



MEETING SUMMARY

CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
JANUARY 17-19, 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Welcome and Meeting Overview	2
Plenary Session #1—DOE Transportation Program Update	2
Spent Nuclear Fuel	2
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	3
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management	4
Fernald Proposed Shipping Campaign	4
Plenary Session #2—Environmental Justice Panel Discussion	5
Plenary Session #3—DOE's Strategic Look at Transportation	6
Plenary Session #4—Price-Anderson Act Discussion	7
Plenary Session #5—Breakout Session Reports and Issue Clarification	8
Breakout Session Summaries	9
General Planning and Public Information & Education	10
Transportation Operations	20
Emergency Management and Training	25
In-depth Discussion of National Survey on Public Perceptions of Transportation Risk	32
Appendices	37
Appendix A—Agenda	38
Appendix B—Participant List	41
Appendix C—Evaluation Results	49
Appendix D—Acronym and Abbreviation List	53

INTRODUCTION

The Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) held its sixth semi-annual meeting January 17-19, 1995, in Charlotte, North Carolina. Participants included TEC/WG members and other interested parties.

This Meeting Summary summarizes the plenary presentations and the discussions in each of the four breakout sessions. The plenary session presentations included an update on the Department of Energy (DOE) transportation program activities, an environmental justice panel discussion, DOE's strategic look at transportation, and a discussion of the Price-Anderson Act. Attendees also participated in four breakout sessions: General Planning and Public Information and Education, Emergency Management and Training, Transportation Operations, and an In-depth Discussion on the National Survey on Public Perceptions of Transportation Risks.

For questions concerning TEC/WG issues, contact co-chairs Judith Holm, Manager, Liaison and Communications Program (EM-26.1), (301) 427-1643, or Markus Popa, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW-45), (202) 586-5330. For any other questions concerning this Meeting Summary, materials available at the meeting, or other general TEC/WG issues, please contact Wendy Morgan, Waste Policy Institute, 1872 Pratt Drive, Suite 1600, Blacksburg, Virginia, 24060, (703) 231-9873.

WELCOME AND MEETING OVERVIEW

Judith Holm, Manager, Liaison and Communications Program (EM-26.1), welcomed the meeting participants, noting the record number (90), and reviewed the agenda. Holm introduced Markus Popa, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW-45), as the other co-chair for TEC/WG. All participants introduced themselves. One participant voiced continued concern about the status of affected units of local government within TEC/WG.

PLENARY SESSION #1 DOE Transportation Program Update

Moderated by Michael Conroy, Program Manager, Transportation Management Division (EM-261), this session provided an update on the transportation related activities of several DOE programs.

Spent Nuclear Fuel

Patrick Wells, Engineer, Office of Spent Fuels Management (EM-37), discussed three programs: 1) Programmatic Spent Nuclear Fuel Management and Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Restoration and Waste Management Programs Environmental Impact Statement (SNF & INEL EIS), 2) status of the Urgent-Relief Shipments of Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel (FRR SNF), and 3) Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel EIS (FRR SNF EIS).

The SNF & INEL EIS is a two volume document. The first volume discusses the options to manage the SNF that DOE is responsible for nationwide up to the year 2035. The second volume of the document discusses the direction of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management activities at INEL for the next ten years. The SNF & INEL EIS presents five options for managing the SNF, ranging from minimum action (taking the necessary steps to safely store the SNF at or close to the generation sites) to centralization (which would involve consolidating all the SNF at one site). The preferred alternative will be identified in the final EIS, which will be issued by April 30, 1995, followed by a Record of Decision no sooner than thirty days later.

Wells provided a brief background of the FRR SNF Program. Beginning in the 1950's, the United States assisted foreign countries with peaceful applications of nuclear energy if they would agree not to develop nuclear weapons. Much of this assistance was in the form of highly enriched uranium (HEU) for use as fuel in research reactors. Since HEU could also be used in nuclear weapons, the United States accepted the SNF, and in 1978, started a program to develop replacement fuels using low enriched uranium (LEU), which cannot be used in nuclear weapons. The acceptance policy expired in 1988 for HEU SNF and in 1992 for LEU SNF. At that time DOE committed to conducting an environmental review on the proposed extension of the program.

During the environmental review process, eight countries with foreign research reactors said they could not wait for the completion of the EIS and needed action taken on their SNF. DOE decided to complete an Environmental Assessment (EA), citing the urgent concerns of the

reactor operators, while still working on the EIS. In April 1994, DOE completed an Environmental Assessment of the Urgent-Relief Acceptance of Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel. This was followed by a Finding of No Significant Impact. DOE indicated it would accept up to 409 spent fuel elements from the eight foreign research reactors. The port of entry would be the Military Ocean Terminal at Sunny Point, North Carolina, and the ground transport would be by train to the Savannah River Site. The first shipment of material was completed in September 1994. During the shipment process the state of South Carolina sued DOE and an injunction was granted to block shipments. DOE was able to complete the first shipment when the injunction was lifted after an appeal to the Fourth Circuit Court. The second shipment has not been completed and the case is still pending in the District Court. [On January 27, 1995, District Judge Perry issued a judgment against DOE and permanently enjoined any further SNF shipments under the Urgent-Relief EA. DOE is appealing the finding.]

Regarding the FRR SNF EIS, a Notice of Intent for the development of the FRR SNF EIS was issued in September 1993. Scoping meetings were held in October and November 1993 at six storage locations and six potential ports of entry (Charleston, S.C.; Oakland, Calif.; Seattle/Tacoma, Wash.; Portland, Ore.; Hampton Roads, Va.; and Sunny Point, N.C.). The Implementation Plan for the draft EIS for a Proposed Policy to Accept Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel was issued in October 1994. The EIS is still being written and should be issued in mid-March 1995. The Implementation Plan indicates that DOE's proposed action is to accept and store the FRR SNF from 41 countries. Overseas reprocessing and management will also be analyzed. A summary of the EIS, when issued, can be obtained by contacting Brenda Fleming, Office of Spent Fuel Management (EM-37), at (301) 903-1457.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

Ralph Smith, Institutional Relations Specialist, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), provided a brief history of the project. WIPP, located 30 miles from Carlsbad, New Mexico, is designed for burial of transuranic (TRU) waste (those materials above and including uranium on the periodic chart) 2,150 feet deep in salt caverns. The waste will be general waste materials, including clothing and other contaminated materials. Waste shipments to WIPP are scheduled to begin in June 1998 when the facility opens. Ten major generating sites will ship TRU waste to WIPP; the first shipments will come from the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory and the Rocky Flats Plant. Training, implemented through agreements with Western Interstate Energy Board and the Western Governors' Association (WGA), has been extensive in each of the affected states. Cooperative agreements are currently in place with WGA and Southern States Energy Board and include 23 states; agreements exist with two tribes and another 37 tribes will be contacted in the next year. One meeting participant recommended that states give an update at the next TEC/WG meeting on the cesium-137 shipments because the states are using WIPP procedures with these shipments.

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management

Allen Benson, Team Leader, Environmental and Operational Activities Division, Office of Civilian and Radioactive Waste (RW-45), reviewed several principal RW activities: the draft Transportation Plan, routing, multi-purpose canister (MPC) activities, and Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. RW has received a considerable number of comments on the draft Transportation Plan, a document previously reviewed by TEC/WG. Benson noted that the name of this document will be changed to the Transportation Report to reflect its true nature, and it will be updated annually. The next draft will be completed this spring and will be presented at the July TEC/WG meeting. In a brief review of the routing issue, Benson noted that a draft routing guidance document is being prepared and public comment will be invited. Further discussion of this topic was deferred to the Transportation Operations Breakout Session (see page 20). In a review of RW's MPC activities, Benson noted that three phases of procurement are anticipated for the sealed canister, which will be transported by rail. Current estimates are that 10,000-12,000 MPCs will be needed; responses have been received on the MPC request for proposal and the MPC EIS is being prepared. The Notice of Intent was published on October 24, 1994, and scoping hearings have been held.

Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended in 1987, states that DOE is to provide technical assistance and funds to states for training for public safety officials of appropriate units of local government and Indian tribes through whose jurisdiction the Secretary plans to transport spent nuclear fuel or high level radioactive waste under section A or under section C. Benson stated a Notice of Intent was issued in the *Federal Register* on January 3, 1995, to solicit comments on how to implement 180(c). Comments are due by April 3, 1995. The notice of proposed policy is expected in early 1996, with the announcement of the final policy and procedures in June 1997. A participant inquired about the number of written comments that had been received. Approximately 365 letters have been received, often with more than one comment per letter. Another participant asked about the actual start date of shipments; Benson replied DOE will ship when the appropriate steps have been taken and DOE is prepared to ship. DOE will address the shipping dates in the updates of the plan. Another participant asked about the impact of the new legislation proposed by Senator Bennett Johnston of Louisiana, which adds a cap on 180(c) liability and adds the word substantial. Benson stated that regardless of the proposed legislation, DOE is moving ahead with the 180(c) process and does not anticipate a significant impact from the legislation.

Fernald Proposed Shipping Campaign

Ned Hallein, Remediation Engineer, Fernald Environmental Management Project Division (EM-423), discussed the proposed shipping campaign of waste from the Fernald site to Envirocare, a private waste disposal company located west of Salt Lake City. Fernald is a 1,030 acre site located outside of Cincinnati, Ohio, which produced uranium products for more than 30 years. Production ceased in 1989, and the area was declared a CERCLA site. Remediation efforts include the disposition of 104 million cubic feet of waste, of which 21 million cubic feet will be shipped off-site for disposal.

Gerald Motl, Vice President of Fernald Environmental Restoration Management Company, discussed proposed rail shipment plans. Motl briefly presented the actual public information

that was used with the local stakeholders. He discussed the numerous steps involved in waste pit remediation, from excavating, drying and loading the material on site, to the transportation route (via rail) to the Envirocare site in Utah, an area zoned for hazardous materials. Safety and emergency response concerns were also presented to the public. Motl discussed some of the concerns raised by the public, including the use of a branch rail line which has not been used often and has received minimum maintenance.

One participant asked if the intent was to keep the waste at the Envirocare site permanently. Motl responded that as far as he knew, that was the intent. Another participant asked what was going to be done with the waste (estimated to be a maximum of 10 percent of total pit volume) that will not meet Envirocare's acceptance criteria. The participant was told waste not meeting Envirocare's criteria is to be trucked to the Nevada Test Site. A participant asked if DOE insures or regulates Envirocare. Motl's response was that Envirocare is regulated and licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. A participant stated that public interaction occurred with the Fernald local governments, but no one spoke with the interested parties in Nevada or Utah where more hazardous material will be shipped. It was further noted that while a transportation plan is under development, only the Las Vegas area has been included. The western states invited Ned Hallein and Gerald Motl to speak at a Western Governors' Association meeting to address these concerns. A participant also suggested using TRANSCOM to track the shipments and to speak with the affected states in advance of the shipments.

PLENARY SESSION #2 Environmental Justice Panel Discussion

Georgia Johnson, Executive Director of Environmental Justice for DOE, discussed how the agency is implementing Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*. This order was signed February 11, 1994, with the goal of achieving environmental justice (EJ). Johnson defined EJ as the fair distribution of environmental hazards and benefits, as well as providing all people access to information and ensuring participation. The purpose of the EJ executive order is to focus federal attention on existing environmental and civil rights laws and to ensure a safe, healthful environment for all communities. The order requires every federal agency to incorporate EJ in its mission. Johnson noted one of the first steps DOE took was to translate the executive order into Spanish.

The proposed DOE EJ strategy (released in mid-January 1995), along with EJ strategies of other agencies, will be the focus of a public meeting in Atlanta on January 20, 1995. The current deadline for the finalized strategy is February 11, 1995, however Johnson hopes this date will be extended to allow for stakeholder input since the release of the proposed strategy was delayed. The proposed strategy places stakeholder involvement as a primary focus of addressing EJ issues. Johnson noted that DOE currently has a steering committee and a working group on EJ. In terms of the programmatic impact of the strategy, Johnson stated that all environmental impact statements completed after this spring will have to be drafted at a much more detailed level in order to address EJ concerns. DOE recognizes that employee awareness is a critical component of effectively implementing EJ; therefore, EJ will be a performance measure for managers and training will be conducted as necessary. One

participant asked if impacts on rural areas, as well as geographical equity, are considered part of EJ. Johnson replied that they were.

