sure it has affected capability; they were already capable.

Got a grant to do something, but don't think there has been a lot generated that has done an emergency responder much good.

#### Other comments

Would be good to have an outside organization evaluate where lessons were learned on a particular shipping campaign.

Ideas but no plan of action — would like to see something more concrete in terms of policy and have concrete planning activities take place, e.g., similar to subcommittee on training which really did something.

Most of accomplishments of TEC/WG are more at the initial stages — it will be some time before the products could be shared and/or implemented and you could see a difference — for example, not until shipments are underway and emergency response is activated.

Looking at all of the organizations — have been able to pick up on it. Surely hasn't been all bad.

## 6. Resolve institutional and coordination issues

### Can't tell/too early/mixed

Can't tell.

Proof is in pudding. Cesium and nitric acid campaigns very successful. Have to see what happens in next campaign.

There is still a way to go since 180(c) is not yet resolved.

Good, but not as good as it should have been.

At least we are able to have a dialogue and make progress with the DOE people we meet at TEC/WG. It's hard to say if they are the right people for removing barriers, e.g., Marcus Popa will not actually manage the waste shipping.

Lots of issues raised, but not resolved. The basic issue is that TEC/WG has not achieved the purpose of TEC/WG, which is to develop consensus.

Resolving in the sense of closure has not been achieved. Resolving in the sense of establishing a process and opportunities for communication is ok.

Trying to do it, but there are a lot of stakeholders who are unwilling to compromise.

TEC/WG has not achieved this because there is still some parochialism.

We are headed in the right direction, but there is still a big question mark about rail — rail inspection and emergency response are issues that we need to know much more about.

### Positive

CVSA before TEC/WG, first helped drop barriers. Dealing with stakeholders helps DOE and stakeholders drop prejudices about DE and each other. The ability to work with DOE as people — competent professionals, concerned trying to improve things — has helped.

There is a lot to deal with here. It is an ongoing process and DOE seems to be improving as they go along with it.

The whole idea provides that medium for exchange and the differences are noted. It will be a matter of time before effectiveness will be demonstrated.

Because of involvement of the different stakeholders, spanned crevices that haven't been spanned before because people have gotten to know one another.

May help a lot, bring trains, etc. and everyone can put their two cents in.

Parochial view from railroads — they had some meetings, have opened the door a little, can talk to the people now.

### OCRWM

Mixed reactions from EM-HQ has been high; from area office and site office it is just beginning — OCRWM — same issues with them. OCRWM is about ready to blow it completely. Judith doing her best to drag them in.

### Requirements for greater effectiveness/remaining issues

Not sure we have involved everyone who should be involved — should include environmental groups since we have industry here — if we don't have all the players at the table, we will not have resolved the issues.

Inspection programs are tangible things which help remove barriers. Now we need some concrete plans of attack.

Make an effort, but the effort, because of turf issues — hasn't been too successful. People still not talking across Federal components. Don't hear about it among other groups. Would give a lot for resolving non federal barriers.

### Explanations for/examples of success

TEC/WG has made progress because they have managed to get closed-minded people from DOE and railroads look at issues from a State and local perspective.

Hearing Hank Jenkins-Smith's research gives us some ideas about where to start in removing barriers in the public sector, e.g., we know who the public trusts and can start to work on that.

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

### 1. Three most valuable achievements/accomplishments of TEC/WG

#### Dialogue/Communication

DOE has identified a wide range of stakeholders that have a vested interest in transportation and established a good structure that provides opportunities for them to come together and interact.

The diversity of people DOE has brought together — just getting them there is an achievement.

Organization of the group — this is the most organized group I have ever encountered — greatly appreciate the way the meetings are set-up/information disseminated ahead/meetings posted well in advance/breakout groups plus plenary format. Tremendous job!

Facilitating the opportunity for various stakeholders to meet in one place and discuss this topic.

The information exchange, which allows people to understand others' concerns and what their perspectives are.

Exchanging information and getting to know what other groups think.

Healthy exchange of information about what is real out there in Nebraska and Missouri — information was being exchanged among diverse (geographically and in terms of responsibilities) groups. Result was the kind of information needed for policy.

Not a specific product; it would be the opportunity to gain this information and have the forum to exchange and communicate with other interest groups--more than any document or product — to hear what other groups say.

Creating ongoing dialogue on important transportation topics.

