
U.S. Department of Energy

**Transportation External Coordination
Working Group**

**Meeting Summary
July 20 - 23, 1993**

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Public Information and Education Session	3
Plenary Session	3
Breakout Session	3
Development of Information Products: Third Party Collaboration	4
Evaluation Strategies for Information Products	5
Shipment-Specific Information Kits	5
Specific Information Products: Group Feedback	6
General Comments	7
Safe, Routine Transport Session	9
Plenary Session	9
Breakout Session	9
Glossary of Terms	9
Definition of Safe, Routine Transport	11
Utilization of Escorts for Shipments	15
Prenotification	17
General Comments	17
Emergency Management, Training and Technical Assistance Session	19
Plenary Session	19
Breakout Session	19
Emergency Management	20
Training Topics	23
Technical Assistance	27
Inspection and Enforcement Session	31
Plenary Session	31
Breakout Session	32
Highway Inspections	32
Railway Inspections	33
CRCPD Directory	36
Federally Integrated Incident Reporting System	37
General Discussion	41
Appendix A: Evaluation Results	47
Appendix B: Meeting Agenda	61
Appendix C: Participants List	69
Appendix D: Materials Request Form	77
Appendix E: Development of Training Problem Statements	81
Appendix F: Acronym List	85

**U.S. Department of Energy
Transportation External Coordination Working Group
July 20 -23, 1993 Meeting Summary**

Introduction

On July 20 - 23, 1993, the Transportation External Coordination (TEC) Working Group met for the third time. Participants included TEC Working Group members and representatives of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). The meeting included presentations requested at previous TEC meetings; introduced draft Task Plans to TEC members; and elicited recommendations from TEC members for future meeting process.

This *Meeting Summary* reports on discussion at each breakout session and provides summaries of the plenary session presentations. The *Meeting Summary* also includes issues which participants raised during the general discussion regarding the TEC Work Plan and the process for future TEC meetings.

The meeting focused on four specific topics and included two general discussions. The specific topics were presented in plenary sessions which were followed by breakout sessions and were:

- Public Information and Education;
- Safe, Routine Transport;
- Emergency Management, Training, and Technical Assistance; and
- Inspection and Enforcement.

During the Public Information and Education Session, Judith Holm, Manager of the DOE Liaison and Communications Program (L&C) made a presentation regarding the overall status of Public Information and Education suggestions from previous meetings and in the work plan. Mary Jo Acke, Acting Institutional Specialist of the U.S. DOE Chicago Field Office and Pat Kusek, Communication Manager Outreach Support at Duke Engineering gave presentations on DOE transportation program specific information products. Orientation material for the breakout session was provided.

Larry Blalock, Director of the DOE Transportation Management Division and Lou Rice, Advanced Transportation Specialist at Westinghouse Hanford Company made the presentation for the Safe, Routine Transport Session. The presentation addressed the overall status of safe, routine transport suggestions from previous meetings and the work plan; the DOE Transportation Operations Procedures Manual and Transportation Coordination Guide; and the DOE Motor Carrier Evaluation Program. Orientation material for the breakout session was provided.

The Emergency Management, Training, and Technical Assistance Session included presentations by Wally Weaver, Director of the DOE Emergency Management Division; Judith Bradbury of Pacific Northwest Laboratories; and Jeffery Davis, Manager of the Hazardous Materials Training Transportation Test Center for the Association of American Railroads. The presentations covered the following topics: overall status of emergency management, training, and technical assistance suggestions from previous meetings and the work plan; a review of federal assistance program applicability for Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) Section 180(c) assistance; perspectives on rail industry emergency response; improving basic source guidance; and standardizing transportation emergency action levels. Orientation material for the breakout session was provided as well.

The Inspection and Enforcement Session included presentations by Susan Smith, DOE Transportation Manager, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management; Fred Dennin with the Federal Railroad Administration; Bernie Morris, Railroad Safety Program Administrator at the Illinois Commerce Commission; Jim Daust of the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance; Terry Moore, Manager, Hazardous Materials Compliance with the Illinois Department of Transportation; Jim Reed, Senior Policy Specialist with the National Conference of State Legislatures; Bernard Bevill representing the Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors (CRCPD); and Larry Blalock. The topics covered in the session were the overall status of inspection and enforcement suggestions from previous meetings and in the work plan; a panel discussion on improving inspection and enforcement systems and how DOE can assist; uniformity in state highway permitting; the CRCPD *Directory of State Agencies Involved with Transportation of Radioactive Material*; and the Radioactive Materials Incident Reporting System and Incident Reporting coordination. Orientation material for the breakout session was provided.

The subject of the first general discussion was a TEC status report and was presented by Susan Smith. Judith Holm presented the second general discussion which focused on a review of work plan activities and an assessment of the evolving TEC Working Group's role.

The participants' responses from the meeting evaluations are included in Appendix A.

This summary includes a copy of the meeting agenda (See Appendix B) and participant list (See Appendix C). Also, a list of materials that were available at the meeting or mentioned in presentations is located at the end of this document for those who are interested in receiving copies (See Appendix D). There is also a Development of Training Problem Statement (See Appendix E) and an acronym list for the document (See Appendix F).

Public Information and Education Session

Public Information and Education Session

Plenary Session

Judith Holm, Manager, DOE Liaison and Communications Program began the presentation with a suggested goal for DOE of improving state, tribal, and local confidence in DOE and the objectives related to this goal. She then updated the status of five recommended agenda items from previous TEC meetings. Judith's presentation continued with a discussion of the goals established in the five year planning process for L&C and their related objectives. She particularly focused on the mechanisms for institutional interactions, both internally and externally. The discussion highlighted the Transportation Institutional Task Force (TITF), the Local Government Network (LGN), tribal and Pueblo government involvement, training, and tribal policy. Judith concluded her presentation showing viewgraphs of current DOE exhibits and provided a contact for information products.

The session continued with presentations by Mary Jo Acke, Acting Institutional Specialist of the U.S. DOE Chicago Field Office and Pat Kusek, Communication Manager Outreach Support at Duke Engineering. Mary Jo discussed specific information products related to transportation management DOE has been developing. The products include exhibits, printed materials (fact sheets, booklets, and brochures), the Emergency Response Information Wheel, videos, and educational curricula materials. She mentioned that DOE is in the process of developing an evaluation strategy for the information products and is also looking for new ways to distribute the materials.

Pat Kusek noted that because of the changing nature of the program it is difficult to always have timely and accurate information materials available. She outlined some of the activities that DOE would like to undertake regarding information materials which included replacing outdated materials, possibly with one page fact sheets that would be easier to revise; creating a new cask model; developing short videos; and establishing a comprehensive speakers bureau. She said that they were in need of TEC's input as to what TEC members need, what products they would like to take back to their member organizations, and which types of materials work best for their audiences.

Breakout Session

The structure of the breakout session was a general discussion of current activities; a discussion and scoping of outstanding issues; discussion to review or provide input to task plans; and preparation of a summary of the process in the breakout session to be shared with the group. The topics for the breakout session were:

- third party collaboration;
- evaluation strategies for information products;
- shipment-specific information "kits"; and
- specific information products: group feedback.

The three breakout groups approached the session in different ways and each group did not address all of the topics due to limited time. It was recommended that when there were materials that DOE wanted the participants to comment on (e.g., the fact sheets), it would be helpful to have them beforehand so time is not spent in the breakout session reviewing the material.

Development of Information Products: Third Party Collaboration

A general comment made by one of the groups on this topic was that the term collaboration should not be used because of its negative connotations. They suggested that the term interaction be used instead. Another general comment was that DOE must learn to respect third party expertise and gave the example of CRCPD videos.

Other issues raised concerning this topic involved the controversial nature of some of the material. It was suggested that DOE discuss both sides of the issue instead of their current method of introducing informative and descriptive materials. Third parties could be used to objectively articulate both sides of an issue which DOE could use to explain the controversy. DOE could use fact sheets or as one group suggested, develop a video showing a panel of individuals having a balanced discussion of a transportation-related issue. DOE could state their position. Another suggestion was the possibility of including a list of alternative sources of information at the end of each fact sheet.

Some drawbacks to this approach were identified. First, it has to be recognized that third parties have different interests and goals. Second, the question was raised as to whether DOE should be presenting advocacy messages. One problem associated with this was the development of information materials before all technical decisions are made. Finally, one participant said his organization would not want DOE to touch the controversy in any way. Instead, DOE should just supply the information and let the controversy surface on its own.

Another issue that was raised addressed research on public perception. It was suggested that DOE consider funding objective research on how the public reacts to DOE information products (i.e., Idaho's testing information; Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) products). A literature search should be conducted and TEC should review a research outline. DOE could supply a general source of information on public perception and what types of messages affect audiences in what ways. Generally this would be basic research that could be used to address specific issues within DOE, other agencies, and industry.

A final suggestion was to review TEC member organizations' outreach programs. Examples included:

Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
(CVSA)

State governments' inspection and
enforcement people (two meetings, 10
active committees, and a newsletter).

Western Governor's Association
(WGA)

Public survey work that is state specific; specifically mentioned Hank Jenkins-Smith and his need for an advisory group so that DOE funded research is not DOE tainted.

Virginia Power

Public forums before shipping nuclear materials and before siting power lines.

Western Interstate Energy Board
(WIEB)

Document for state legislatures; policy and technical issue background document.

Evaluation Strategies for Information Products

There was limited discussion within the groups as to evaluation strategies which could be used. One recommendation for an evaluation strategy was the use of focus groups comprised of a mix of people to evaluate specific products. In another group's discussion of information products, it was suggested that draft fact sheets be distributed to TEC members for their review and input. The possibility of add-on meetings before or after TEC meetings was mentioned to give members the opportunity to review proposed information products.

Shipment-Specific Information Kits

Detailed discussion on shipment-specific information kits was limited. One participant questioned what constitutes a campaign for which a kit would be designed. One group did review the Cesium Information Kit. A WGA representative briefly discussed the history and development of the Cesium Kit. There was concern as to whom the intended audience of the material was and a suggestion was made that all future materials being reviewed by TEC members be tagged with the intended audience. The WGA representative informed the group that the Cesium Information Kit was designed as a multi-layered packet — the material becomes more technical as you go through the kit. The following specific recommendations were made for the improvement of the Cesium Information Kit.

- Delete information on the RSI-1500 packaging since it has been de-certified. The BUSS Cask is the only packaging that will be used to ship the cesium.
- Since strontium is discussed in "Cesium at a Glance" (page 2 of the packet), it should also be mentioned in the fact sheet.
- Clarify that there are no more leakers (in the first paragraph of the fact sheet, it states that DOE recalled the cesium capsules after one leaked at a facility).
- Tell how much cesium is in each shipment.
- Use arrows to identify parts of the shipping cask.

- Add a local contact.
- Explain the term authorized user in the fact sheet text concerning TRANSCOM.
- Include information on the carriers' safety records.
- List other fact sheet titles at the end of the fact sheet.

Specific Information Products: Group Feedback

This topic appeared to have been the most broadly discussed in the breakout session. The most prominent issue that was raised was the need to clearly state the targeted audience on the product — is it targeted to a specific audience or a general one? Once an audience has been identified it was suggested that the information product be tailored to the particular interests of that audience. For example, general comments about spent-fuel shipments may be appropriate for an audience not living near the intended shipment route; a more detailed fact sheet would be needed for those living adjacent to the route; and an even more specific fact sheet for the first responders. It was noted that there often would be various audiences interested in a topic, thus several fact sheets at different levels may be required (i.e., explain issues in more detail for press and education audiences). To ensure that information in the fact sheets is useful to the intended audiences, it was suggested that it might be helpful to provide draft copies to TEC and obtain their input prior to issuing the final information.

How DOE should target the appropriate audiences was an issue discussed in one group. Again, it was noted that there would be various factions of interest and audiences should be grouped accordingly. Examples given were a certain region of the country and individual and professional interests.

Content of the information products was also discussed. One group reported that the products presented rose colored information and included ambiguous terms. It was noted that photographs, drawings and text in the fact sheets do not always accurately portray the situation (i.e., different equipment may be used, alternate routes may be selected). When this happens, credibility is lost. DOE needs to ensure that what occurs in actual operations is shown in fact sheets to maintain credibility. It was also suggested that the products include a section on alternative viewpoints and/or a list of alternative information sources. Another suggestion was to put products in the context of specific shipping activities as was done with the cesium kit. Focus groups from the targeted audience could review the products to ensure accuracy.

Timing of distribution was also discussed. The type of product would determine when it should be distributed. Products intended for distribution prior to formal prenotification should be sent out as early as possible. Products providing general information could be distributed closer to the event or topic so as to provide real time information.

The final issue dealt with distribution. There were numerous recommendations on the best ways to get the information to intended audiences. Possibilities included distribution through national conferences, state agencies or local emergency planning committees. Distribution might also be achieved by listing the available publications and letting audiences select the ones they want through reader response cards and/or a toll free number. TEC members could possibly distribute materials to their organizations. A regulator in one group stated he had never seen a fact sheet before attending a TEC meeting. The suggestion was made that it might be possible to distribute information materials to all the state agencies involved in radioactive materials transport as well as national organizations for dissemination to the states.

The recommendation made to the plenary session was:

- to develop a task plan to comprehensively list organizations to receive/disseminate information products. The completed list would be reviewed by TEC.

General Comments

There were a couple of general comments that were made during the breakout that did not fall under any of the topics. The comments related to the TEC process. First, the group should revisit TEC goals and objective. Second, the focus should be on improving credibility in transportation issues, not credibility for all of DOE.

This page intentionally left blank

Safe, Routine Transport Session

Safe, Routine Transport Session

Plenary Session

The session began with a presentation from Larry Blalock, Director of the DOE Transportation Management Division on the overall status of suggestions from previous meetings on safe, routine transportation and the work plan. Larry outlined nine recommended items that had come out of the last TEC meeting which are included in the work plan and indicated all are underway. Larry continued with a discussion of transportation operations procedures and regulatory compliance training. He indicated the coordination guide will be developed in conjunction with an operating procedures manual; packaging development and certification; L&C; stakeholder participation; and emergency response components. Regulatory compliance training for DOE and professional development activities were also discussed and focused on the modular training program which is designed to meet the requirements of Department of Transportation (DOT) regulation HM-126F.