Linda Lingle, Special Assistant, Office of Public Accountability (EM-5), the second EJ panelist, noted the movement for EJ started in North Carolina with Ben Chavis, former director of the NAACP. Lingle discussed how the Office of Environmental Management is implementing EJ. DOE is placing EJ high on the priority list as is evident by Tom Grumbly's expected presence at the upcoming public meeting in Atlanta. EM is making EJ an integral part of its programs. Lingle stated EM's goal is to involve all stakeholders and communities as plans are developed for cleaning up sites. The Site Specific Advisory Boards are closely tied to implementing EJ successfully. Another part of DOE's EJ activity includes seeking environmental partnerships and opportunities to increase involvement of minority businesses. Lingle noted Loveless Johnson's (Program Manager, Environmental Justice, Office of Public Accountability, EM-5) is the EJ point of contact for EM.

Jim Reed, the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) TEC/WG representative, provided an overview of what actions state legislatures are taking to address EJ. Reed stated that there are two types of actions states can take: reactive (corrective) and proactive. For example, Virginia has been reactive in authorizing a study of existing facilities, whereas Arkansas has been more proactive by requiring a 12 mile buffer zone when locating high impact solid waste management facilities. Mitigation is another reactive approach, however there has not been any significant mitigation legislation at the state level. Reed noted prevention as a proactive measure; this involves outreach to the local communities, participation in the solution by those parties most affected, modifying regulation prior to siting, and working closely with businesses and industries seeking to locate in the community. Steps for positive EJ action include strong citizen involvement, gathering information, and developing practical solutions. Reed stated the information gathered by legislators comes from public hearings and working groups in a number of states. Information is also gathered by legislative agencies, state agencies, and universities. Reed noted that Louisiana has a bill that contains language that directly relates to transportation. NCSL is providing information on EJ in legislative reports and can provide speakers to those who are interested.

PLENARY SESSION #3 DOE's Strategic Look at Transportation

Rich Brancato, Director, Office of Transportation, Emergency Management, and Analytical Services (EM-26), discussed the results of a transportation needs assessment completed in late 1994. The goal of the assessment was to optimize the transportation program and reduce costs. Brancato noted that a paper with the results of the study will be presented at the Waste Management '95 conference in Tucson, Arizona in March. Information for the study was gathered from the Shipment Mobility/Accountability Collection (SMAC), other studies currently under way to determine a baseline inventory for the Office of Environmental Management programs, and additional sources including environmental impact statements. Brancato noted the types of DOE shipments: 46 percent inbound, 48 percent outbound, and 6 percent on site. Three percent of DOE shipments are radioactive, two percent are nonradioactive hazardous, and the remaining 95 percent of shipments are nonradioactive and nonhazardous.

Breakout Session Summaries

GENERAL PLANNING AND PUBLIC INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Session Overview

Allen Benson, Team Leader, Environmental and Operational Activities Division, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW-45), and Judith Holm, Manager, Liaison and Communications Program (EM-26.1), facilitated the General Planning and Public Information and Education Breakout Sessions. Benson led the discussions on Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) and the TEC/WG Glossary; Holm reviewed the other task plans discussed within General Planning and Public Information and Education.

Task Plan I-A.1 Coordinating Section 180(c) Implementation Plans

History

The task plan was designed to develop a process for coordinating implementation of Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, with state, tribal, and local government programs. TEC/WG members have provided input on draft materials prepared by RW. RW's approach is outlined in the *Strategy for OCRWM to Provide Training Assistance to State, Tribal, and Local Governments* (DOE/RW-0374P, 1992); also, in 1992, the office published a Preliminary Draft Options Paper that outlined five options for providing technical assistance and training, as required by Section 180(c). On January 3, 1995, RW published a Notice of Inquiry in the *Federal Register*, describing the implementation options being considered and requesting public comment.

Discussion

Allen Benson explained the 180(c) notice process and proposed schedule. Participants were encouraged to submit comments in response to the *Federal Register* notice. There was a brief discussion of Section 203(c) of an amendment to the NWPA that has recently been introduced by Senator Johnston of Louisiana. A representative from a DOE cooperative agreement group asked whether it would be possible to obtain an extension on the date for submission of comments because some groups would not be meeting until one week after the submittal date. They were assured that DOE is anxious to have their comments and were encouraged to request an extension. One participant questioned the relationship between Section 180(c) training and the DOE training that was discussed during the Emergency Management and Training breakout session. Benson responded that DOE is developing guidance for the entire department, whereas RW is mandated to provide technical assistance and training under the law for jurisdictions through which NWPA-related shipments of high-level radioactive waste or spent fuel will be transported. It was also noted that specific statutory mandates apply to Waste Isolation Pilot Plant shipments.

Key Points

- The possibility of extending the date for submission of comments on the *Federal Register* Notice on Technical Assistance and funding under Section 180(c) of the NWPA.
- The relationship between training provided under 180(c) and training guidance being developed by the department.

Action Items

- Affected cooperative agreement groups will write a formal request for an extension of the comment period on the *Federal Register* notice.

Due Date

April 1995

Task Plan I-B.2 Transportation Institutional Policy

History

The policy establishes several principles that provide a framework for involving stakeholders in DOE's transportation programs. It aims to foster coordination among DOE transportation program headquarters and field elements in their interactions with stakeholders. The policy is intended to be applied DOE-wide. The task was first proposed in September 1993 and TEC/WG members have reviewed draft and final drafts of the document. However, DOE wishes to reexamine the policy and incorporate environmental justice considerations into the policy before it is finalized.

Discussion

Judith Holm outlined the purpose of the policy and noted that it had been written prior to DOE's Strategy on Environmental Justice. She emphasized that she would welcome suggestions from members on how to incorporate environmental justice considerations into the Transportation Institutional Policy. The Office of Waste Management (EM-30) has provided written guidance to the field offices. One participant questioned the effect of budget cuts in Environmental Safety and Health (which would normally be responsible for this type of activity) and whether the cuts would "make environmental justice an exercise in rhetoric." Further discussion focused on the implications for routing, particularly for railroads. For example, an Association of American Railroads (AAR) representative voiced a concern about the lack of flexibility that railroads face, especially in rural areas where many tracks are already on tribal lands. It was pointed out that environmental justice was often a case of awareness and consideration of what can be done in terms of mitigation rather than changing existing routes.

Key Points

- Discussion of the importance of awareness of cultural resources.
- Concern about the implications of environmental justice for the railroads where flexibility in routing is lacking.
- Concern about the impact of budget cuts on efforts to implement environmental justice.

Action Items

- | <u>Action Items</u> | <u>Due Date</u> |
|---|-----------------|
| · EM-26.1 will revisit the environmental justice section of the Transportation Institutional Plan after the Strategy document is finalized. | TBD |
| · EM-26.1 will provide copies of EM-30's written guidance. | when available |

Task Plan I-B.3 Liaison and Communications Long-Range Plan

History

The goal of this task plan is to obtain stakeholder input on the long-term goals and objectives of the program. The Liaison and Communications Long-Range Plan, which is updated annually, establishes goals and objectives to promote effective communication among DOE transportation programs and interested parties and identifies activities to meet those goals and objectives. The task plan was reviewed by TEC/WG in January 1994 and the Long-Range Plan was extensively revised with comments incorporated into the FY 1995 Plan.

Discussion

Holm asked for comments on the revised draft within 60 days so that DOE can include the information in the 1996 budget cycle. Discussion was limited.

Action Items

- | | <u>Due Date</u> |
|---|-------------------|
| · TEC/WG members will provide comments on the Liaison and Communications Long-Range Plan. | within 60 days |
| · EM-26.1 will provide a final draft of the 1996 plan to TEC/WG. | July 1995 Meeting |

Task Plan I-B.4 Program Managers' Guide to Transportation Planning

History

The guide has been developed as a tool to help the Office of Environmental Management program managers become aware of, and incorporate into their programs, planning issues related to the off-site transportation of radioactive materials. It describes important elements in program development and identifies resources for program managers at sites, operations offices, and headquarters. The revised draft of the guide, distributed at this meeting, incorporates comments provided by TEC/WG in October 1994; internal DOE review in November 1994; and external peer review in December 1994.

Discussion

Holm noted the value of the guide to EM in planning and conducting cesium and spent fuel shipments and reviewed changes that had been made to the Transportation Planning Matrix in response to comments. DOE plans to put an electronic version of the guide on the Internet.

Breakout group participants raised several questions about the guide. An AAR representative asked to what extent lessons learned from previous campaigns such as cesium and spent fuel shipments are incorporated into new campaigns. Holm explained that the intent was to include lessons learned in the guide and that the Southern States Energy Board and Western Governors' Association were developing a "lessons learned" from the two recent campaigns. The representative also asked for clarification of DOE's policy on deployment of Radiological Assistance Program (RAP) resources, discussed on pages 12 and 13 of the guide, in particular whether DOE consistently does not participate in an emergency unless called by the state. (During the closing plenary session Wes Taylor, Office of Emergency Response (DP-23), stated that RAP teams only respond if requested, however some states have an agreement with DOE for the RAP teams to respond to any incident on certain shipping campaigns.) One TEC/WG participant commented on a recent Hanford decision not to ship because an Environmental Assessment had not been done and recommended that EM strengthen the pertinent section in the guide to clarify the level of environmental assessment needed. Another participant asked whether the guide would incorporate an assessment of prioritizing stakeholder involvement. In response to a question on whether EM-26.1 was still accepting comments, Holm stated that comments were welcome and that work was continuing on the draft to increase its usefulness.

Key Points

- Lessons learned will be incorporated into future versions of the guide.
- Several changes were recommended:
 - Clarification of DOE policy on the deployment of RAP teams.

- Further explanation of the required level of environmental assessment.
- Provision of guidance on prioritizing stakeholder involvement.

Action Items

- TEC/WG members will provide comments on the current draft.
- EM-26.1 will revise the guide based on input from TEC/WG members and on internal review and discussion.

Due Date

within 60 days
within 60 days

Task Plan I-B.5 Risk Perception Analysis

History

A draft task plan was distributed to members in October 1994.

Discussion

There were no comments on the draft task plan. Limited time was devoted to discussion of this topic as an entire breakout group was being facilitated by Hank Jenkins-Smith during this meeting in which he presented the findings of two pilot risk perception studies and previewed his upcoming nation-wide risk perception survey. (Please refer to the summary of the In-depth Discussion of National Survey on Public Perceptions of Transportation Risk Breakout Sessions on page 32.)

Task Plan I-B.6 Environmental Justice

History

The purpose of this task plan is to determine the implications of environmental justice (EJ) on DOE's transportation activities and to address the requirements and intent of Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*. The issue was first discussed at the TEC/WG meeting in July 1994. EM-26.1 provided copies of the executive order and of the draft task plan to TEC/WG members in October 1994. This TEC/WG meeting included a panel discussion on the issue. (See page five for a summary of the panel discussion.)

Discussion

A particular concern centered on EM's specific plans and the need for consistency in approach, e.g., in preparing environmental impact statements. One participant emphasized the difficulty of examining the issues in the abstract. For example, until base case routes are available, it is not possible to identify whether there are EJ impacts and what the alternatives are. Some of the data sources for considering EJ implications (e.g., INTERLINE, GIS) were discussed. There was some discussion of the lack of progress in this area that has been made by other agencies and concern was expressed about the cost implications of implementing the executive order. In response to members' questions on whether they would be notified when the DOE strategy on EJ is issued and whether EM-26 would evaluate transportation activities after that, Holm explained that DOE is doing this and recognized the need for a consistent approach. She noted that EM-30 has already issued a directive to the field which spells out some of the implications, for example the need to reach out to stakeholders who are silent and do not come to meetings or comment on activities or reports. The representative from the National Tribal Environmental Council (NTEC) offered to give a presentation on tribal issues at the next TEC/WG meeting.

Key Points

- Concern about EM's specific plans:
 - Difficulty of discussing EJ in the abstract.
 - Need for EM-26.1 to develop a list of the pertinent issues to be examined.
 - Need for consistent guidance on preparation of EISs.
 - Use of data sources for considering EJ implications.
 - The cost implications of EJ.
- Lack of progress by other agencies.