Bringing together concerned stakeholders to facilitate communication both with DOE and among stakeholder groups.

Exchange of viewpoints.

Stakeholder involvement.

Bringing people together — people are interested in this topic because of the TEC/WG meeting — a place where people with an interest can come together.

Leave it there — bringing people together to discuss issues is a good idea.

Initiate forum for discussion among stakeholders.

Opening the door for knowledgeable people to talk who have very different ideas and solutions.

TEC/WG has been a vehicle for getting people together, but in fact many of the accomplishments have been outside of the formal meetings themselves.

Getting all groups together to share ideas and information.

Simply getting people to turn up and meet together.

Serves as a conduit for getting a very broad perspective on issues.

#### Products Development/Program Impact

Exercise to put *Transportation Manager's Guide* together.

Arrive at uniform/working definitions.

Task orders appear to be getting worked on.

Streamlining inspection program.

Helped influence Hank's study, which has been valuable. Really useful for us at the local level to get feedback on what perceptions are so we can deal with them better.

Hank-Jenkins Smith's studies of grass-roots perceptions.

Have helped survival of RERO, which is not available elsewhere and is extremely valuable.

One in particular addressing training requirements regarding emergency response.

Training exercise they are going through.

Have developed decent plans, especially on highways, but progress on emergency response has not been so good.

Actually having proven the results in enhanced safety protocols in recent shipping campaigns (cesium, nitric acid) and in trying to standardize these.

Beginning the planning process of how to respond to an emergency.

*Resource Notebook*, which I use for so many things. Also the glossary of which is a great reference (have installed it on my computer and made a part of our state trans plan).

*Program Manager's Guide* — was DOE's initiative, but TEC/WG provided valuable input. It has been useful to have something like this in place.

Bringing issues into concise statements and dealing with them.

Cesium campaign demonstrates direct benefit — DOE followed their *Program Manager's Guide* for talking and listening to people/addressing their concerns and explaining why not where they could not. Avoided controversy.

Will bring resolution for 180(c) — training, equipping, and trying to resolve what the shipping routes will be.

Participation of stakeholders in forming 180(c) policy.

#### Relationships/Interactions and networking

Opportunity to develop relationships with neighbors, especially State and local responders, so we can develop joint approaches to emergency response — especially important given shortage of funding.

Interactions with other members that help us in gaining resources (e.g., WGA now provides resources to us).

Giving basis for intercommunication and coordination across programs (least value).

Bringing the stakeholders and DOE together for discussion and potential implementation.

Opportunity to interact with transporters, especially railroads, with whom Tribes have historically had a poor relationship. Maybe interaction will result in railroads' willingness to discuss/negotiate and enable us to work together to solve problems.

Ability to interact with many other groups who are knowledgeable about transportation.

Getting States and national organizations talking to one another and getting their input on the problems.

[2] Great networking and shoulder rubbing.

Networking is the biggest achievement.

Development of network among people who have concerns or a role to play.

Developed working relationships so that people know who to contact if needed (also helped DOE as well as members).

Provides opportunity for two-way communication and keeps us updated on what is going on.

Helps coordination with other groups.

People with expertise we can call.

#### External parties better understand/trust DOE

Increased trust in DOE.

DOE has been very supportive in answering questions. Has really increased trust among groups.

Rebuilding stakeholder trust.

Help representatives of national organizations get a better understanding of how DOE is prepared (or not prepared) to ship.

TEC/WG provide a good forum for discussion and DOE does appear to listen to and incorporate our input. But not sure what they do with it.

Hearing from different offices within DOE and learning what they are doing.

Through TEC/WG, organizations have an avenue to learn about future shipments, who are the contacts, what is needed as well as to provide input on notification procedures.

DOE, by opening themselves up and not being so closed, is now more aware of what is happening at the local levels. Also is a forum for different entities to get together and eyeball-to-eyeball talk to one another among themselves.

Among TEC/WG group itself, there is a better feeling, view of DOE transportation program in general. Heightened awareness of the lengths that DOE goes in terms of the campaigns, planning, procedures, etc.

#### Influence DOE/increase DOE understanding/coordination

One job is to educate the mainstream America about indigenous peoples of this country, but in particular to remind the trustees — the Federal employees at every level — that they are in the role of a fiduciary which should not be taken lightly.