Lou Rice, Advanced Transportation Specialist at Westinghouse Hanford Company followed with a presentation on the DOE Motor Carrier Evaluation Program which was developed in 1989 and implemented in 1990. Lou indicated that the program has broadened in spectrum from its original focus and currently is being reformatted to make it more user friendly. The program allows a broad picture of the carrier to be developed through a review of the SafetyNet document, accident history, service and maintenance program, and insurance compliance report. They are also trying to add a Dunn and Bradstreet report to the pre-evaluation information. Because of the success of the Motor Carrier Evaluation Program, DOE is considering creating a Rail Carrier Evaluation Program. However, it is recognized that the program would have a different application from the Motor Carrier Evaluation Program.

Breakout Session

The breakout session structure was the same as that of the previous section. The topics for this breakout session were:

- the glossary of terms;
- definition of safe, routine transport;
- utilization of escorts for shipments; and
- DOE Motor Carrier Evaluation Program.

Glossary of Terms

All of the breakout groups spent time discussing the glossary of terms. The purpose of the glossary, as written in the Task Plan, is to achieve a degree of uniformity in application of transportation related terminology to TEC activities. A preliminary list of definitions was suggested at the December 1992 meeting.

One group was informed that there are several glossaries in existence among various DOE documents. In developing this glossary, it was noted that deference will be given to the regulatory definitions as supplied by DOT or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

The group discussed the need to differentiate between certain terms and specified criteria for inclusion of words in the glossary. The group suggested that it is important to differentiate between a transportation accident, incident, and delay. The terms accident and incident are used interchangeably in pertinent transportation regulations. Most participants agreed that by differentiating between an incident (e.g., a fender-bender) and a delay (e.g., traffic congestion), DOE could avoid raising undue alarm among the public.

It was noted that Virginia Power has definitions for accident, incident, and delay. The representative from Edison Electric Institute (EEI) was asked to provide DOE with Virginia Power's definitions. The group was informed that any definitions developed are meant primarily for use in TEC related documents and discussions, and TEC member organizations would not be expected to incorporate them in their respective terminology. Participants agreed that DOE should continue developing the glossary as planned and provide TEC members with a more polished version at the next meeting. One participant requested that the glossary be sent to members well in advance of the next meeting to give members time to review it with their respective organizations. The group suggested the following task.

- DOE should continue developing the glossary of terms, providing TEC members with a review version at least 60 days prior to the next meeting. Among others, the glossary should provide acceptable definitions for accident, incident, and delay.

The second group learned that the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) is taking the lead in producing this glossary. One critical definition that is needed is one for the term safe, routine transport. An initial comment regarding the glossary was that the purpose of the glossary should be identified in the task plan.

One participant asked if the definitions produced by RW and this group would apply to all DOE programs. Such definitions could mean different things to different programs. The answer was that although the TEC charter and NWPA only mention spent nuclear fuel (SNF) and high-level waste (HLW), the glossary's terms should apply to all Highway Route Controlled Quantity (HRCQ) shipments, for uniformity's sake. A representative of the National Association of Counties (NACO), said that all definitions, for clarity, should have as few acronyms as possible.

Another participant asked if this glossary would be part of the TEC work plan or if it would be a stand-alone product. While it would be preferable to have Department-wide applicability, it would be easier to have the glossary function as part of the TEC work plan. Although it was recommended that a process be developed to get the glossary to all DOE offices.

Another group began its discussion by generally agreeing that there is a need for a common vocabulary and understanding among all groups participating in TEC. However, two concerns were raised over the current glossary. First, the group thought it was too narrow. They noted that the terms appear to have been taken from a specific document. Second, criteria should be specified for what needs to be included and they identified several missing categories. The categories included:

- institutional terms and items of importance to state, tribal, and local officials (e.g., command and control, incident commander, prenotification);
- items that are routine to DOE but may not be to others, (e.g., shipper, carrier, point of origin);
- emergency response terms (e.g., first responder, emergency action levels);
- medical terms;
- radiation terminology; and
- legislation (i.e., OSHA requirement in section 1910.120 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)).

The group also questioned if a document of this nature can be generic enough for all people. It was suggested as with public information materials, the audience be identified. The group expressed a need to provide a common vocabulary for all concerned groups, at varying levels, to use in communicating with each other. It was suggested that each group be tasked to supply their concerns/terms to TEC for DOE's work.

From their discussion, the group formulated glossary action items. A revised glossary should be developed, using existing documents/terminology. This can be done by one of two methods.

- DOE should obtain input from everyone, compile a revised glossary, and distribute to TEC members for review and comment.
- A small group, representative of broad constituencies, should be formed to generate a revised version for TEC review and comment.

Definition of Safe, Routine Transport

All three groups spent time focusing on a definition of safe, routine transport. One group's discussion began with a reminder that both Section 180(c) of the NWPA as amended and the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act use the term safe, routine transport. Although RW is taking the

lead on defining what is meant by safe, routine transport, its definition should be applicable to all DOE shipments. Several participants pointed out, however, that the term is used mostly in relation to hazardous materials, specifically radioactive materials, and therefore its definition should be predicated on that fact. One participant commented that at one point RW wanted to limit the definition to support for inspection and enforcement only.

The discussion continued for several minutes as to the type of material covered by the definition. Several participants proposed that it apply to HRCQ material only, while others supported a less restrictive application. It was noted that although transuranic waste is not an HRCQ material, for purposes of the WIPP shipments, DOE will treat it as such. Thus, there could be a problem with defining safe, routine transport exclusively in terms of HRCQ material because such a definition would technically exclude WIPP shipments.

It was reiterated that it was DOE's desire to devise a definition which could be consistently applied to as many of its shipping programs as possible, not simply RW and WIPP shipments. From discussions with the WGA regarding the cesium capsule shipments, DOE recognizes the need for a commonly accepted definition to guide future movements. DOE does not anticipate a simple, concise statement.

A concern was raised that because the NWPA uses the term in relation to funding affected jurisdictions, applying it to non-NWPA shipments could generate a demand to use Nuclear Waste Funds for those non-NWPA shipments. It was agreed that an appropriately worded statement within the definition should eliminate that possibility. It was recommended that DOE draft several definitions and seek TEC group input on them. Participants agreed, but advised that they would need to seek extensive input from their respective organizations and therefore would need sufficient lead-time prior to the next meeting.

The group reviewed the three definitions provided in the initial Task Plan. Section 180(c) of the NWPA was read to provide the context in which the term was originally used. It was noted that safe, routine transport is differentiated from emergency response. One member of the group proposed the following definition: safe, routine transportation is that movement of radioactive material that does not require emergency response. Although the group debated this definition, it was generally agreed that this would serve as the basis for a much more comprehensive definition. It was recommended that the second definition provided in the task plan be retained to characterize what activities result in safe, routine transport. Furthermore, the definition will need to address the type of material to which the term can be applied (e.g., HRCQ). It was acknowledged that the definition of safe, routine transport would need to differentiate between accident, incident and delay. Also, it was noted that emergency response would have to be clearly defined.

From their discussion, the group generated the following task suggestion.

- DOE should draft a definition of safe, routine transport which takes into consideration activities constituting safe, routine transport, the type of material

to which the definition will apply, an acceptable definition for emergency response, and differentiate between a transportation accident, incident, and delay. The following should serve as a basis for the definition: safe, routine transportation is that movement of radioactive material that does not require emergency response.

One group was informed that a researcher had spent some time on the draft task plan included in the participants' materials outlining the different components of safe, routine transportation and why the definition was important to DOE. According to Section 180(c) of the NWPA, the Department must help states and tribes prepare for both emergency response needs as well as those related to safe, routine transport. DOE needs a definition that both it and affected parties can live with.

It was suggested that the definition problem may not be a big one. If a transportation-related activity is not an emergency response activity, it must be related to safe, routine transport by default. A DOE official agreed with that general principle, but pointed out that DOE needs to be able to bound what other activities it is required to fund. Providing tracking information through a system like the Transportation Communication Network (TRANSCOM) was used as an example. If safe, routine transport was interpreted in its broadest sense, then state officials could argue that the cost of learning to use a modem is DOE's responsibility. It was also stated that inspection and law enforcement personnel in any given state or tribe along a potential route will be concerned with DOE shipments as only one of many responsibilities. DOE needs to determine what part of officials' functions are related to DOE transport and then provide support and assistance for that component. Many skills are cross-cutting and not just related to implementing the NWPA. The group generally agreed with the definition elements included on the matrix, but made the following suggestions.

- add tracking to the definition elements;
- clarify proper loading; and
- expand the options on the matrix to include both inspection and enforcement.

One participant asked why the definition of safe, routine transport was so important. Both the Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act (HMTUSA) and the NWPA use safe, routine transport in their statements of DOE requirements under the law. The Department has been told many times that there is more to safe, routine transport than DOE has admitted thus far. What managers want to know is how much more safe, routine transport really does entail. Another member of the group added that the definition is important because DOE and the states need to know what is covered; they need to define the criteria that apply and list the elements of safe, routine transport ahead of time, before shipments commence.

While there had been a definition of safe, routine transport that had been used by the

Department in the past, an improved one is needed. A solid, workable definition is needed particularly for the budget process, when programs will have to clearly define how they will use resources to satisfy regulatory drivers.

In another breakout group, no final definition of safe, routine transport was proposed. However, initial disagreement on the scope of safe, routine transportation ended in general agreement on elements that should be incorporated into a definition, with a caveat that the definition may be mode-specific. The group began a general discussion by commenting on the strawman definitions provided in the Task Plan materials. It was noted that no surprises was one of the original aspects of safe, routine transport and was missing in all of the drafts. Second, the group thought identifying the ingredients of safe, routine transport is a major part of the effort. Third, the question was raised as to whether emergency preparedness should be one of the items on the matrix. One member of the group thought that it should not be part of safe, routine transport because the use of safe and routine should functionally exclude an emergency. Instead, procedures for handling an emergency (an emergency management system) should be a part of safe, routine transport. Specifically the group focused on the following four topics in their discussion.

First, they discussed a narrow versus a broad definition. There was initial disagreement between a narrow definition from a rail representative and a broader viewpoint of a state representative. The narrower viewpoint was: "If, as a shipper or carrier, you follow the requirements in CFR Title 49 you will expect safe, routine transportation." The broader viewpoint emphasized that the definition should include the element of no surprises, (i.e., you should not face something unexpected or for which you are unprepared at any point in the process).

Second, the group identified elements which should be incorporated into a definition of safe, routine, transport. However, there was no conclusion on which of these elements should be funded under Section 180(c). The elements include:

- existence of an emergency management system (the details, "what the system is," is another issue);
- QA/QC, which is inherent in the various activities;
- the definition should encompass four aspects:
 - 180(c);
 - WIPP;
 - day-to-day operations; and
 - shipping campaigns
- individual words can be defined as follows:
 - safe = incident-free movement;
 - routine is redundant; and

- transport = as per regulations.

Third, the group addressed the issue of certification. The term certification, which is included in the strawman definition, should be clarified. It needs to be indicated if certification applies to transportation facilities or emergency response. Also, it needs to be indicated who is responsible for doing the certification.

Finally, the group decided it may be necessary to create more than one definition. The definitions may need to vary depending on the mode of transportation (i.e., highway, rail, air, water).

The group formulated a definition action item in conjunction with the above discussion.

- TEC participants should mark up the chart that is included in the package, discuss it with members of their organizations, and return it to DOE.

Utilization of Escorts for Shipments

All three groups spent some time in their breakout session addressing utilization of escorts for shipments. The first group reviewed the outline for the proposed study on using escorts for RW shipments. Participants debated what the primary function of escorts would be (either physical security or emergency response), and the potential impact on other DOE programs if RW used escorts. One participant noted that because the NRC does not require armed escorts, their primary function would be to provide emergency response. Another participant noted that the intent of other shipment escort programs of which he is aware (the U.S. Air Force and the Italian Government) is to have immediate expertise to assist first responders. It was indicated that this study was motivated to determine the plausibility of replacing the need for federally trained state, tribal and local responders with federally equipped escorts. There were no substantive comments on the proposed structure of the study.

In another group, it was noted that the issue of escorts had been around for several years, and that the Office of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (EM) had recently committed to working with RW on a comprehensive study of the escort concept. The study, if conducted, would look at such issues as potential trade-offs at the state, tribal and local levels in terms of assistance, as well as other funding and technical assistance originating at the federal level. The Department does not have a really clear vision of who does and who does not like the concept of escorts; moreover, there are different types of escorts that can accompany a shipment, and there is no clear consensus on what people want or what goals having an escort will achieve. One participant commented that if the concept is being broadened to include EM shipments, the outline would be substantially changed.

There was general agreement that the group would review the outline and send comments in by mail. During the breakout, they raised questions they had about escorts. Generally, the group questioned what DOE meant by escorts and what DOE wants from escorts.

A participant representing the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA), asked if DOE had looked at the escort programs of certain states for cost/benefit information. The reply was that the issue has not been examined lately, but that state escort programs were certainly going to be examined as part of the study process.

A member of the group representing the Midwest Office of the Council of State Governments (MOCSG), noted that the draft task statement implied that the escorts being looked at would be of the Winnebago type, including response personnel and associated equipment.

One participant contended that first responders can have adequate generic training and be able to respond to most incidents that may involve radioactive materials. However, for special shipments of high-activity materials like spent nuclear fuel, the additional personnel, expertise and equipment that an escort vehicle provides makes escorts a necessary evil. It was added that it might be informative to perform some type of root-cause analysis of why people are asking for escorts along routes. Perhaps, there are other ways that DOE can provide added levels of public confidence without the expense of fully equipped and staffed escort vehicles.

One participant said she had heard that supplying escorts was being discussed as an alternative to offering emergency response training. The response was that there were many different ways to approach the escort question; DOE wants to take a comprehensive look at the experience of other movements in the U.S. and Europe.

It was added that one alternative to examine could be the use of a caravan approach in which several vehicles carrying hazardous materials were moved at the same time accompanied by emergency response personnel. Another participant remarked that the important thing in assuring the public is to let people know in plenty of time what is going to be moved and when.

Another breakout group found through their discussion that escorts offer several advantages. First, they provide a measure of confidence in locations where training and other resources are lacking. Second, they provide an on-scene resource that has a known capability and training level. An escort system would ensure that calibrated instruments are checked daily by a trained health physics staff. Finally, the experience of the U.S. Army shows that escorts avoid jurisdictional problems.

The group also thought the use of escorts should be combined with familiarization/basic radiological training for first responders (this would provide adequate assurance of safe, routine transport). Like the preceding group, they also addressed the role of the escorts. This group thought that the escorts should be viewed as technical resources as opposed to an actual response team. The group considered the composition of the escorts. It was discussed whether the escorts should be national, state, tribal, or a mix. The group decided this was an issue for further study. One question the group raised was whether escorts were to be in addition to funding or would they fall under technical assistance.

The group formulated one action item.