Action Items

- | | <u>Due Date</u> |
|---|-------------------|
| · EM will review and revise its policies after release of the final DOE Strategy document. | February 1995 |
| · EM-26.1 will mail the draft EJ Strategy document and copies of the EM-37 directive (a sign-up sheet was provided at the meeting). | when available |
| · NTEC will give a presentation on issues concerning the tribes. | July 1995 meeting |

Task Plan I-D.1 TEC/WG Process Plan

History

The Process Plan, which defines the process by which TEC/WG is involved with DOE in identifying and resolving significant transportation-related issues, was approved by TEC/WG members at the July 1994 meeting.

Discussion

There was no discussion.

Action Items

- | | <u>Due Date</u> |
|--|-----------------|
| · EM-26.1 will distribute copies of the TEC/WG Process Plan. | March 1995 |
| · The task plan is now closed. | |

Task Plan I-D.2 TEC/WG Work Plan

History

The TEC/WG Work Plan maintains a record of the issues identified by TEC/WG members, goals and objectives for resolving those issues, and actions taken by DOE to meet those goals and objectives. The Work Plan was distributed to TEC/WG members at the July 1994 meeting and suggested revisions were distributed in November.

Discussion

There was no discussion.

Action Items

- | | <u>Due Date</u> |
|---|-------------------|
| · EM-26.1 will distribute the Work Plan. | March 1995 |
| · TEC/WG members will review the Work Plan. | July 1995 meeting |
| · EM-26.1 will update and distribute the Work Plan to TEC/WG members as needed; the entire Work Plan will be distributed every 18 months. | as needed |

Other Issues: HMIX Pilot for Electronic Transfer of Documents

History

At the TEC/WG meeting in July 1994, seven volunteers offered to participate in a pilot test to determine the capability of members in receiving TEC/WG materials through the Hazardous Materials Information eXchange (HMIX).

Discussion

EM-26.1 suggested a panel discussion of experiences with HMIX be conducted at the next TEC/WG meeting. However, participants expressed a preference for EM-26.1 to compile a report rather than participation in a panel discussion. Some of the participants discussed their experiences to date. Several noted that the system is easy to access, but difficult to download and that the time limit of 15 minutes is too short for transmitting documents. They expressed concern that quality control measures would be taken to prevent the spread of viruses. There was some discussion of the capability for on-line commenting and whether the Internet may be a preferable option. (HMIX now has a gateway to the Internet.)

Key Points

- The pilot will continue with the current volunteers.
- Comments on experiences to date include:
 - HMIX is easy to access but not to download.
 - The time limit of 15 minutes on HMIX is too short for document transmission. *[The 15 minutes does not include download time. There is also a toll number available for 60 minutes of use (708) 972-3275].*
 - A quality control system is needed to prevent future occurrences of virus transmission.
- Questions were raised about the capability for document review on HMIX and whether the Internet may be the optimum method. *[HMIX is now on the Internet, however document transmission is not available at this time.]*
- Participants prefer to provide input to EM-26.1 rather than participating in a panel discussion.

Action Items

Due Date

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · WPI will develop a list of questions and will schedule a conference call with the volunteers to compile results. · WPI will prepare a summary of volunteer experiences. | <p>March 1995</p> <p>July 1995 meeting</p> |
|--|--|

Task Plan VII-A.1 TEC/WG Member Organizations' Outreach Programs

History

The purpose of this task is to identify alternative and innovative methods for involving interested parties in DOE and TEC/WG members' activities and incorporate appropriate methods into DOE outreach activities. Members were asked to provide profiles of their organizations by November 1994, for inclusion in the *Resource Notebook*; only nine responses have been received.

Discussion

Holm reminded members to mail in their profiles and also emphasized that she would like to hear from them about their outreach activities and how they provide information and interact with their members.

Action Items

- TEC/WG members will provide profiles.
- EM-26.1 will send out a list of educational materials.

Due Date

ASAP
March 1995

Task Plan VII-A.2 Shipment Information Packets

History

The purpose of this task is to provide interested parties with information about DOE's unclassified shipments of radioactive and other hazardous materials. Cesium and spent fuel information kits were provided prior to the shipping campaigns. There are no additional packets at this time.

Discussion

Holm explained that additional packets will be developed and provided for TEC/WG review as needed. She noted that EM is now developing information on prospective flows and that members' thoughts are welcome.

Task Plan VII-A.4 TEC/WG Glossary

History

Work on a glossary of transportation-related terms was initiated to facilitate development of a common understanding among the TEC/WG membership. The draft task plan and draft glossary were presented and discussed at the January and July 1994 TEC/WG meetings and the final glossary has been distributed to TEC/WG members.

Discussion

Allen Benson stated that he wished to close out this task, although he would keep the glossary updated. Members expressed appreciation that the document is comprehensive and asked if it could be provided on HMIX so that it could be downloaded for use in documents. The need for several revisions to the glossary was noted. One member recommended that RW check the page numbers for cross-references and a representative from the Association of American Railroads (AAR) offered to provide a more accurate definition of *special train*. Several persons recommended that the glossary include a definition of *environmental justice*. In response to a question from a Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors (CRCPD) representative, Benson replied that additional comments could be submitted.

Key Points

- Appreciation was expressed for the comprehensive nature of the glossary.
- Several revisions were suggested:
 - A final check on the page numbers for cross-references.
 - An alternative definition of *special train*.
 - Inclusion of a definition for *environmental justice*.
- One member wished to provide additional comments.
- Members requested that DOE provide an electronic copy of the glossary on HMIX.

Action Items

- The AAR representative will provide a revised version of the term *special train*.
- RW will check cross reference page numbers, include a

Due Date

ASAP

ASAP

definition of *environmental justice*, and incorporate the AAR definition of *special train* in an errata sheet to accompany the glossary.

- Weston will provide a disk copy of the glossary to WPI to transfer to HMIX. when available
- The CRCPD representative will submit comments. ASAP

Task Plan VII-A.5 Cooperative Efforts with Third Parties

There was no discussion on this task plan.

Task Plan VII-A.6 Annual List of Planned DOE Shipments

History

The purpose of this task is to help state and tribal officials prepare for their public safety responsibilities related to DOE's unclassified shipments of radioactive materials. Members discussed information to include in the list at the July 1994 TEC/WG meeting. EM-26.1 developed a draft format in November 1994; comments from the Western Governors' Association were received the following month.

Discussion

Holm outlined the criteria, information, and distribution methods developed by TEC/WG at the July 1994 meeting and additional types of shipments suggested by WGA—high hazard materials, high volume, high hazard or radioactive materials in liquid or odd ball shipments (e.g., overweight shipments)—and requested additional comments from members. An AAR representative noted the need to define terms such as "high hazard" and asked what would be included in the list (i.e., would it be more than high level waste or spent fuel and what is the need for more information)? Discussion ensued about the extent and type of information needed and how best to balance the value and costs of providing information. One representative pointed out, for example, that WIPP shipments entail 30,000 shipments, which would involve a massive notification problem for DOE and problems for the states in managing pages of information. There appeared to be general agreement that the primary need is for information that will help procurement and transportation management, in particular ensuring that information is available so that medical personnel will know what the materials are and how to treat people in case of an emergency. In response to one participant's question about the value placed on this activity by DOE, Holm responded that sites are now being requested by the states to provide material flow information which is required by the Environmental Protection Agency or Department of Transportation programs. Questions were also raised about the Transportation Communication Network and whether DOE was planning to examine the overall communication system as opposed to individual modules such as TRANSCOM. One member noted that information about water transport should be expanded to include ocean terminal information as more shipments may move by ocean.

Key Points

- Critical issue is to determine the value versus the cost of providing information—how extensive does information need to be? DOE needs input from TEC/WG members.
- Extent and type of information needed: primary need is for procurement and management, especially medical needs in an emergency.
- Site information is needed by states for material flow information required by DOT and EPA.

- Members questioned whether DOE is planning to examine the overall communication system as opposed to individual modules such as TRANSCOM.
- Water mode should be expanded to include ocean shipments.

Action Items

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · DOE will continue work on the draft report and distribute to TEC/WG members. · TEC/WG members will provide further input on their information needs. · EM-26.1 will provide copies of the information screens. | <p><u>Due Date</u></p> <p>when available</p> <p>ASAP</p> <p>March 1995</p> |
|--|--|

Task Plan VII-B.1 Evaluation of L&C Information Products

This task was redirected to become an evaluation of the entire Liaison & Communications information program rather than individual products.

Discussion

Holm noted that EM-26.1 is planning to evaluate the effectiveness of current products by linking into the Office of Public Accountability (EM-5) activities/evaluation of products and exhibits. She plans to incorporate the risk perception data from the studies being conducted by Hank Jenkins-Smith. There was no discussion and no action items.

Task Plan IV-E.2 Medical Community Awareness Access to REAC/TS Information

History

This task plan was formulated and reviewed by TEC/WG members at the July 1994 meeting. The purpose is to provide poison control centers with better access to information from the Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site (REAC/TS).

Discussion

A list of poison control centers was compiled and a REAC/TS handbook was distributed to members during the breakout sessions. Holm noted that REAC/TS has been asked to provide an additional letter to the poison control center staff to remind them about the REAC/TS organization. Members recommended that telephone numbers be included on the list of poison control centers.

Key Points

- Telephone numbers should be included on the list of poison control centers.

Action Items

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · EM-26.1 will revise the list to include telephone numbers of poison control centers and distribute to TEC/WG Members. · This task plan will be closed. | <p><u>Due Date</u></p> <p>TBD</p> |
|---|-----------------------------------|

Other Activities

1. EM-37 Hypermedia Handout on Spent Nuclear Fuel

Brenda Fleming, Public Participation Specialist, Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel (EM-37), explained the handout and requested TEC/WG comments. One participant suggested that DOE examine some of the medical literature, in particular some of the literature that had used dollar trade-offs.

Action Item

TEC/WG to provide comments.

Due Date

February 17, 1995

2. HAZTRANZ Board Game

Members participated in playing the game developed by Argonne.

Action Item

TEC/WG members to provide comments to Sam Bowen, Argonne, on:

Due Date

ASAP

- Suggested corrections or revisions to the game.
- Candidate sites to use the game.
- Suggestions for other applications.

Other Issues

Issue #1

Several members expressed confusion over collapsing of some of task plans and asked that a matrix be provided so that members could keep track of the most recent versions of task plans.

Action Item

EM-26.1 will provide a listing.

Due Date

March 1995

Issue #2

An AAR representative asked about the status of DOE's risk management concept as applied to the multi-purpose canister.

Action Item

RW will report on the status of risk management as it applies to MPCs.

Due Date

July 1995 meeting

Issue #3

A WGA representative expressed concern about the "astronomical" increase in the number of DOE environmental impact statements. Members noted that there is considerable confusion about the relationship among the documents, particularly the implications for transportation, and that there is a need for consistency between programs about what is examined in the EIS.

Action Item

EM will review and report to TEC/WG.

Due Date

July 1995 meeting

Issue #4

An AAR representative emphasized the need for consistency among all DOE programs. He stated that the issue of fragmentation and different policies required a "high-level look" e.g., by the Secretary.

No action was taken.

TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS

Session Overview

The Transportation Operations Breakout Sessions were facilitated by Michael Conroy, Program Manager, Transportation Management Division (EM-261). Tasks previously listed under Safe Routine Transportation and Inspection and Enforcement have been combined under Transportation Operations and were reviewed. TEC/WG member written comments were requested by March 1, 1995 on materials mailed prior to the January meeting. Comments on the routing documents are due April 30, 1995.

Task Plan II-B.1 DOE HRCQ Routing Guidance

History

The objective of this task plan is for DOE to develop departmental guidance for programs to use in selecting routes for Highway Route Controlled Quantities (HRCQ) of radioactive material. Draft discussion papers were distributed in December 1994 for members to review.

Discussion

DOE gave a presentation on the draft strategy plan and draft highway and rail discussion papers. The discussion centered around the allotment of time for development of the guidance. In the plenary session, it was noted that more time was needed by TEC/WG members to properly review the materials mailed in December 1994. It was agreed that a draft guidance document would be developed and mailed two weeks prior to the July 1995 TEC/WG meeting. Once reviewed, the draft guidance would be revised and then offered in the *Federal Register*. The strategy plan will also be revised.