The treaties are still valid, Indian country is still in effect, and the cultural preservation of Federal programs is at stake — implementation of these programs, will continue to monitor them and call for consideration and acceptance of our recommendations by DOE and other agencies responsible. First, compatible dynamics of the participants — this type of process/dynamics takes place over time to understand people and their viewpoints. Over time, trust and understanding, and agree to disagree — the players themselves. Not the Feds.

Ability to change the mindset of DOE so they understand that local concerns have value/are important whether or not DOE thinks they have substance, i.e, they are institutional problems to be solved.

Trying to standardize across DOE programs.

Improved coordination between DOE and the key players in the DOE transportation area — good to have OCRWM and EM talking to each other in the meetings — hard to see, good to have feedback and show they work together to common good.

Better coordination within DOE. This is good so when they talk to different shops, there is better understanding.

#### Increased awareness/understanding of other organizations' view points

Invite health providers/stakeholders for input.

Introduced a variety of people to the concerns of the railroad industry.

Illustrated by a tour and other means something about the railroad industry and its equipment so they understand issues and their context (have seen railroad cars).

Bringing organization concerns of the participation organizations — they vary significantly.

Tribal governments — it's been a recognition of most of the participants and sponsors of the accoutrements of Indian nations with inherent sovereign powers which may be exercised at some point even though they may not be doing it now.

### Information

Disseminate information about shipping plans, procedures.

I am kept abreast of developments in the field.

Information exchange among all members and DOE.

Information we can distribute to our State Task Force.

Information that is passed out, e.g., railroad information, CVSA.

Bring information to the organizations that need to know. Provide an opportunity for the organizations to know. Getting information and requirements out.

Information received from other organizations about their role — now much clearer, for example about the railroads — they can do what they want to do — they could care less about putting restrictions on them.

Good effort by DOE.

Appreciate efforts of DOE but their hands are tied by stalemate on the legislation.

### Other

Have attended only one meeting and this is too brief a period for me to assess achievements.

## **2. Three things that have contributed most to effectiveness**

### TEC/WG DOE leaders and staff

Efforts and genuine concern from DOE who are involved, especially Judith Holm.

Integrity and responsiveness of DOE personnel, Judith Holm especially. They always respond to my phone calls. They are easy to work with, are really concerned, and trying to help improve transportation.

DOE's people commitment — Gerald Boyd, Judith Holm, and the management of EM.

Dedication of the DOE people in the TEC/WG program — very good people trying to run this effort.

Key people in DOE (Judith Holm) — their input and coordination and concerns (include George).

Judith and Rich in particular who have addressed issues with the approach "let's look at it from a different angle."

Caliber of people involved. Judith Holm and Larry — who has grown a lot and now seems sincere about commitment. Consultants been pretty good. Some continuity and responsiveness all around, including OCRWM.

Rich Brancato's understanding that cultural change needs to take place in DOE and his willingness to champion this in the DOE organization.

DOE personnel (Judith, Larry) have really worked hard.

Support staff who have made the meetings run so smoothly — they are among the best organized meetings I have attended.

DOE's willingness to listen.

Commitment of DOE people — with very few exceptions, the DOE TEC/WG people are committed and intent on doing the right thing. Also the members themselves are very capable and committed to doing the right thing for their constituents.

DOE has — and has maintained over 4 years — a real commitment to TEC/WG.

Individual DOE people involved.

Open-mindedness and caring on DOE's part.

High-level DOE participation.

[2] Good atmosphere, largely created by DOE's example of being willing to listen — they are doing a good job here (especially Judith Holm) of being concerned and really listening to us.

DOE shops talking to one another.

DOE taking some of the directives and making an effort to review and implement — this is the basic set-up for what we are doing.

DOE supports it; there are regular meetings; someone takes care of all the details.

Getting to know the various DOE personnel that have concerns within TEC/WG.

Give credit to DOE for letting you do this survey and getting input from members on where they perceive change is needed.

DOE has listened.

#### Composition/Behavior of Participants

- [8] Diversity of groups and viewpoints represented. Diversity of key stakeholders — invite the relevant stakeholders and not necessarily all the little ones. Broad representation — large group of constituencies (though should be broader). Interest and participation from so many diverse people and getting cooperation from broad groups. The diverse representatives and the cross-talk among attendees that often occurs outside of the meeting itself. Real commitment on part of DOE to get practitioners together — key people representing diverse interests were there.

Stakeholder dedication: people show up.

Value placed on speaking to the point and presence of members who sincerely were trying to use their time to get something constructive done.