- TEC members should take the study outline to their organizations for review and comment, providing input on which issues and concerns need to be incorporated into the study.

Prenotification

The issue of prenotification was discussed in the breakout groups. One group asked if DOE intended to provide notification to jurisdictions below the state level (e.g. municipalities and counties). The response was that it is the states' role to do if they are so inclined. The regulations are very clear on this point. It was also noted that tribes will be treated with equity in DOE notification activities, and that DOE will proceed with a petition to the NRC to include tribes in NRC notification requirements. There was no further discussion of the topic as time was running short.

Another group initially dealt with some confusion over the inclusion of a sheet on the TRANSCOM and TRANSNET. They also addressed the following issues dealing with prenotification. One member of the group asked who received notification. It was indicated that either the Governor of the state or a designee, with it almost always being the latter. Several participants reported on the problems raised by foreign (Canadian) shipments. The group also discussed problems associated with prenotification specific to Indian tribes. It was emphasized that Indian tribes lack the basic infrastructure to address this topic. It was stated that immediate funding under Section 180(c) would ensure adequate infrastructure to handle prenotification.

In one group, participants were asked for their input on a prenotification policy for DOE shipments, particularly those sponsored by RW. They were informed that RW had drafted a letter to the NRC asking for clarification on whether DOE can use the TRANSCOM system as a replacement for the written notification required in the regulations, as well as an acceptable protocol for notifying Indian tribes.

General Comments

One group examined a draft matrix that showed different levels of governmental responsibility related to transportation planning and preparation issues. One member of the group stated that the group needs to clarify who has what responsibilities within the matrix. It was agreed that more clarification was needed and the issue should be tabled until later.

This page intentionally left blank

**Emergency Management, Training and Technical
Assistance Session**

Emergency Management, Training and Technical Assistance Session

Plenary Session

The presentations for this session were given by Wally Weaver, Director of the DOE Emergency Management Division; Judith Bradbury of Pacific Northwest Laboratories; and Jeffery Davis, Manager of Hazardous Materials Training Transportation Test Center for the Association of American Railroads (AAR). Wally reviewed the overall status of suggestions from the work plan and previous TEC Working Group meetings. He reported on the status of the work plan tasks in relation to emergency management, training and technical assistance. Wally also reviewed the current DOE activities associated with the ten initiatives of the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program.

Judith Bradbury reviewed federal assistance program applicability for NWPA Section 180(c) assistance. She indicated that both financial and technical assistance are available from different agencies which include the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), DOT, and DOE. Two issues which Judith raised were the lack of consistency between available assistance and the lack of consistency in dealing with Indian tribes.

Jeffery Davis' presentation was on the rail industry's emergency response perspective and was in response to previous suggestions from TEC members. He addressed four points in his discussion.

- A basic understanding of the railroad operating environment;
- background on AAR and an historical perspective with respect to hazardous materials;
- present capabilities of railroads with respect to hazardous and radioactive materials; and
- recommendations with respect to railroads' role to hazardous materials response and management.

He stressed the importance of remembering what may be appropriate for motor carriers may not be appropriate for rail carriers. He also raised several concerns for the rail industry which included who will do what; that the rail industry believes DOE should use the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards; and that the DOE transportation policy for high level waste and spent nuclear fuel should fully state what it expects and define performance standards for training.

Breakout Session

The structure for the breakout included a general discussion of current activities; discussion

and scoping of outstanding issues; definition of the problem statement for DOE task plans to address; review or provide input; and preparation of summary for plenary report. The topics for the breakout were:

- emergency management topics:
 - TEC/DOE relationship for Emergency Response Guidebook (ERG) updates;
 - guidance on mutual aid agreements; and
 - work plan item status.
- training topics:
 - identifying preparedness/response capability shortfalls; and
 - possible training fixes for shortfalls.
- technical assistance topics:
 - defining technical assistance; and
 - DOE's role in federal technical assistance.

Emergency Management

All of the groups discussed the ERG. One group received an explanation of the ERG. It was noted in this group that the Springfield Accident Report said ERG and the Chemical Transportation Emergency Center (CHEMTREC) information did not match — there were conflicting guidelines. The group was informed that a new guide should be available in early October. TEC will have time to make recommendations for changes in the next issue which is due in 1996. However, one member of the group noted that the Western States commented on the ERG a few years ago and were told thanks but no thanks.

The group turned its discussion to how TEC could most effectively comment on the ERG. One suggestion was to have TEC member organizations send suggestions in separately and let TEC know so DOE can be an advocate for them. A second suggestion was to let TEC collect the comments and DOE present them. Another possibility would be to use both methods.

The group continued with a general discussion on the ERG. Issues that were raised were inviting DOT to address TEC about the ERG. One problem associated with the ERG that was raised was that first responders get the same information about the materials in the truck from the shipping papers as they do when using the ERG. Another member of the group noted that first responders have limited responsibility and therefore they do not need to have a lot of information. The group also talked about the application of technology to ERG updates. One example was the talking cask. Units on the inside and outside of the cask talk to each other to find out what is going on inside the cask. The possibility of linking this information to a communication system with a warning light or ability to be queried electronically was raised. Other possibilities discussed were timing during design phases and a database at the scene. The group also suggested opening the discussion to other federal

agencies for ERG.

The group had the following three recommendations.

- DOT person to attend TEC Working Group to discuss ERG;
- Applegate study - computerize ERG -was the purpose; and
- look at technology beyond hard copy ERG.

Another group began its discussion questioning why the ERG needed to be revised as there was concern over what was driving this task. It was suggested that the Springfield, Massachusetts incident drove much of the concern about the use of the ERG as a basic source. The group discussed the problems that exist in ERG beyond guides 61-66. The purpose of the guidebook was also a topic covered by the group. It was noted that the purpose of the guidebook is to alert first responders to the best available information. ERG is intended as a defensive tool for the first thirty minutes, pending establishment of a command/control chain. Finally, the group discussed the relationship of ERG and CHEMTREC. It was noted that calling into CHEMTREC will result in obtaining the same information as that provided in the guidebook. In part, the problem relates to referral to the appropriate agency.

The group generated the following recommendation.

- Involve TEC in an early review for the next cycle. Circulate current revisions, when available, for review and compilation of comments and suggestions from TEC organizations.

In one group the session began with the group learning that the DOT was responsible for publishing and updating the ERG, and that new editions appeared approximately every three years. The next update will be released in 1996, so comments should target that edition. It was noted that the external groups require a long lead time for committee review within their organizations prior to submitting their comments.

Discussion then focused on whether the scope of the topics being examined were appropriate for this forum. It was noted that a real need exists in the field for reliable and useful source guidance. It was suggested that participants expand, if necessary, the group's task plans to identify which information sources DOE should work on. The committee could also identify where improvements are needed in other areas, and then the Department could concentrate its resources there.

Another suggestion was that any comments that are sent to DOT should reflect the fact that they were produced cooperatively with many different interested parties. It was suggested that comments on the ERG, for example, could be incorporated by obtaining a copy of the

draft from the Federal Radiological Protection Coordinating Committee (FRPCC) and then discussing the draft at a dedicated TEC session. One member responded that an activity of this nature would be a very worthwhile use of the Working Group's time.

Mutual aid agreements were also discussed in the breakout. One group noted that the WGA is compiling a list of mutual aid agreements concerning WIPP. It was suggested that TEC could convene a panel to discuss mutual aid agreement issues. Specific issues that were mentioned by the group included the parameters of the agreements, legal considerations, worker compensation issues, training, and the level of preparedness. The group also discussed a study that has been done on response time reduction by using neighboring states. They also discussed intrastate/regional response teams. One member questioned if DOE has mutual aid agreements with states and locals on response. A suggestion was made to have a panel at a TEC meeting to hear what is going on in the utility industry, among others. The issue of individual hospitals looking for mutual aid agreements with emergency responders was raised and it was questioned if they were using the proper mechanisms for establishing the agreements. The group concluded their discussion requesting clarification on mutual aid agreements and regional response teams.

Another group was asked what they thought the role of DOE should be with regard to mutual assistance between states, tribes and localities. Participants mentioned that there were several mutual assistance agreements in place between states, notably the Southern Mutual Radiation Assistance Plan (SMRAP), as well as a model assistance agreement produced by MOCSG. Mutual aid agreements could/should be developed with the use of a model identifying key issues.

One participant asked why DOE would be involved in the mutual aid process at all, since the agreements would be on a state-state, state-local or state-tribal (essentially non-federal) level. The response was that DOE is interested because some local jurisdictions and many tribes along potential or current DOE shipping routes do not have a baseline response capability. Agreements between jurisdictions that would provide for such capability might be a good way to provide for effective and needed response capability. DOE resources could be more effectively used to address such needs.

Another group began their discussion by questioning the purpose of the task concerning mutual aid agreements. Participants were uncertain about whether it was an appropriate task for DOE/TEC, based on a belief that drawing up mutual aid agreements is a highly individualized process. No clear conclusions were drawn from the discussion. There was general agreement that the primary goal was to draw up a menu of elements to be included in such agreements.

The group agreed that the need for mutual aid agreements is greatest in rural areas and for Indian tribes. Participants questioned whether an applicable model could be found. It was suggested that DOE circulate the Southern States Energy Board (SSEB) model agreement.

The group continued its discussion by raising several issues concerning emergency action levels. One participant noted that the issue of emergency action levels (EALs) was moot in his state. State personnel either responded or did not respond, based on direction from a senior, health physics team which is sent out to evaluate each incident. However, further discussion indicated that not all states followed the same approach. Another participant questioned why there is confusion over terminology, given that terms are well-established for responders at fixed facilities and that the responders are the same people. DOE representatives responded that the scheme was not easily transferrable to transportation incidents and that some of the states did not want the same scheme because of public perceptions/connotations.

The group concluded their discussion by formulating the following action items.

- DOE should circulate the SSEB model mutual aid agreement to TEC members.
- TEC members/organizations should develop a menu of elements to be included in a model mutual aid agreement.
- Discussion of tribal issues about mutual aid agreements should be deferred until more representatives can participate (a possible forum is the workshop on emergency preparedness, which is scheduled for the annual National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) convention in Reno at the end of November/beginning of December).
- DOE will collect existing schemes/criteria that states are using to determine the severity of transportation incidents.

Training Topics

The groups continued with discussions regarding training. One group began by addressing preparation/response capability shortfalls. One member noted that the most effective training he has seen has been campaign specific. The discussion continued with problem identification. One problem that was identified was turnover. This is especially true for rural areas. Another problem is that locals are being trained for shipments that never happen (e.g., WIPP). Also, there is the problem of medical preparedness. Hospitals are not prepared to deal with radioactively contaminated patients and there are some transport vehicles that will not take these patients to the hospital. A need to match trainers to trainees was identified (i.e., volunteer fire department personnel train volunteer fire people). The group also discussed train-the-trainer.

The group continued by discussing training issues related to WIPP. It was suggested that the WIPP training program which is in place be analyzed. WIPP is sending a report to Congress every year and they are retraining. It was noted that under the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act, OSHA is required to evaluate training (1910.120 CFR employer responsibility for training).

The discussion regarding WIPP training continued by noting that WIPP was training first responders but they do not employ them. They have developed a medical training program, Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site (REAC/TS) so hospitals can learn to plan how they will handle contaminated patients.

The group continued their discussion of training by addressing a variety of issues. It was noted that HMTUSA requires drivers to be trained so they can inform first responders on how to handle the load, if they are able to give responders information. It was observed that transportation exercises end up re-training the state people since they show up at the local incidents. Although it was noted that the exercises make participants comfortable and ease fears of the unknown because of the layers of events that are incorporated into the exercises. It was also noted that exercises can build relationships, confidence, and communications.

It was pointed out that from a state standpoint, people are not familiar with what DOE can offer in the way of assistance. It was noted that the solutions to the country's hazmat questions/problems should be expanded as it is not just a DOE problem. A train-the-trainer course was suggested for states under the Transportation Emergency Training for Response Assistance (TETRA). The group also suggested a panel or similar forum to focus on the status of other training programs. It was recognized that training needs would be affected by escorted shipments.

In discussing specific training methods, it was suggested that industry be consulted as to the methods they are using. The need to look at radiological training adaptable to transportation was raised.

The group also suggested getting agreement states in to talk about fixed facilities. Nebraska was suggested and also to look for states with a lot of nuclear power plants. Another participant noted that the group was fixated on the highways and mobile response. A rail awareness course needs to be done for DOE people. Questions were raised as to how do you get response to a place only accessible by train and where the train, cargo and car are all owned by different people. A final issue raised was the need to look at other means of transport (i.e., barge).

The discussion in another group highlighted the need for agreement on problem definition/scoping. One participant was quoted "we have not answered who we have to train or to what end do we train them?" Much of the discussion consisted of a series of questions. The group asked "are we trying to identify specific groups for whom training should be provided?" The answer they reached was both yes and no. The group realized there are unique situations which must be addressed (e.g., Indian tribes). Second, even though OSHA requirements exist, the training does not exist. A related question is whether OSHA requirements apply to volunteer responders.

The group's questions continued when they tried to answer where DOE responsibilities begin. Although training should focus on the radioactive aspect of a shipment, not the whole

hazmat spectrum, what happens when the baseline required by other regulations does not exist. FEMA cuts, which affect the baseline, were noted as a problem. DOE should provide whatever training they believe is required to feel comfortable.

Another question was what makes it different when DOE rather than a chemical manufacturing company is the shipper? Aspects that make a difference were cited as follows.

- Image;
- special shipments (high impact/low probability of accidents);
- unique corridor populations and jurisdictions with accountability all along the line;
- section 180(c) and the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act require DOE to provide training assistance;
- legal requirements versus political requirements;
- public versus private creates perceived requirements; and
- as a public agency, DOE needs to provide training as required to address comfort levels. But, how do you adapt the current system so that the comfort level is improved? It was noted that we do not have much experience here.

Other questions and issues raised by the group were:

- How do you measure what is needed against some benchmark? How does DOE decide what level of training is adequate, given the absence of regulatory/statutory basis?
- How much is needed in public education and information rather than training?
- Do we want to train people to be defensive (e.g., awareness level of training) or proactive (e.g., training in diking and draining, plugging, or cleanup)?
- Does DOE need to (or is the agency being forced into) applying a higher level for radioactive requirement? The costs here may be prohibitive.
- Train-the-trainer programs may be the least costly approach to training; however, the need for retraining and recertification, given the high turnover rate among volunteers will add to the cost.