Key Points

- Consider environmental justice.
- Consider risk factors other than population.
- Methodology revision: consult jointly with carriers and state, tribal and local governments.
- Schedule diagram needed.

Action Item

- | <u>Action Item</u> | <u>Due Date</u> |
|---|-------------------|
| · TEC/WG members to review and comment on discussion papers. | April 1995 |
| · Revise draft Strategy Plan. | July 1995 meeting |
| · EM-261 develop draft guidance and transmit to TEC/WG. | July 1995 meeting |
| · Discuss draft guidance (with the Department of Transportation). | July 1995 meeting |

Task Plan II-C.2 Bad Weather and Road Conditions Guidance

History

The purpose of this task is to develop a DOE "guidance" document on Bad Weather and Road Conditions which meets applicable Department of Transportation, state, and tribal regulations. The preliminary draft guidance document was distributed prior to the meeting for the members to review.

Discussion

The preliminary draft guidance was discussed. A decision was made that the guidance document was too oriented to the cesium-137 shipments and needs to be revised similar to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Bad Weather and Road Conditions protocols. TEC/WG

members noted that the guidance should have two parts, one for routine shipments and one for special shipments, such as the cesium-137 material. TEC/WG members noted that the definition of adverse weather needs to be specified, similar to what is in the Cesium-137 Transportation Plan. Also, TEC/WG members noted the need to consider weather checks along the whole route and not just the immediate area of shipment departure. Once revised, the draft guidance will be resubmitted to TEC/WG for final comments. The discussion also covered what weather conditions could affect rail shipments. It was agreed that rail, especially branch lines, needs more consideration (i.e., who is to deal with local governments and rail companies about branch lines and is this a shipper or rail company responsibility).

Key Points

- Rewrite routine shipments based on WIPP protocol, special shipments based on Cesium Plan.
- Need adverse weather definition.
- Need to consider application to rail shipments (local conditions on branch lines).

Action Item

- Revise Guidance Document

Due Date

May 1995

Task Plan II-C.3 Escorts Guidance

History

The objective of this task is to provide a definition of escorts and to identify possible use of escorts for DOE shipments. This task will also address what benefits, if any, escorts accomplish in relation to safety and public perception. A preliminary draft escort guidance document was distributed before the meeting for the members to review.

Discussion

The draft definition of escort was reviewed by TEC/WG. The definition does not include the activities of a safeguards/security type escort. A point was made that the name "escorts" may not be appropriate for the function discussed since escorts connotes a Nuclear Regulatory Commission safeguard and security task. A number of points were raised concerning evaluating the needs of rural and tribal resources, analysis of benefits and costs, duration of the campaign, material transported, number of shipments, if training has been done already in the area, first responders arrival time, and using escorts versus DOE providing training. TEC/WG members agreed that DOE should evaluate the use of escorts on a case-by-case basis. A key function of the escort should be to support the incident commander with information on the shipment. For highway, the escort should be in a separate vehicle. Escorts for rail shipments need special consideration regarding whether the escort should be located on the train or in a separate rail vehicle.

Key Points

- Need to develop criteria for when to use escorts versus training.
- Determination of need for and particular functions of escorts to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
- Definition to be revised with input from TEC/WG members.
- Need to consider how to transport rail escorts.

Action Item

- Revise Guidance Document.
- Revise Task Plan.
- Discuss revised definition.

Due Date

May 1995
May 1995
July 1995 meeting

Task Plan II-C.8 Transportation Package Recovery

History

The purpose of this task is to incorporate accident recovery considerations in DOE radioactive materials packaging design. The task was proposed at the July 1994 meeting. The draft task plan was distributed in December 1994 for members to review.

Discussion

The draft task plan was discussed. Several participants were concerned about the recoverability of a 125 ton package such as RW is proposing to develop. Another TEC/WG member noted that recovery is not the only issue and that all aspects of emergency response need to be considered when designing packagings. TEC/WG members suggested that the guidance include designing packagings for multiple lifters, e.g., more than one crane to lift a very heavy package. DOE noted that the guidance could be incorporated into a DOE Order or into a Package Developers Guide that is under development. TEC/WG members also suggested that training materials on recovery of transport packages be supplied to first responders. TEC/WG members noted that the Multi-Purpose Canister (MPC) Request for Proposal (RFP) needs to include recovery and emergency response considerations. No further amendments may be added to the RFP since it has been published. RW suggested that any comments on this topic be sent to Jeff Williams, Director of Engineering Division, Office of Waste Acceptance, Storage and Transportation (RW-46), (202) 586-9620.

Key Points

- Concern on recovery of RW's MPC.
- Need to consider emergency response and recovery aspects in design and operations.

Action Item

- Develop Guidance Document.

Due Date

May 1995

Task Plan II-C.9 DOE "courtesy communications"

History

The objective of this task plan is to evaluate the need and options for DOE to provide "courtesy communications" to state and tribal governments when a DOE Highway Route Controlled Quantity shipment travels through the respective jurisdictions. The task was proposed at the July 1994 meeting. A draft task plan was distributed in December 1994 for members to review.

Discussion

The draft task plan was reviewed and comments consisted of what information was needed and how best to supply the information to state and tribal governments. TEC/WG members noted that it would be useful to use one system to notify them for HRCQ and Nuclear Regulatory Commission required shipments. The task plan requires revision as well as developing an options paper.

Key Points

- Need to develop approach through Transportation Internal Coordination Working Group.
- Provide electronic access to information on upcoming shipments.

Action Item

- Develop Options Paper and revise task plan.

Due Date

May 1995

Task Plan II-C.10 Shipping Campaign Definition

History

The purpose of this task plan is to provide a definition for the term "shipping campaign" and to identify requirements for use of such a definition for DOE shipments. The task was proposed at the July 1994 meeting. A draft task plan and a draft definition were distributed in December 1994 for members to review.

Discussion

The draft definition was reviewed by TEC/WG members with comments ranging from "why do we need this" to a need to revise the definition. Once it was determined that the shipping definition was useful, a number of text revisions were suggested in terms of number of shipments and to what modes the definition applies. Also, the word aggressive in the definition was deemed inappropriate. TEC/WG members noted that Remote-Handled Transuranic waste was left off the order of importance list. An important issue for TEC/WG members was to consider that numerous shipments from multiple origins to one destination could be called a campaign.

Key Points

- Revise definition per comments received at January 1995 TEC/WG meeting and mail out in May for discussion at July 1995 meeting.
- The guidance applies to all modes of transportation.
- Definition to include multiple origins to one destination.
- Consider a campaign to be more than one shipment in 12 months.
- Need to add Remote-Handled Transuranic materials to the order of importance.

Action Item

- Revise Guidance Document.

Due Date

May 1995

Task Plan II-G.7 Look for additional campaigns to test CVSA procedures

History

The purpose of this task plan is to test the draft Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) inspection procedures through a pilot program, collecting data on inspections by the new procedures. The draft task plan was reviewed at the January 1994 meeting.

Discussion

DOE will continue to look for shipping campaigns to test the CVSA procedures on, however it would like to close this task plan. It was suggested that this task plan be closed because it is redundant with Task Plan II-G.3.

Key Points

- Close this task plan and add a measurable step to Task Plan II-G.3.

Action Item

- Revise task plans.

Due Date

May 1995

Task Plan II-G.13 Develop a report of all radioactive shipments with accidents or incidents

History

The purpose of this task plan is to develop a report focusing on the rail inspection requirements for past radioactive shipments and the number of incidents and accidents associated with those shipments. The task was proposed in February 1994 and a draft task plan was distributed in December 1994 for members to review.

Discussion

A report is needed that briefly covers radioactive material transport incidents. Each incident should be a page with the whole report roughly 10-12 pages. EM-26.1 has offered to take over this task plan and will supply a report outline for TEC/WG approval at the July 1995 meeting.

Key Points

- Access to the Radioactive Material Incident Report database does not close the task plan.

Action Item

- EM-26.1 will revise task plan to assume responsibility.
- EM-26.1 will supply a report outline.

Due Date

May 1995

July 1995 meeting

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING

Session Overview

Jim Cruickshank, Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program Manager, Emergency Management Division (EM-262), facilitated the Emergency Management and Training Breakout Sessions. There were two basic objectives for these sessions. First, as proposed in Task Plan V-A.6 Identification of opportunities for improvement in TEP training, participants received an extensive briefing on DOE's transportation emergency preparedness (TEP) training. Presentations were made by Bruce Hurley, Emergency Management Training Coordinator, DOE-Nevada, and George Kramer, Technical Training Specialist, Analysas Corporation, that covered TEP courses offered internally to DOE personnel and externally to state, tribal, and local organizations. After answering participants questions, Cruickshank then moved on to the second topic and explained the new perspective that EM-262 is taking for the development and implementation of TEP. The key aspect to this new approach is its focus on the emergency responders. Cruickshank discussed the goal, related initiatives, and priorities for accomplishing these.

After receiving strong support for the responder focused initiatives from breakout session participants, the group then discussed the existing Work Plan Objectives and modifications needed to make them better align with the new TEP focus. Several Emergency Management and Training task plans were closed while others were placed into "pending" status with all associated work suspended for the time being. Members agreed with this postponement of task plan activities to allow a more complete focus on the development of new TEP Program documents. Cruickshank announced that he will be establishing a TEC/WG Emergency Management Special Interest Group to assist in the development and technical review of documents related to the new responder focused TEP Program, and members (or their constituents) interested in participating should contact him at (301) 427-1626.

The following synopsis of the new TEP vision was discussed during the breakout sessions.

EMD's Strategy for TEP

EM-262 provided the following goal statement:

EM-262 envisions a responder focused program that is designed to provide state, tribal, local, and DOE emergency responders with the skills, knowledge and equipment requirements necessary to respond efficiently, effectively, and safely to EM site and transportation incidents and accidents involving unclassified DOE hazardous materials shipments. EM-262 will integrate DOE's emergency preparedness policies, procedures, and resources with those of the state, tribal, and local responders making the best use of available assets.

Main initiatives

- Increase percentage of effort and resources toward providing assistance to and strengthening the emergency response capabilities of state, tribal, local, and DOE emergency response organizations for radioactive material incidents/emergencies.
- Increase support for DOE Operations Offices to help coordinate the development and integration of EM-262's TEP Program into the DOE Emergency Management System and focus more directly toward the emergency responders.
- Create an appropriate mechanism to augment resources for state and tribal transportation

emergency response organizations, and share appropriate emergency management program guidance and training necessary to develop and hone the incremental increase in response capabilities that DOE hazardous materials shipments require.

- Create a TEP training curriculum that is consistent with the response hierarchy in the TEP planning guidance. Training programs will be revised to reflect maximum availability of training to emergency responders.
- Create integrated Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) planning guidance for Operations Offices, states, and tribes. Accelerate formulation and promulgation of the guidance the field needs to develop and implement effective TEP across the DOE complex.
- During the remainder of FY 1995, EM-262 will develop plans for beginning transition year 1996 implementation of responder focused TEP program. This program implementation will start in FY 1996 and should be fully implemented by the end of FY 1997.

EM-262's Priorities (Sizable reductions in budget and staff support necessitate re-evaluation of tasks and their priorities):

Planning

- Define the overall TEP system.
- Identify tiers and associated roles and responsibilities of the TEP system.
- Develop job and task analysis for DOE TEP response.
- Define appropriate training and exercise systems to support TEP.

Training

- Identify/develop TEP training curriculum.
- Develop TEP training products to fill any "holes" and provide maximum availability to emergency responders (e.g., remote/distance training).

Exercises

- Define planning and performance standards for TEP exercises.

Operations

- Develop standardized list of minimal equipment that is associated with TEP hazards and appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the TEP response system.

Financial

- Shift a significant percentage of EM-262 resources toward development and implementation of new responder focused TEP initiatives.
- Develop criteria for field requests for EM-262 TEP augmentation.

Proposed Working Arrangement between TEC/WG and EM-262

- Concurrence between objectives or priorities for TEC/WG and EMD.
- Use TEC/WG as conduit to technical experts for peer review of appropriate TEP materials.
- TEC/WG input/involvement needed with:
 1. Defining the TEP response system.
 - Roles and responsibilities for "tiered" response.
 - Expectations of capabilities/functions for each level.
 - Issues of geographical areas of responsibility.
 2. Develop TEP implementation guidance.
 3. Establish a TEP standard equipment list.
 4. Determine TEP training objectives and curricula in defining and validating.
- Group questions/discussions.