Group itself, which is open-minded and have not come with pre-set agendas.

Participation of interested parties — for most part, the right people are there. Should also include FEMA, DOT and NRC in the running of TEC/WG, not just as occasional visitors, because everyone has to deal with these agencies, have them there in a prominent role (strong emphasis).

Bring right people in to provide information, who know regulations, etc.

Right organizations, key organizations — gotten a bit unwieldy — some added interest groups without group discussion (e.g., Nuclear Energy Institute) but in general groups asked to participate have been good. Shouldn't add new groups without discussion in group.

### Behavior of participants

DOE communicating more openly with states and other groups.

Cooperativeness and patience of stakeholders.

Openness of sharing information.

DOE's and whole group's willingness to listen to what the stakeholders have to say.

Sharing information and solving issues by the entire group.

Attitude of personnel involved. Everyone has a good attitude of working together. DOE set the stage and now this positive attitude is demonstrated among most of members also.

Many hours sitting together in same room and rubbing off the rough edges improved all our ability to see other's viewpoint and understand where they are coming from.

### Structure/process of meetings

In meetings, everyone has opportunity to present and discuss their issues and concerns — not dominated by one point of view.

Support for meetings, there is a support mechanism there, I keep the thing alive.

Promoting the dissemination of information exchange between stakeholders.

Opportunity to meet with others and communicate with other interest groups.

Use of subcommittees to get work done/focus.

Meetings have provided an atmosphere for change and exchange of ideas. Much less adversarial than in the beginning and much more an attitude of "let's do this together and come up with some resolution."

Purposefulness in procedures and moving the discussion along.

All the work that goes into the meetings and preparing information.

- [4] Getting information from other DOE field offices and transportation programs as well as OCRWM and EM. Getting information out about their programs has

helped members know DOE better. Getting information out promptly. Briefing materials good — get out earlier and more, better information is useful.

Actually scheduling the meetings — identifying the right people and getting them there.

- [3] Meeting format of breakout sessions followed by plenary session. Breakout sessions. Meeting forum has helped a lot. Getting to hear all the issues. Breakout sessions with plenary to cover key activities/current events has been helpful.
- [2] Having funding to allow us to attend; covering the cost of people to attend TEC/WG meetings.

### Critiques

Too much time in plenary, need more small group discussions.

Clearer articulation about what are the laws and regulations on the books that [we] have to conform to. A lot of discussion about what the ideal world would look like, if had unlimited amount of resources, but should look more closely at what is really going on.

TEC/WG is important, but let's move on — let's make it work!

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: CHANGES TO INCREASE EFFECTIVENESS

### 1. Representation/Composition/Continuity

- [2] New people with different perspectives — need a broader range of organizations, not change in representatives which would result in change in continuity and knowledge, e.g., at least one Tribal representative in each breakout group; invite some additional interest groups to make sure that everyone with a vested interest is represented, e.g., smaller railroads — sometimes there are suggestions for a topic area that didn't have representatives — expand some.

More representation from local counties would increase effectiveness, especially with WIPP shipments due to start soon.

Need contingency planners.

Ensure that all transportation interests in DOE are represented.

Broad range of DOE personnel from different departments need to attend.

Increased Tribal government participation and funding for Tribal representatives — they are identified for the most part, the difficulty lies in the financial end and the administrative end of carrying out this sort of program — funding and treaties.

DOE has approached some Tribes or invited them to attend at their own expense — wonder what would happen to the dynamics if had 10 Tribal representatives there.

More attendance or more involvement by members. At several meetings key organizations didn't have representatives here.

Needs to be an intergovernmental-wide group — have all the Feds with responsibility for radmat transportation play a prominent role (DOT, NRC, FEMA).

Open up who the stakeholders are and their concerns.

More involvement of environmental groups.

Have a few more health effects/health professionals involved so they could help disseminate information to stakeholders — who could ask some technical questions.

Have someone with internal dosimetry expertise and other health professionals; including someone from AMA, radiobiologists, epidemiologists (CDC).

Too cumbersome as currently structured — too many people and too many parameters — discussions are endless and everyone acts like an expert.

Need to have fewer people and have appropriate experts for the issue under discussion.

Need to deal with membership issue — too big. Have to have a committee of the whole, go back to original catharsis — as new people have come in — five key issues to address in the next year.