The group also decided that the transportation system needs to be defined before decisions

about training can be made. For example, use of escorts raises several issues. First, how would this basic change in the system alter the type and level of training needed? Second, will escorts satisfy Section 180(c) requirements? Finally, what is the most efficient use of resources? The key here is a comparison of risk versus benefit. A rail representative stated that he would not do anything without first having a trained staff person evaluate the radiological issues; escorts would provide a rapid means of evaluating the situation. Another participant observed that it is difficult to keep staff and equipment at an adequate state of readiness and that escorts may be a safer and more efficient way to provide that assurance.

The group concluded its discussion by formulating one action item as follows.

- TEC organizations should draft problem statements and/or identify the problem from their perspective, using the information and issues discussed during the breakout session.
- (* Note: For an example of the development problem statements by DOE, see Appendix E).

In another group, one participant stated that one problem for local responders is that there is no clear consensus on what first responders are actually expected to do or should be prepared to do. The roles and responsibilities for local, state and federal responders need to be clearly spelled out. It was suggested that model scenarios be developed to help identify minimum training requirements as well as minimum equipment requirements for first responders. One example of questions local responders have is when could a local official expect to have federal assistance in place to help with emergency response. DOE assistance can arrive on an accident scene within eight hours of an accident anywhere in the country.

The group was questioned as to whether enough was known about the capabilities and roles of local responders to ask questions and make assumptions about what federal responders would do or what assistance they would provide. One participant responded that FEMA has a database, updated quarterly, that contains information about what agencies and officials have which responsibilities. It was added that the definition of roles varies widely from state to state.

It was noted that training for emergency responders had added difficulties because there were unclear requirements about what a responder might be expected to do. A representative of Westinghouse-WIPP said that training for WIPP shipments are predicated on a bounding case accident scenario that was specifically developed for those shipments, and that this approach seems to have worked well. One task suggestion was generally agreed upon by the group as a good point of departure for the training issue.

- The Working Group could develop and provide to DOE a hypothetical bounding case or cases for different types of potential accidents. Emergency response training, then, could be built to address the needs identified in those cases.

The participants were asked for their input on potential delivery mechanisms for emergency response training. One member suggested that the FEMA basic emergency response training course was a good one; with some enhancements, he said, the course could serve as a type of baseline training. One question that should be asked is how the course was incorporated into the state/local training programs. Another participant said that the Civil Defense 700 course had an excellent delivery system for getting to emergency responders on the local level; DOE should look at how that course was delivered. In addition, he said, radiological emergency preparedness courses should be built into the general certification process for responders. It was suggested that DOE work with existing certification programs to incorporate the training.

It was noted that there remained a need to tailor training to specific shipments; the materials in question are going to make a big difference in how emergency response will be implemented. It was noted that emergency response trainers normally teach to the sixteen type of radioactive materials classifications, and not to campaign-specific material types. The example of the fresh fuels fire that had occurred in Springfield, Massachusetts was cited and it was stated that fire chief had not received training that he needed. Incidents like that are what this kind of training should be designed to prevent. It was suggested that a more generic approach to types of training might be the best mechanism for training at this point in time. However, a more clear picture of what types of materials are moving throughout the complex might be useful in tailoring training at a later time.

A representative of CRCPD stated that FEMA funding for emergency response training in states has been drying up in recent years. Perhaps DOE could step into this funding void where appropriate. The group adopted this as another suggestion to make to the wider working group. It was asked if DOE had not already done so with funding support for the RERO course being taught in Nevada. The response was that such was indeed the case.

The group made the following request.

- A presentation at the next TEC on future shipments/transportation plans (what will be shipped? when?).

Technical Assistance

Each group addressed the issue of technical assistance. One group was told that one helpful piece of information would be to have a clear idea of what DOE is providing at the current time in the area of technical assistance. It was noted that the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act of 1992, Section 16, spells out in some detail what technical assistance DOE will provide to the state of New Mexico. The group made the following suggestion.

- DOE needs to have a type of laundry list of equipment and materials that defines technical assistance.

It has to be a list that the states and other affected parties can live with; states, tribes and local emergency responders really need the most. TEC should look at what is being done in other technical assistance programs for potential lessons learned.

One participant said that technical expertise, not necessarily equipment, is perhaps the most important technical assistance that can be provided. It was suggested that an equipment and training list could serve as a minimum level below which responders would receive training, equipment and funding.

Another suggestion made was what responders could really use is a simplified, easy-to-use radiation detector — one that is durable and long-lasting, that can quickly signal whether or not contamination at an accident scene is or is not a problem.

There was some discussion about the issue of revising EALs. Participants looked at the draft task plan that was presented during the plenary session and there was general agreement to support going ahead with the task plan. One suggestion was made regarding EALs.

- Bring some examples of EALs to the next TEC meeting.

In another group, the discussion began by noting that Section 180(c) issues will not be resolved until rulemaking. It was suggested that negotiated rulemaking be explored. General discussion on this topic included a suggestion to explore initiatives in technical assistance with tribes. The question was raised how do they relate to states? The group has the following two recommendations.

- During the next six months, focus on Section 180(c) with DOE and state/tribal organizations and bring back to TEC.
- Define technical assistance broadly to include the participation of the system itself.

One group's discussion of technical assistance was short due to limited time. The participants in the group generally agreed that they needed more time and an opportunity to get feedback from their organizations. They made the following observations.

- Escorts may be considered technical assistance.
- Technical assistance should include resources to handle matters such as the provision of prenotification.
- Technical assistance should be defined as information transfer, using the term in its broadest sense to include:
 - any relevant information (e.g., packaging systems, tie downs, anything that

people need to know about transportation); and
- no turf battles — complete openness and willingness to share all information.

- Both NWPA and the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act distinguish between technical assistance and funding.
- DOE could facilitate sharing of lessons learned.

This page intentionally left blank

Inspection and Enforcement Session

Inspection and Enforcement Session

Plenary Session

The Inspection and Enforcement Session included presentations as well as a panel discussion. The topic of the panel discussion was "Improving Inspection and Enforcement Systems and How DOE Can Assist." The panel was made up of Susan Smith, Fred Dennin, Bernie Morris, and Jim Daust. Jeanette Wolfley was scheduled to be on the panel to address tribal responsibilities, but was unable to attend the TEC meeting. Fred Dennin with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) reported on the FRA's Hazardous Materials Program. He explained how the program operates and the role of state inspectors in the program. Opportunities for states to participate in hazardous materials (hazmat) inspections exist under the FRA Railroad Safety State Participation Grants-in-Aid Program. Currently, nine states are participating and two other states have expressed interest. FRA is willing to train hazmat inspectors for motor carriers for rail inspections, provided the state will commit at least fifty percent of their inspectors' time to rail hazmat safety activities. States that are interested should contact Arnold Gross, State Safety Program Manager (RRS-21), FRA, 400 7th Street S.W., Washington, D.C., 202-366-0536. Bernie Morris presented a video on the Illinois program for inspection and escort. Jim Daust explained the goals of the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance as well as the involvement by states and agencies and support groups. He described the cooperative pilot program between CVSA and the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM). He discussed the enhanced inspection procedure and training course.

During the second part of the session, presentations were given by Bernie Bevill, Larry Blalock, Terry Moore, and Jim Reed. Bernie Bevill discussed the CRCPD Directory and asked participants to review the document during the breakout and make suggestions as to additional agencies to receive the directory.

Larry Blalock discussed DOT's Radioactive Materials Incident Report (RMIR) in response to a request from the previous TEC meeting. Larry explained the history of RMIR and how it is used by DOT. He also discussed the three classes of reporting under RMIR. RMIR is available through TRANSNET.

Terry Moore provided information on the Illinois Highway Inspection and Performance Program within the Illinois Department of Transportation during his presentation. He explained how the program works and the reasons behind its success. He also provided information on the funding mechanisms for the program.

The final presentation in this session was given by Jim Reed and addressed activities by the Alliance for Uniform Hazardous Materials Transportation Procedures. He described some of the Alliance's activities and mentioned a report that Alliance would be publishing in September.

Breakout Session

The structure for the breakout was a general discussion of current activities, discussion and scoping of outstanding issues, review or provide input to task plans, and preparation of summary for breakout session. The topics for the breakout were:

- highway inspections;
- railway inspections;
- CRCPD Directory; and
- federally integrated incident reporting system.

Highway Inspections

Each breakout group spent some time discussing highway inspections. Two groups focused on CVSA related issues while a third group focused on tribal inspection authority. Jim Daust provided one group with information about the CVSA inspection procedures. He informed the group that the CVSA procedures inspect the same items as the North American Standards with more stringent criteria. It was indicated that despite the uncertainty of when WIPP shipments would commence, New Mexico will follow the enhanced CVSA procedures in state inspections. Data from the inspections will be used to create a database and evaluations on the results will begin. CVSA will also continue to train inspectors so that they will be prepared when WIPP shipments begin. Following this discussion, it was recommended that utilities planning spent nuclear fuel shipments be asked to subscribe to the enhanced CVSA procedures. The idea could be presented to the utilities by DOE through presentations to EEI/UWASTE with the goal of raising utility awareness and facilitating data collection of shipment inspections.

Another group was updated on the status of the DOE-CVSA cooperative agreement. The group was informed that out of service criteria are completed and available; a training course has been developed and delivered to thirty state inspectors; and a video on the training course and inspection system is available. There are plans to test the program's procedures in WIPP shipments and, when appropriate, will be formally adopted by the CVSA organization and its members. There are however, no governmental or organizational requirements forcing states to adopt the devised procedures.

It was suggested that the enhanced CVSA inspection procedures be applied to other DOE-related shipments. It was indicated that CVSA standards will be applied to the Cesium capsule shipments. However, there is no formal agreement nor authority for their application. As such, violations of enhanced CVSA standards (i.e., anything above North American Standards) will not result in a citation, although they will be reported to DOE so the Department can work with the carrier to correct them. It was added that trial run WIPP shipments have been inspected using enhanced CVSA standards.

The following recommendations and comments were made by the group.

- DOE should continue to provide updates on the CVSA program to the TEC when changes in the program warrant it.
- DOE continue searching for additional campaigns to which it can apply the enhanced CVSA inspection procedures.
- Participants in the group generally agreed with DOE's decision to support tribal efforts to obtain membership in the CVSA.

The third group's discussion focused on tribal inspection authority. The problem of South Dakota not being a member of CVSA was raised because many of the state's reservation roads are being used for hazardous waste transportation. DOE reported that CVSA has had some discussions with tribes and is awaiting a meeting with Jeannette Wolfley to clarify and further discuss the issues. The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) meeting, scheduled for the week of July 26, would provide an opportunity to coordinate some of the discussions. The group generated the following action item.

- RW and EM will coordinate with NCAI, CVSA and NCSL to review issues and will report back to the next TEC meeting.

Railway Inspections

Again, all the breakout groups spent time discussing railway inspections. Each group received a presentation by Fred Dennin with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and Bernie Morris with the Illinois Commerce Commission. One group questioned what rail inspectors look for when inspecting rails. They were told that an FRA inspector, accompanied by a representative of the rail company, travels along the tracks in a specialized pick-up truck, looking for among other things, height differentials between abutted rail joints, fractures in rails, and the condition of cross timbers. During the course of an inspection, a written report listing deficiencies in the track is completed and provided to the rail representative, who is then responsible for immediately initiating corrections either by requesting the dispatch of a repair crew or the imposition of speed limits over deficient sections of rail.

Participants asked questions pertaining to a variety of specific subjects, including: the relationship between speed and track class; bridge inspections; inspection frequency; inspector qualifications; and maintenance requirements relative to track class. Bernie Morris noted that the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety (IDNS) maintains records on the inspections performed by state inspectors, while the FRA has records on both state and federal inspections.

In response to a question about enforcement, Fred Dennin asserted that states participating in

the FRA's rail inspection program have the same enforcement authority as federal inspectors. Any state can become a participant with FRA, however, there are limited or no funds available to support state participation. He also added that the FRA's program also includes inspection of the rail equipment used during a movement.

The group also discussed other issues, including whether or not Illinois' program should continue to be viewed as a model of an enhanced inspection program, if DOE needed to promote the development of an enhanced rail inspection program, and the FRA's inspection criteria. Participants were somewhat uncertain as to whether or not the FRA's program is based on criteria for track evaluation and, similarly, if there is criteria for inspector qualifications.

It was suggested that DOE consider developing a rail inspection program similar to that being conducted by the CVSA for highway inspections. After several minutes of discussing a task, participants made the following suggestion.

- DOE should develop a task plan for studying issues relevant to such a program. The study should include inspection of the rail infrastructure (e.g. track, rail beds), safety equipment (e.g. signals, crossing gates), rolling equipment (e.g. engines, cars), rail company operating procedures for radioactive materials, and personnel qualifications.

The group also thought the study should also look at package, highway and water inspections, inspection technology (e.g., specialized inspection vehicles), and rail company inspection procedures. It was also agreed that DOE should delineate the federal regulations for rail inspection, identify and examine state rail inspection programs, and compare and contrast the federal, state and rail industry inspection programs. Among other things, it was suggested that the study consider the impact of a uniform rail inspection program on all DOE programs, public perception in using rail transport (e.g. with regard to dedicated trains and speed limitations), and rail industry work rules. A glossary of terms should be included in the study.

The second group's discussion focused on track class differentiation and the impact this has on inspections. Federal funding for state inspectors was discussed and the group made recommendations.

On track differentiation, the group learned that railroads are differentiated by class (Classes I through III). This is not to be confused with Track Class of which there are six (based on track condition). Class I track is the worst (maximum operating speed: 0-10 mph); Class VI is the best (maximum operating speed: 110 mph). Track inspections differ depending on the track class and the classification can change from year to year, largely as a result of the volume of traffic being carried on it. If traffic decreases (thereby decreasing revenue), the track is likely to drop to the next lower classification. State inspectors, who are trained and certified as being qualified by the state, inspect for the class track the railroad says it is

going to operate. If the railroad does not maintain the tracks accordingly, the FRA may fine the railroad. State inspections follow FRA procedures and state inspections are recognized from one state to the next. There is good cooperation between Illinois and the railroads, but the FRA could be called in if there were not. A question was asked regarding whether there should be federal funding of state rail inspectors. The group seemed to agree since the states are already performing this service it was not likely the federal government would be willing to step in, particularly in these times of austere federal budgets. It was recommended the state should concentrate on making better what they already have.

The group recommended that a Task Plan be added in the area of safe, routine transport dealing with the topic of special and dedicated trains. Again, it was suggested that the CVSA enhanced procedures be assessed to determine if such enhancements can be applied to the FRA procedures. It was also suggested the procedures used in the past for spent nuclear fuel shipments be compared to the FRA procedures to see if enhancements are desirable. This group also requested more presentations on the use of rail for spent nuclear fuel shipments.