Re-examination of TEC/WG Work Plan Objectives within Emergency Management

The following are either new or unchanged objectives.

Emergency Management Objective A

Current

Develop approaches to improve state, tribal, and local emergency response capabilities, including a federal interagency program to assist states, tribes, and local jurisdictions along DOE transportation corridors in the development of emergency response plans annexes for response to incidents involving radioactive materials.

Proposed

Develop approaches to improve capabilities of emergency responders along DOE transportation corridors for responding to incidents/emergencies involving unclassified DOE radioactive and mixed hazards material shipments.

Related EMD priorities/activities

- Shift a significant percentage of EM-262 resources toward development and implementation of new responder focused TEP initiatives.
- Define the overall TEP system.
- Identify tiers and associated roles and responsibilities of the TEP system.
- Develop job and task analysis for DOE TEP response.
- Define appropriate training and exercise systems to support TEP.
- Identify/develop TEP training curriculum.
- Develop TEP training products to fill any "holes" and provide maximum availability to emergency responders (e.g., remote/distance training).
- Define planning and performance standards for TEP exercises.
- Develop standardized list of minimal equipment that is associated with TEP hazards and appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the TEP response system.

Emergency Management Objective B

Current

Develop "user-friendly" emergency response guidance for DOE shipments: including looking at basic or generic guidance plus incident specific and mode specific information, including specialized audiences such as the media.

Proposed

Develop planning and response guidance for implementation of TEP by DOE elements. It should include issues on interaction/integration with state, tribal and local emergency response organizations.

Related EMD priorities/activities

- Identify tiers and associated roles and responsibilities of the TEP system.
- Develop job and task analysis for DOE TEP response.
- Define appropriate training and exercise systems to support TEP.
- Define planning and performance standards for TEP exercises.
- Develop standardized list of minimal equipment that is associated with TEP hazards and appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the TEP response system.

Emergency Management Objective E

Current

Address medical preparedness.

Proposed

No change.

Related EMD priorities/activities

- Define the overall TEP system.
- Identify tiers and associated roles and responsibilities of the TEP system.
- Develop job and task analysis for DOE TEP response.
- Define appropriate training and exercise systems to support TEP.

Emergency Management Objective J (*new objective*)

Proposed

Develop standard lists of minimal equipment needed for TEP response to radioactive material incidents/emergencies. (This item, with slight variation, was originally listed under Training Objective A.)

Related EMD priorities/activities

- Develop standardized list of minimal equipment that is associated with TEP hazards and appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the TEP response system.

Emergency Management Objective K (*new objective*)

Proposed

Identify the various tiers and associated roles and responsibilities of the parties associated with the TEP response system, including agencies/organizations of federal, state, tribal, and local governments, and the private sector.

Related EMD priorities/activities

- Define the overall TEP system.
- Identify tiers and associated roles and responsibilities of the TEP system.
- Develop job and task analysis for DOE TEP response.

Training Objective A

Current

Determine appropriate levels of training and equipment.

Proposed

Determine appropriate TEP training curricula based on the requirements from a job and task analysis for the TEP response system.

Related EMD priorities/activities

- Identify tiers and associated roles and responsibilities of the TEP system.
- Develop job and task analysis for DOE TEP response.
- Define appropriate training and exercise systems to support TEP.
- Identify/develop TEP training curriculum.
- Develop TEP training products to fill any "holes" and provide maximum availability to emergency responders (e.g., remote/distance training).

Training Objective B

Current

Develop performance standards for training by adapting existing standards or developing new ones.

Proposed

Identify appropriate performance standards for jobs associated with TEP roles and responsibilities.

Related EMD priorities/activities

- Identify tiers and associated roles and responsibilities of the TEP system.
- Develop job and task analysis for DOE TEP response.
- Define appropriate training and exercise systems to support TEP.
- Identify/develop TEP training curriculum.
- Develop TEP training products to fill any "holes" and provide maximum availability to emergency responders (e.g., remote/distance training).

The following are objectives that were deleted.

Emergency Management Objective C

Current

Participate in developing a nationwide inventory of national response capabilities and identify federal, state, tribal, and local response agencies.

Proposed

Delete this objective. The activity suggested by the current objective has been conducted through the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Department of Defense.

Emergency Management Objective D

Current

Support or discuss the need for standardizing level of response.

Proposed

Delete this objective. It is an implicit part of the new objectives to define roles and responsibilities and to identify standardized lists of response equipment.

Emergency Management Objective F

Current

Facilitate mutual aid agreements and other state, tribal, and local agreements for response.

Proposed

Delete this objective. After many questions from TEC/WG members about the origin, appropriateness, and ultimate value of this objective, and prioritization forced by reductions in EMD funding, staffing, and support, it is being deleted.

Emergency Management Objective G

Current

Facilitate the integration of the private sector (e.g., carriers and utilities) into the state, tribal, and local emergency planning process involving DOE shipments.

Proposed

Delete this objective. It is an implicit part of the new objective to define roles and responsibilities of the TEP response system.

Emergency Management Objective H

Current

Provide incident data to state, tribal, and local emergency responders and determine their other information needs.

Proposed

Delete this objective. This type of information is currently available through a number of sources, including the DOE EM-26 Transportation and Emergency Management Resource Center.

Emergency Management Objective I

Current

Clarify responsibility for emergency response to DOE rail shipments.

Proposed

Delete this objective. It is an implicit part of the new objective to define roles and responsibilities of the TEP response system.

Training Objective C

Current

Coordinate DOE training development and delivery with other federal, tribal, state, local, and industry training programs.

Proposed

Delete this objective. This is current practice, and since no associated tasks or activities have been identified for this objective, it can be deleted without impact.

Training Objective D

Current

Ensure adequate and appropriate funding for training, identify sources, coordinate sources, and identify recipients.

Proposed

Delete this objective. Training is central in the EMD TEP Vision, and this topic will be addressed under the objectives to develop appropriate training curricula and job performance standards.

Based on results of the breakout sessions, the following are status updates for EMD's task plans.

I-B.1 Review and Revision of the TEPP Strategy Plan

Status: Closed.

Reason: Based on a number of factors EM-262 has determined that the 1991 TEPP Strategy Plan is not misaligned with current program initiatives nor is its revision vital to further developments in the program. Thus, in order to meet higher priority needs, reissuance of a revised TEPP Strategy Plan has been indefinitely postponed and this task plan closed.

IV-A.2 Identification & Improvements of Basic Source Materials for First Response

Status: Active, but change to pending.

Reason: This activity should build on the development of roles and responsibilities associated with the TEP response system, and TEP training curricula; suggest suspending activity and changing its status to pending.

IV-D.1 Standardized Transportation Emergency Action Levels (EALs)

Status: Active, but change to pending.

Reason: Reduction in EM-262 resources (funding and contract support staff), and the refocus toward direct support to emergency responders, necessitate shifting this lower priority activity to a pending status.

IV-F.1 Emergency Response Issues within Mutual Aid Agreements

Status: Closed.

Reason: After many questions from TEC/WG members about the origin, appropriateness, and ultimate value of this task plan, and its relatively low priority the TEC/WG Planning Committee has decided to close it.

V-A.3 Establish a Train-the-Trainer Course for States

Status: Active, but change to pending.

Reason: This activity should build on the development of roles and responsibilities associated with the TEP response system, and TEP training curricula; suggest suspending activity and changing its status to pending.

V-A.3 Identification of Opportunities for Improvement in TEP Training

Status: Active, but change to pending.

Reason: This task plan was the impetus for these Breakout Session discussions on TEP training. However, this activity should build on the development of roles and responsibilities associated with the TEP response system, and TEP training curriculum; suggest suspending activity and changing its status to pending.

V-C.2 Rail Transportation Issues Awareness Training

Status: Closed.

Reason: This task plan was completed with the development and delivery of the TETRA Rail Module in November 1994.

V-E.2 Medical Community Awareness of DOE RAM Training Information

Status: Active, but change to pending.

Reason: Work on this Task Plan has been suspended due to reductions in budget and support. Activity on this Task Plan stands at milestone four.

VI-H.1 Compilation of Lessons Learned from RAM Transportation Incidents

Status: Active, but change to closed.

Reason: This status report is the last milestone identified in the task plan. The EM-26 Transportation and Emergency Management Resource Center currently maintains copies of materials from documented transportation exercises and incidents.

IN-DEPTH DISCUSSION OF NATIONAL SURVEY ON PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF TRANSPORTATION RISK

Hank Jenkins-Smith, Director, Institute for Public Management, University of New Mexico, led the breakout sessions on the National Survey on Public Perceptions of Transportation Risk. In the sessions, Jenkins-Smith provided a review of the study's activities and results to date, and conducted focus groups using an accident scenario.

Over the past year, two pilot studies have been conducted. One examined public perceptions among citizens in Idaho and Oregon of the Cesium-137 Capsule Return Program, which involved shipping the materials from North Glenn, Colorado, to Hanford, Washington. The second pilot study surveyed citizens along the Foreign Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Return Campaign route in North and South Carolina.

More than 1,200 people were interviewed before and after the cesium campaign to see how their perceptions changed. Significant opposition was found at the outset, especially by those who had not heard of the program. Those who had heard about the program (30 percent) had high opposition initially; however, those same people had a drop in perceived risk after the shipments had occurred. Therefore, education and information resulted in a decreased risk perception. It was noted the staged accident as part of the TRANSportation Accident eXercise occurred in the area after the initial interview. Jenkins-Smith stated that all groups that showed a change in the perception of risk over the period of shipments and TRANSAX, showed a decreased perception of risk. A report on the study is available through the Liaison and Communications Program Office.

In the second study, 1,200 people along Foreign SNF Return Campaign route were interviewed prior to the shipment in September 1994. Jenkins-Smith will return after the shipments are complete to interview the same individuals to see what change in perception develops. Citizens in all of the counties along the route were surveyed and Jenkins-Smith found substantial opposition (46 percent strongly or somewhat opposed) to the program. The individuals surveyed that had heard of the program understood the international implications (including the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons); however, domestic risk was the priority among the people who previously knew nothing about the program. Jenkins-Smith found that the greater the perceived risk from proliferation of the weapons-grade material, the greater the support for the program. One participant asked if there was a core of individuals that will not believe him no matter what he tells them about the shipments. Jenkins-Smith replied yes, there is a group of individuals that distrust the government.

These two studies are a precursor to the nation-wide study. This regionally stratified study will include phone interviews with 2,400 randomly selected individuals from around the nation, focusing on the transportation corridors. The study will seek to understand how people formulate their perceptions of risk with different kinds of materials. Jenkins-Smith noted that people are much more frightened of manmade radioactive materials than natural radioactive materials. This study will also seek to assess the public's perception of how the route through their region was selected; the level of emergency preparedness; and the risks and benefits of the program. The survey will be implemented in May 1995 and a final report will be available in August 1995.

During the second segment of the session, participants were asked to respond to a scenario described by Jenkins-Smith. He proposed the following scenario: There has been a train derailment in a suburban area at 4 a.m. The train is carrying radioactive material, but there has been no release (this is not known initially). There is a 24 hour period of confusion and very little concrete information is shared with the public. The public does not know the specifics of the danger. Traffic, both road and rail, is impeded by the derailment. Each participant was asked to respond to the following questions: What public reaction would you expect from the given scenario? How will this scenario unfold?

Many insightful comments were made by the participants. Several noted that the presence of radioactive material would heighten normal fears. Many participants discussed how appropriate plans and procedures can minimize public concerns. This includes providing advanced notice and information about shipments to prepare local officials, the community, and the media. Public confidence in the local response capabilities is also crucial. It is important to acknowledge that accidents may occur, and when an accident does occur, information must be disseminated from the scene in a consistent, credible, and timely manner. The future credibility of all involved depends on how they handle this situation. The initial panic experienced by the public will give way to reasonable concerns, such as: Who was involved? Why did this happen? What is the radioactive material and what implications does it have for the community? All of the breakout groups acknowledged the limited effect education and planning efforts have. All comments will be reviewed by Hank Jenkins-Smith in preparation for implementing his nation-wide survey; specific comments appear below

The following issues were summarized from the three sessions:

The Media—Beliefs

- The media will always hype an event because they tend to filter information to enhance sensational aspects to increase ratings and profits; the public is also guilty of filtering information such that they only retain that which alludes to risks or threats.
- Media reports are typically perceived as distortions of actual events by officials involved with particular hazardous materials incidents.
- The media often justifies stories regarding potential threats (as interpreted by them) to the public from hazardous materials accidents since officials are perceived as unwilling to provide accurate information about events when they do occur (this appears, then, to be a credibility problem on both counts).