Lack of continuity among some of the organizations' representatives. Whole group has to start over from the beginning to bring them up to speed and this hinders progress.

Additional meetings with other groups — TEC/WG-phase-2 with new stakeholders with more local perspectives — get providers closest to the response, more valid input.

NRC and DOT have roles in this process, and should be more coordinated approach. They should have policy representation at the organizing level--look at problem from systems perspective, not just DOE.

#### Format of meeting

Continue to have breakout session where there is opportunity for input on different issues.

Use plenary session as a more interactive session, current structure has too much time spent simply reacting to DOE's agenda instead of asking people what their pain is and trying to resolve that pain.

Consistency in breakout group reports — DOE participants often do not seem to know what other DOE people are doing.

- [2] Modify seating at TEC/WG to distinguish between members/nonmembers (members in inner circle/horseshoe) — don't sit auditorium style; auditorium style emphasizes "I'm here and you're there" need a circle or horseshoe style, one inside the other if too many attendees — that in itself says something about your orientation.

Open dialogue with less orchestration.

- [2] Better facilitation in some of the breakouts — some are good, but others are not sufficiently neutral and do not allow us to get down to resolving the real issues — they just talk around the issues.
- [2] Cut back on plenary/DOE presentations and have time for another breakout; keep plenary sessions to a minimum, but make sure they provide good and up-to-date information — decisive information.

Logistics/rooms too cold, not good signage.

#### Subcommittees/working groups

- [5] Work together on subcommittees, really learning from one another as work toward solution. Training subcommittee good exemplar; put stakeholders to work — break into smaller working groups focusing on specific issues — currently there are a lot of gifted people sitting on their hands and unable to put their knowledge to work. Organize working groups so can come up with concrete courses of action to solve issues. Use subcommittees more. Divide up into specific focus issues — subcommittees — have to get to deal with rail and air transport.

Set up working groups to work on common response to 180(c) — we can do this better under sponsorship of DOE rather than trying to do on our own (State).

More presentations/discussions composed of TEC/WG members, e.g., regional groups. Training subcommittee was excellent — people from around the country, was driven by states rather than DOE, included non-TEC/WG people who are affected.

Use regional groups to work on issues together — be real working groups looking for consensus solutions. Break members into four regions, bring in national reps to assist.

Current breakouts don't have west and east representatives working together.

Would be good to give some issues to a subcommittee to work on, e.g., like training subcommittee.

Training subcommittee was great! We need more focused subcommittee, accomplished much more by focus.

## DOE Feedback

- [2] DOE report back to TEC/WG about impact on broader DOE structure — system of measures. Know we had impact on cesium campaign, what about other parts of DOE; include reasons if they did not include our input — perhaps produce a one-page summary.

More feedback from DOE saying this is what we heard and this is what we've done as a result — need to know especially what happened in DOE overall with our input.

Need feedback from DOE on where TEC/WG helped. Again a one pager spelling out very concisely "this is what DOE did as a result for the last TEC/WG meeting."

Some indication/recognition that DOE values TEC/WG, e.g., have Secretary O'Leary or someone of her stature come to a meeting, demonstrate that TEC/WG is valuable, hear something about its value to DOE.

Have transportation managers tell us how they actually used the *Transportation Manager's Guide* — what was useful, what wasn't, did it make a difference, what value to them.

Might be good to have an upper management program person — someone from Secretary's office above Dreyfus, to come in and get a glimpse of what is important. TEC/WG should be important enough for this.

## DOE actions, preparation/presentation

DOE should avoid getting in habit of talking among themselves about policy issues/budget problems — too much whining and disagreement shown.

Avoid being too closure-oriented on task plans.

More communication within DOE — at meeting but most especially beyond the meeting within the overall DOE organization.

DOE speak up/clearly express DOE viewpoint. It was hard to know who was running the show!

Try to cut down on different DOE groups and streamline DOE internally. It would help if DOE met among themselves to coordinate internally.

DOE maintain commitment to cooperative agreement groups, which are backbone of TEC/WG — will be difficult with budget cuts/downsizing.

A single routing plan — now there are NRC, DOE, DOT, Reg Facility Guides which have all routing plans. We must have *one* plan for 180(c) so we can plan training.

### Communication

Better organization of pre-meeting material, earlier and more commentary/information about what will be addressed specifically, what they will try to tackle in the meeting.

Share information.

Get the *Notebook* back in better shape — forget about showing all the revisions-- just show what the new status is.