The third group discussed the national inspection plan, information on accidents and incidents, and inspections with Fred Dennin and Bernie Morris. It was noted that a national inspection plan is in place. The group learned that accident history and volume of hazardous waste per route are the two primary factors affecting how much time is spent on each inspection. FRA observed that human factors are the major cause of accidents. It was indicated that FRA maintains a database on incidents and accidents.

Track inspections were also a topic of discussion. The track inspections are usually announced because authority is needed to take an inspection vehicle over the tracks. Unannounced inspections do occur when differences between promised and actual performance are detected. The inspections usually focus on direct observation rather than record keeping.

Other issues that were discussed were DOE's responsibility in rail inspections, the Rail Carrier Evaluation, and tribal issues. One participant asked whether DOE has a responsibility in rail inspection. Lou Rice replied that enactment of HMTUSA has resulted in contractors being liable for incidents; and it is therefore important for contractors to learn more about carrier operations and liabilities.

The group learned that a draft DOE Rail Carrier Evaluation is due to Headquarters at the end of August. The final document is expected to be ready at the beginning of the fiscal year and TEC comments will be sought. Lou emphasized that the carriers would be evaluated and the Department was looking for regulatory compliance and a proactive stance. The program would be rigorous, with two areas of special interest being equipment maintenance and train crew training. A question was asked regarding track condition evaluation in the program. It was indicated that all five topical areas discussed in the plenary session would be included in the evaluation. The AAR representative pointed out that there are fundamental differences between motor and rail carriers and that it is important to understand the inspection

procedures already in place. It was noted that American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) input would be of value.

Two tribal issues were also addressed during the session. First, it was noted a major issue for tribes is whether capabilities exist for implementation of authority for inspection and enforcement. Second, concern was expressed about the occurrence of three accidents within one month through Fort Hall, Idaho.

The group suggested the following action items.

- DOE will provide copies of the Rail Carrier Evaluation Program to TEC for their review.
- DOE will include state rail agencies on the Joint Application Design (JAD) Team through AASHTO.

CRCPD Directory

The breakout groups made suggestions for the inclusion of additional agencies/persons in the CRCPD Directory, expanded distribution, and suggestions as how the document can be made more useful. One suggestion voiced was the inclusion of the state designee for receiving shipment prenotification. The list is published by the NRC in June, thus could be included in the CRCPD annual update at the end of September. It was suggested that the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC) lead agency be included as well as investigate the possibility of including state legislative committees. One group thought it would be helpful to include a page indicating which agencies have responsibility at the federal level.

Suggestions to enhance distribution were also made by the groups. The directory should be placed on the (HMIX) and on TRANSET. Also, copies of the directory should be made available to the utilities and advertised in appropriate trade publications as being available to those who are interested in receiving a copy. Another suggestion was to provide copies to the major carriers.

Several recommendations were made that the groups believed would help to clarify the material in the directory and make it more useful. Because the directory is not specific as to which state agencies are involved in the various inspection processes, it was recommended that the directory provide additional detail on the roles of the state agencies. It was also observed that currently the level of detail provided for each state varies. The need to clarify state agency responsibility for radiation control was suggested. Other clarifications included the specification of the DOT Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) contact for each state and explanation of no authority which is used in the directory.

One group indicated that the directory needed to be reformatted. They came up with the following action item.

- coordinate with the TEPP Steering Committee to reformat the document.

Federally Integrated Incident Reporting System

Two breakout groups discussed RMIR. It was requested that the Department begin collecting incident and delay information on past DOE shipments. Several participants thought that would be too broad of a data collection activity and asked for a more narrow definition of information to be collected. A survey was proposed that included all scheduled and unscheduled stoppage over a specified period of time yet to be determined. It was noted that such information for TRANSCOM-tracked shipments can be easily obtained. However, obtaining that information on other shipments would require a great deal of extra paper-work for drivers. It was agreed to delay implementing this task until such time as working definitions for accident, incident, and delay can be developed as discussed in a previous breakout session.

With regard to TRANSCOM as an information resource, it was noted that it will be made available to NRC licensees, but that the Department is not planning to petition NRC to require it. Furthermore, RW will use TRANSCOM for its shipments as a matter of policy. Users must agree to utilize shipment information provided by TRANSCOM in accordance with the NRC's safeguard procedures.

A suggestion was made for DOE to conduct lessons learned from commercial real-time tracking systems as an analogous to using and answering questions about TRANSCOM. It was noted that such a study would provide public confidence in the system and it could also provide DOE with evidence of TRANSCOM's utility. After discussing the suggestion further, participants agreed to ask the private-sector company operating the satellite used by TRANSCOM and commercial tracking systems to make a presentation to TEC regarding its experiences. It was noted, however, that as a private enterprise, the operator may be reluctant to provide extensive information about its operation. The suggestion was made to contact state officials using TRANSCOM for their experiences with the system.

The group made the following task suggestions.

- DOE should develop a task plan to gather information inspections of rail infrastructure, safety equipment, and rolling equipment; rail industry operating procedures for handling radioactive materials; and qualifications for rail personnel involved with inspections. Information should also be gathered on package, highway and waterway inspections, federal inspection regulations and criteria, state inspection programs and criteria, and rail industry inspection programs.

- As appropriate, DOE should provide updates to the TEC Working Group on CVSA activities.
- DOE should continue its support for tribal efforts to become members of the CVSA.
- DOE should recommend to the CRCPD that it include the name, address and telephone number of the state designee for receiving advance notification of shipments as required by the NRC.
- Pending development of working definitions for a transportation accident, incident, and delay, DOE will devise a task plan for collecting information about scheduled and unscheduled stoppages during transit. This task will be discussed in greater detail with TEC members when those definitions are available.
- DOE will ask the private sector company operating the satellite used by the TRANSCOM system to make a presentation to the TEC Working Group about its satellite operations.

In the other group which discussed RMIR, the first issue which was raised was lack of knowledge of the database prior to the presentation in the plenary session. This led the group into a more general discussion reflecting concern over communication and the omission of the Organization of Agreement States from the list of TEC members. One participant provided two specific examples: an attempt to site a radioactive waste facility in a state and notification of the TEC meeting through the Council of State Governments, Midwestern Office rather than from DOE. A DOE representative responded that (1) unless the facility was a Monitored Retrievable Storage (MRS) facility, DOE would not know about it, and (2) DOE was using contacts such as the CSG, under the assumption that when a contact was notified, they in turn, would notify appropriate state and local officials.

The group returned their focus to RMIR asking questions about the database. Group members were interested in knowing the difference between HMIX and RMIR. They also wanted to know if mixed waste and National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) materials were included in the database. The group questioned the existence of other federal and state data collection pools which are currently not included in the database. They also cited a need for coordination between states and the Sandia people who are responsible for compiling and managing the database as well as the need for consistency in the definitions of incident and accident across all federal and state agencies. The suggestion was made for possible distribution of the database through CRCPD.

The group formulated the following action items.

- Check that NTSB data are included in the database and check on mixed waste.

- DOE will approach the newly formed CRCPD Radioactive Waste Transportation Committee to see whether the RMIR report can be distributed to all State contacts through the CRCPD.
- DOE will contact the Organization of Agreement States concerning TEC membership.
- DOE will establish contact between Sandia and state organizations likely to have incident information.
- DOE will research other federal and state databases and report back to TEC.

This page intentionally left blank

General Discussion

General Discussion

Judith Holm facilitated the last session of the meeting. The focus of the session was a review of work plan activities, an assessment of the evolving TEC Working Group role, and a review of the schedule and future plans.

Judith began the session with a recommendation from DOE for the TEC Working Group documentation. Judith suggested a three ring binder for TEC participants with the following living documents in separate tabs:

- TEC Working Group Charter
- Membership list
 - designated member list
 - actual attendees
- Minutes from all the meetings
 - New Orleans - 1992
 - San Francisco - 1992
 - Chicago- 1993
- Work Plan
 - revised before each meeting with complete tasks moved to the back after review and closeout by TEC
- TEC meeting presentation items plan
 - revolving lists of presentations and speakers
- Task planning document
 - as the Task Plans are developed, with the status area changing before each TEC meeting.

TEC members engaged in an open discussion with Judith and other DOE representatives with suggestions and comments regarding the activities of the TEC Working Group. The first suggestion was that a list of materials distributed and displayed at meetings be made available. It was also suggested that a designation of tabled be applied to those items that the group realizes they cannot do any more with at this time. A request was made for more specific, focused information on federal assistance programs.

A lot of the discussion focused on the work plan. The first issue raised was the evolution of the document to work plan from Planning Guide with the question asked "Whose work plan is it?" Judith responded that it is the TEC's work plan that DOE maintains. Rich Brancato, Director, DOE Office of Special Programs, added that it is the TEC's work plan which requires participants to take information back to their organizations and constituents. TEC

members have the responsibility of taking the input back and engaging in the necessary activity which needs to follow TEC meetings. One participant agreed with this, but pointed out that until this meeting, there really was not a coherent document to send back to the organizations. However, another participant noted that in order for the work plan to be readable to the constituencies additional analysis and clarification are required. A question was raised concerning task plans. Judith responded that the task plans would be part of the overall binder, but a decision needed to be made as to whether include them in the work plan. When the discussion returned specifically to the work plan, it was noted that there were one hundred items out there with fifteen task plans. This raised the question of why those fifteen items were chosen. The participant said he would like to see the items ranked by TEC members in order of priority. There was agreement by other TEC members and the discussion began to focus on how to accomplish a ranking.

Susan Smith asked how TEC could prioritize the items. The response was for DOE to send a list out of all the items in the work plan and let the members of TEC rank them and see how they fall out. Susan then said that DOE has ideas on process and prioritization and suggested that DOE write up a draft and send it out to TEC members depending on whether the members found that useful or confusing.

Following comments regarding members' responsibilities, one participant observed that DOE is looking for two or three things from constituent organizations: representational buy-off, expertise, and using TEC members as conduits to get information out and level the playing field. Each of these may require different kinds of information. The use of the term buy-off prompted some discussion. Rich responded that buy-off is not what DOE wants. DOE needs an understanding of inputs from diverse groups in order to make recommendations to Congress as DOE is answerable to Congress. This resulted in a clarification of the term buy-off. The participant who originally used the term said he was using it in the context of buy-off being part of a function of DOE asking "here is how we see the world, are we on the right track?" Another TEC member responded if this is what DOE is looking for from the TEC members, then state that in the work plan as there is an obligation to keep the focus.

Another participant was concerned about the lack of involvement of regulators in the TEC Working Group, observing that there were private and public sector members. He noted that DOE, because it is self-regulating, has not had to deal with agreement states. He discussed regulatory mandates and pointed out that until states implement definitions, etc... it does not make any difference. The regulators need to be involved. Rich responded explaining what he would like to see TEC do. TEC can help DOE focus on those issues DOE has to pursue and come to resolution on these. The process to achieve this will often lead into a regulatory framework.

Judith asked if DOE needed to clarify what kinds of endpoints DOE is looking for from TEC. The response was that clarity of endpoint is critical. Judith indicated that this can be included in the process plan.

Other topics of discussion during the last session included the possible need for more background information on TEC. It was noted that there were a lot of new members and in order to keep everyone up to speed, they may require more background information. Also, TEC has to start focusing on items identified as priorities.

Measuring the success of TEC was also discussed. One participant felt that the measure of success is whether TEC members can look at DOE activities and see a pattern of improvement based on recommendations.

Judith asked if all the right people were at the table. Inclusion of Agreement State Organizations was suggested. It was also requested that DOE get emergency management to FEMA, especially those at the top of FEMA.

Judith concluded this part of the session with a work plan checklist showing the close out of resolved issues. The list was as follows:

- safe, routine transport
 - all tasks underway
- emergency management
 - 6c - report to TEC on federal assistance programs
- inspection and enforcement
 - 6f - provide copies of the CRCPD Directory to TEC Working Group
 - 6g - present RMIR material to the TEC Working Group
 - 6k - presentation to TEC on rail inspection authorities
 - 6m - NCSL present to TEC summary of uniformity efforts
 - 6n - Tribal presentation to TEC on tribal authority and implementation of authority to inspect radioactive shipments

(* Note: The DOT ERG revision for the 1993 version has also been completed. However, this activity will continue with proposed revisions to the 1996 version).

The session resumed with an assessment of the evolution of the TEC Working Group role. Judith presented the following questions to the group:

- Do we formalize a process plan for the future?
- Do we formalize designated member list?
- What materials do you want, who do we send them to?
- Who do you want from DOE to be at the meetings?

The discussion began by addressing problems associated with a changing membership. It was suggested that materials be sent both to the organizations and the organization members attending the TEC meeting. However, one member said there was the problem of readability of the material for people not attending the meetings that would be associated with the two-fold approach. It was suggested that TEC could perhaps go to primary and secondary membership designations.

The issue of the number of DOE representatives and contractors versus the number of member representatives was addressed. It was generally agreed that the additional DOE attendees and contractors were a useful resource, but their roles should be limited to serving only as resources. It was suggested that different names tags could be used to differentiate between DOE representatives, contractors, and member representatives. It was also suggested that DOE representatives and contractors not be active participants in breakout discussions. They could possibly be seated around the perimeter of the rooms and serve solely as resources when needed.

The discussion continued regarding groups that might be included in TEC membership. One member suggested representatives from DOT. The DOE response was that by not including other federal agency representatives, it remains clear what the group is. A possible solution would be not adding other feds to the membership, but invite them as guests or speakers. They could be used as resources for TEC until the group becomes immersed in an issue that involves another agency.

One member suggested inviting the Military Production Network as an umbrella organization. TEC members need to deal with watchdog groups such as this one. Through their participation, TEC members can find out what they think about the issues instead of speculating on what their position is. One member expressed opposition to this idea. The suggestion was made to select particular groups which are more open to discussion. One member noted that the groups look over shoulders and comment on the appropriateness of Indian behavior. This threatens tribal sovereignty with the MRS issue. Another member thought it was too early to introduce such critical visitors. TEC is still a bit confused about themselves.

The focus of the discussion then became who from DOE should be at the TEC meetings. One question asked was if all the DOE shipping people were represented because if it is to be an across the board representation of DOE, these people need to be present. It was noted that there was a spent fuel person there and they were trying to get a Cesium person as well as a Federal Facilities Compliance Act person there. However, one member believed that TEC members needed to decide what they wanted from DOE at these meetings before addressing who from DOE to include.