Official Information

- PIOs (Public Information Officers) often lack relevant information when an incident occurs because incident commanders usually have not had the opportunity to conduct comprehensive evaluations/site assessments. Thus, PIOs should also be trained on various aspects of programs so as to provide some sort of preliminary assessments.
- Good communication is often lacking between incident commanders and responsible parties since jurisdictional disputes often occur when accidents happen.
- First responders often lack adequate knowledge of the context of incidents and, thus, do not have the capacity to disseminate the information necessary to assure the proper response and equipment is forthcoming for mitigating an accident site (need to alleviate time lag factor).
- The public doesn't often give first responders the right to error on the side of caution when conducting initial site assessments at the scene of an accident. This can lead to an

accountability problem when the public then perceives decision makers as having misguided them when facts change.

- Emergency Responders are not always accepting of media presence at incident sites due to the sensationalism propagated by most media organizations about risky events; also disliked is the media's propensity to interfere with mitigation efforts by distracting responders.

The Public

- The public wants to be told the truth by informed decision makers, but may feel this is not possible since they have evidence that decision makers are not always credible; consequently, the public often relies on the media, right or wrong.
- The public always perceives the worst scenario if even a hint of risk is perceived to be associated with a particular situation; such situations can incite panic.
- The public generally wants to be informed up front so they don't feel like they are being fooled when information about hazardous programs (and their potential risks) comes to light.
- Citizens must perceive "responsible" authorities can effectively respond and mitigate situations so they don't unduly interfere with everyday activities (i.e., journey-to-work, or -home trips) or public health or safety.

Problem Resolution

- Early education of public and media on relevant aspects of programs to allay fears linked to perceptions of risk.
- Establish effective lines of communication with media early on to avoid situations which promote inaccurate reports regarding programs; strong, trusting relationships among all stakeholders can reduce the probability that biased information will get out when incidents do occur (the same can be said when planning programs).
- Develop strong procedural mechanisms which allocate jurisdictional authority to proper parties prior to implementation phases of programs.
- When incidents do occur, be honest and personable with the media and the public. If incident commanders or PIOs do not have all the facts, they should tell the people this. (Tell them what is known and assure them that they will be informed of any additional facts as soon as they become known.)
- Respond to the needs of those who are at risk (or potentially at risk) in an effort to decrease the panic potential when events do occur. It is all about strong community relations and trust.
- Make sure first responders are sufficiently knowledgeable about potential situations so they can address media and public concerns as soon as possible, while also disseminating any relevant information to allay fears until the proper officials or PIOs are on the scene.
- Scope out all contexts for potential incidents (rural v. urban settings, time of day, etc.) to identify any problems or panic situations which could occur (this should be done during the planning phase of a program); inform the public and media of all aspects considered to reassure them that every effort was made to counter potentially hazardous incidents. It was believed that it only takes one accident to stigmatize not only one program, but an entire range of related programs unless the proper information/education is provided. You can never be over-prepared.
- Stay in control of situations; don't ever let the media get the upper hand. This type of setting can be influenced when mutually beneficial relationships are established.

- Early information/education about programs is the best way to counter negative reactions.
- Assure the public that while the infrastructure may be lacking in their particular towns, adequate response capabilities are proximate to the locale and will allow for the appropriate response in a minimal amount of time.
- The public also needs to be aware of the potential short-term and long-term effects of an incident involving hazardous materials near their homes and work places; the public also should be made aware of programs directed at educating them on what to do in the event of an incident.
- Identifying/educating the most receptive groups can help assure information stays accessible to the public, especially if focus is placed on opinion leaders. However, this still will not help if the information is not deemed relevant enough even by these groups to make it worthy of recall.
- Remember that there are limits to what can be expected of the public and the media; even the best laid plans fail or are not always supported. Thus, everyone involved with a particular program must be able and willing to respond to situations as they arise.
- Anticipate degradation of system/components involved in programs and establish procedures for evaluating the current state to avoid accidentally promoting an incident (or making on worse) because something was broken or someone was not adequately prepared.
- Build confidence by developing effective and strong relationships with the public to reduce (to the extent possible) the potential for domestic terrorism to interfere with program implementation.
- Admit when something isn't known to show the public and media that decision makers aren't infallible; however, officials must be willing to assure people that their concerns will be addressed and that their questions will be answered as soon as they can.
- Understand the publics' perception of the costs v. benefits related to particular programs; their perceptions may not be the same as those held by decision makers since the public may understand the issue differently.
- Make sure all potential first responders know all relevant facts about shipments so they can adequately assess the need for specific response groups and various types of equipment at various incident scenes.
- Perhaps the best way to proceed is to have escorts for all shipments (or at least several of the initial shipments to assure absolute response and to control incident scenes until proper jurisdictional authorities arrive on scene.
- Keep command, control, and communications pathways open and in tact from the beginning to the end of programs.
- While programmatic stigmatization may occur with an incident, stigmatization can also be attached to proximate communities whether specifically involved with an incident or not. This means that immediate knowledge of where an accident occurs and the extent of damage must be known as soon as possible so the proper steps can be taken to reduce levels of panic and fear (even over the long-term).
- Education might include information on the level of everyday risk people expose themselves to so they can truly understand the context of particular programs relevant to their areas and lives.
- Stigmatization of transporters must also be considered in the event of an incident so a strategy for alleviating negative affects early on can be instituted.
- Issues of property damage must be considered to assure the public they will not unduly suffer from an incident (i.e., through the loss of their homes, land, etc.).
- Jurisdictional disputes must not occur when response to an incident is required, such

situations only prolong the time required to mitigate potentially hazardous situations and decrease public confidence in decision makers and emergency responders.

Action Items

- Completion of public focus groups
- Design of Survey Instrument
- Implementation of Survey (2,400)
- Draft report
- Preliminary results distributed
- Final report

Due Date

March 1995
April 1995
May 1995
June 1995
July 1995 meeting
August 1995

Appendix A—Agenda

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY



Meeting
January 17-19, 1995
Charlotte, North Carolina

AGENDA

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17

1:00 pm - 1:15 pm	Welcome and Meeting Overview <i>Graves Room</i>	<i>Judith Holm, DOE</i>
1:15 pm - 2:30 pm	Plenary Session #1 DOE Transportation Program Update <i>Patrick Wells</i> <i>Ralph Smith</i> <i>Allen Benson</i> <i>EM-37</i> <i>DOE-Carlsbad</i> <i>RW-45</i>	<i>Mike Conroy, DOE</i> <i>Moderator</i> <i>Ned Hallein</i> <i>EM-423</i>
2:30 pm - 3:15 pm	Plenary Session #2 Environmental Justice Panel Discussion	<i>Judith Holm, DOE</i> <i>Moderator</i> <i>Georgia Johnson and</i> <i>Linda Lingle, DOE</i> <i>Jim Reed, NCSL</i>
3:15 pm - 3:20 pm	Breakout Session Orientation	<i>Judith Holm, DOE</i>
3:20 pm - 3:30 pm	Break	
3:30 pm - 5:30 pm	Breakout Session #1	
	Group A <i>Audrey Room</i> General Planning and Public Information & Education <i>Led by Judith Holm and Allen Benson</i>	Group B <i>Dunn Room</i> Emergency Management and Training <i>Led by Jim Cruickshank</i>
		Group C <i>Caldwell Room</i> Transportation Operations (formerly Safe Routine Transport and Inspection & Enforcement) <i>Led by Mike Conroy</i>
5:30 pm	Adjourn	
5:30 pm - 7:30 pm	Reception <i>Gwynn Room (3rd Floor)</i>	

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18

- 8:00 am - 8:30 am **Continental Breakfast**
Area outside Breakout Rooms
- 8:30 am - 9:00 am **Plenary Session #3**
Graves Room
DOE's Strategic Look at Transportation *Rich Brancato, DOE*
- 9:00 am - 9:15 am **Break**
- 9:15 am - 11:15 am **Breakout Session #2**
- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group A</u>
<i>Graham Room</i>
Indepth Discussion
of National Survey on
Public Perceptions of
Transportation Risks
<i>Led by Hank Jenkins-Smith</i></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group B</u>
<i>Dunn Room</i>
General Planning and
Public Information
& Education
<i>Led by Judith Holm
and Allen Benson</i></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group C</u>
<i>Caldwell Room</i>
Emergency Management
and Training
<i>Led by Jim Cruickshank</i></p> |
|--|--|---|
- 1:15 am - 11:30 am **Break**
- 11:30 am - 1:00 pm **Lunch** *(provided)*
- 1:00 pm - 1:30 pm **Plenary Session #4**
Graves Room
Price-Anderson Act Discussion *Susan Klein, DOE*
- 1:30 pm - 1:45 pm **Break**
- 1:45 pm - 3:45 pm **Breakout Session #3**
- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group A</u>
<i>Graham Room</i>
Transportation Operations
<i>Led by Mike Conroy</i></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group B</u>
<i>Dunn Room</i>
Indepth Discussion of National
Survey on Public Perceptions of
Transportation Risks
<i>Led by Hank Jenkins-Smith</i></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group C</u>
<i>Caldwell Room</i>
General Planning and Public
Information & Education
<i>Led by Judith Holm
and Allen Benson</i></p> |
|---|--|--|
- 3:45 pm - 4:00 pm **Break**
- 4:00 pm - 6:00 pm **Breakout Session #4**
- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group A</u>
<i>Graham Room</i>
Emergency Management
and Training
<i>Led by Jim Cruickshank</i></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group B</u>
<i>Dunn Room</i>
Transportation Operations
<i>Led by Mike Conroy</i></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Group C</u>
<i>Caldwell Room</i>
Indepth Discussion of National
Survey on Public Perceptions of
Transportation Risks
<i>Led by Hank Jenkins-Smith</i></p> |
|---|---|--|
- 6:00 pm **Adjourn**

THURSDAY, JANUARY 19

8:00 am - 8:30 am **Continental Breakfast**

8:30 am - 11:30 am

Plenary Session #5

Graves Room

Breakout Session Reports and Issue Clarification

General Planning and Public Information & Education

Transportation Operations

Emergency Management

*Judith Holm and
Allen Benson, DOE
Mike Conroy, DOE
Jim Cruickshank, DOE*

11:30 am - 12:00 pm

Closeout Session

Meeting Location

*Judith Holm, DOE
Markus Popa, DOE*

12:00 pm

Adjourn

Appendix B - Participants List



Transportation External Coordination Working Group

Participants List

Peggy Allen

Planner
Waste Policy Institute
1872 Pratt Drive, Suite 1600
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Phone Number: (703) 231-3324
Fax Number: (703) 231-3968

Allen Benson

Program Relations Division
U.S. Department of Energy, RW-45
Office of Waste Accept., Stor. & Trans.
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone Number: (202) 586-2286
Fax Number: (202) 586-1047

Bernard Bevill

Health Physicist Supervisor, Arkansas Department of
Health
CRCPD
4815 West Markham Street
Little Rock, AR 72205
Phone Number: (501) 661-2301
Fax Number: (501) 661-2468

Larry Blalock

Acting Director, Emergency Management Division
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-262
Quince Orchard Building
Washington, DC 20585-0002
Phone Number: (301) 427-1618
Fax Number: (301) 427-1537

Sam Bowen

Program Leader, Systemic Reform
Argonne National Laboratory
9700 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone Number: (708) 252-3228
Fax Number: (708) 252-3193

Judith Bradbury

Senior Policy Analyst
Battelle/Pacific Northwest Laboratories
901 D St. S.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20024-2115
Phone Number: (202) 646-5235
Fax Number: (202) 646-5233

Rich Brancato

Director, Off. of Trans., Em. Mgt., & Ana.Serv.
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-26
Quince Orchard Building
Washington, DC 20585-0002
Phone Number: (301) 427-1635
Fax Number: (301) 427-1537