Get more feedback/participation by members — it is a challenge, would be good if each member gave a little more, hard because no time between meetings.

Reduce the paperwork.

Disseminate or communicate the products of the TEC/WG — within DOE and to outsiders and participants.

So many people — we need more information interaction — going to dinner together, not in separate groups.

Present information about upcoming meetings and discussions in a more exciting format — task plans are ok for working group members, but we need a short, simple, concise one-pager that highlights issues/successes.

Knowing government and processes, TEC/WG is moving in the right direction, but it will not happen overnight.

### Focus/prioritization

Another attempt at doing a session assessing where we are and taking another stab at prioritization.

Consciously adopt a dual focus for TEC/WG — short-term, communication among DOE/key stakeholders and long-term, consensus-seeking planning function.

Adopt a consensus building approach — DOE would gain more by being collaborative/making TEC/WG a real working group.

More attempt at issues resolution, not just discussion. We need more than just cross-talk at TEC/WG.

Define some scenarios that must be dealt with — now we're dealing with a scenario cloud. Create scenarios for different parts of the country and say, "What would you do to deal with them?"

[Re scenarios] Have to get realistic about the value of training because of turnover — it is a fallacy that you can train everyone that needs training, that their instruments will be right and ready, they will be there when you need them. You are very likely not going to be there when needed — all the effort in training will probably go to waste — they will forget. States want the training money, but at some point, you have to get realistic.

Have fewer tasks and prioritize them so we can handle them in a reasonable manner.

Have more technical (health) discussions.

Go back through the process of who, what, and why.

Decide what are the 3-4 key issues that need to be addressed to make the system safe, efficient, and cost effective.

After identifying 3-4 issues, focus on getting closure — an end product — determine how to work together to make it happen, get to how it is going to work.

#### Orientation for new members

Need to define goals for new people so we can understand what is going on — orientation would have helped.

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: PRIORITIZATION

### 1. How do you feel about prioritization as a focus for TEC/WG?

- [15] Important/good/essential; will give us a point of direction — moves the entire system forward; very good idea — key in a variety of ways.

Should be a dual role — participating organizations should have some organizational leadership within TEC/WG where we could highlight issues that are concerns for us and prioritize them for review and presentation — dialogue with respect to agendas. Very important issue — this is where TEC/WG could be most useful; have to do it or we're going to start falling apart — it's been held together by a few DOE people and a few stakeholders. Not only a technical group, but building relationships and credibility — mutual support — where you can support each other in different political contexts.

Every organization has to prioritize things. Important thing is to achieve some consensus among participants about prioritization — there has been an effort to do that, but not satisfied. There are other barriers that keep key issues from being resolved.

- [2] [Good focus] but not certain it has been accomplished; didn't seem to me that there was an attempt to provide such focus.
- [3] Appropriate, in fact has been done. At first meeting we identified a list of issues and we seem to be reviewing the same stuff every meeting. Need to spend time and effort on important things like this--though I think we are pretty well done.

Have done this with subcommittees, otherwise is too general to get solid accomplishments.

Don't have a problem with it, have to focus on something.

Fine, it hasn't been discussed much — from DOE's perspective it makes good sense, to give DOE the stakeholders' perspective and priorities.

#### Dangers/considerations of prioritization

- [3] Need to address everyone's priority issues — issues that are low priority for us may be very important for others; important, but need to take into account group differences — Indians have one set of priorities, other organizations have others.

Good idea, but don't know if you can get TEC/WG to do it, they are so large and diverse — everyone has a certain interest. Vocal people get their own way. At some point, DOE has to say this is the way it needs to be because they know it is the right way.

Afraid that the composition of the group would lead to putting priorities of CVSA at bottom of the list — too much emphasis on emergency response — don't roll over to majority or the most vocal (raises issue of membership and roles of members/nonmembers).

Issue is not prioritization but how to go about issues identification; reason why people don't want to spend time prioritizing is because they don't want to deal with issues DOE's ways.

Good, but has to be in line with limitations of resources.

It might work but there will be significant amounts of time spent on the process — the process is everything — do we want to prioritize? Sure, if I can get my issues on the priority list. Not sure he would want to push in this direction. May not be advantageous to the participants to prioritize.