The structure of the meeting was discussed. The general consensus was that the plenary sessions were too long and the breakouts were too short. Several members indicated that they would like some lead time in reviewing materials for which DOE was seeking comment. One

suggestion was to send the materials out prior to the meeting, while another member suggested providing time at the meeting for review. Another suggestion was to limit DOE presentations to actions and updates. External people should be brought in for topical presentations. It was also suggested that subgroups be established for specific issues (i.e., emergency management). They could attend presentations and then report to the whole group. A general comment made by one member on the process was that DOE had heard TEC and made changes. It was evident that changes were being made and this proved that the method worked.

Judith reviewed the TEC schedule and future plans. Topics she addressed were:

- minutes for this meeting
 - commitment to earlier release

- next meeting
 - location: New Orleans, Albuquerque, or Orlando?
 - date: 1st week of December, 1993

- revised work plan

- schedule of next year's activities

Scheduling the next TEC meeting was discussed. The tentative location and time are Orlando at the end of January. Some members thought that time of the year is a more important issue than location.

In discussing the next year's activities for TEC, one member requested that DOE show compelling evidence of its commitment to TEC. He suggested a secretarial level letter or statement supporting TEC.

The last topic covered in the session was items to be addressed at the next meeting. Suggestions included focusing on the transportation guidebook discussed by Larry. Members could hear more about it and be given the opportunity to provide input. An interest was expressed in the HMTUSA mandated studies and it was suggested that this could be handled through mailings. A final suggestion concerned what is in the 5 - 10 year planning horizon. This information would be important in TEC efforts to prioritize issues. Again, it was suggested that this could be handled in a mailing.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendices

Appendix A: Evaluation Results

This page intentionally left blank

U.S. Department of Energy
Transportation External Coordination Working Group
 Chicago Hilton and Towers, Chicago
 July 20 - 23, 1993
Evaluation Form

1. **Affiliation:**

- 14 TEC Member Organization Representative
- 5 U.S. Department of Energy
- 6 U.S. DOE Contractor
- 3 Observer
- 28 Total*

2. **How useful were the following presentations or sessions in providing you with ideas or information that directly addressed your needs? (Circle one for each session)**

a. **General Discussion**

1)	Introductions	very useful (12)	somewhat useful (12)	not useful (1)	didn't attend (2)
2)	Meeting Overview	very useful (8)	somewhat useful (17)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (2)
3)	TEC Status Report	very useful (13)	somewhat useful (5)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (2)

b. **Public Information and Education**

1)	Plenary Session	very useful (10)	somewhat useful (14)	not useful (1)	didn't attend (2)
2)	Break Out Sessions	very useful (14)	somewhat useful (11)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (2)
3)	Report of Breakout Sessions (Working Lunch)	very useful (12)	somewhat useful (13)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (1)

c. **Safe, Routine Transport**

1)	Plenary Session	very useful (10)	somewhat useful (15)	not useful (2)	didn't attend (1)
----	-----------------	------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------

2)	Break Out Sessions	very useful (16)	somewhat useful (10)	not useful (1)	didn't attend (1)
3)	Report of Breakout Sessions (Working Lunch)	very useful (11)	somewhat useful (14)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (1)
d. Emergency Management Training and Technical Assistance					
1)	Plenary Session	very useful (10)	somewhat useful (14)	not useful (1)	didn't attend (1)
2)	Break Out Sessions	very useful (9)	somewhat useful (16)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (1)
3)	Working Lunch	very useful (6)	somewhat useful (15)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (1)
e. Inspection and Enforcement					
1)	Plenary Session	very useful (15)	somewhat useful (11)	not useful (1)	didn't attend (0)
2)	Break Out Sessions	very useful (14)	somewhat useful (11)	not useful (2)	didn't attend (0)
3)	Report on Breakout Sessions (Friday Morning)	very useful (9)	somewhat useful (14)	not useful (2)	didn't attend (0)
f. General Discussion					
1)	General Review	very useful (12)	somewhat useful (2)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (1)
2)	Assessment of Evolving TEC Working Group Role	very useful (7)	somewhat useful (6)	not useful (0)	didn't attend (1)

3. **What changes in meeting arrangements, materials, or logistics would you suggest for the next TEC Working Group meeting?**

Less expensive accommodations could have been found closer to airport. Have materials out to participants for review prior to meeting. Not enough time in issue discussion.

In the topic to discuss outlines- Highlight somehow, what you want from the group. Give out the material prior to meeting that you want reviewed and considered. i.e. 1/2 day earlier.

Have briefing materials distributed in advance of the meeting. Have shorter plenary sessions and longer break-out sessions. Structure the break-out sessions so that stakeholders are at the table and resource people are at the perimeter (such as DOE and DOE Contractors).

Meeting location, materials, etc out earlier.

The meeting again is very compressed - the process used this time was much better than the past 2 meetings.

More time for break-outs and facilitator training for DOE folks moderating break-out sessions. *Moderator needs to keep Halstead from dominating the group's discussion time. It is rudely resented by other participants.

Materials to be reviewed need to be available in advance.

Put DOE personnel and contractors against wall as resource, not at table.

Reduce the number of topics to try to resolve in the 1 1/2 hour session. Send out preliminary review info prior to meeting for representatives to review.

Set materials out early. Meeting arrangements/logistics excellent - no changes.

Distribute briefing materials for the breakout sessions 1-2 weeks in advance so people have a chance to read and think through them. Shorten the time allotted for plenary session so breakout groups can run 2+ hours (plenary sessions for Emergency Management and Inspection and Enforcement were longer than breakouts!) When in doubt during breakout sessions as to what the intent was behind a suggestion a table raised at a previous meeting, ask if anyone in the session was a member of the original group that made the suggestion and ask for clarification.

I liked how DOE facilitated breakout sessions.

I consider it a waste of tax dollars to hold a meeting at an expensive hotel in a downtown area (\$25-\$30 cab from airport) when many acceptable facilities are available closer to major airports at lower rates at: Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Kansas City, Memphis, Salt Lake City at lower rates per night. This is an ISSUE.

The format of having the same topic discussed in all breakouts at the same time is great, but move the participants from group to group so they can interact with other

participants.

I think the TEC process should be oriented more toward small task forces bringing findings to the TEC for adoption, discussion, further development, etc. There are many experts in the group, but they are not qualified to address all the topics, especially the technical aspects. The task forces could do work before the meetings and then bring the work to the entire TEC constituency. This would be a more effective way to spend time - I think.

Why so upscale? Could save a bundle if you went to area of lower cost hotel, closer to airport, etc.

Pre-meeting briefing materials are helpful. Keep exhibits up throughout meeting along with 1 or 2 tables with samples of publications and sign-up sheets.

Good format. However, too much info to cover in very short time. Not sure justice was done to each subject area. Info provided was good. I hope info provided was useful to host DOE.

Survey all data bases available and determine the one that could assist our efforts. Have expert on EALS address the next meeting.

More detailed information needs to be mailed out to participants well in advance of next meeting, including summary of this meeting. More time needed for break-out discussions; less time for plenaries; recommend we only focus on 2-3 tasks under each heading. All materials should use consistent format and be double sided copies.

The meeting summary needs to be distributed in a more timely fashion (no more than 45 days?) Materials for the meeting need to be distributed far in advance of the meeting.

More meaningful material (decisions) needs to go to attendees during conference. Less expensive facilities.

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

Maybe some hands-on of actual shipment (or preparation of).

How can participants influence (suggest) agenda preparation and identify hot topics that may have developed between the meetings.

DOE Transportation Operations Procedures Manual and Transport. Coordination

Guide: Status reports, review by TEC.

HMTUSA-mandated studies and activities relevant to TEC focus: status reports, discussion by TEC.

Future DOE Radioactive Materials Shipments and Shipping Campaigns: What is on 5-10 year planning horizon?

Applicability of federal transportation laws and regulations to DOE shipments (NRC, DOT, OSHA, etc)

Prioritization of tasks is sorely needed.

Have a group to look at all training that is currently available and determine how it can be integrated into our requirements.

Suggest a survey be done to determine the states capabilities to provide emergency response. I think we need to know where the weak areas are throughout the country. It appears Pennsylvania has a program that could be a model for the weak states.

Too much now. Some fragmentation. Need to resolve current issues.

Topics were timely but could not be discussed adequately. If moderators guided discussion more, sessions would not have to be that much longer. Or, plenary overviews could be shortened and that time given to breakouts if briefing materials were distributed before the meeting.

Enough is enough.

Member organizations can contribute in more ways by attending meetings or making presentations. We can, for instance, gather information from our constituents and even produce written reports to accommodate DOE's attempts to complete tasks (eg, model mutual aid agreement can be handled by regions, tribal authorities and other issues by tribes. This is not to say we should take over DOE's tasks - rather we can help by contributing to briefing materials for breakout sessions.

More emphasis on training, technical assistance, safe routine transport.

Less on inspection/enforcement

DOE presentation on how implementing TEC suggestions.

The primary problem that I see in dealing with many issues is that the exact direction that DOE will be taking is unknown. This makes it very difficult to even start to determine what training is really needed and what technical assistance is needed.

Thus we often chase our tail in circles.

More issues and topics associated with rails need to be reviewed if we are to use the MultiPurpose Canister.

DOE needs to work with TEC WG to develop some statement of vision: What is the situation to which all this activity is aimed? Perhaps a mission statement for the

TEC WG would emerge. That would help focus activities. Discussion of public involvement, as opposed to public information. Tribal authorities and capabilities. Rail routing and operating requirements, and their implications for inspection, enforcement, emergency response, and public perception. Systemic concept of training and technical assistance based on goals derived from the vision statement.

Tribal issues need to be addressed.

Invite persons that have been involved with previous shipping campaigns to give a presentation on the planning process and the lessons learned as they relate to the issues of the TEC Group such as emergency management and inspection/enforcement. These persons could include federal, state and local officials, as well as utility personnel and carrier personnel.

Use professional facilitators (similar to the MPC conference)

Hold the next meeting in Atlanta or the Northeast.

Provide meeting summaries in a more readable format with the issues spelled out so that it is easier for attendees to distribute to our constituents (non-attendees) for comments.

1. Overview of Regulatory Environment/Ruling Process.
2. Overview of Packaging/Transportation Logistics in DOE shipments
3. Classification of shipments discussed - less than 1/10 of 1% of DOE shipments qualify as Type B or HRCQ. Most are limited quantity, LSA and a few Type A. Sample shipments to support site clean up make up large percentage of shipments.
4. In depth discussion of Motor Carrier Evaluation Program - assurances of quality of carrier. Carrier representatives explain operations, safety programs and experience handling RAM shipment. Carrier/Shippers interface. Preparation of Packaging and Documentation. Emphasis on safety and compliance. Have state representative discuss their experience with RAM shipments - problems, successes, other experiences. DOE shippers discuss typical RAM and HM shipping activities at sites.
5. Representatives of COMED Organization.

Federal Regulatory Development process

Comprehensiveness of Federal Regulatory scheme

Carrier (Motor & Rail) operations perspective of RAM transport

NCSTS and additional state actual experience re: RAM

transport/inspection/enforcement as compared to other HM transport.

DOE/Contractor actual TM to present a walk through of all steps of executing a shipment from material characterization to receipt by consignee

M.Conroy to explain DOE & U.S. Packaging Development, Testing and Certification process.

T.Thomas to explain TRANSCOM and its overall integration into TIN

T.Thomas to explain DOE Transportation Information Network and integration throughout DOE and availability to stakeholders.

LGB to discuss the general material movements that DOE has underway - only at TEC not at smaller groups.

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

Emergency Management (4)

Safe, Routine Transport (4)

Rail Roads (2)

Public Information and Education (2)

Inspection & Enforcement (2)

Breakout for discussion (1)

Inspection and Enforcement - presentations by Illinois state officials and the railroad association. (1)

EMT & TA plenary; but breakouts were also useful. (1)

Inspection - unable to attend final session - should be better session in the future. (1)

Breakout- improvement to CRCPD directory; Discussions Re: Ill. Rail Inspection Program (1)

Safe, Routine Transportation - (I hated it) - really opened my eyes to key issues which need to be resolved outside of TEC. (1)

Public Information and Education breakout (needed more time, of course) (1)

Inspection and Enforcement breakout (1)

Inspection and Enforcement was most interesting and provided information applicable to my current projects. (1)

All good. (1)

Discussion on Purpose and Structure of TEC WG (1)

Breakouts and wrap-ups (1)

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

Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
(5)	(21)	(1)	(1)	(0)

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

Preconference information	excellent	good	average	fair	poor
	(2)	(7)	(8)	(6)	(5)
Meeting facilities	excellent	good	average	fair	poor
	(17)	(9)	(1)	(1)	(0)
Lodging facilities	excellent	good	average	fair	poor
	(17)	(8)	(1)	(0)	(0)
Transportation Service	excellent	good	average	fair	poor
	(3)	(12)	(4)	(4)	(0)
Food services related to meetings	excellent	good	average	fair	poor
	(15)	(11)	(2)	(0)	(0)

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

Carriers/Traffic Managers, RSPA(DOT), NCSTS

NO!

The composition of the TEC group, with respect to external organizations, is just about right. As progress continues, there will be a greater need for participation by hands-on individuals, e.g. training experts, local fire fighters, RAP team personnel. At this meeting, there were way too many DOE and DOE Contractors participating. This reduces the time for external organizations to provide input, especially during the breakout discussions. In the future, such individuals should be used as resources for information/clarification purposes and not take an active, leading role in the breakouts.

US DOT, NRC, CHEMTREC - maybe

No- enough info, in fact too much.

More representatives from state agencies, especially corridor states. Representatives from public advocacy groups.

More Indian tribes should be represented - there were plenty of other state government representation- try balancing it with some tribal viewpoints.

RSPA, Carriers, FHWA

The medical community appears to be missing again. ACEP, AMA

Additional DOE Program Managers responsible for transportation.

More state and local government in addition to tribes, need to be represented. We were again outnumbered by DOE and supporting staff. We do not need to add any new state or local organizations to official membership - rather we should make sure current members have an opportunity (including funding) to attend. 3-4 participants from various member organizations (eg. state cooperative agreement groups) would help.

NRC agreement states, Citizen/Environmental Groups, Tribes

Normally we have more tribal representatives. I was surprised that only R.Holden was present.

In the discussion of the DOT ERG, Wendell Garricku, the individual responsible for it, might have been invited to explain and/or defend.

CHEMTREC or CAMEO representative would have added light to their particular program.

Leave the option for external parties.

No- Do not involve Greenpeace types!

Be sure and continue to invite EM-37.

Environmental/Watchdog groups. eg. Military Production Network. A few other areas of expertise, perhaps as advisors rather than members. eg. Indian law, complex training systems, public perception, technology transfer, railroad operation.