John Burge

President
Urban Energy & Transportation Corp.
406 W. 34th Street, Suite 710
VFW Building
Kansas City, MO 64111
Phone Number: (816) 531-5745
Fax Number: (816) 531-6539

William "Bill" Caligan

Senior Communications Coordinator
Duke Engineering & Services
600 Maryland Ave.
Suite 601
Washington, DC 20024
Phone Number: (202) 479-2124
Fax Number: (202) 488-2313

Wayne Cameron

County Commissioner
White Pine County Nevada
953 Campton St.
Ely, NV 89301
Phone Number: (702) 289-8841
Fax Number: (702) 289-8842

Participants List

Robert Cayler

Radiological Protection Officer
Tennessee Emergency Management Agency
3041 Sidco Drive
Nashville, TN 37204-1502

Phone Number: (615) 741-2880

Fax Number: (615) 741-8238

Peter Conlon

Chief, Facilities Safety
Association of American Railroads
Transportation Test Center
P. O. Box 11130
Pueblo, CO 81001

Phone Number: (719) 584-0554

Fax Number: (719) 584-0711

Michael Conroy

Program Manager, Trans. Mgt. Div.
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-261
Washington, DC 20585

Phone Number: (301) 427-1652

Fax Number: (301) 427-1538

Jan Cortelyou

Education Specialist
Science Applications International Corp.
800 Oak Ridge Turnpike
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Phone Number: (615) 481-4775

Fax Number: (615) 483-1198

Sandra Covi

Manager, Chemical Trans. Safety
Union Pacific Railroad
300 S. Harrison St.
Pocatello, ID 83204

Phone Number: (208) 236-5413

Fax Number: (208) 236-5591

David Crose

Director, Technical Hazards Division
Indiana State EMA
Indiana Government Center South
402 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2739

Phone Number: (317) 232-3837

Fax Number: (317) 232-4987

Jim Cruickshank

Emergency Management Division
U. S. Department of Energy, EM-262
Quince Orchard Building
Washington, DC 20585-0002

Phone Number: (301) 427-1645

Fax Number: (301) 427-1538

David Cudmore

State Radiation Officer
State of Nebraska; MOCSG
Council of State Governments, Midwest Office
1300 Military Road
Lincoln, NE 68508

Phone Number: (402) 473-1420

Fax Number: (402) 473-7433

Jack Daly

President
United Minerals & Energy, Inc.
P.O. Box 5279
Laytonsville, MD 20882

Phone Number: (301) 840-9280

Fax Number: (301) 840-9280

Tim Dantoin

Associate Analyst
Waste Policy Institute
2400 N. Lakeview, Suite 1707
Chicago, IL 60604

Phone Number: (312) 665-9371

Fax Number: (312) 348-7480

James Daust

Program Director
Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
7346 Lombard Ave., Apt. 6103
Gaylord, MI 49735

Phone Number: (517) 732-4727

Fax Number: (517) 731-2954

Linda Desell

Director, E & O Activities Division
U.S. Department of Energy, RW-45
Office of Waste Accept., Stor. & Trans.
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585

Phone Number: (202) 586-1462

Fax Number: (202) 586-1047

David Edington

Manager of Hazardous Materials
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad
920 SE Quincy
Topeka, KS 66612-1116

Phone Number: (913) 435-3570

Fax Number: (913) 435-2202

Participants List

Lydia Ellis

Senior Transportation Specialist
Science Applications International Corp.
555 Quince Orchard Road
Suite 500
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone Number: (301) 924-6172
Fax Number: (301) 924-4594

Ronald Falkey

Emergency Management Staff
BDM Engineering Services Company
555 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 400
Gaithersburg, MD 20878-1437
Phone Number: (301) 212-6243
Fax Number: (301) 212-6250

Allan Fisher

Director, Operating Rules
Conrail
2001 Market St. 14C
Philadelphia, PA 19101-1414
Phone Number: (215) 209-5533
Fax Number: (215) 209-5530

Herbert Fivehouse

Energy Consultant to the Governor
State of Maryland
Urban Energy & Transportation Corp.
8808 Wolverton Road
Baltimore, MD 21234
Phone Number: (410) 661-0597
Fax Number:

Brenda Fleming

Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-37
19901 Germantown Road
Trevion II Bldg., Mailstop 339
Germantown, MD 20585
Phone Number: (301) 903-1457
Fax Number: (301) 903-1431

Fun Fong

American College of Em. Physicians
4180 Ridgehurst Dr.
Smyrna, GA 30080
Phone Number: (404) 616-4620
Fax Number: (404) 659-6012

Amy Fromer

University of New Mexico
UNM Institute for Public Policy
Social Sciences Building
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
Phone Number: (505) 277-1099
Fax Number: (505) 277-2821

Bob Fronczak

Executive Director of Environmental Affairs
Association of American Railroads
50 F Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Phone Number: (202) 639-2839
Fax Number: (202) 639-2930

Beth Fulmer

Policy Analyst
Southern States Energy Board
3091 Governors Lake Drive, Suite 400
Norcross, GA 30071
Phone Number: (404) 242-7712
Fax Number: (404) 242-0421

Carolyn Gay

Senior Policy Analyst
Social & Scientific Systems, Inc.
555 Quince Orchard Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone Number: (301) 990-0110
Fax Number: (301) 417-0375

Sandy Green

Project Coordinator
Yucca Mountain Information Office
P.O. Box 714
Eureka, NV 89316
Phone Number: (702) 237-5407
Fax Number: (702) 237-5169

Steve Gunderson

Director, Emergency Management Unit
Colorado Dept. of Pub. Health & Env.
Western Governors' Association
4300 Cherry Creek Drive, South
Denver, CO 80222-1530
Phone Number: (303) 692-3022
Fax Number: (303) 782-4969

Loretta Hall

Associate Analyst
Waste Policy Institute
1872 Pratt Drive, Suite 1600
Blacksburg, VA 24060-6363
Phone Number: (703) 231-3324
Fax Number: (703) 231-3968

Participants List

Ned Hallein

Remed. Engr.
U. S. Department of Energy, EM-423
Germantown, MD 20874
Phone Number: (301) 427-1749
Fax Number: (301) 427-1858

Michele Halseth

Western Interstate Energy Board
600 17th Street, 1704 South
Denver, CO 80202
Phone Number: (303) 573-8910
Fax Number: (303) 573-9107

Robert Halstead

Transportation Advisor
Nuclear Waste Project Office
P. O. Box 60
Madison, WI 53901
Phone Number: (608) 742-3973
Fax Number:

Jim Hardeman

Environmental Radiation Program Manager
GA Environmental Protection Division
Southern States Energy Board
4244 International Parkway
Atlanta, GA 30354
Phone Number: (404) 362-2675
Fax Number: (404) 362-2653

Glenn Harrison

Oak Ridge National Lab
MS 6270, Building 4500 N
P. O. Box 2008
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6270
Phone Number: (615) 576-8686
Fax Number: (615) 574-3431

Maurice "Monk" Hilliard

Chief, Radiological Operations Division
Penn. Emergency Management Agency
National Emergency Management Association
P. O. Box 3321
Trans. & Safety Bldg., Rm B-149
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3321
Phone Number: (717) 783-8150
Fax Number: (717) 783-7393

Juanita Hoffman

Program Director
Repository Oversight Program, Esmeralda Co., Nevada
P. O. Box 490
Goldfield, NV 89013
Phone Number: (702) 485-3541
Fax Number: (702) 485-3510

Robert Holden

National Congress of American Indians
900 Pennsylvania Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20003
Phone Number: (202) 546-9404
Fax Number: (202) 546-3741

Judith Holm

Manager, Liaison & Comm. Program
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-26.1
Quince Orchard Building
Washington, DC 20585-0002
Phone Number: (301) 427-1643
Fax Number: (301) 427-1538

Bruce Hurley

Emergency Management Training Coordinator
U.S. Department of Energy, Nevada
P.O. Box 98518
2753 S. Highland
Las Vegas, NV 89193
Phone Number: (702) 295-1284
Fax Number: (702) 295-2383

Hank Jenkins-Smith

Director, Institute for Public Policy
University of New Mexico
Social Sciences Building
Albuquerque, NM 87131-1121
Phone Number: (505) 277-5028
Fax Number: (505) 277-3115

Georgia Johnson

Exec. Dir. of Envir. Justice for DOE
DOE
Office of Economic Impact and Diversity
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone Number: (202) 586-1593
Fax Number: (202) 586-3075

Susan Klein

Assistant General Counsel
US Department of Energy, GC-52
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone Number: (202) 586-6975
Fax Number: (202) 586-6977

George Kramer

Technical Training Specialist
Analysas Corporation
3 Main Street
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Phone Number: (615) 576-9403
Fax Number: (615) 576-9121

Participants List

Edward "Bill" Lent

Chief, Plans & Programs, Office of Emergency
Preparedness
National Coord. Council on Emergency Mgt.
7911 Anchor St., Room 218
Landover, MD 20785
Phone Number: (301) 499-8053
Fax Number: (301) 350-3471

Linda Lingle

U. S. Department of Energy, EM-5
Office of Public Accountability
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, D.C., 20585
Phone Number: (202) 586-0199
Fax Number: (202) 586-0293

Conchita Little

Argonne National Laboratory
9700 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone Number: (708) 252-4495
Fax Number: (708) 223-3193

Cheryl Lopez

Senior Staff Member-Transportation
BDM Federal
555 Quince Orchard Rd.
Suite 400
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone Number: (301) 212-6245
Fax Number: (301) 212-6250

Cori Macaluso

U. S. Department of Energy, RW-45
1000 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone Number:
Fax Number:

Scot Mackey

TRW Environmental Safety Systems
600 Maryland Ave., SW
Suite 601
Washington, DC 20024
Phone Number: (202) 488-2310
Fax Number: (202) 488-2313

Florindo Mariani

Nuclear Waste Project Coordinator
White Pine County Nevada
957 Campton Street
Ely, NV 89301
Phone Number: (702) 289-2035
Fax Number: (702) 289-2514

Gary McNutt

Environmental Specialist IV
Missouri Dept. of Health
CRCPD
210 El Mereado
P.O. Box 570
Jefferson City, MO 65102
Phone Number: (314) 751-6160
Fax Number: (314) 526-6946

Linda Minton

Assistant Nurse Manager, Em. Serv.
Emergency Nurses Association
University of Louisville Hospital
530 South Jackson St.
Louisville, KY 40202
Phone Number: (502) 562-3970
Fax Number: (502) 852-0066

Louise Monegain

Argonne National Lab
9700 S. Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone Number: (708) 252-9123
Fax Number: (708) 252-3193

Participants List

Avagene Moore

Emergency Management Project Manager
Contractor
TRADE
1017 Hayes Road
Lawrenceburg, TN 38464
Phone Number: (615) 762-4768
Fax Number: (615) 762-7359

Richard Moore

Consultant
State of Wyoming
Western Interstate Energy Board
502 East 24th Street
Cheyenne, WY 82001
Phone Number: (307) 634-7676
Fax Number: (307) 635-2483

Wendy Morgan

Associate Analyst
Waste Policy Institute
1872 Pratt Drive, Suite 1600
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Phone Number: (703) 231-3324
Fax Number: (703) 231-3968

Grady Morris

Senior Governmental Affairs Analyst
DOE/WIPP, (Westinghouse)
401 N. Canal
P.O. Box 2078
Carlsbad, NM 88220
Phone Number: (505) 234-7534
Fax Number: (505) 887-0351

Gerald Mott

Vice President
FERMCO
P. O. Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45235-8704
Phone Number: (513) 738-6363
Fax Number: (513) 738-9539

Pat Noblett

Transportation Specialist
BDM Engineering Services Company
555 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 400
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone Number: (301) 212-6246
Fax Number: (301) 212-6250

Ellen Ott

U. S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone Number: (202) 586-2936
Fax Number: (202) 586-6977

Jill Peters

Communication and Education Coord.
National Tribal Environmental Council
1225 Rio Grande, NW
Albuquerque, NM 87104
Phone Number: (505) 242-2175
Fax Number: (505) 242-2654