## **2. Priority transportation issues for your organization**

### Routing

- [9] Routing — it directly affects ability of emergency responders to be prepared; better routing decision process — DOE way behind technology curve in routing tools; define routes — this will affect 180(c) training needs and will also point to new issue, i.e., bordering states/continuity of routing.

DOT grants are in place, but what will routes be? Will we have shipments and can we handle it?

Route selected by DOE or DOE/PUC without too many other people involved.

### Increased capability/preparedness

Ability to interact with other transporters.

Ability to respond in case of an accident and coordinate emergency response among Tribes and with Fed/State/local agencies.

Make sure hospital providers have adequate knowledge and are trained for patient care.

State preparedness — are States going to be responsible for everything, are we going to have escorts, or what?

Figure out issues related to preparedness/EM responsibility e.g., for adequate training, equipment, etc.

Thorough nationwide assessment of emergency response capabilities/coordination, using current technology.

Emergency response contingency planning — what do we do in case of this or that event.

Communication to emergency responders.

Emergency preparedness.

### Operational safety

Individual officer safety on the street.

Mode of transport.

Equipment adequacy.

Proper instrumentation.

Inspection and enforcement — don't seem to appreciate the public acceptability value of getting the inspection established and understood.

Escorts.

Bad weather/safe parking.

Rapid, reliable delivery system.

### Rail Shipments

How are rail shipments going to move — we support dedicated trains.

Rail routing.

Safety of the train in which the vehicle is carried.

Organization of emergency response process for rail (who to do what, etc.).  
railroads.

- [2] Concern about worthiness of cask in train derailment; cask safety.

Rail security — stopping at State border to pick up security personnel.

- [2] Rail speed limits; move at no more than 55 mph using dedicated trains that provide direct route, can keep track of train and cars, and standardize weights.

Design of cask and rail car.

Move under 49 CFR regulations and no more restrictions — no escorts or State inspections to impede interstate transport.

### Notification/tracking

If accident occurs, we want to be aware/notified immediately and know what we are dealing with, have adequate surveillance.

Notification — how is local notification effectuated. Need someone to coordinate that, and don't think that is about to happen.

Learn what shipments are coming.

Contact at all times between carrier and shipper.

- [3] Advance notification; emergency notification.

### Training

- [3] Training; including effective training protocols/guidelines.

Training and planning at the local level.

Emergency training.

Training and equipping locals.

Training for emergency responders that is mode and location specific.

180(c) and how to handle the mechanics of 180(c) — should it come through the Governors office, etc.

### Funding/180(c)

Funding for training and public awareness related to routes.

- [2] Adequate funding for state/local transportation needs; make sure identify every opportunity to help locals, even if funding is short.

Find out what resources are available to help with transportation.

- [2] 180(c) funding; implementation of 180(c).

### Go beyond WIPP

Involve those corridor states not under WIPP, e.g., NE.

Generalize what we've done — beyond WIPP — outline, keep, enhance, thought out.

WIPP shipments which will affect my State within next three years.

Applying lessons learned from WIPP.

DOE performing transportation functions more consistently across the board. WIPP is a shining example of how things should be done — don't want DOE to adopt every single element, but should consider WIPP as standard. Need consistency — if not afraid that another part of DOE's transportation program will cause problems for our program by having an accident or incident (in another component).

### Exchange with DOE

Dialogue with DOE on what can be offered to Indian Tribes to help with emergency preparedness.

Two-way information exchange between DOE and local governments is needed. Often when we have problems at local level, it is because information got lost at State level. We need access to Feds, which is difficult without TEC/WG.

Obtain information.

Have avenue to provide input to DOE transportation policies.

## Networking and communication

Better relationship between DOE and AMC because if DOE screws up, everyone suffers.

DOE's role. At some point, DOE needs to say they think the most important issues are X — focus the discussion, these are the 3-5 issues.

## Tribal issues

How to ensure safe transportation through Indian Country.

Represent broad range of Tribal issues; key consideration is fulfillment of trust responsibility.

## Miscellaneous

Public awareness/acceptance.

Assuring public re cask safety, e.g., do a film of full-scale cask testing-cask maintenance; this would get the message across.

Education.

State latitude in addressing state/local concerns within consistent DOE approach.

Accident impact mitigation — since accidents are going to happen, mitigate the effects of an accident in terms of fewest hurt, least exposed, least public demands — this is what TEC/WG should be focusing on.

Have a national transportation system that works, that everyone works together to make happen — safe and cost effective.