Tribal issues must be addressed.

More state representatives from eastern and southern regions. Invite more stakeholders in general.

Carrier representatives, Regulators (DOT, EPA, OSHA), First Responder Organizations, HAZMAT Teams Commanders.

National Conference of State Transportation Specialists

Cooperative Hazardous Materials Education and Development (COHMED)
US DOT, Research and Special Programs Administration
-Office of General Council
-RAM Branch
Actual Carriers (Motor & Rail)
Association of State Highway Transportation Specialists (AASHTO)

General Remarks:

The breakout session which dealt with the same topic was a major improvement. Discussion topics for the future meetings should be much more narrow. We cannot effectively deal with the large number of topics that have to be dealt with. I suggest that DOE, its contractors and/or the TEC prioritize the tasks. Once that has been done, future TECs will address the top three areas and a few subtopics. In this priority setting process we need to determine what can be dealt with such that intelligent solutions can be reached. Again DOE needs to have its direction solidified. Until we have a real course, we will be adrift at sea rowing around in circles.

As an afterthought... there needs to be a package of material that could be given to others within each organization that explains in detail what has transpired step by step in this TEC process. Thus, it could be handed off with a verbal briefing from a rep of that organization that would enable them to come to these meetings and start to function as a viable member. I have seen new representatives come to the TEC and spend 75% of the meeting just floundering around trying to figure out what may be happening.

It would be very useful to discuss at each breakout session whether the participants feel the possible Program tasks are worthwhile. That is, just because one or two people at one breakout session had a suggestion doesn't mean the rest of the TEC group agrees that the suggestion has merit and should be addressed. As an extension of the evaluation we should try to prioritize these program tasks so DOE has an idea of what we feel the group should work on first. Also: make double-sided copies.

A much better planning effort over the next 6 months (not last 10 days) must be executed for the next meeting. The plenaries must be more concise and hard hitting. The Friday 9:30am session reinforced the requirement for documented TEC expectations and process/procedures.

Comment on make-up of groups: It is unfortunate that the turnover is so high. Some of this may be unavoidable, but it does nothing for continuity.

I would suggest that DOE officials need to become more aware of the emergency response capabilities in states.

With the current situation with the FEMA Radiological Defense Program possibly being terminated, which could be the loss of the radiological instrument support, DOE should make a strong pitch to FEMA to consider retaining the programs with a peacetime focus. Let the FEMA leadership be involved and aware of DOE's TEC mission.

Many people noted that Plenary Sessions were too long and Breakout Sessions were too short, as well as the fact that meeting briefing/Preconference Information should have been distributed at an earlier time. Some also noted that the food and facilities were above average, but they felt it was too expensive.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix B: Meeting Agenda

This page intentionally left blank

10:00am - 10:15am Break/Exhibits (Williford C)

10:15am - 11:30am **Public Information and Education Break Out Sessions**
(Private Dining Rooms 1, 3, and 4)

Development of Information Products: Third Party Collaboration

Evaluation Strategies for Information Products

Shipment of Specific Information Kits

Specific Information Products: Group Feedback

11:30am - Noon Break/Exhibits (Williford C)

Noon - 1:15pm **Working Lunch** (Joliet Room)

Break out session reports

1:15pm - 2:15pm **Safe, Routine Transport Plenary Session** (Williford A)

Overall status of safe routine transport suggestions from previous meetings and the Work Plan *Larry Blalock, DOE*

DOE Transportation Operations Procedures Manual and Transportation Coordination Guide

DOE Motor Carrier Evaluation Program

Orientation Material for Breakout Sessions

2:15pm - 2:30pm Break (Williford C)

2:30pm - 4:00pm **Safe, Routine Transport Breakout Sessions**
(Private Dining Rooms 1, 3, and 4)

Glossary of Terms

Definition of safe, routine transport

Utilization of Escorts for Shipments

DOE Tribal Notification Policy

4:00 pm - 4:30pm Break/Exhibits (Williford C)

4:30pm - 5:30pm **Safe, Routine Transport Plenary Session** (Williford A)

Break Out Session Reports

Dinner on your own

Thursday, July 22

7:30am - 8:00am **Continental Breakfast**

8:00am - 9:15am **Inspection and Enforcement Plenary Session**
(Room location to be announced)

Overall Status of Inspection and Enforcement suggestions from previous meetings and in the Work Plan *Susan Smith, DOE*

Panel Discussion on improving inspection and enforcement systems and how DOE can assist

- DOE approach to assistance for inspection and enforcement

Susan Smith, DOE

- Rail inspections

Fred Dennin, Federal Railroad Administration

Bernie Morris, IL Inspection Program

9:15am - 9:30am Break

9:30am - 9:55am CRCPD Directory of State Agencies Involved with Transportation of Radioactive Material

*Bernard Bevill
Arkansas Dept. of Health*

Radioactive Materials Incident Reporting System & Incident Reporting Coordination

Larry Blalock, DOE

Orientation Material for Break Out Sessions

Susan Smith, DOE

9:55am - 10:00am Break

10:00am - 11:30am **Inspection and Enforcement Breakout Sessions**
(Private Dining Rooms 1, 3, and 4)

Rail Inspection

Highway Inspection

CRCPD Directory

Clarification of Proposed Tasks for
Federally Integrated Incident Reporting Systems

11:30am -12:00pm Break

12:00pm - 1:15pm **Working Lunch** (Joliet Room)

Break Out Session Reports

1:15pm - 2:20pm **Emergency Management, Training, and Technical
Assistance Plenary Session** (Room location to be announced)

Overall Status of Emergency Management, Training and

*Wally Weaver,
DOE*

Technical Assistance suggestions
from previous meetings and the Work Plan

Review of Federal Assistance Program
Applicability for NWPA Section 180(c)
Assistance

*JudithBradbury,
Pacific Northwest
Laboratories*

Perspectives on Rail Industry Emergency
Response

*Jeffery Davis,
American Assn. of
Railroads*

2:20pm - 2:30pm Break

2:30pm - 3:30pm •Highway inspections

*Terry Moore,
IL Dept. of
Transportation*

Uniformity in State Highway Permitting

*Jim Reed,
National Conference
of State Legislatures*

Improving Basic Source Guidance (i.e., DOT
Emergency Response Guide)

Wally Weaver, DOE

Standardizing Transportation Emergency Action Levels (EALs)

Orientation Material for Breakout Sessions

3:30pm -3:45pm Break

3:45pm -5:15pm **Emergency Management, Training, and Technical
Assistance Break Out Sessions** (Private Dining Rooms 1, 3, and 4)

Technical Assistance Definition

Identifying Shortfalls in Capabilities
that Training Might Resolve

Regional Mutual Aid Agreements

Dinner on your own

Friday, July 23

7:30am - 8:00am **Continental Breakfast**

8:00am - 9:00am **Emergency Management, Training, and Technical
Assistance Plenary Session**
(Joliet Room)

Break Out Sessions Reports

9:00am - 9:15am Break

9:15am - 10:30am **General Discussion** (Joliet Room)

General Review of Work Plan Activities

Judith Holm, DOE

- Closeout of Resolved Issues

- Prioritization of New Issues

10:30am - 11:00am

Break

11:00am - Noon

General Discussion (Continued)

Assessment of Evolving TEC Working Group Role

Judith Holm, DOE

Review of Schedule and Future Plans

Adjourn

Appendix C: Participants List

This page intentionally left blank

**TEC Working Group Meeting
Chicago Hilton
July 20-23, 1993
Participants List**

Key: *Italics* define TEC Working group Member Organizations.

Mary Jo Acke
Acting Institutional Specialist
U.S. DOE Chicago Field Office
Waste Mgt. & Technology Development Division
9800 South Cass Avenue
Bldg. 201
Argonne, IL 60439
Ph: 708-252-8796 Fax: 708-252-2654

Bernard Bevill
*Conference of Radiation Control Program
Directors*
Health Physicist Supervisor
Arkansas Department of Health
4815 West Markham Street
Little Rock, AR 72205
Ph: 501-661-2301 Fax: 501-661-2468

Larry Blalock
Director
U.S. Dept. of Energy
Transportation Management Division
Trevion II Building, EM-561
19901 Germantown Road
Washington, DC 20585-0002
Ph: 301-903-7273 Fax: 301-903-7235

Peter Bolton
Manager, Transportation & Logistics
Weston/Rogers & Associates
955 L'Enfant Plaza
8th Floor
Washington, DC 20024
Ph: 202-646-6681 Fax: 202-863-2220

Harold Borchert
*Council of State Governments
Midwest Office*
Director, Division of Radiological Health
Nebraska Department of Health
301 Centennial Mall
Lincoln, NE 68509
Phone: 402-471-2168 Fax: 402-471-0169

Judith Bradbury
Pacific Northwest Laboratories
901 D SC. SW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20024-2115
Ph: 202-646-5235 Fax: 202-646-5233

Rich Brancato
Director
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Special Programs, EM-56
EM-56, Trevion II
19901 Germantown Road
Washington, DC 20585-0002
Ph: 301-903-7270 Fax: 301-903-7613

John Burge
President
Urban Energy and Transportation Corporation
406 W. 34th Street, Suite 710
VFW Building
Kansas City, MO 64111
Phone: 816-531-5745 Fax: 816-531-6539

James H. Carlson
Director, Transportation and Logistics Division
U. S. Department of Energy
OCRWM RW-43
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5616 Fax: 202-586-9608

Jeremy Crow
Intern
Council of Energy Resource Tribes
1999 Broadway, Suite 2600
Denver, CO 80202
Phone: 303-297-2378

Tim Dantoin
Policy Analyst
MACTEC, c/o DOE Chicago Operations Office
Argonne National Laboratory
9800 S. Cass Ave. Bldg. 201
Argonne, IL 60439
Ph: 708-252-2569 Fax:

James Daust
Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
2649 Melville Road
East Lansing, MI 48823
Ph: 517-337-6034 Fax: special inst

Jeffery Davis
Association of American Railroads
Manager, Hazardous Materials Training
Transportation Test Center
P.O. Box 11130
D.O.T. Road
Pueblo, CO 81001
Ph: 719-584-0583 Fax: 719-584-0790

Fred Dennin
Federal Railroad Administration
Ph: 312-353-6203 Fax:

Jenni Dickenson
Public Information Specialist
SAIC
P. O. Box 2502
800 Oak Ridge Turnpike
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 615-481-2934 Fax: 615-483-1198

James L. Doran
President
*National Coordinating Council on
Emergency Management*
24832 Jim Bridger Road
Hidden Hills, CA 91302
Ph: 818-888-0555

Lynn Eaton
Manager
Governmental Affairs
Westinghouse Electric Corp./WIPP
P.O. Box 2078
401 Canal
Carlsbad, NM 88220
Ph: 505-885-7512 Fax: 505-887-0351

Thomas H. Eblen
Finance Officer
Urban Energy and Transportation Corporation
406 W. 34th Street, Suite 710
Kansas City, MO., 64111
Phone: 816-531-5745
Fax: 816-531-6539

Ronald Falkey
BDM/
Quince Diamond Executive Center
555 Quince Orchard Rd.
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Ph: 301-212-6243 Fax: 301-212-6250

John Fisher
Edison Electric Institute
Virginia Power
P. O. Box 26666
Richmond, VA 23261
Ph: 804-775-5001 Fax: 804-771-3388

Herb Fivehouse
Urban Energy and Transportation Corporation
Energy Consultant to the Governor
State of Maryland
8808 Wolverton Road
Baltimore, MD 21234
Phone: 410-225-1293
Fax: 410-661-0597

Donald A. Flater
*Council of State Governments
Midwest Office*
Chief, Bureau of Radiological Health
Iowa Department of Public Health
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
Phone: 515-281-3478
Fax: 515 242-6284

Beth Fulmer
Project Manager
Southern States Energy Board
3091 Governors Lake Drive
Suite 400
Norcross, GA 30071
Ph: 404-242-7712 Fax: 404-242-0421

Katie Grassmeier
Transportation Manager
YUCCA Mountain Project Office
U.S. Dept. of Energy
101 Convention Center Drive
P.O. Box 98608
Las Vegas, NM 89193
Ph: 702-794-7525
Fax: 702-794-7908

Dick Halsaver
Consultant, MACTEC
1008 Rocky Point Court, N.E.
Albuquerque, NM 87123
Phone: 505-299-1777 Fax: 505-296-2755

Robert Halstead
Transportation Advisor
State of Nevada
Nuclear Waste Project Office
1802 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701
Phone: 702-687-3744 Fax: 702-687-5277

Alton Harris
Transportation & Emergency Preparedness
WIPP Project Division/DOE Headquarters
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-342
Trevion II Building
Washington, DC 20585-0002
Ph: 301-903-8466 Fax: 301-903-7213

Charles Hill
Transportation Analyst
SAIC
P. O. Box 2501
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 38731-2501
Phone: 615-481-2915 Fax: 615-481-8591

Maurice Hilliard
National Emergency Management Association
Radiological Officer
Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency
P. O. Box 3321
Trans. & Safety Bldg.
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3321
Ph: 717-783-8150 Fax: 717-783-7393

Robert Holden
National Congress of American Indians
900 Pennsylvania Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20003
Ph: 202-546-9404 Fax: 202-546-3741

Judith Holm
Manager, Liaison & Communications Program
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Special Programs, EM-56.1
12800 Middlebrook Road
Trevion II Building, 4th
Washington, DC 20585-0002
Ph: 301-903-7242 Fax: 301-903-7235

Robert M. Jefferson
Consultant, WPI
11336 Academy Ridge Road
Albuquerque, NM 87111
Phone: 505-291-0484 Fax: 505-291-0484

Douglas Johnson
Supervisor
TESS, Inc.
Transportation Institutional Relations
2650 Park Tower Drive
Vienna, VA 22180
Ph: 703-204-8927 Fax: 703-204-8620

Carol Ann Kania
Council of State Governments
Midwestern Office
641 E. Butterfield Road, Suite 401
Lombard, IL 60148
708-810-0210

Pat Kusek
Communication Manager Outreach Support
Duke Engineering
2650 Park Tower Drive Suite 800
Vienna, VA 22180
Phone: 703-204-8522 Fax: 703-204-8581

Kristine Lavery
Transportation Analyst
MACTEC, c/o DOE Chicago Operations Office
Argonne National Laboratory
9800 S. Cass Ave. Bldg. 201
Argonne, IL 60439
Ph: 708-252-2818 Fax: 708-252-2654

Cheryl Lopez
BDM
555 Quince Orchard
Suite 400
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Ph: 301-212-6245 Fax: 301-903-7235