Vernon Poe

Director
Mineral County Office of Nuclear Projects
Mineral County
P.O. Box 1600
Hawthorne, NV 89415
Phone Number: (702) 945-2484
Fax Number: (702) 945-0702

Markus Popa

OCRWM, Operational and Activities Team
U.S. Department of Energy, RW-45
Office of Waste Accept., Stor. & Trans.
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone Number: (202) 586-5330
Fax Number:

James Reed

Program Principal
National Conference of State Legislatures
1560 Broadway, Suite 700
Denver, CO 80202-5140
Phone Number: (303) 830-2200
Fax Number: (303) 863-8003

Ronald Ross

Program Manager
Western Governors' Association
600 17th Street
Suite 1705 South Tower
Denver, CO 80202
Phone Number: (303) 623-9378
Fax Number: (303) 534-7309

Participants List

Robert Rupp

Production Control Sup. (Carshops) 7
Union Pacific Railroad
300 South Harrison
Pocatello, ID 83204
Phone Number: (208) 236-5494
Fax Number: (208) 236-5278

Laurie Saroff

Research Assistant
International City Mgt. Assoc.
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20002-4201
Phone Number: (202) 962-3672
Fax Number: (202) 962-3500

Lisa Sattler

Policy Analyst
Council of State Governments
641 East Butterfield Road, Suite 401
Lombard, IL 60148-5651
Phone Number: (708) 810-0210
Fax Number: (708) 810-0145

Sharon Skuchko

U. S. Department of Energy, RW-45
Environmental & Operations Activities
1000 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone Number: (202) 586-4590
Fax Number: (202) 586-1047

Lois Smith

Manager, Environmental/Institutional
Woodward-Clyde/TRW
600 Maryland Avenue, SW, Suite 695
Washington, DC 20024
Phone Number: (202) 488-2326
Fax Number: (202) 488-2323

Ralph Smith

Institutional Relations Specialist
U.S. Department of Energy-Carlsbad
P. O. Box 3090
Carlsbad, NM 88220
Phone Number: (505) 234-7335
Fax Number: (505) 887-5419

Steve Smith

Washington Rep's Office
Nye Co. Nevada
1925 North Lynn St.
Suite 400
Rosslyn, VA 22209
Phone Number: (703) 516-2504
Fax Number: (703) 243-8265

Tom Smith

Ohio Emergency Management Agency
2825 W. Dublin Granville Rd.
Columbus, OH 43235-2789
Phone Number: (614) 799-3680
Fax Number: (614) 889-7183

Nelson Soucek

Jason Associates Corporation
591 Park Ave., Suite 202
Idaho Falls, ID 83402
Phone Number: (208) 522-7622
Fax Number: (208) 522-2076

Paul Standish

Engineer II
Intergrated Resource Group, Inc.
101 Convention Center Dr., Suite 407
Las Vegas, NV 89109
Phone Number: (702) 794-7824
Fax Number: (702) 794-5348

Chuck Stowell

Market Manager, Govt. Sales and Marketing
CSX Transportation
500 Water Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202
Phone Number: (904) 359-1765
Fax Number: (904) 359-3999

Wesley Taylor

Office of Emergency Response
U.S. Department of Energy, DP-23
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874
Phone Number: (301) 903-3034
Fax Number: (301) 903-6417

John Thompson

Transportation Engineer
Roy F. Weston
955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, DC 20024
Phone Number: (202) 646-6776
Fax Number: (202) 863-2220

Jack Valencia

City Councillor
P. O. Drawer CLC
Las Cruces, NM 88004
Phone Number: (505) 526-0322
Fax Number: (505) 524-6249

Participants List

Gordon Veerman

Fire Chief
c/o Argonne National Laboratory
International Association of Fire Chiefs
9700 S. Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439

Phone Number: (708) 252-6136

Fax Number: (708) 252-5440

Patrick Wells

U.S. Department of Energy, EM-37
1000 Independence Avenue S.W.
Trev. II, Rm. 314
Washington, DC 20585

Phone Number: (301) 903-7959

Fax Number: (202) 586-5256

Christopher Wentz

Coordinator/Senior Policy Analyst
Western Governors' Association
Radioactive Waste Task Force
2040 Pacheco Street
Santa Fe, NM 87505

Phone Number: (505) 827-5950

Fax Number: (505) 438-3855

Stephen White

Emergency Management Committee
National Association of EMTs
166 Lakeshore Drive
Weymouth, MA 02189

Phone Number: (617) 331-5523

Fax Number: (617) 331-5523

Tom Whitney

Professor
South Carolina State University
P. O. Box 7221
Orangeburg, SC 29117

Phone Number: (803) 536-7117

Fax Number: (803) 533-3623

Appendix C

U.S. Department of Energy
Transportation External Coordination Working Group
Omni Charlotte Hotel
January 17-19, 1995
Evaluation Results

1. **Affiliation:** 12 TEC/WG Member Organization Representative
 1 U.S. Department of Energy
 1 U.S. DOE Contractor
 4 Observer

2. **How useful were the following presentations or sessions in providing you with ideas or information that directly addressed your needs?**

Note: Not all questions were answered by all respondents.

a.	Meeting Overview	very useful (9)	somewhat useful (8)	not useful	didn't attend
b.	Plenary Session #1 DOE Transportation Program Update	very useful (9)	somewhat useful (9)	not useful	didn't attend
c.	Plenary Session #2 Environmental Justice Panel Discussion	very useful (5)	somewhat useful (8)	not useful (4)	didn't attend (1)
d.	Breakout Sessions				
	1) Breakout Orientation	very useful (6)	somewhat useful (11)	not useful	didn't attend
	2) General Planning and Public Information and Education	very useful (9)	somewhat useful (8)	not useful	didn't attend
	3) Transportation Operations	very useful (12)	somewhat useful (5)	not useful	didn't attend (1)
	4) Emergency Management and Training	very useful (10)	somewhat useful (6)	not useful (1)	didn't attend (1)
	5) In-depth Discussion of National Survey on Public Perceptions of Transportation Risks	very useful (8)	somewhat useful (9)	not useful (1)	didn't attend
e.	Plenary Session #3 DOE's Strategic Look at Transportation	very useful (10)	somewhat useful (8)	not useful	didn't attend
f.	Plenary Session #4 Price-Anderson Act Discussion	very useful (8)	somewhat useful (8)	not useful	didn't attend (1)

g.	Plenary Session #5 Breakout Session Reports and Issue Clarifications	very useful (11)	somewhat useful (4)	not useful (1)	didn't attend (1)
----	---	------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------

3. What changes in meeting arrangements, materials, or logistics would you suggest for the next TEC/WG meeting?

Preparation/Scheduling/Location:

- Locations at hubs, etc.
- The first half day activities should not be excessively long (i.e., end at 18:15!) In traveling to the site many have been up since 4 am and have ridden planes and suffered delays. Then to have a very long session is demanding. The 1/2 day, full day, half day format however has great merit.
- Probably not a popular suggestion, but maybe add an extra day (i.e., more breakouts, only run sessions to 5:00 pm)
- Arrange for materials to be sent to the 10 Affected Units of Local Government so we can be better prepared to participate.
- Provide documents for review or discussion with some time for study prior to meeting date.
- The last two have been extremely well organized and managed. Could not suggest anything better, except come to Louisville, Kentucky!

On-site issues/space:

- Meeting space was too small.
- A little more space in conference rooms. Things were pretty tight. I did like the schedule, when we began in the afternoon on the first day and ended in the morning on the last day. The food was also good at this meeting.
- Plenary session seating excellent after 1st session. All other facilities ok.
- Larger rooms.
- Larger meeting room, need more space. More discussion time. Slightly longer breaks (not enough time for phone calls). Consider a northeastern location!
- Large rooms to accommodate expected # of attendees.
- Need larger rooms and tables for main sessions. Need more lead time on questions and due comments.

The participation at this meeting exceeded everyone's expectations based on prior meeting attendance. Future planning will take into consideration the increased attendance.

4. What additional topics or issues do you think need to be addressed at future TEC/WG meetings?

Routing:

- Specifics on routing.
- DOT routing policy.
- Would like detailed maps of routes or corridors with the major cities along the way so I could get pertinent information to those hospitals and emergency departments.
- More statistics with regard to shipment/incidents, from what route, etc.

Other:

- More panel discussions.
- NRC computer simulation of cask strengths and what they mean in a railroad

environment.

- Lessons learned from foreign fuels shipping campaign, or any other relevant shipping campaign (presentation from participants, videos, pictures, etc.).
- Combining various training resources DOE/DOT/FEMA etc.
- I think we have our plate full with topics and issues. Adding more should be questioned.
- You hit the biggies.

5. What session from this meeting was most useful to you?

- Discussion of National Survey on Public Perceptions of Transportation Risks (4)
- All useful
- Ms. Klein's presentation on the Price-Anderson Act was the best presentation on this topic that I have heard on the topic.
- Emergency Management and Training (3)
- Transportation Operations (3)
- All breakout sessions
- Transportation Program Update, Transportation Operations Breakout

6. How would you rate the meeting overall? (Circle one)

Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
(9)	(9)			

7. Please indicate your opinion of the following: (Circle one)

Preconference information	excellent (4)	good (12)	average (1)	fair (1)	poor
•much of it was not received					
Meeting facilities	excellent (5)	good (10)	average (2)	fair	poor
Lodging facilities	excellent (11)	good (5)	average	fair	poor
Transportation Service	excellent (5)	good (7)	average (1)	fair	poor
Food services related to meetings	excellent (10)	good (6)	average (1)	fair	poor

8. Are there any individuals (or types of individuals) who you think should have been here but were not?

Suggestions:

- DOT
- Law enforcement
- Trucking industry (FRA & highway).
- Utilities representative(s) involved in past shipment campaigns.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police representative had a scheduling conflict. The American Trucking Association (ATA) has been contacted, but chosen not to participate in TEC/WG at this time. Utility representatives have been invited to attend; however they have been unable to participate.

None:

- The present group is very diversified. Excellent cross-section.
- No, about right.
- None that I can think of.

Other comments:

- Need someone to show the overall picture on the proposed routing for the different types of shipments. Update on agreements reached between states about routing. Areas that will have to be upgraded, whether rail or highway and who will assume costs. 1998 is fast approaching.
- With a vast number of new DOE faces involved in TEC/WG, many changes in the direction were noted. Most of these changes brought about movement in lieu of wheel spinning. At this time I have a positive opinion that we are making some progress. Even greater, I sense that most of the DOE participants are genuinely interested in the stakeholders' needs and concerns (and not just paying lip service).
- Emergency Management and training—restructuring excellent.
- Discussion on National Survey on Public Perceptions of Transportation Risks—excellent!

Appendix D

Acronym and Abbreviation List

AAR	Association of American Railroads
ATA	American Trucking Association
AULG	Affect Unit of Local Government
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation and Liability Act
CRCPD	Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors
CVSA	Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
DOE	Department of Energy
DOT	Department of Transportation
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EJ	Environmental Justice
EM	Office of Environmental Management
EMD	Emergency Management Division
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FERMCO	Fernald Environmental Restoration Management Corporation
FONSI	Finding of no significant impact
FRA	Federal Railroad Association
FRR	Foreign Research Reactor
HEU	Highly Enriched Uranium
HMIX	Hazardous Material Information eXchange
HRCQ	Highway Route Controlled Quantity
INEL	Idaho National Engineering Laboratory
LEU	Low Enriched Uranium
MPC	Multi-Purpose Canister
NCSL	National Conference of State Legislatures
NOI	Notice of Intent
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NTEC	National Tribal Environmental Council
NWPA	Nuclear Waste Policy Act
OCRWM	Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
RAM	Radioactive Material
RAP	Radiological Assistance Program
REAC/TS	Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site
RFP	Request for Proposal
RW	Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
SMAC	Shipment Mobility/Accountability Collection
SNF	Spent Nuclear Fuel
SSAB	Site Specific Advisory Board
SSEB	Southern States Energy Board
TEC/WG	Transportation External Coordination Working Group
TEMRC	Transportation and Emergency Management Resource Center
TEP	Transportation Emergency Preparedness
TEPP	Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program

TRANSAX TRANSportation Accident eXercise
TRANSCOM Transportation Communication Network
TRU Transuranic
WGA Western Governors' Association
WIEB Western Interstate Energy Board
WIPP Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WPI Waste Policy Institute