There is one priority and that is safety — beyond that it is what are you going to do to achieve it — bounded by the realities of resources and the laws, how do you work together to achieve it?

Even though issues sometimes get raised too high that it creates controversy. It's easier to get forgiveness than permission.

Our priorities are those of the local communities.

Cut out the bureaucracy.

TEC/WG should work itself out of existence.

Improving safety by objective, statistical criteria — improve the system, decrease risk, cost, and increase practicality.

Should address issues instead of spending all the time addressing political sensitivities — add more technical aspects (though it might burn out some of the other stakeholders, which would be ok).

### **3. How should DOE do this prioritization?**

#### Do it at a TEC/WG meeting

Do it at TEC/WG — discuss with members what issues are but why and how strongly they feel — need to consider the outliers if they are really important to a particular group.

Devote better part of next TEC/WG meetings to do this in open facilitated discussion — first identify what is important; then (next meeting) identify solution strategies to resolve them and draw up an action/implementation plan.

Do it at meeting, but large part of the problem is lack of continuity — we have new people at each meeting and have to rehash the same things for them.

Do prioritization at TEC/WG meeting where have captive audience — if you send out a survey, people too busy. Could do it in written survey or discuss results from our evaluation.

Use same form as for TEC/WG — use the meeting. Break into working groups on same issue and have each come up with their consensus on what priorities are, then have joint meeting and list on chart. Have Tribes develop priorities separately.

Check back to original list from New Orleans to see how the issues have been addressed, then have brainstorming session at TEC/WG to see what has been resolved and what we need to focus on so we can avoid talking about the same issues over and over.

Do it at TEC/WG meeting — brainstorming and list issues to decide what needs to be done immediately.

Have subcommittee do pre-work before the meeting and come back to main group with 2-3 recommendations — has to be done at the meeting. Final decision making face to face with peers.

Do written survey at meeting or allow people 3 minutes to stand and talk about their priorities at the meeting.

Sit down with TEC/WG members at a breakout session — say "these are our topics, what are yours?" then discuss.

Ask people to send in their priorities prior to the meeting and have them do it at the meeting. Basically, DOE has to make the final decision, based on what issues they feel they have the potential to be effective.

Easier to discuss during breakout than in plenary, providing there is time.

#### Already achieved

Have achieved this by and large; have already done a good job — have taken overall priorities and jelled each group's concerns into a package we can work on, which is difficult for DOE because so many different ideas and personalities.

#### DOE's role

Look at problem from DOE perspective, identify 5 things have to do to move and use this to keep focus — currently they are faced with so many issues to address.

Difficult to do when organizations have very different concerns — discussion at TEC/WG would at least allow the organizations to express their concerns, as long as we don't have a strict numerical rating system.

Resolve current issue with OCRWM — can't go on without them.

#### Steering committee approach

- [2] Have steering committee/subcommittee rank the issues; try subgroups based on key functions of the organizations — come back to main group with 2-3 recommendations.

Representation is a tough issue (need environmental perspective).

#### General focus recommendations

Deal more with technical issues, not so much with political sensitivities — am so tired of having this city or that city saying they don't want it for this reason or that — we need to move to a mode that is dealing with technical aspects of risk/safety.

Too much focus on administrative issues, more responsibility for making decisions/addressing issues. Majority of time has been productive; bring back the most important information.

#### Process considerations/methods

Not by majority or by most vocal.

Modified Delphi — can't get together that often — could do focus groups, written comments, and go through the catharsis. Needs to have limited contractor participation — have the participants do the work — perhaps use EMAB as an example for restructuring.

Report back after meetings and emphasize accountability theme (reference to lack of response to DOE's request for identification of priorities).

#### **4. How priorities changed over time**

##### Persistence/little/no change

Routing always top priority.

Base on program and input from Congress — TEC/WG can't do much to help although DOE should listen to how TEC/WG feels.

[12] Always the same; long term concerns; longstanding; TEC/WG provided better understanding of need for public acceptance; greater awareness, e.g., about training opportunities.

[2] Same, these are the priorities I hope to resolve by coming to TEC/WG; same but fine-tuning now.

##### Other

We have had an opportunity for an exchange of priority issues.

[2] Just new member.

Yes, initially focused on a single campaign (WIPP) so we were in a crisis mode — now received opportunity to take a more comprehensive look — what does and doesn't work, what can we do — help develop credibility and dialogue, mutual support.