Scott Mackey
TRW Environmental Safety Systems
2650 Park Tower Dr.
Suite 800
Vienna, VA 22180
Ph: 703-204-8957 Fax: 703-204-8581

Dennis L. McCall
Manager Transportation Programs
Westinghouse Hanford Company
P.O. Box 1970 Mail Stop G-2-02
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-1651
Fax: 509-376-7551

Brad Mettam
National Association of Counties
Project Coordinator
Planning Department, Inyo County
YUCCA Mountain Repository Assessment Office
P.O. Drawer L
139 N. Edwards Ofc.
Independence, CA 93526
Ph: 619-878-0380 Fax: 619-878-0382

James Miernyk
Policy Analyst
Western Interstate Energy Board
600 17th Street
Suite 1704 South Tower
Denver, CO 80202
Ph: 303-573-8910 Fax: 303-573-9107

Avagene Moore
Senior Emergency Management Specialist
Oak Ridge Institute for Science & Education
1017 Hayes Road
Lawrenceburg, TN 38464
Ph: 615-762-4768 Fax: 615-762-7359

Terry Moore
Manager, Hazardous Materials Compliance
Illinois Department of Transportation
3215 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, Illinois 62703
Phone: 217-785-1181 Fax: 217-782-9159

Wendy Morgan
Waste Policy Institute
1872 Pratt Drive, Suite 1600
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Phone: 703-231-3324 Fax: 703-231-3968

Bernard Morris
Railroad Safety Program Administrator
Illinois Commerce Commission
527 East Capitol Ave.
Springfield, IL 62789
Phone: 217-782-7660 Fax: 217-785-1448

Ellen Ott
Office of General Counsel
U.S. DOE
Office of Nuclear Programs - GC-31
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-6978 Fax: 202-586-6977

Russell Paule-Riggs
Senior Policy Analyst
Council of State Governments
5 World Trade Center, #9241
New York, NY 10048
Phone: 212-912-0128 Fax: 212-912-0549

Donna L. Powaukee
Manager, Environmental Restoration and Waste
Management Dept.
Nez Perce Tribe
P. O. Box 365
Lapwai, ID 83540
Ph: 208-843-7375 Fax: 208-843-7378

Max Power
Nuclear Waste Program Specialist
Western Interstate Energy Board
c/o Department of Ecology - NMWM
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600
Ph: 206-459-6670 Fax: 206-493-2976

James Reed
Senior Policy Specialist
National Conference of State Legislatures
1560 Broadway Suite 700
Denver, CO 80202-5140
Ph: 303-830-2200 Fax: 303-863-8003

Louis Rice
Advanced Transportation Specialist
Westinghouse Hanford Company
P. O. Box 1970, MS G2-03
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-1646 Fax: 509-376-2364

Robert J. Rooney
Senior Engineer - Transportation
Logistics Dept.
Weston, Inc.
955 L'Enfant Plaza N. SW
8th Floor
Washington, DC 20024
Phone:

Ronald Ross
Program Manager
Western Governors' Association
600 17th Street
Suite 1705 South Tower
Denver, CO 80202
Ph: 303-623-9378 Fax: 303-534-7309

Rachael Rowland
Radiological Preparedness Division
FEMA
500 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20472
Phone: 202-646-4571 Fax: 202-646-3508

George Ruberg
Program Manager
Waste Policy Institute
1872 Pratt Drive Suite 1600
Blacksburg, VA 24060-6363
Ph: 703-231-9872 Fax: 703-231-3968

Lisa Sattler
Policy Analyst
Council of State Governments Midwest Office
641 East Butterfield Rd.
Suite 401
Lombard, IL 60148-5651
Ph: 708-810-0210 Fax: 312-353-0813

Laura Scheele
Policy Analyst
Western Governors' Association
600 17th Street
Suite 1705 South Tower
Denver, CO 80202
Ph: 303-623-9378 Fax: 303-534-7309

Judy Schwab
Waste Policy Institute
1872 Pratt Drive, Suite 1600
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Ph: 703-231-9814 Fax: 703-231-3968

Steve Smith
Nye County NV
1925 N. Lynn Street, Suite 500
Rosslyn, VA 22209
Phone: 703-818-2434 Fax: 703-818-2437

Susan Smith
Transportation Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
OCRWM RW-431
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, DC 20585
Ph: 202-586-5616 Fax: 202-586-9608

Tom Smith
Ohio Emergency Management Agency
2825 W. Dublin Granville Rd.
Columbus, OH 43235-2789
Ph: 614-766-7595 Fax: 614-889-7183

Elaine Specht
Associate Analyst
Waste Policy Institute
1872 Pratt Drive, Suite 1600
Blacksburg, VA 24060-6363
Ph: 703-231-9845 Fax: 703-231-3968

Paul Standish
Nuclear Waste Technology
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
101 Convention Center Dr.
Las Vegas, NV 89109
Ph: 702-794-7824 Fax: 412-247-6299

John Thompson
Trans. Engineer
Weston/Rogers
955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, DC 20024
Ph: 202-646-6776 Fax: 202-863-2220

Alex Thrower
Technical Writer/Research Assistant
Social & Scientific Systems, Inc.
20030 Century Blvd., Suite 210
Germantown, MD 20874-1112
Ph: 301-903-7242 Fax: 301-353-1060

Elissa Turner
U. S. Department of Energy
OCRWM, RW-431
1000 Independence Ave.
Washington, DC 20585
Ph: 202-586-1710 Fax: 202-586-9608

Chief Gordon Veerman
International Association of Fire Chiefs
c/o Argonne National Laboratory
9700 S. Cross Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439
Ph: 708-252-6136 Fax: 708-252-5440

Wally Weaver
Director
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-562
OSP Emergency Management Division
Trevion II, Fourth Floor
12800 Middlebrook Rd.
Washington, DC 20874
Ph: 301-903-7669 Fax: 301-903-7235

Christopher Wentz
Western Governors' Association
Coordinator/Senior Policy Analyst
State of New Mexico
Radioactive Waste Task Force
2040 Pacheco Street
Santa Fe, NM 87505
Ph: 505-827-5950 Fax: 505-438-3855

Jeanne Weyandt
Manager, External and Governmental Affairs
Department
Westinghouse Electric Corp. Waste Isolation
Division
P. O. Box 3090
Carlsbad, NM 88221
Express mail - 101 W. Greene Street, Carlsbad,
NM 88220
Phone: 505-885-7230
Fax: 505-887-1941

Stephen White
Chairman
National Association of Emergency Medical
Technicians
Emergency Management Committee
166 Lakeshore Drive
Weymouth, MA 02189
Ph: 617-331-5523

(addresses not available)
Roger Carlson
Hall Bollinger
Howard Christiansen

Appendix D: Materials Request Form

This page intentionally left blank

**Transportation External Coordination Working Group
Meeting Materials Request Form**

To receive materials available at the TEC Working Group Meeting (July 20-23), place a check mark next to the item you would like and return this form to Wendy Morgan at the Waste Policy Institute 1872 Pratt Dr., Suite 1600 Blacksburg, VA 24060.

Exhibit Materials

DOE Orders

Emergency Management System

- 5500.1B Emergency Management System
- 5500.2B Emergency Categories, Classes, and Notification and Reporting Requirements
- 5500.3A Planning and Preparedness for Operational Emergencies
- 5500.4A Public Affairs and Planning Requirements for Emergencies
- 5000.3B Occurrence Reporting and Processing of Operations Information

Materials Transportation and Traffic Management

- 1540.1A Materials Transportation and Traffic Management
- 1540.2 Hazardous Material Packaging for Transport - Administrative Procedures
- 1540.3A Base Technology for Radioactive Material Transportation Packaging Systems

DOE Publications

- Motor Carrier Evaluation Program Plan (DOE/Westinghouse Hanford Co.)
- "Report on Legislative Developments in Radioactive Materials Transportation" (DOE/NCSL)
- "Proposed Outline for Additional Options for Providing Section 180(c) Assistance" (DOE)
- "Options for Providing Technical Assistance and Funding Under Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as Amended" (11/92, DOE/SEAL & ORNL)
- Emergency Preparedness for Transportation Incidents Involving Radioactive Materials 5/90 (DOE)
- Report on the Emergency Response Training and Equipment Activities Through 1991 for the Transportation of Transuranic Waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant 4/92 (DOE)
- Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) 4/91 (DOE/EM)

DOT Publications

- "Training - It's the Law (DOT)
- "Research and Special Programs Administration - Hazardous Materials Safety" (DOT)
- "Hazardous Materials Exchange" (DOT)
- "Cooperative Hazardous Materials Enforcement Development" (DOT)
- "Shipments of Radioactive Materials" (DOT)

WIPP Fact Sheets

- Transportation - The WIPP TRU Waste Carrier
- Transportation: TRUPACT - II
- Transportation: A Satellite Tracking System

Yucca Mountain

- _____ Yucca Mountain Project Behind Schedule and Facing Major Scientific Uncertainties - 5/93 (GAO)
- _____ Yucca Mountain Video Update

Other

- _____ 1993 Hazmat Transportation Conference - Preliminary Program
- _____ Transport of Radioactive Materials Q & A (Oak Ridge Assoc. Univ.)
- _____ CVSA - Recommended Procedures
- _____ Handbook of High-Level Radioactive Waste Transportation (Midwestern Office of the Council of State Governments)
- _____ Guidelines for Selecting Preferred highway Routes for Highway Route Controlled Quantity
- _____ Emergency Response to a highway Accident in Springfield, Mass. - Dec. 16, 1991 6/91 (NRC)
- _____ Guidance for Developing State, Tribal, and Local Radiological Emergency Response Planning and Preparedness for Transportation Accidents 6/92 (FEMA)
- _____ Report form University of Nevada - Transportation via Rail
- _____ MPC Fact Sheet (preliminary draft)

Presentation Viewgraphs

General Discussion

- _____ "TEC Status Report- Where we've been; Where we're going (Susan Smith)

Public Information and Education

- _____ Plenary Session (Judith Holm)
- _____ Breakout Session Structure

Safe, Routine Transport

- _____ Plenary Session (Larry Blalock)
- _____ Breakout Session Structure

Emergency Management, Training, and Technical Assistance

- _____ Plenary Session (Wally Weaver)
- _____ Plenary Session (Judith Bradbury)
- _____ Breakout Session Structure

Inspection and Enforcement

- _____ Plenary Session (Susan Smith)
- _____ Breakout Session Structure

Other (Please list)

Appendix E: Development of Training Problem Statements

This page intentionally left blank

TEC Working Group, Chicago Meeting
Training Breakout Session

Development of Training Problem Statements

- I. Training to enhance the capabilities of emergency responder units is a costly proposition when considered against the long term benefits
 - A. Qualification and subsequent certification/requalification of emergency responders in health physics disciplines requires the availability and dedication of a significant percentage of the responders' time in training overhead
 - B. In those locals where training is most needed to qualify first responders for radioactive material shipments many of the primary emergency response organizations are comprised of volunteers
 - C. Significant rates in first responder personnel turnover make training is highly perishable
 - 1. Qualification for first responder personnel in detecting and dealing with incident involving radioactive materials is dependent upon recurrent exercising and/or reinforcement of these skills
 - 2. Initial training is more time intensive (costly) then maintenance or follow-up training
 - D. The sporadic or intermittent nature of radioactive material shipments through many communities/jurisdictions lengthens the periods between potential applications of trained skills, thus reducing the retention of subject matter and the overall effectiveness of most training initiatives
- II. Among the first responders to a radioactive materials transportation incident, someone should be qualified to detect and measure/monitor any radioactive material leakage, and access the incidents potential radiation hazards
- III. Maintaining accurate calibration of equipment for detection/measurement of radioactive materials is a difficult task
 - A. Achieving a standardized calibration is not simple, requiring a highly trained or experienced technician

- B. The equipment is delicate and requires constant "care and feeding" to maintain a standardized calibration
- IV. While statues and regulations, applicable to various jurisdictions, mandate certain levels of response capabilities, there is no assurance that those basic responsibilities have been met
- A. Requirements are often imposed on local jurisdictions without regard to funding issues (particularly the abilities of the affected governments to absorb the cost and provide the services with their existing organizations)
 - B. No minimum performance standards have been established
 - C. There is little in the way of positive (or negative) incentives to prompt compliance with the statutory and/or regulatory requirements
 - 1. No inspection/certification program is in place to verify that jurisdictions are in compliance with statutory/regulatory requirements
 - 2. No authority/responsibility for enforcing the provisions of the basic response capabilities exist
- V. The political aspects (i.e., public perceptions) of a radioactive material shipment incident can be a greater influence in determining response postures than the actual threat/risk posed by the incident
- A. When it is outside of their depth of experience, local jurisdictions may need assistance in achieving a certain "comfort level" for first response to radioactive material shipments
- VI. Many first responders lack basic RAD health/safety qualifications
- VII. While both the threat/risk and the response capability change as a radioactive material shipment moves along a route, there is no assurance that these two aspect increase or decrease together
- A. There should be a minimum response level available regardless of location (threat/risk)

Appendix F: Acronym List

This page intentionally left blank

TEC Meeting Summary Acronym List

AAR	American Association of Railroads
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway Officials
CAR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHEMTREC	Chemical Transportation Emergency Center
CRCPD	Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc.
CVSA	Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
EALs	Emergency Action Levels
EEI	Edison Electric Institute
EM	Office of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management
ERG	Emergency Response Guidebook
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FRPCC	Federal Radiological Protection Coordination Committee
HLW	High-Level Waste
HMIX	Hazardous Materials Information Exchange
HMTUSA	Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act
HRCQ	Highway Route Controlled Quantity
IDNS	Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety
JAD	Joint Application Design
L&C	Liaison and Communications
LGN	Local Government Network
MCSAP	Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program
MOCSG	Midwest Office of the Council of State Governments
MRS	Monitored Retrievable Storage
NAC	National Association of Counties
NCAI	National Congress of American Indians
NCSL	National Conference of State Legislatures
NEMA	National Emergency Management Association
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NTSB	National Transportation Safety Board
NWPA	Nuclear Waste Policy Act
OCRWM	Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/ Quality Control
REAC/TS	Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site
RMIR	Radioactive Materials Incident Report
RW	Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
SERC	State Emergency Response Commission

SMRAP	Southern Mutual Radiation Assistance Plan
SNF	Spent Nuclear Fuel
SSEB	Southern States Energy Board
TEC	Transportation External Coordination Working Group
TETRA	Transportation Emergency Training for Response Assistance
TITF	Transportation Institutional Task Force
TRANSCOM	Transportation Communication Network
WGA	Western Governors' Association
WIEB	Western Interstate Energy Board
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant