

TEC/WG

Meeting Summary

Dallas, Texas

January 25-28, 1994

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
General Discussion	2
Opening Remarks	2
TEC/WG Status of Activities Plenary Session	3
Status of DOE Radioactive Transportation Program Activities Plenary Session	6
Introduction	6
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	6
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management	10
Office of Spent Fuel Management	12
Office of Site Operations	12
DOE Emergency Response Assets	14
Issue Prioritization Results, <i>Process Plan</i> , and <i>Work Plan</i> Breakout Orientation	15
Issue Prioritization Results, <i>Process Plan</i> , and <i>Work Plan</i> Breakout Session	15
Group A	15
Group B	19
Group C	23
Reports on Issue Prioritization Results, <i>Process Plan</i> and <i>Work Plan</i> Breakout Session ..	28
DOE Transportation Information Network	31
Annual Operating Plan for EM's Office of Special Programs	33
Status of Existing Task Plans and Introduction of New Draft Task Plans Breakout Session	34
General Planning and Public Information and Education Breakout Session	34
General Planning Discussion	34
General Planning Task Plan Review	37
Task Plan I-A.1, Coordinating Section 180(c) Implementation Plans	37
Task Plan I-B.1, Review and Revision of the TEPP Strategy Plan ..	37
Task Plan I-B.2, The Transportation Institutional Policy	38
Task Plan I-B.3, The Liaison and Communications Long Range Plan ..	38
Task Plan I-B.4, The Program Manager's Guide to Transportation	39
Planning	39
Information Products Review	39
Additional Comments	40

Safe Routine Transportation Breakout Session	41
Safe Routine Transportation Task Plan Review	41
Task Plan II-A.1, Definition of Safe Routine Transportation	41
Task Plan II-B.1, DOE Hazardous Materials Routing Policy	43
Task Plan II-C.1, Consistency between NRC Notification Regulations and DOE Notification Policy	44
Task Plan II-C.2, DOE Policy for Transportation Operations for Bad Weather and Road Conditions	44
Task Plan II-C.3, Use of Escorts for DOE Shipments	45
Task Plan II-C.4, Transportation Operations Procedures Manual ..	46
Additional Comments	47
 Inspection and Enforcement and Technical Assistance Breakout Session	 48
Inspection and Enforcement Task Plan Review	48
Task Plan III-A.2, The Transportation Network (TRANSNET) and Radioactive Incident Report (RMIR)	48
Task Plan III-B.1, Work with CRCPD to Revise Directory of Enforcement Agencies to include Roles and Performance Indicators	48
Task Plan III-B.5, State, Tribal, and Local Inspection and Enforcement Issues with Regard to Rail Shipments	48
Task Plan III-B.9, Transportation Communications and Tracking System	49
Task Plan III-C.2, Facilitate Use of CVSA Inspection Program by Tribes	49
Task Plan III-C.3, Have CVSA Look at Coordination to Minimize Enroute Inspection	50
Task Plan III-C.5, Determine which Tribes have Inspection Authority and Interest in Joining CVSA	50
Task Plan III-C.6- Contact EEI/UWASTE to have Utilities Subscribe to CVSA Procedures	50
Task Plan III-C.7, Look for Additional Campaigns to Test CVSA Procedures	50
Task Plan III-C.8, Assess CVSA Procedures for Application to FRA Inspection Procedures	50
Task Plan III-C.9, Compare SNF Shipment Inspection Procedures to FRA Procedures	50
Task Plan III-C.10, Coordinate with NCAI, CVSA, and NCSL to Review and Report on Inspection Issues	51
Task Plan III-C.11, Develop Plan to Study Issues Related to Rail Inspection Programs	51
Task Plan III-C.12, Include State Rail Agencies on AASHTO JAD Teams	51
Additional Comments	51

Technical Assistance Task Plan Review	52
Task Plan V-A.1- Develop a Directory of Technical Assistance Sources	52
Task Plan V-F.1- Prepare a List of Available Technologies for Use by State, Tribal, and Local Agencies	52
Task Plan V-G.1- Refine Definition of Technical Assistance	52
Additional Comments	53
Emergency Management and Training Breakout Session	54
Emergency Management Goals and Objectives Review	54
Emergency Management Task Plan Review	54
Task Plan IV-A.1, Revision of DOT ERG	54
Task Plan IV-A.2, Identification and Improvement of Basic Source Material for First Responders	54
Task Plan IV-C.2, Transportation Incident Response Role and Capabilities of the DOE's Radiological Assistance Program (RAP)	55
Task Plan IV-D.1, Standardized Transportation Emergency Action Levels (EALs)	55
Task Plan IV-F.1, Emergency Response Issues within Mutual Aid Agreements	56
Training Goals and Objectives Review	57
Training Task Plan Review	57
Task Plan V-A.3, Establish a Train-the-Trainer Course for States ..	57
Task Plan V-A.6, Identification of Opportunities for Improvement in TEP Training	58
Task Plan V-C.2, Rail Transportation Issues Awareness Training ..	58
General Discussion	58
Reports on Status of Existing Task Plans and Introduction of New Draft Task Plans Breakout Session	60
General Planning and Public Information Breakout Report	60
Safe Routine Transportation Breakout Report	61
Emergency Management and Training Breakout Report	63
Technical Assistance and Inspection and Enforcement Breakout Report	65
Closeout Plenary Session	67

**U.S. Department of Energy
Transportation External Coordination Working Group
Meeting Summary
January 25-28, 1994**

Introduction

The Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) held its fourth meeting January 25-28, 1994, in Dallas, Texas. Participants included TEC/WG members, other interested parties, and representatives from the Department of Energy.

This *Meeting Summary* provides brief summaries of the plenary session presentations and reports on the discussions in each breakout session. Topics in the *Meeting Summary* follow the agenda from the meeting. A copy of the revised agenda is included in Appendix A which reflects changes that were made during the meeting.

The major focus of the meeting was to review existing and new draft task plans. Attendees participated in four breakout sessions (General Planning and Public Information and Education; Safe, Routine Transportation; Emergency Management and Training; and Inspection and Enforcement, Technical Assistance) that were facilitated by DOE managers. Attendees also participated in a breakout session to discuss the results of the issue prioritization, the draft *TEC/WG Process Plan*, and the *TEC/WG Work Plan*. The presentations were mainly chosen from requests from previous meetings and included a panel discussion on the status of DOE radioactive transportation program activities, DOE emergency response assets, DOE transportation information network, and the annual operating plan for Environmental Management's (EM) Office of Special Programs.

Additional appendices include attendee list (Appendix B), meeting evaluation results (Appendix C), and an acronym list (Appendix D). A list of materials that were available at the meeting or mentioned in presentations is included as well (Appendix E).

General Discussion
Wednesday, January 26
8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Brancato, Director, Office of Special Programs (EM-56), began by explaining that the Office of Environmental Management (EM) is in the midst of a standdown order. Assistant Secretary Thomas Grumbly ordered the standdown to allow EM, along with its contractors, to look at ways to provide better performance and define accomplishments. During the standdown, EM is restricted in its travel and meeting activities. The fact that the TEC/WG meeting was the only EM meeting not canceled by the standdown indicates the importance of the TEC/WG to upper-level management. Mr. Brancato went on to discuss the Office of Special Program's (OSP) reorganization within EM from research and development to site oversight and compliance. The entire OSP organization will move from EM-50 (Office of Technology Development) to EM-20 (Office of Compliance and Program Coordination) where Randy Scott serves as the Deputy Assistant Secretary. [Editor's Note: Reorganization had not been approved as of March 31, 1994.]

TEC/WG Status of Activities Plenary Session

Wednesday, January 26

9:00 a.m. - 9:25 a.m.

Ms. Holm opened the plenary session on the status of the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) activities. She introduced Susan Smith, Transportation Manager within the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) and co-chairperson of TEC/WG. The agenda was briefly reviewed and it was noted that in response to requests made by participants at previous meetings, a substantial amount of time was being devoted to breakout sessions. She highlighted other suggestions made by participants which have been addressed since the last meeting. These include the prioritization process, revisions to the *Work Plan*, drafting of a process plan for the group, and revision of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to expand Department of Energy (DOE) office participation. Another suggestion, a secretarial level endorsement of TEC/WG, had been initiated and was in the process of concurrence.

Meeting participants were asked to introduce themselves. Following introductions, the issue of TEC/WG membership was addressed. It was noted that organizations belonging to the TEC/WG membership are those which have traditionally expressed an interest in DOE transportation activities. Members were asked to consider if there were other groups that should be invited to participate in TEC/WG.

Attendees were also asked to think about the role of TEC/WG. It was indicated that DOE sees TEC/WG as a forum for DOE and stakeholders to address policy and operational issues that face all transportation programs. However, it was emphasized that it is realized that there will continue to be a need for smaller discussions for specific programs. It was further explained that TEC/WG will not replace the traditional regional and cooperative agreement group framework for DOE interactions with stakeholders, noting that the TEC/WG is not the right forum for all DOE transportation activities.

The draft *TEC/WG Process Plan* was briefly addressed with it being noted that time would be allotted in the breakout session that afternoon for discussion. Participants were asked to consider several questions concerning the process prior to the breakout to help ensure that TEC/WG functions effectively. The following questions that were posed to the group: are the right amount of people and/or organizations present; how are differences of opinions among the group resolved; and how does the group manage its time to discuss what is most important.

It was explained that participating DOE programs meet on a regular basis to prepare for TEC/WG meetings and review their TEC/WG-related activities. By organizing for TEC/WG, participating DOE program managers are able to keep informed about the activities of other DOE programs. Several TEC/WG-initiated efforts (e.g. escorts), originally intended to address an issue within a specific program are now being addressed on a DOE-wide basis.

With the floor open for discussion, a TEC/WG member complimented DOE on its efforts to develop process documents for TEC/WG. He questioned the effort to establish TEC/WG as the primary mechanism for interacting with external parties, noting inconsistencies between the discussion that morning in regard to the role of the TEC/WG and language in documents such as the secretarial endorsement.

In response, Mr. Brancato said he believes the *Process Plan* accurately reflects his view of TEC/WG's purpose—a mechanism for identifying and resolving transportation-related issues. He reiterated the earlier statement that TEC/WG will not supplant the traditional relationships among DOE programs and individual organizations. He noted that the TEC/WG membership has diverse interests and should not be asked to approve or implement specific DOE measures. Rather, as individual organizations, TEC/WG member organizations should continue working with DOE in their traditional settings to resolve issues of importance to a particular campaign or region, as well as the broader policy issues addressed by TEC/WG.

The member requested that TEC/WG documents be reworded to appropriately reflect these arrangements. Mr. Brancato agreed it may be necessary to do so.

Ms. Holm assured participants that the topics addressed during the plenary will be discussed in greater detail within the issue prioritization breakout groups. She proceeded to review the purpose, development, and current status of several TEC/WG documents, including the *Process Plan*, the *Work Plan*, and the *Resource Notebook*. As indicated by the presence of these documents, it was noted a good deal of information on the process of TEC/WG has been developed since the last meeting. Also, the *Process Plan* and *Work Plan* are draft documents and TEC/WG members' comments will be incorporated into the final versions. Members were asked to comment on the usefulness of the *Resource Notebook*. The *Resource Notebook* contains all TEC/WG-related documents including the *Process Plan* and the *Work Plan*, and it is designed to help keep members up to date on the group's activities. She reminded participants that the *Resource Notebooks* were available outside the meeting room, and if they took a copy, they needed to sign the accompanying sheet to ensure they receive updates and changes to the documents within the notebook.

Following her discussion of TEC/WG documents, Ms. Holm turned the floor over to Susan Smith to discuss the prioritization results. Before discussing the results of the survey, Ms. Smith noted that any late responses would be incorporated into the results after the meeting. She then identified the organizations that responded to the prioritization letter and briefly recapped the structure of the survey.

She commented that developing the survey and attending monthly planning meetings helped DOE program managers become familiar with TEC/WG recommendations related to their programs as well as those related to other DOE programs. The hardest topical area (e.g. General Planning) and specific recommendations to address turned out to be of greatest interest to members responding to the survey.

The relative rankings of each of the seven topical areas, the highest priority recommendations within each of the topical areas, and the highest priority recommendations overall were presented. The ranking by topic area was as follows: General Planning; Emergency Management; Safe Routine Transportation; Technical Assistance; Training; Inspection and Enforcement; and Public Information and Education. She concluded by noting the prioritization exercise is only one aspect of determining what topics are addressed by the department.

**Status of DOE Radioactive Transportation
Program Activities Plenary Session**

Wednesday, January 26
9:55 a.m. - 12:00 noon

Introduction

Larry Blalock, Director, Transportation Management Division (TMD), served as the moderator for the panel discussion and explained that this session was intended to introduce Department of Energy (DOE) programs and personnel to the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) membership and begin a means for communication between members and program managers. He emphasized the session was on transportation activities only and that other issues would be discussed during the breakout sessions on Thursday afternoon.

Mr. Blalock provided the panel participants with general guidelines for their presentations and asked them to address the following questions when possible.

- What hazardous (particularly radioactive) materials will your program be shipping?
- How much (by general grouping) will be shipped?
- What laws, if any, drive your program?
- What are the time frames for shipments?
- What are the origins and destinations?
- Who are the DOE players?
- What do the states, etc. need to be concerned with?
- What is the current status?

The members of the panel were introduced. Participants included Steve Gomberg with the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW-431), Alton Harris with the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Project Division (EM-342), and David Hoel with the Office of Spent Fuel Management and Special Projects (EM-37). Larry Harmon with the Office of Site Operations (EM-32) was unable to attend the meeting. In his absence, Larry Blalock made his presentation.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)

Alton Harris, Transportation Emergency Preparedness Manager for the WIPP Project Division (EM-342), gave the first presentation and discussed transportation activities related to WIPP. Mr. Harris stated that although the waste receiving and disposal facilities are in place for contact-handled transuranic waste, certain regulatory issues must be addressed before waste is received at the WIPP facility.

Mr. Harris continued by identifying the hazardous materials that will be transported to the WIPP facility. The materials include transuranic (TRU) wastes and mixed transuranic wastes (TRU wastes with hazardous constituents) that have been generated primarily through national defense activities from processes used in the fabrication of nuclear weapons at DOE facilities. Mr. Harris explained that almost all TRU waste intended for disposal at WIPP is contact-handled (maximum radiation dose rate at the surface of waste container cannot exceed 200 millirims per hour) and can be handled safely without any shielding other than that provided by the waste container (i.e., 55 gallon steel drums or metal boxes). Contact handled waste comes in a variety of forms, ranging from unprocessed laboratory trash, such as paper, glassware, gloves, and boots, to scrap metal and solidified sludges from the dewatering of liquids. About three percent of transuranic waste destined for the WIPP facility is classified as remote-handled (surface radiation dose rate at the surface of the waste container exceeds 200 millirems per hour) and must be handled and transported in shielded casks.

Mr. Harris continued by stating the WIPP facility can store 6.2 million cubic feet of TRU waste. Currently, TRU waste generating sites project 3.7 million cubic feet of contact-handled TRU and 295,000 cubic feet of remote-handled TRU for a total of 3.9 million cubic feet of TRU waste for disposal at WIPP.

Mr. Harris mentioned two public laws that affect the WIPP Project. First, the U.S. Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-164) that authorized WIPP. Second, the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-579) that withdrew federal lands surrounding the WIPP facility from public use and transferred the title of these lands to the Secretary of Energy. Mr. Harris highlighted the transportation requirements in the Land Withdrawal Act as follows:

The shipping container, the TRUPACT-II, is a Type B packaging, which has been certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The quality assurance program for the TRUPACT-II was reviewed in January 1993 by the NRC, and the NRC issued a final report with no findings, no concerns, and no observations.

TEC/WG input will be helpful under the category of notification. Mr. Harris indicated that one of the benefits of WIPP being involved with TEC/WG is to gain a better understanding of what information stakeholders desire from notification. He also indicated that TRANSCOM will be used to provide notification of WIPP shipments.

Under the topic of accident prevention, Mr. Harris noted the WIPP Project has used the State Training and Education Program (STEP) since 1988 to provide training to ensure state, local, and tribal WIPP emergency response readiness. Hospital training has been provided by the Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site (REAC/TS). It was estimated that approximately 1,000 medical personnel from six states have been trained by REAC/TS. A series of WIPPTREX and TRANSAX exercises have also been conducted to augment what has been learned through

classroom training.

In regards to emergency response training, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration reviewed WIPP emergency response training programs for compliance with *29 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1910.120* and found the programs in compliance as they specifically applied to WIPP.

Mr. Harris also indicated that the Secretary of Energy had asked the State of New Mexico to create a medical advisory committee to review WIPP emergency response training programs. The advisory committee is expected to report its findings to DOE and the Department of Labor in the near future.

One participant noted that WIPP training for emergency medical personnel has been well received, although many participants indicate that their equipment is severely outdated. The participant asked that this issue be considered by TEC/WG. In response, Mr. Harris reiterated his desire to work through regional groups such as the Western Governors' Association.

Mr. Harris mentioned the WIPP Project has been preparing a transportation study which compares the transportation options (i.e., truck, regular train, and dedicated trains) being considered for disposal phase shipments to the WIPP facility. The study is expected to be sent to the Congress in the near future.

Mr. Harris turned the focus of his discussion to the time frames for shipments to the WIPP facility. He explained that DOE announced in October 1993 that tests using radioactive wastes would be conducted in laboratories rather than underground at the WIPP facility. The earliest date the WIPP facility expects to receive waste shipments is mid 1998.

Mr. Harris indicated that the origins of the waste shipments are 10 waste generators or temporary storage facilities located at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, the Rocky Flats Plant, the Hanford Reservation, the Savannah River Site, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the Nevada Test Site, the Argonne National Laboratory-East, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and the Mound Laboratory.

Mr. Harris identified the major DOE players as the Carlsbad Area Office/National Transuranic Program Office, DOE Headquarters' Office of Environmental Restoration and the 10 waste generator or temporary storage facilities.

Mr. Harris then asked Robert Spooner, Packaging, Transportation and Emergency Response Manager at the Carlsbad Area Office/National Transuranic Program Office in Carlsbad, New Mexico, to discuss activities at his office. His office is responsible for stakeholder involvement and for working with the generator sites and/or storage facilities to determine packaging, transportation, and emergency response requirements needed to meet the

anticipated disposal shipments in mid 1998.

A TEC/WG member asked if there are any shipments occurring between the 10 generating sites before 1998 and if so, would they be shipped in TRUPACTs. Mr. Spooner indicated that such shipments are not likely to occur, although his office will work with each generating site based on its particular storage needs. However, should a shipment of this type occur, both Mr. Brancato and Mr. Spooner confirmed that any DOE shipments of transuranic or mixed hazardous waste would be in TRUPACTs.

Another member of the group stated he felt all the precautions and packaging measures limit the likelihood of a spill of transuranic waste. Nonetheless hospitals are training as if a spill is a foregone conclusion. He suggested that hospitals along the WIPP corridor should be cautious in spending money on training personnel who are unlikely to use the training.

Although agreeing in principle with this comment, Mr. Brancato noted that those decisions are not made by WIPP personnel. People living along WIPP and other transportation corridors have reasonable concerns that must be addressed through the political process. Thus, the decisions to spend money and the amount that will be spent on things such as emergency medical training for potential incidents involving transuranic waste must be made by Congress and implemented by the administrative agency.

Mr. Brancato continued by stating that DOE does have some influence on the federal budget process, and the department will propose its budget be based in part on recommendations from groups like TEC/WG. Congress will then react to DOE's proposed budget. Placing transuranic waste in context of more dangerous substances moving on the highways, it was questioned whether or not the relative risk justified spending more money on items related to transuranic waste transportation. Mr. Brancato again acknowledged the assertion but reiterated that decisions like those are made at the congressional level.

Another member of the group agreed with the issue being raised, noting that his organization is dealing in many instances with the perception of risk for shipments of radioactive material rather than actual risk. For instance, before attending REAC/TS training, certain Colorado hospitals refused to take patients involved in a truwaste accident. Their positions and perceptions changed, however, after REAC/TS training.

Another participant asked Mr. Harris and Mr. Spooner two questions: what is the status of the transportation container for remote handled transuranic waste and what is the status of including cleanup in the TRANSAX exercises.

Mr. Spooner responded to the question regarding the TRANSAX exercise. He noted that during the TRANSAX '93 exercise, the state cleaned up in the manner they should. There was some initial confusion as to who was responsible for cleanup, but that was clarified and everything proceeded as it should.

Regarding the shipping containers for remote-handled transuranic waste, it was explained that the Safety Analysis Report for Packaging has been prepared for the remote-handled cask. An independent review will be performed before an application is submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a Certificate of Compliance.

A TEC/WG member was interested in knowing if tribes were involved in an exercise recently conducted at Los Alamos. Wally Weaver, Director, Emergency Management Division (EMD), responded that the exercise at Los Alamos was conducted a few weeks ago to fulfill a site exercise requirement. A DOE system performance exercise is scheduled for March at Los Alamos. This is not a TRANSAX exercise. Although he was not certain, Mr. Weaver believed there have been discussions about involving tribes around Los Alamos in the system performance exercise. Mr. Weaver committed to providing the member with a contact at Los Alamos for him to pursue his question. Mr. Weaver then provided some information about the TRANSAX '94 Exercise.

TRANSAX '94 will be conducted along the Oregon - Idaho boarder and will involve a simulated cesium-137 capsule return program shipment. Planning is under way and has included all of the corridor states and the Confederate Tribes of the Umatilla. The exercise is scheduled to take place on August 3-4, 1994.

Mr. Harris concluded by addressing the question of the number of shipments which would be on the road. He replied that there were a lot of uncertainties regarding this issue. One uncertainty that must be resolved will be the ability of the WIPP facility to process the waste at the same rate as it arrives at the WIPP facility. However, based on current planning the estimates for the maximum number of shipments anticipated during the disposal phase are 28,534 truck shipments, 15,384 regular train shipments, or 6,622 dedicated train shipments depending on the transportation option selected over the 20 year operational life of WIPP.

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW)

Steve Gomberg, Chief of Transportation Branch with the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW-431), provided an overview of activities within the RW program. As part of his presentation, Mr. Gomberg described RW's mission, provided a graphic depiction of the program's organization, and identified and discussed the regulations and legislation driving RW's activities. The legislation and regulations affecting the transportation program include the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) of 1982 and amendments of 1987, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulations governing packaging and transportation and physical protection, as well as applicable DOE orders for management and implementation of its program.

Mr. Gomberg showed a map of spent fuel storage facilities and amounts throughout the country and noted that DOE will pick up commercial spent fuel based on a principle of oldest fuel first. In addition to spent fuel, high level radioactive waste from defense reprocessing in

the form of vitrified glass from three production sites—Savannah River Site, Idaho National Laboratory, and Hanford— and vitrified high level waste from commercial reprocessing activities at West Valley will also be shipped to a geologic repository. DOE-owned spent fuel from various department activities (e.g., electric power production, foreign spent fuel, naval reactors, weapons production, etc.) representing three percent by weight of all commercial spent fuel will also be shipped to a repository. Shipments to a repository are expected to begin in 2010.

Mr. Gomberg discussed the number and mode of shipments required under various scenarios including the use of a multipurpose canister (MPC). He described the MPC as a canister holding multiple fuel assemblies loaded and sealed at the reactor site, and stored, transported and disposed of in various overpacks.

According to Mr. Gomberg, RW's critical schedule includes a 1998 opening for a monitored retrievable storage (MRS) facility and a transportation system, and a 2010 opening for a geologic repository. Current transportation program activities include: the development of an RW transportation plan; Section 180(c) training assistance; an RW routing strategy to determine criteria for identifying transportation routes; a cask development program; and risk management and assessment activities designed to address the perceived and actual risks of transporting spent fuel. Mr. Gomberg emphasized that certain institutional activities and issues are specific to RW and will continue to be pursued through the RW regional and cooperative agreements and the Transportation Coordination Group (TCG).

A question was asked about the status of the MRS negotiator. Mr. Gomberg stated that Richard Stallings has been appointed to the position and is working to identify a site. Mr. Gomberg noted, however, there are limitations on the MRS siting process. In the 1994 budget procurement, RW is restricted from providing Phase II B funding. He said that the MRS siting activities is being pursued at a slower pace than in the past.

A TEC/WG member asked Mr. Gomberg to explain the status of the RW routing strategy. Mr. Gomberg explained that they were looking to expand it to a DOE-wide initiative and the strategy would be sufficiently general so it could be applied to most DOE shipping programs. He noted that this would be discussed in greater detail during the breakout groups on Thursday afternoon. Mr. Brancato added that the intent is to turn the routing strategy into a DOE order which would then be a required procedure for DOE programs.

In response to a question, Mr. Gomberg once again explained the MPC. He referred to RW's analysis of various transportation scenarios and modal splits involving the MPC, but noted that a final modal split has not yet been adopted. He added that a request for proposal (RFP) for the MPC will be issued in the spring. An MPC conceptual design report is completed and available. The vendor meeting the RFP will be responsible for developing the safety analysis report for its MPC design. Mr. Gomberg added that the Transportation Plan was scheduled to be released in December 1993, but is being delayed until program decisions and budgets are

made which will make the plan more applicable. The plan will be released in the next few months.

Office of Spent Fuel Management and Special Projects

Mr. David Hoel, Environmental Project Specialist, Office of Spent Fuel Management and Special Projects (EM-37), gave an overview of the EM-37 program responsibilities and stated the program's goals and objectives. He noted that ninety-nine percent of spent nuclear fuel is at DOE's Hanford, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), and the Savannah River sites. He discussed the various elements comprising the spent fuels programs, including foreign research reactor fuel, domestic research reactor fuel, and naval propulsion reactor fuel. He also reviewed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation requirements and schedule. He added that Brenda Fleming, also with the Office of Spent Fuel Management, would be in the General Planning and Public Information breakout sessions on Thursday afternoon to discuss several program factsheets.

Mr. Hoel discussed the proposed policy for shipping foreign research reactor fuel and noted that the fuel is being brought to the U.S. to limit the proliferation of nuclear materials. The domestic research reactor fuel is currently stored at originating sites, which are primarily at major universities around the country. He discussed the criteria being used to set priorities for domestic research reactor fuel shipments, and likely schedules for those shipments, as well as foreign research reactor fuel, and naval reactors fuel. Mr. Hoel also briefly discussed general and specific (e.g., physical security) regulations and legislation governing spent nuclear fuel shipments by EM-37. In response to an inquiry about good sources of public information on DOE's spent nuclear fuel programs, Mr. Hoel suggested the Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) for each program are probably the best sources of information.

Office of Site Operations

Mr. Larry Blalock discussed DOE's transportation activities for mixed-waste. Larry Harmon, Director of Waste Operations (EM-32) was originally scheduled to give this presentation but was unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Blalock described the types of mixed waste and listed their generating and storage locations. Thirty sites have DOE mixed waste. However, ninety percent of the mixed waste is stored at twelve sites, and only four sites (INEL, Y-12, Savannah River Site (SRS), and K-25) store 70 percent. He noted that a copy of a report by Mr. Harmon's office was available at the registration desk.

The Federal Facilities Compliance Act of 1992 (FFCA) drives DOE's mixed waste program. The program has limited resources and a short planning horizon in which to bring federal facilities into compliance with the FFCA. Mixed waste transportation is subject to a complex transportation regulatory environment. Critical hazardous waste transportation requirements

cover pre-transportation activities for generators; the uniform hazardous waste manifest; and proper packaging, labelling and marking. Radioactive waste transportation regulations address packaging requirements based on waste activity levels. Given these complex requirements, characterization of mixed waste before transportation is critical to ensuring compliance throughout the storage, transportation, and disposal process.

Mr. Blalock followed the discussion of DOE's mixed waste program with a brief description of the cesium capsule return program. The capsules will pass through six states en route from the IOTTECH facility in Colorado to DOE's Hanford Site in Washington State. The BUSS packaging may be used to move the capsules. The package can contain up to sixteen capsules. The surface of the BUSS package is approximately 169 degrees fahrenheit. Tri-State Motor Transit Company of Joplin, Missouri, will be the carrier, and once the campaign begins, there will be approximately one shipment every 30 days. TRANSCOM will be used to track both the loaded and empty return shipments. Also, the Enhanced North American Standards for Motor Vehicles (i.e., the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) procedures) will be applied to the shipments with Colorado performing a pre-shipment inspection and Washington State performing a post-shipment inspection. A training program is being developed for emergency responders along the route from IOTTECH to Hanford. DOE is working with the Western Governors' Association (WGA) and western states to develop a transportation plan for returning the capsules. The entire shipping program will take about two years.

The capsule return program was launched when a capsule at the RSI facility in Decatur, Georgia, was thought to be defective. Capsules at the Iotech Facility and the ARECO wood processing facility in Lynchburg, Virginia, are not damaged, but will nonetheless be returned to the Hanford Site.

Following Mr. Blalock's comments on the Cesium Capsule Return Program, the panel adjourned.

DOE Emergency Response Assets

Wednesday, January 26

1:30 p.m. - 2:20 p.m.

Wes Taylor with the Office of Transportation Safeguards and Emergency Management within the Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Defense Programs (DP) discussed the emergency management response assets of DOE and introduced the seven components of the DOE Emergency Response Program. The components are as follows:

- Accident Response Group (ARG);
- Aerial Measuring Systems (AMS);
- Atmospheric Release Advisory Capability (ARAC);
- Federal Radiological Monitoring and Assessment Center (FRMAC);
- Nuclear Emergency Search Team (NEST);
- Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site (REAC/TS); and
- Radiological Assistance Program (RAP).

Mr. Taylor's presentation continued with a short video on DOE's Emergency Response Program.

After the video, Mr. Taylor briefly described the seven program elements and explained DP responsibilities at headquarters and in the field. Of the seven program elements, Mr. Taylor stated RAP is likely to be of most interest to Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) participants. In describing RAP, he noted that its resources are to supplement, not replace, local resources. RAP will be implemented for incidents involving DOE shipments and for other shipments only upon request by the responsible jurisdiction.

The extent to which RAP resources are used depends on the degree of the incident to which DOE is responding. The RAP response procedures are described in the Field Response Plan. The response provided by DOE depends on the information received from the requesting jurisdiction. Data collected by the RAP team during a response will be made available to local officials. The RAP team will assist local officials during incident closeout and provide recommendations during incident evaluation. In response to an inquiry about RAP team members, Mr. Taylor responded that the RAP teams consist of volunteers at DOE sites rather than a separate staff dedicated to emergency response. Volunteers, however, are experts in their particular fields. Mr. Taylor added that RAP teams do not respond to non-radioactive hazardous materials incidents, although they are being trained to an appropriate level such that local incident commanders are comfortable with RAP members entering an incident zone for radiological materials.

Issue Prioritization Results, *Process Plan*, and *Work Plan* Breakout Orientation

Wednesday, January 26

2:20 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.

Susan Smith discussed the procedures for the breakout sessions and the items to be discussed. She cautioned members that time would be available to discuss specific tasks during Thursday's breakouts and that members should concentrate on the prioritization and Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) documents during the afternoon's breakouts.

Issue Prioritization Results, *Process Plan* and *Work Plan* Breakout Session

Wednesday, January 26

2:45 pm - 5:30 pm

Group A

Breakout Group A, facilitated by Judith Holm, was asked to discuss the results of the task plan prioritization which were distributed to all TEC/WG participants prior to the meeting. The discussion revolved around both the actual survey results and the general prioritization process.

During the discussion, many questions were raised by the group. One participant questioned how new issues were sorted as they became identified. He and other group members felt longer term issues or problems should be considered separately from the relatively simple requests for information. Some of the prioritized activities are requests for information that can be handled quickly, with relative ease. A separate listing of issues would clarify the true priorities of the group.

A TEC/WG member recommended that the Department of Energy (DOE) develop a layering system to rank tasks. He felt most of the important issues identified through TEC/WG could be categorized on a one to four scale as follows:

- 1 = TEC/WG meeting recommendation;
- 2 = DOE change policy;
- 3 = DOE provide information; and
- 4 = Presentation requested.

The group also discussed the small number of survey responses. One TEC/WG member felt DOE should not plan work based on, in some cases, only 10 responses. He agreed the group needed to weed out unimportant issues that may cloud the ranking results.

One participant questioned the validity of the rankings. He believed the issues, as ranked by importance, may be biased by the current composition of TEC/WG. The real population might

have a different agenda than the small group of stakeholders attending the meeting.

The group went back and identified the actual issues as opposed to requests for information or tasks that were simple fixes. The following activities were identified as issues by the group.

I. General Planning

- a. Develop recommendations for coordinating Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) Section 180(c) with existing state, tribal, and local governments.
- b. Develop a process for an ongoing review of the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) and 180(c) strategies, including identifying how and when the public should be brought into the decision making process.

II. Safe Routine Transportation

- a. Establish notification for NWPA consistent with DOE policy.
- b. Adopt DOE bad weather and road condition criteria.
- c. Develop a definition of safe routine transportation considering participant suggestions.
- e. Create an outline for a study to look at the escort concept.
- i. Support tribal effort to amend Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations on notification.
- j. Address the topic of special and dedicated trains.

III. Inspection and Enforcement

- b. Work with DOT, NRC, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to build a coordinated incident reporting system.
- c. Discuss an ideal enforcement program.
- e. Better define the DOE approach to inspection and enforcement.
- j. Look at state, tribal, and local inspection, enforcement, and involvement with safe routine transport of rail shipments.
- p. Set up a briefing on Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act

(HMTUSA) for the next meeting.

- r. Utilities planning spent nuclear fuel (SNF) shipments should be asked to subscribe to Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) enhanced procedures.
- t. CVSA enhanced procedures should be reviewed to determine if such enhancements can be applied to the Federal Railroad Administration procedures.
- w. DOE should develop a task plan for studying issues relevant to a rail inspection program.

IV. Emergency Management

- a. Study railroad emergency response policies and initiate interactions regarding implementation of Section 180(c).
- b. Develop guidance for mutual aid agreements. (The group believed this was an issue, but it needed to be reworded.)
- g. In terms of standardizing response levels, consider making initial classification of an observable condition, factor in local response capabilities, and help responders understand DOE's support role.

V. Training

- f. Develop model scenarios to help identify minimum training requirements for first responders.
- g. Build training into existing certification programs.
- h. TEC/WG organizations should draft problem statements and/or identify the problem [of training] from their perspective, using information and issues discussed during the breakout session.
- j. TEC/WG could develop and provide to DOE a hypothetical bounding case or cases for different types of potential accidents. Emergency response training could then be built to address the needs identified in those cases.

VI. Technical Assistance

- c. Refine the definition for technical assistance and address resources for, among other things, detection devices, and technical in-kind financial resources.

During this identification process some discussion occurred regarding the definition of an issue versus an action. It was suggested that anything TEC/WG felt to be an issue should be defined as an issue. The group clarified that in some cases there were actions as written that could lead to underlying issues. For the time being, these activities were identified simply as actions to be taken by DOE. However, underlying issues will surface over time.

The group quickly walked through the five steps of the *Process Plan* flow chart. The group had the following questions.

In Step II, one member felt TEC/WG members needed an appeal mechanism if DOE disagreed with something they had identified as an issue. He went on to say, "We need to give TEC/WG a chance to rebut."

Another member responded that DOE had the final say on all issues and would be held responsible by the stakeholders for those decisions. Another replied that, to keep stakeholders happy, TEC/WG needed a way to revisit issues DOE felt were outside of their purview or not relevant to the group's goals. The group concluded that Item Seven in Step II should feed back into Step I, thus allowing for reintroduction of the issue by a TEC/WG member.

One participant said the term issue in the document should not be used to define importance.

Regarding Step V, the group discussed how to determine when an issue is resolved. TEC/WG should not be based on a majority rule. If a single stakeholder has a continuing concern after TEC/WG has determined that an activity is closed, this should not affect the stakeholder's status as a member of TEC/WG. Individual TEC/WG members, as private stakeholders, should continue one-on-one discussions with DOE on the issue, however, these discussions should not result in a change of status as a TEC/WG member.

The group then discussed the *Resource Notebook*. Judith Holm began by explaining that the *Resource Notebook* was intended for TEC/WG members to use in distributing information to their groups. She asked the members to provide DOE with comments over the next month.

The participants agreed that the *Resource Notebook* should not be controlled, but it is important that the membership has updated information. Misinformation tends to hang on within the groups, so it is helpful to have dates on every document sent to TEC/WG members. Also, there was a request for a one page update to be handed out at each TEC/WG meeting explaining the status of each section in the notebook and stating when it had been updated last (e.g., Section 2 was updated on pg. 6-8 on January 26, 1994). The group also felt there was a need to designate all material in the notebook as draft material to avoid confusion between draft documents in official notebooks.

The group also talked about the creation of a TEC/WG computer bulletin board with generic access for all TEC/WG members. The information on the system would be formatted as read

only. Tony Thomas volunteered to look into developing such a system and indicated he would try to develop a test plan with one stakeholder to see how the system could work. In the interim however, the group felt hard copy was still necessary for the main documents.

The group then participated in an open discussion regarding TEC/WG. One TEC/WG member noted that the process is working.

One group member asked about the role comparative risk plays in TEC/WG. She felt comparative risk should be used with Environmental Impact/Assessments, and DOE needed to separate risk perception from risk analysis. The group went on to discuss risk communication and concluded that this would continue to be an important factor in dealing with radioactive transportation issues. The conclusion that was reached was that communicating risk was a function of the institutional branch of DOE.

Group B

Wally Weaver facilitated and opened the session by reviewing the three primary documents which will be used to direct discussion during the breakout. Following his brief description, participants examined the matrix comparing DOE budgeted tasks to TEC/WG priorities. There was limited discussion concerning the matrix. It was suggested participants discuss the tasks from the General Planning area. It was noted that the task originally pertained to Section 180(c) and the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) was split into two separate tasks.

A TEC/WG member asked if suggestions made at earlier meetings not appearing in the *Work Plan* under one of the seven topical areas had been dropped. It was explained that tasks that are not included in one of the groups were categorized as not in DOE's purview and do not appear in the *Work Plan* or the prioritization list. The original analysis of the group's list of tasks can be made available for members to review if they are interested.

At the request of a participant, the facilitator ran through several examples of what actions DOE will take with respect to a particular task based on the priority given to it in the prioritization exercise. Another TEC/WG member asked if column five in the matrix indicated that DOE has dedicated resources for FY94-95 to a particular task. The response was yes, but noted that certain tasks could possibly need additional resources to implement the entire tasks as defined by DOE and TEC/WG.

One TEC/WG member asked how a task will be addressed if it was originally proposed by an individual and only that individual continues to express an interest in it. The facilitator responded that even though one individual raised the task, the ranking indicates the interest in the task by the entire group or, more specifically, those responding to the survey. Thus the prioritization exercise controls for single-interest recommendations.

Participants were asked to consider how new tasks should be prioritized in relation to previously ranked tasks. A member suggested that the group revise the prioritized list every few meetings to account for changes in TEC/WG membership and DOE program progress. The facilitator suggested that the highest priority issues are likely to remain high priority regardless of when and how often all tasks are ranked.

Several participants stated that they never received the prioritization letter. Thus the ranked list does not reflect the interests of the entire group. It was also noted that the results may not be valid for statistical reasons. It was suggested sending the letter again immediately following this meeting. Furthermore, he suggested that DOE should not expect to prioritize TEC/WG recommendations at the meeting. Members need time to get input from their constituents. Prioritization within each of the seven topical areas was also suggested. This would avoid the problem of emergency management related tasks being more heavily weighted (i.e., skewed) simply because the TEC/WG membership is bent toward emergency management-related organizations. It was pointed out, however, that limited DOE resources may necessitate comparison of tasks across the seven topical areas.

The group was asked to consider those items which were identified on the prioritization list as unclear. Items were designated as unclear if only one individual responded that it was unclear to them. The group agreed that items on that list should be addressed during the breakout sessions on specific tasks and noted that many of them are already being addressed.

The group then discussed the TEC/WG documents. The facilitator noted that everyone attending the meeting will receive a copy of the *TEC/WG Resource Notebook*, although only one organizational representative will receive changes or updates to the material in the notebook. Representatives will then be responsible for subsequent distribution to their constituents or other interested parties.

Participants were asked if there was other material which should be added to the notebook. Group members requested that DOE clearly mark material to be added to the notebook. Updated material will be mailed with clear instructions for adding and subtracting material. A request was made that any changes to material in the notebook be made using strike throughs to help readers determine what is in fact different from the previous version. It was also suggested that the TEC/WG documents be placed on an electronic bulletin board or supplied on disk to members.

The *TEC/WG Process Plan* and the five steps of the issue resolution process were reviewed. It was noted that the task plans developed by DOE will be reviewed by the TEC/WG during the breakout sessions on Thursday. This review represents Step III in the issue resolution process. The group members were reminded that the flow chart in the *Process Plan* reflects the text of the *Process Plan*, and they should review it and provide DOE with their comments. He added that current TEC/WG recommendations are at various steps in the process. Concern was expressed that there was no method in the flow chart to review the goals for each of the

topical areas. Mr. Weaver suggested that it was implicit in box 17 of the flow chart that goals would be evaluated along with objectives. However this could be made explicit by adding the term goals to box 17.

The group agreed that the goals as written were sufficiently broad to accommodate any future adjustments TEC/WG might want to make. They also agreed that future issues or recommendations made by TEC/WG members could be incorporated into TEC/WG's deliberations as specific objectives.

A participant asked if the prioritization exercise was related to box four on the flow chart. The facilitator replied affirmatively but noted that box four had yet to be completely defined. It was suggested that the review portion of box four take place at TEC/WG meetings while prioritization takes place later to allow TEC/WG members to communicate with their respective organizations.

The group was asked how the text of the *Process Plan* could be clarified to reflect the role of TEC/WG as explained during the opening plenary. A TEC/WG member replied that the phrase "primary mechanism" heightened concern about the role of TEC/WG in relation to existing groups working with DOE. It was pointed out that the phrase referenced relates to a department-wide mechanism rather than a program specific mechanism. This is in keeping with the role defined in the opening plenary. Group members agreed that the problem could be handled by adding a sentence explaining that DOE programs will continue working with stakeholder organizations to examine program specific issues, and TEC/WG will address higher level policy questions affecting all programs. They agreed that, with clarification of this wording, the *Process Plan* would be acceptable. A clarifying statement will be submitted to the entire TEC/WG during the breakout group reports.

Following a short break, the group began discussing the *TEC/WG Work Plan*. It was explained that the *Work Plan* has evolved from basically a listing of the group's recommendations to a document which provides a context for those recommendations. It was further explained that there are terminology discrepancies between the *Work Plan*, *Process Plan*, and DOE task plans which must be clarified.

Participants were asked if they had any additional comments on the prioritization effort, TEC/WG documents, or TEC/WG in general. One participant felt TEC/WG was well organized and purposeful. Another agreed and added that the group's effectiveness overall and within breakout sessions is enhanced by the fact that a DOE person is facilitating the sessions. The facilitator responded that, as one of the DOE program managers responsible for addressing recommendations of the TEC/WG, he found it useful to facilitate breakout sessions because he can be sure what the group is recommending and respond to inquires about his areas of responsibility.

A TEC/WG member felt that TEC/WG documents, with the change noted earlier, are much

better than at the Chicago meeting. However, he did request that TEC/WG-related material be sent to members much earlier. Group members confirmed that DOE committed to a sixty-day lead time on any material on which it expects the membership to provide comments. The facilitator stated that he would, in some instances, prefer providing members with material at the meeting, asking them to respond either within a specified time period following the meeting or at the next meeting. Also, he noted that time constraints at meetings limits the amount of time that can be devoted to task implementation (i.e., gathering task specific information from group members).

It was proposed that TEC/WG-related material be provided via electronic mail to those members with such capability. A member agreed that would be useful and added responses could be returned to DOE electronically as well. Paper copies could be sent out for those without electronic capability. Breakout participants agreed the volume of mailed and meeting material was a problem and DOE should pursue electronic document exchange. They also agreed the TEC/WG process and documents are shaping up nicely. It was added that with the TEC/WG process essentially in place, it will be interesting to see if the substantive work of the group can move forward just as efficiently.

To ensure important material (e.g., the prioritization letter) is received by members, participants requested that DOE make at least one follow-up call or mailing. They agreed, however, that DOE is not responsible for hounding members for their action or response. Members are responsible for supplying DOE with some sort of response to requests even if that response is negative.

Mr. Harris, Transportation Emergency Preparedness Manager for the WIPP Project Division, commented that in addition to being useful for TEC/WG member organizations, addressing TEC/WG recommendations and preparing for TEC/WG meetings has helped DOE program personnel learn about issues affecting other programs. The facilitator noted that DOE will continue its monthly meetings to report to each other about the status of their TEC/WG-related activities as well as plan for the next meeting. Mr. Taylor added that his office (DP-23) is relatively new to TEC/WG, but he appreciated being involved to learn about other DOE programs and understand stakeholder concerns.

In recapping the issues to be reported back to the plenary, the topic of prioritization was again discussed. Prioritizing issues after every meeting was suggested. It was suggested doing it annually to coincide with the DOE budget process with it noted however, that prioritization skewing detracts from the usefulness of the ranked issues to dictate budget priorities. It was generally agreed that the priority list, because of flaws in the survey methodology and biases inherent in TEC/WG's makeup, cannot be used alone to reflect TEC/WG's priorities.

Group C

Group C was led by Susan Smith. The group began its session with a general discussion of the prioritization process and results. Initial comments included a caution against using the prioritization as an end product—instead it should be used as a guide. One TEC/WG member felt that some issues showed up as priorities because they could be accomplished quickly. He suggested that upcoming shipping campaigns be examined to identify priorities. Another TEC/WG member indicated that he did not see anything in the tasks that relate to lessons learned from actual events. As a new member, he also requested that member organizations provide a statement of what they do and why they are involved in TEC/WG. This would be useful orientation material for new members in understanding the group.

The facilitator proceeded by posing a question to the group for consideration: how are new tasks integrated into the process.

Participants in the group continued with additional comments. A TEC/WG member requested that appropriate reference materials be included when materials were sent out for review. Specifically, he mentioned there were numerous references to Section 180(c) and it would be useful to have a copy of this section of legislation. He also asked how the results are being interpreted as far as the ranking of the issues are concerned, explaining that the group hears the views of those who are talking and this does not necessarily reflect everyone's views. Further, he wanted to know if a process is in place to follow-up that available resources (e.g., training aids) are being utilized and if there was a mechanism to determine if the group has accomplished what it set out to achieve.

In regards to the prioritization, a participant commented that there are different perspectives among the group as to what issues are priorities. He suggested that it might be useful to do the prioritization every other meeting.

The facilitator responded to the general comments noting that tasks identified by the group will be reviewed at every meeting to show their status. She agreed that a follow-up prioritization could be useful and noted that it would be helpful to DOE if it coincided with the budget process. Perhaps the task of prioritizing issues could become a permanent process for TEC/WG.

The discussion continued with a clarification concerning training. It was explained that training examined by TEC/WG does not encompass all training. Training issues for TEC/WG focus on training for radiological emergencies.

Discussion then returned to the question concerning a mechanism to determine accomplishments. A member inquired if that question meant, is DOE doing something to verify that it is hitting its targets and hitting them adequately. If this is the question, DOE should redirect it back to the TEC/WG membership. For instance in the case of training, DOE

cannot answer the question of how effective the training is. One reason TEC/WG is here is for members to respond to issues such as—is training effective, is it too much, is it too little?

It was suggested that it would be relatively simple to conduct a random sampling of pertinent organizations to determine the knowledge level and this could be used as a baseline to measure the level of change over time. He emphasized going back to the lessons learned for the process and the identification of issues.

Another member agreed that learning from past experiences is important. He also thought it is important for TEC/WG to get information from groups that are under TEC/WG represented organizations. He noted this was part of the responsibilities of TEC/WG members. He also commented one thing lacking in the *Process Plan* is a reality check to determine if issues which are put into practice are effective.

The facilitator responded that the idea of bringing members of this group together is the reality check and the issues that are raised are often those things which are not being addressed.

A participant disagreed that TEC/WG members should be considered the experts. He explained that there is not enough data available because of the low probability of occurrence of the emergencies being discussed. DOE could get to the experts through a good random sample.

It was noted that DOE maintains (on behalf of DOT, DOE, and NRC) the Radioactive Materials Incident Response (RMIR) database. However, the member did not believe the type of analysis that was suggested had been conducted.

One member thought an evaluation of RMIR would be useful. However he pointed out that the right answers are not found unless the right questions are asked. It would be necessary to review the data collection for RMIR to ensure that the correct questions are being asked.

Another member suggested clarifying the role of TEC/WG in issue formulation. In response, it was asked how issues can be formulated without looking at lessons learned from past experiences. The member responded that was where TEC/WG fit in. Another participant disagreed.

One participant noted that State Emergency Response Commissions (SERCs) have the responsibilities for collecting data from the Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs). Data is available for relatively few incidents. It was explained that RMIR contains data from reports to DOT and from other sources; however, DOE has no way to assure "all" incidents are reported. It would be possible to run evaluations on information that DOE has.

TEC/WG member thought this would be most expedient and effective. He suggested utilizing the SERCs to obtain information from transportation and fixed facilities.

A TEC/WG member from DOE's Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel and Special Projects indicated that her office had recently held scoping meetings on the Foreign Research Reactor (FRR) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). They had received more than two thousand comments. She said the comments helped put things in perspective—of the thousands of shipments, there have been relatively few accidents. A study of the data would show this.

From the discussion, the group concluded that it was necessary to build lessons learned into the process of identifying new issues. The group also thought the issue of prioritization needs to be revisited through an annual prioritization survey to ensure that the correct issues are being addressed.

Before continuing with a discussion on the *Resource Notebook*, Ms. Smith told the group she receives letters from TEC/WG members between meetings. She wanted to know if members would be interested in receiving copies of the letters. It was suggested that a list of the letters with a short summary of the points made be developed and distributed to the members. If members were interested in particular letters, they could let her know. The issue of the feasibility of electronic transfer for information exchange between the group was raised. The group expressed an interest in this.

At this point, the discussion turned to focus on the *Resource Notebook*. The facilitator briefly reviewed the sections in the notebook and asked the participants for their comments on the notebook.

One TEC/WG member noted that it would be helpful if a brief description of the offices accompanied the organizational charts. Several TEC/WG members thought the notebook was a good idea. A suggestion was made to include identifiers on the pages to indicate which revision the page is and to ensure people have current versions.

The floor was opened for general discussion on TEC/WG noting that meeting agendas were usually quite full and structured and this would give the participants an opportunity to let DOE know what they thought of the meetings.

One participant was encouraged with the progress that has been made, especially during the last six months. While a lot of material has been distributed, he was glad to get it. He thought the *Resource Notebook* showed a lot of thought and the *Process Plan* was a good start and something that TEC/WG members had requested. He was also encouraged by DOE participation.

Another member of the group noted that she appreciated the opportunity to meet with DOE and other groups participating in TEC/WG. She noted that there were some issues which

needed to be clarified but thought they would be addressed in the breakouts on Thursday. One issue that concerned her is getting needed information to regulators at the right time.

Another participant who was attending the meeting as an observer said that TEC/WG was helpful because he was able to find out things from other groups and learn valuable information.

A TEC/WG member indicated that it was valuable to hear the different perspectives which are presented at TEC/WG, but problems could arise in terms of which issues are addressed by the group. He expressed concern about TEC/WG being the primary stakeholder forum for DOE transportation activities. He was glad to see the presentation on shipping activities and inquired if there were any plans for a written document to this effect.

Another observer noted that the administration of the meeting had been superlative. He did not have a comment on the content of the meeting at this point, but was glad to see DOE moving to a position of openness.

One TEC/WG member said she benefited from the meetings. As a representative of law enforcement, she said it was sad to become aware of all the information available that would be beneficial to law enforcement, but she was previously unaware. She suggested that it might be helpful if participants could decide which breakouts to attend—they could choose sessions which match their interests and experiences.

Another TEC/WG member thought the direction of TEC/WG was becoming more crystallized. He suggested allowing the group to further discuss the prioritization and hear DOE's rationalization for funding what it does.

One participant found the meetings to be well organized and thought the *Resource Notebook* was a good idea.

The last member in the group said he did not envy the attempt to integrate the different points of view. However, he was glad to see it being done as there are issues which need to be addressed.

The group spent a limited amount of time discussing the role of TEC/WG. Concern was raised about TEC/WG being the primary forum for stakeholder interaction on DOE transportation issues. One member stated that the role was clear, however, it was inaccurately stated as the primary forum in TEC/WG documents. It was agreed that changing sentences in the *Process Plan* and the *Work Plan* would alleviate the inconsistency.

The final issue the group considered was the budgeting of tasks. The facilitator indicated that the groups would probably go through each task during the breakouts on Thursday with DOE managers, and questions could be answered then. She said that to date, TEC/WG has not

come up with any issues that are not being considered and/or funded by DOE. One participant asked if the number of tasks under a topic affected budgeting decisions. The facilitator responded while it is not possible to tie money to tasks, as more work is brought up, more tasks will be written and more money will be spent.

A general comment about funding concerns was made. One participant believed that it might be cheaper to hold TEC/WG meetings in the D.C. area. This would reduce travel expenses of bringing DOE personnel to locations such as Dallas. It was noted that having meetings in D.C. had both positive and negative factors. One drawback is that DOE personnel can easily be pulled out of the meetings by their superiors if they are in the D.C. area. However, it would be beneficial to be in the D.C. area because it would be possible to get higher level personnel to attend.

Another member of the group noted that if meetings were to be held in the D.C. area that there would be the drawback of the TEC/WG members being greatly outnumbered by DOE personnel.

A final suggestion was to have the meetings in a fixed location.

Reports on Issue Prioritization Results, *Process Plan*, and *Work Plan* Breakout Session

Thursday, January 27
8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

Thursday morning began with a plenary session in which each group reported on their breakout sessions from the previous afternoon. Following is a consolidated list summarizing the groups' comments that was compiled from the viewgraphs used during the presentations.

Prioritization Results

- Group recommends we distinguish between three types of items and restructure survey by:
 - issues
 - actions
 - information
- Responses may not reflect importance of items to other constituents
- Items from original list of recommendations not included in the prioritization letter
- Prioritization
 - completing it
 - reprioritization (how, when)
 - skewing (values and budget)
- Use the results as a general guide
- Do follow-up on prioritization
 - yearly to support budget planning
 - base on actual shipments need to re-prioritize
- Need to discuss how budget matches up with prioritization

Process Plan

- Two items missing from flow chart
 - Step II, item 7 needs feedback loop
 - Step V, TEC/WG majority agreement may not mean issue resolved
- Ask for written comments on *Process Plan*
- Good, but needs refinement (suggested revision: TEC/WG is structured to promote broad-based input in the DOE's program activities. An endorsement from the Secretary of Energy is being sought to establish TEC/WG as the primary mechanism for involving stakeholders in Department-wide transportation-related policy decisions. As in the past, DOE will continue to work with appropriate organizations and jurisdictions to identify and resolve program- or shipment-specific issues.)

- TEC/WG is a two-way process
 - not a decision-making body
 - identifies issues
 - provides feedback

Resource Notebook

- Comments to be given in next 30 days - categories
- Controlled document not needed
 - need to closely track updates
 - provide list of what is updated
 - draft dates
- Format - paper or . . . ?
 - TEC/WG computer bulletin board for updates
 - provide electronic notebooks for TEC/WG members
 - develop a test plan
 - still a need for hard copy
- *Work Plan* useful, but terminology must be consistent with other documents
- Electronic transfer of TEC/WG material
 - who has capability
- Too much paper
 - Flag material to be added to Resource Notebook
- Provide basic resource material (i.e., legislation)
- Include descriptive paragraph of member groups and DOE offices
- Develop revision process

Interests of the Members

- Process valued
- What role does comparative risk plan in TEC/WG deliberations
 - risk may not be the real issue
- TEC/WG role in working issues and tasks
- Do members want to be involved in work?
- Material distribution (60 days vs. at the meetings)
- Tasks plan requirements for members may be too much for meetings (must be coordinated among all task plans)
- DOE should make one follow-up call per member organization on important items (e.g., prioritization letter)
- Generally on right track with process and documents (members recognize that their voices are being heard)
- Need document describing upcoming DOE shipments
- Allow members to choose which breakout sessions they attend

- Hold meetings in locations which reduce DOE/contractor travel costs
 - Washington, D.C.
 - Las Vegas
 - Fixed vs. revolving location
- Clarify role of TEC/WG
 - the forum to receive broad input for DOE to develop and improve DOE-wide transportation policy
 - program specific stakeholders continue to address program specific issues in existing forums
 - clarify in *Process Plan*, charter, *Work Plan*

Following the reports a participant stated that the issue of membership must once again be considered by the group. He also stated that the secretarial endorsement being pursued by DOE should be applicable within the DOE organization to ensure that individual programs are responsive to the TEC/WG initiative. Ms. Smith responded that membership issues will be discussed in the final plenary on Friday. In the meantime, she asked the meeting participants to consider what criteria might be applied to determine membership.

DOE Transportation Information Network

Thursday, January 27

9:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.

Tony Thomas of the Transportation Management Division (TMD), gave a presentation on the Department of Energy's (DOE) Transportation Information Network (TIN). Mr. Thomas began by explaining that the purpose of TIN was to integrate existing information systems. Mr. Thomas included a diagram in his handouts which illustrated how the automation efforts integrate into the mission.

Mr. Thomas continued by explaining some of the different automation services currently in use. TRANSNET is a publicly accessible system used by DOE, the Department of Transportation (DOT), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and approximately 15 states. The Radioactive Materials Incident Report (RMIR) is used by DOE, DOT, NRC, and possibly FEMA. RMIR allows for both input and use of data.

Mr. Thomas' handouts included a copy of the TIN user access form. He explained the form should be completed if an individual wants to gain access to TIN. The form was designed to meet certain computer security rules.

The data in TIN will be updated approximately quarterly. Mr. Thomas indicated that as information systems become available, the procedures will stay consistent for additional access. Documentation will be upgraded to inform users of additional systems as they become available.

Mr. Thomas focused on issues which had been raised during the sessions held on Wednesday. One issue was the use of a bulletin board for the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) to facilitate electronic transfer of information. Mr. Thomas indicated such a bulletin board would be feasible on TRANSNET.

Mr. Thomas discussed TRANSCOM and encouraged participants to visit the TRANSCOM exhibit on display at the meeting. Mr. Thomas explained that TRANSCOM is DOE's satellite tracking system which has been developed over the last several years. TRANSCOM uses satellite capability, and because it cannot pinpoint locations, the department plans to look at GPS systems. Mr. Thomas expects that the department will probably do a study this year to look at the progression of technology.

TRANSCOM access can be requested and Mr. Thomas indicated that most western states have accounts as do state environmental protection offices and highway patrol offices. Users are provided with a disk explaining the structure. User workshops are conducted at Oak Ridge.

Mr. Thomas explained that TRANSCOM has more restrictions than other publicly accessible systems and therefore has greater overhead costs because of the access controls. At this point, Mr. Thomas opened the floor for questions.

One member of the group made the following three comments: documentation in a data base on incidents as opposed to accidents would be useful for risk management; he indicated he had never seen good, historical data on naval reactor shipments; and data on routine transportation management would be useful, particularly in areas of delays and re-routing because of weather and construction.

Another participant in the group responded to a comment concerning additional data from incidents. She noted that in one respect, gathering the information can become counterproductive. The more times the driver inspects the load, the more the driver is exposed to radiation, making the driver a radiation worker.

A suggestion was made regarding the use of TRANSNET. Heavy users of the system might consider getting a leased line to reduce noise which is often encountered on ordinary telephone lines.

Mr. Thomas concluded by asking participants to let DOE know what data they are interested in since many data bases may already exist. He noted that some problems are encountered with existing data because it may be in the wrong format, delaying access.

Following the presentation by Mr. Thomas, Ms. Smith noted that the DOT Mode and Route Study is available for comments and a Federal Register Notice has been posted. DOE will submit comments and she invited TEC/WG members to submit their comments.

Annual Operating Plan for EM's Office of Special Programs

Thursday, January 27

9:30 am - 10:00 am

Mr. Brancato gave a presentation on the Office of Special Program's (OSP) Annual Operating Plan (AOP). Mr. Brancato stated that one of Secretary O'Leary's primary goals is to improve information accessibility and stakeholder input into the department. Mr. Brancato displayed a viewgraph of the secretary's priorities, the corresponding strategic goals of the Department's Environmental Quality Team, and the corresponding Environmental Management (EM) Program Goals as defined by Assistant Secretary Thomas Grumbly. The goals were then further refined into program goals for EM, and many relate to what the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) is trying to accomplish. Mr. Brancato explained how those higher level goals relate to the operational goals of the Office of Special Programs. OSP's goals are defined in the AOP. TEC/WG members will be provided a copy of the AOP upon request. Mr. Brancato added that issues defined by the TEC/WG falling within OSP's purview will find their way into the AOP. Thus, the AOP is a yard stick to measure OSP's progress in meeting its commitment to the TEC/WG.

Status of Existing Task Plans and Introduction of New Draft Task Plans Breakout Session

Thursday, January 27, 10:45 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Friday, January 28, 8:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.

Larry Blalock, Judith Holm, Susan Smith, and Wally Weaver facilitated the breakout sessions under this topic. The managers rotated among the three breakout groups, conducting their breakout session for each group. Each group had the opportunity to discuss issues under the seven Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG) topic areas (General Planning, Safe Routine Transportation, Inspection and Enforcement, Emergency Management, Training, Technical Assistance, and Public Information and Education) with the responsible Department of Energy (DOE) manager.

General Planning and Public Information and Education Breakout Session

Ms. Holm facilitated the breakout sessions on General Planning and Public Information and Education. Each group devoted time to the topic of General Planning, although two groups spent considerably more time on this topic than the third breakout group. The comments that follow resulted from the discussions on General Planning.

General Planning Discussion

Participants had the following comments on the general planning question of whether the purpose of TEC/WG was to help policy or give DOE issues/problems that TEC/WG needs to address.

One participant observed that he viewed TEC/WG as an opportunity for those at the grass roots (the bottom people) to provide their perspective on DOE's plans—to tell the top guys this is what it's like down here. Another commented that TEC/WG members do not always know what the major questions are and that their role is to represent a lot of people; provide input for the people in the field. A third summarized the general feeling that the key was for TEC/WG members to feel comfortable that DOE considered TEC/WG members' input to reach decisions.

Decision making and TEC/WG involvement was also addressed during General Planning discussions. A member in one breakout group distinguished between being a part of a decision and providing input on a decision. She pointed out that if you are part of the decision-making process, you have to take responsibility for the decision. She did not think TEC/WG members could do this and that DOE alone has authority to make decisions. TEC/WG could, however, contribute to the second type of decision. DOE can take the advice of external groups; thus, TEC/WG input feeds into the decision that the agency reaches. She pointed to areas of transportation planning where DOE could get ahead of the game by

seeking outside input. An example cited was cask design. DOE knows what campaigns are going to take place, and it is useful for the agency to get TEC/WG input early in the process.

A DOE legal representative stated that she knew of no law that would permit any group to take DOE's decision-making authority and that it was very clear that TEC/WG should provide suggestions and recommendations. She could not see how anyone would think that DOE does not have responsibility for decisions.

It was noted that the perception that TEC/WG was a policy-making group may exist and that a member could complain to the secretary that DOE had not followed what TEC/WG had agreed on. A DOE participant emphasized that it was important for DOE to confirm that it had heard TEC/WG viewpoints and to explain, if necessary, why DOE did not follow what TEC/WG had agreed on. A state representative commented that he did not disagree with DOE having decision-making authority, but felt there may be an over-sensitivity about DOE's turf being invaded. It appeared to him that the essential issue was one of accountability, and a distinction should be made between accountability and decision-making authority. TEC/WG's role is to make recommendations and DOE should be accountable.

Additional comments on TEC/WG and decision making included the need for DOE to find a way to let TEC/WG know that its input had been considered when it was not adopted. It was suggested that a formalized method be developed for doing this. A DOE representative stated that there are some examples of how DOE does this (e.g., debriefing after a bid or responding to all comments on a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document) and that he would welcome any suggestions from the group.

One participant noted that statements such as TEC/WG becoming the primary means of input which had been written on a flip chart during the meeting could foster the perception that TEC/WG is a policy-making body. DOE staff responded that the statement had been erased to avoid any misconceptions.

A participant in one breakout session commented that he was concerned—indeed overwhelmed—by this administration's effort to open things up and that stakeholders were beginning to think they are helping set policy for DOE. He expressed concern that some TEC/WG members might think they are setting policy and believed that it was important for all members to have a realistic understanding that TEC/WG is not a policy-making body. He envisioned three roles for TEC/WG:

- identify issues,
- assess what will work, and
- incorporate an appeal process.

He also emphasized that the simpler the process, the easier it is to make things work. He conceives of General Planning as a process in which DOE managers continue to demonstrate

and report back on how issues are being factored into plans and budgets and explain why things had or had not been done.

Discussion during the General Planning portion of the breakout sessions also focused on integration between DOE offices. A representative from the field observed that a general concern that needed to be addressed is the inability of some members to understand why DOE as an organization has no way to address coordination issues between all programs (e.g., training).

An Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) representative stated that, in his opinion, the agency did undertake planning as a science but the key is how planning is done and whether the agency was getting information so plans are integrated and complete. This soon links into policy making. Traditionally, DOE had adopted a decide/announce/defend approach; however, the agency is now trying to change how it makes decisions. Proceeding in this way increases DOE's accountability and the process also gives TEC/WG some idea of how difficult it is to change. Overall, DOE does feel that it is getting input sooner and in a collegial manner.

A tribal representative commented that he was trying to be optimistic. When he first became involved in the mid-80s, he tried to contact a DOE person and got no response. He stated that he represented only a part of the Indian world and that it was important to maintain communication with tribes. He commented that there were obstacles to achieving this. For example, the process of establishing the cooperative agreement for the group that he represented had taken longer than previous years; as a result, he had been unable to keep in contact with the tribes or commit to tribes attending the TEC/WG meeting. Each of the programs needed to take that extra step. He also emphasized that risk management (how you put values into an equation) was a major tribal concern. The American Religious Freedom Act values of Indian tribes are what tribes care about.

Other comments received during discussion of General Planning included the problem that is encountered in communication with the media in the transportation area. A participant expressed the opinion that DOE could do a lot of preventative work in this area. If a member of the press understood, it may be possible to make the information more understandable to the public and develop a level of comfort with the media. He also recommended that DOE read up on literature on news media and disasters, noting that NRC had done a report on this.

Another participant pointed out that the problem was much bigger than this noting local reporters, in general, have an inadequate background in science.

Concern was raised regarding DOE's public involvement efforts. It was questioned whether DOE is putting more emphasis on demonstrating public involvement. He was critical of the amount of time that had been allowed for commenters to review the recent DOE policy on public involvement, remarking there were only two or three days to respond with comments.

RW's planning was briefly addressed in one breakout session. A participant emphasized that introduction of the multipurpose canister (MPC) would have considerable effect on RW's planning. He recommended that RW place more emphasis on interacting with railroads and with eastern states that will be affected by introduction of the MPC.

The final topic discussed under general planning was the planning documents. One participant recommended including an organizational roadmap—a chart with a brief paragraph or description of what people do. Other participants in the breakout urged DOE to give some thought to publishing the *TEC/WG Process Plan* for the public; they had found it be a concise, useful document.

General Planning Task Plan Review

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

Along with General Planning issues, the breakout groups also spent time discussing the task plans and accompanying documents which were included under General Planning. Task I-A., Coordinating Section 180(c) Implementation Plans was reviewed by the three groups. DOE requested that participants review the draft of the November 1992 options paper with their constituents and provide comments, noting to date that the only comments received were from the Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB). Participants asked to whom comments should be provided. They recommended that a person be identified as the contact for receiving TEC/WG comments on all documents and that a timeframe be specified. It was indicated that comments on the options paper should be received by the end of March. [Editor's Note: The deadline for comments was revised after the meeting. Comments are now requested prior to the July meeting.] In regards to this task, one participant emphasized the need for a firm schedule for implementing 180(c) in view of the imminent release of Nevada's routing document.

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

The groups also reviewed Task Plan I-B.1, Review and Revision of the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) Strategy Plan. One participant commented that the document omitted statements of support for private centers such as hospitals and physicians. He believed the reason for fragmentation was the lack of DOE interaction with other organizations. He said DOE needs to coordinate with other hazardous waste groups rather than doing training for radioactive waste only. In his opinion, DOE also needs to transcend transportation. [Editor's Note: TEPP is transportation.]

Further comments included the criticism of constant use of the words internal training in Section 3.6 of the strategy. The participant believed there should be more emphasis on training for state, local, and private organizations.

The final comment on the TEPP Strategy Plan was a request to add the National Association of Counties (NACO) to the list of organizations.

Ms. Holm requested that other comments be provided by April in time for the 1994 update of the document. [Editor's Note: The deadline for comments was revised after the meeting. Comments are now due by June 17, 1994.]

Task Plan I-B.2, the Transportation Institutional Policy

The groups commented on Task Plan I-B.2, the Transportation Institutional Policy. In one group, a participant asked how DOE identifies stakeholders and assures all stakeholders are being communicated with, not just public interest groups. She emphasized that a stakeholder is anybody who has an interest in the outcome. Therefore, DOE should be clear about its intentions. Specifically, what does DOE want TEC/WG members to be? Is TEC/WG intended to represent all stakeholders? DOE should identify what is wanted from this group. A useful strategy may be to develop a strawman definition to discuss with TEC/WG.

Another participant observed that there are probably reasons to have a group with membership such as TEC/WG. However, he advised that DOE needs to hear directly from outliers as well as TEC/WG members and TEC/WG may not be the best mechanism for this. He recommended this explanation be included in the Institutional Plan.

An additional comment emphasized that DOE needs information from people who could help them get the job done rather than stakeholder input and TEC/WG's role was to fulfill the former need.

It was suggested that DOE clarify the use of the term affected, which has a specific connotation under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA), noting that the term is used frequently in the document and in the Liaison and Communications Long Range Plan.

One group revisited the issue of integration raising the need for DOE coordination/integration. It was noted TEC/WG is forcing this integration.

The general response to the document was positive and each group expressed an interest in receiving full text of the document. DOE was commended for including tribes as well as states in the discussion. In one group, further guidance as to what participants should focus on in their comments was requested. It was indicated that full text of the document would be distributed following the meeting.

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

Two groups spent time discussing Task Plan I-B.3, the Liaison and Communications Long Range Plan. Ms. Holm explained that the purpose of the document is to help her plan for the

long term—to identify activities for which she must plan in order to fit in with other DOE plans and documents. She asked members to take the document to their constituencies, reviewing in particular the goals and objectives, and provide comments within sixty days. DOE would then revise the document and provide it to members at the next TEC/WG meeting.

A recommendation was made for DOE to place greater emphasis on the use of video productions and faster, more timely production of materials. Establishment of a central group to coordinate development of DOE information materials was also recommended.

One participant commended DOE for the documents, which he believed were exactly the types of documents TEC/WG needs to review as they provide a broad strategy.

Several specific comments were made concerning the document. One participant commented on "constraints" on page four and recommended that technical managers' job descriptions as well as performance evaluations should include a requirement for public participation. Another comment was that figure 3.2 did not provide much information. Additional comments must be made by the end of March.

Task Plan I-B.4, the *Program Manager's Guide to Transportation Planning*

The final task plan which two of the groups spent time discussing was I-B.4, the *Program Manager's Guide to Transportation Planning*. The facilitator indicated that planning sessions are currently under way with program offices to incorporate lessons learned. The intent is to subsequently have discussions with TEC/WG about what interactions need to take place.

Several participants were critical about the cartoons but were reassured that the document was for internal uses only. It was also recommended that DOE produce a video, using the cesium campaign as a demonstration, for use as a training tool.

Again, participants expressed an interest in receiving the full text of the document. [Editor's Note: Meetings are currently being held with internal program personnel to assess their needs. A revised draft of the document is expected prior to the July meeting].

Information Products Review

Information products were reviewed as part of the breakout sessions. Participants in the breakouts were given draft copies of the Spent Fuel Information Kit and the Cesium Information Kit. The facilitator asked the participants to review the material and provide any comments.

During the breakout session, there were no specific comments on the Spent Fuel Kit, however the booklet, *Transport of Radioactive Materials Q&A about Incident Response*, which is

included in the kit was praised. It was asked whether the booklet is being distributed at the local level, and the response was distribution had not been systematic, but that it had gone out in various ways.

There were several specific comments on the Cesium Information Kit. There was some disagreement on the level of detail. One participant was critical of the statement that risk is slight and recommended including some specific numbers. Another participant stated that from the local perspective the level of detail was fine and that more detailed information would pose problems (i.e., they would have to go into too much detail). However, it was noted that there was already a lot of detail on the chart. Another participant noted an error on temperature that was included in the material.

One participant was interested in the training mentioned in the kit. He asked whether DOE had provided training and queried whether locals have received training, as stated in the fact sheet. The facilitator responded that DOE is providing a training package to the states that will train responders up and down the corridor over the next few months.

Brenda Fleming with the Office of Spent Nuclear Fuels and Special Programs (EM-37) asked the breakout groups to review three draft fact sheets from her office, Foreign Research Reactor Spent Fuel Acceptance; Spent Nuclear Fuel; and Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage, Conditioning and Disposal. Evaluation forms were provided for comments.

A recommendation was made that more detail be provided in the fact sheet on foreign reactor spent fuel about what a spent fuel rod from a foreign reactor looks like. Members of the general public may think it is much more than it is—it should be related to the boiling water reactor (BWR) spent fuel assemblies with which the public is more familiar.

Appreciation was expressed for the presentation on spent fuel as the information underscores the need for advance information and also leads directly to questions about potential routes.

Participants with comments on the fact sheets were asked to return marked up copies by the end of the meeting. It was explained that EM-37 is interested in how to involve the public in its programs and asked the participants to complete the one-page questionnaire on how stakeholders would like to be involved in the program.

Additional Comments

During the breakout sessions, two specific questions were asked that did not directly relate to the topics discussed. One participant was interested in learning the status of the glossary. The facilitator replied that work is being done on revising the document and it is not yet ready. Another participant was interested in the status of the DOE Transportation Road Map. The facilitator replied that she would find out about this and get back to him. [Editor's Note: The 1993-1994 version is completed and is being prepared for distribution.]

Safe Routine Transportation Breakout Session

Larry Blalock, Director of the Transportation Management Division, conducted the sessions on Safe Routine Transportation (SRT). Each group spent time reviewing and discussing the task plans under SRT.

Safe Routine Transportation Task Plan Review

Task Plan II-A.1, Definition of Safe Routine Transportation

Each session was opened with a discussion of Task Plan II-A.1, Definition of Safe Routine Transportation and the strawman definition for SRT. The facilitator stated that the TEC/WG goal was to reach an agreement in each session for SRT and bring it to the entire body for discussion.

There was considerable discussion on this topic and each group presented ideas of how the definition should be structured. There were comments from each group concerning differentiation of incident and accident as well as discussion about what SRT included. The groups also suggested additional elements that need to be considered when creating the definition. The first two groups defined what they thought SRT was and this information was presented to the final breakout group. The third breakout group devoted most of their time to commenting on the two definitions.

In discussing the structure of the definition, the groups basically agreed that the definition should be in two parts. The first part would be a short definition followed with an explanation of the mechanisms for accomplishing SRT. One participant mentioned that the definition needs to lend itself as stated in the task plan. It was also suggested that the definition needs to be written in common (reader friendly) language.

In discussing incident and accident, the groups had the following comments. One group noted that the Radioactive Material Incident Report (RMIR) is based on the Department of Transportation (DOT) definition of accident. There was also discussion concerning the different uses of the word incident in different agencies. One participant suggested that "incident free" be explained or include the phrase "accidents do not impact cargo or vehicle operation." DOT defines incident as meaning spill. Another participant said in RADTRAN, incident is no cargo impact. A participant in one group questioned whether a flat tire is an incident. The group responded that they thought it was.

The groups suggested additions and deletions for the definition relating to incident and accident. One participant thought that the phrase "with goal of incident/accident prevention" should be added. Another thought incident should be included in the first sentence in the definition.

The groups also considered what SRT should include. In one group Mr. Blalock explained that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's (WIPP) current plan is for highway and RW's is primarily rail, and DOE is also considering intermodal. A participant responded that rail should be excluded because of the threat of landslides and DOE should look at mode mutual. Another participant noted that the definition did not cover barge transportation.

There was considerable discussion in one group about whether the definition was based on Section 180(c) or if it could be all hazardous materials. Other participants also commented on which materials were covered by SRT—does it cover hazardous materials, radioactive materials, or both.

One group asked the facilitator what he thought SRT was. He stated possibly "going from point A to point B without incident, in timely manner and in compliance." The group then discussed just what impacted safety (flat tires?, group response was no). It was noted that SRT could include minor events and a question was raised about what acute/chronic meant. The threat to human life issue was raised as was the impact of the problem (i.e., motor trouble), where the stop occurs (i.e., middle of interstate versus middle of downtown), and what you do, i.e., severity of the event (incident).

There was discussion in one group concerning the funding issue. It was noted that RW funding for long term objectives was involved in the original definition and is explained in the task plan. However, there is the need for a broader purpose for a DOE definition. Mr. Blalock stated that DOE needs a baseline since there is no commonality across the board and there is also a need to have Section 180(c) defined since each entity has a different opinion.

One group redefined SRT as:

SRT is the incident free movement of hazardous materials that presents neither an acute nor chronic threat to human health and the environment.

A second group redefined SRT as:

SRT is shipment from origin to destination without damage to the integrity of the cargo and in compliance with applicable regulations.

The facilitator commented that the second definition is two-pronged. Is this strictly internal DOE or external? You have to have concern on emergency responders' definition of this. Steve Gomberg commented that RW needs to define SRT because it is codified under Section 180(c), noting the task came about primarily because RW has to define SRT, but the definition could be used throughout DOE.

It was suggested that options were needed as the definition was not specific enough. Another suggestion was to include examples with the definition. A final suggestion was to provide

three definitions for review and use as a baseline for DOE.

The final breakout group spent time reviewing the two definitions. They began with a brief discussion regarding grants to states under Section 180(c) and the DOE-wide baseline application for transportation. Their comments on the two definitions were as follow. One participant noted that there is a problem with the term "cargo impact" and a need was identified to address the term "as planned." One participant suggested deleting the term incident free. It was noted that accident and incident needed to be defined because neither one covers breakdowns. One participant suggested using the phrase "cargo intact." The group asked if the previous sessions had considered routing in defining SRT, with one participant noting routing above regulatory requirements (i.e., dedicated train or may have to reroute 100 miles for safety—these are not regulatory requirements). It was suggested that there is a need to include elements of routing in the definition. A final suggestion was to add the words "local" and "laws" to the definition.

Other specific changes suggested by the groups include: add enhanced criteria; delete stakeholders involved with lessons learned; define routine, safe, and transportation; use unplanned events instead of emergencies; take out road; add language that says what safe is, routing is, and applies to all modes; and the second sentence, which addresses planning, needs to explain transportation.

Other issues that were discussed that participants thought should be considered in defining SRT included: inspection/enforcement (all covered by state, local, and tribal); shipments must be violation free; "planned" is not routine; consider infrastructure; foreseeability discussed; shipment gets from A to B with no effect on cargo; and definition of transportation from origin to destination with no impact on cargo—anticipation is not a good discriminator

Task Plan II-B.1, DOE Hazardous Materials Routing Policy

The groups also discussed Task Plan II-B.1, DOE Hazardous Materials Routing Policy. The facilitator explained that the purpose of discussing this topic was to review the task plan purpose and to inform the members that public comments on DOT's routing/modal study that was released are due by the end of February. The facilitator indicated that DOE will try to have a draft outline of a guidance document for routing prior to the next TEC/WG meeting.

In one group, the facilitator discussed the consideration of transportation routing in DOE program planning and stated that DOE will comply with state and federal routing requirements as a minimum. Above regulatory requirements, other things will be considered as tradeoffs and there will be joint decisions both internally and externally. This will include risk analysis, etc. . . It was asked if there was anything in writing stating that DOE will follow the regulations. The facilitator responded that DOE will follow them. A TEC/WG member commented that the alternate becomes the preferred route—the one to use. The facilitator added that states have sovereign right to select second alternate for one time or an

emergency, but if more permanent, it needs to be coordinated with the appropriate authorities.

There were several questions and comments concerning the routing policy. One participant asked if there would be two routing regulations for RAM Highway Route Controlled Quantity (HRCQ) and non-HRCQ. Another participant asked if comments were being sought as to the purpose. It was also stated that state alternate routes need to be addressed as does RAM below HRCQ. One participant asked if the discussion included railroads. The answer was no, just highway for now.

Task Plan II-C.1, Consistency Between NRC Notification Regulations and DOE Notification Policy

The groups also reviewed Task Plan II-C.1, Consistency Between Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Notification Regulations and DOE Notification Policy. One group discussed the internal conflict with NRC/DOT and DOE. RW is subject to NRC, but Environmental Management (EM) is not subject to all usually. RW has written NRC to advise them that DOE will give tribal notification based on Departmental requirements, however, NRC was concerned about safeguarding information since this is not public information. It was asked if this meant there were to be two notices and the response was that they could be all one notification. This was also discussed in another group. A tribal representative stated that the notice has to be official or written for tribal addition. A TEC/WG member indicated a need to look at NRC statute for a determination. A response was made that DOE should not have to go to NRC for tribal notification. The TEC/WG member stated it should not be an issue. The group agreed this is not an issue just a notice that tribes are included in notifications.

Task Plan II-C.2, DOE Policy for Transportation Operations for Bad Weather and Road Conditions

The next issue addressed by the groups was Task Plan II-C.2, DOE Policy for Transportation Operations for Bad Weather and Road Conditions. The groups were asked to review the purpose and explained that a draft guidance document will be available for the summer meeting. The facilitator stated that he will try to mail the draft about three months before the meeting to allow adequate time for review.

There was discussion in each group that if a good product was developed, TEC/WG and DOE may want to petition for a rulemaking. Someone questioned if the rulemaking should go through TEC/WG and the facilitator stated that it would probably have a positive impact on DOT for the rulemaking. A representative from the state of Colorado stated that if TEC/WG produces a good, quality product or precedent we should have the option to sell/push to others besides DOE as Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) to DOT. A representative from Nevada stated that if rulemaking were to happen, perhaps other state agencies would join in the rulemaking.

Several questions came up during the breakout sessions. A TEC/WG member asked what the definition of campaign was. Mr. Blalock replied that it was not yet defined. Another TEC/WG member was interested in knowing who DOE was coordinating with on this issue.

The need for two approaches to be taken was raised—radioactive material (RAM) and hazardous material (HAZMAT). One participant noted that states regulate roads for all HAZMAT. This prompted a TEC/WG member to ask if RAM is more dangerous than HAZMAT or is it public perception. Because its public perception, we do not want to stop RAM shipments along road if possible. It was noted that above regulatory compliance fosters safer shipments.

Some general comments one group made are as follow: does the last line of the task plan include all hazardous material or radioactive? Another participant asked why single out DOE, why not include others. A representative from Colorado said bad weather and road conditions were extremely important to WGA, but this is pretty well covered in task plan II-C.2. It was also noted that potential problems are high density routes (i.e., Salt Lake City) and must be thought out in advance and need to agree on procedure for long term contact.

The facilitator stated that by virtue of DOE decisions, we will treat tribes equally with states. Also, DOE is aware that things in resource book will cost taxpayers dollars. DOE has a mandate to spend those dollars wisely, but also provide safe transportation.

A participant asked if this affected other shipments or shippers and the response was "that the task plan for DOE bad weather and road conditions applies only to DOE." Another participant asked if this is within the scope of TEC/WG—"looking at DOE programs, there are many HAZMAT shipments other than DOE's. Is DOE setting precedent?"

Other comments include there is no problem with RAM adhering to higher criteria, but sulfuric acid or others, a problem can exist; if it becomes too onerous, change it; address it by softening language; primary focus is RAM, if we have good product, may fit other material; change all to other HAZMAT; and change to DOT regulatory requirements. There was basic agreement that if TEC/WG, states, and DOE come up with good policy to propose it for NPRM to cover all HAZMAT.

Task Plan II-C.3, Use of Escorts for DOE Shipments

Task Plan II-C.3, Use of Escorts for DOE Shipments was also discussed by the three groups. The facilitator told the groups that the task plan listed incorrect milestones, but he would like them to review the purpose. He stated that at the summer meeting, or perhaps before, the members would receive a draft on what kind of escorts, why escorts, etc.

During the discussion in one group, Steve Gomberg indicated that he had a problem with the

wording "rather than". The facilitator said perhaps we can also benefit from other group (Group B) meeting (i.e., purpose needs to be apart from Section 180(c)). Comments were made about rewording this phrase in another group as well.

The type of escort was also discussed. The groups questioned whether it would be federal, state, or county escorts, or if it would be a driver with equipment. During this discussion, the issue of public perception was addressed. One participant stated that if considering dedicated federal escorts, it will require monitoring for dosage especially if one thousand or more miles (consider rad worker concerns). Another participant commented that only state level governments should be coordinated with, not county to county.

The relationship between escorts and Section 180(c) was discussed in two of the groups. Comments were made in one group regarding divorcing from Section 180(c). Another TEC/WG member stated that this goes beyond Section 180(c) as it is broader and the cost benefits ratio needs to be considered. Another group questioned the approach and whether Section 180(c) was in it. One participant noted it was not just Section 180(c), but how will DOE handle shipments. Another participant suggested that the focus should not be on Section 180(c) and questioned what kind of escort and its function.

General discussion also addressed the issue of escorts supplementing or replacing training and safety. Someone questioned whether this guidance would include rail to which the facilitator responded that the initial thrust is for highway, but others would eventually be included. The discussion also addressed the need to clarify the language of "study" and "poll" and noted that the task plan wording was old and had not been corrected. The facilitator said DOE will draft it up for the summer meeting and will cover Section 180(c) elements and funding.

Other general comments made in one group were: no one assumes escorts in place of i.e., escort or tracking or health physics personnel with shipment; problem with purpose is should be case-by-case, look at effectiveness of escorts; define escorts, looking at security or what; change to in addition to or in place of; what do we mean, is it effective, what is escort; two things involved— who provides escorts and what are they for; escorts are symbolic things, federally provided or any other; need to determine effect on safe transport; does it reduce public resistance/perception. The session was concluded by stating the several tasks will come out of this session with a purpose to rework (not to Section 180(c))and expand task plan.

Task Plan II-C.4, Transportation Operations Procedures Manual

The final task plan for Safe Routine Transportation that was discussed in two groups was Task Plan II-C.4, Transportation Operations Procedures Manual. The groups were asked to review the purpose and were provided with a first half outline for review and comments. The facilitator asked for comments by the end of February. He explained that the manual was not a procedures document, but a guidance manual. He advised that a more updated version and additional information will be provided at the summer meeting. A TEC/WG member asked

how the manual ties into the *Program Manager's Guide*. It was explained that this is strictly as traffic operations working level document but can be used along with other documents involving DOE transportation operations and will be factored in the guide. These documents will integrate.

Additional Comments

The facilitator mentioned the DOE Motor Carrier Evaluation Program (MCEP) task plan (missing from the *Resource Notebook*) in one group. He asked the group to review the purpose and advised them that DOE is following through with the suggestion about Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) reviewing MCEP.

Inspection and Enforcement and Technical Assistance Breakout Session

Ms. Smith facilitated the breakout sessions on Inspection and Enforcement and Technical Assistance. The sessions were structured so each group could review and discuss existing task plans and accompanying documents under the two topics. The topic of Inspection and Enforcement is covered first, followed by Technical Assistance.

Inspection and Enforcement Task Plan Review

Task Plan III-A.2, the Transportation Network (TRANSNET) and Radioactive Material Incident Report (RMIR)

The breakout groups spent time discussing Task Plan III-A.2, the Transportation Network (TRANSNET) and Radioactive Incident Report (RMIR). One participant requested information on naval reactor shipments that resulted in incidents or accidents. Mr. Thomas agreed to look into getting that information but wants to obtain an official task plan before he begins work. Some questions arose on the accessibility of the system. Mr. Thomas explained all systems were readily accessible except TRANSCOM, but even TRANSCOM accessibility was possible if a need was determined.

Task Plan III-B.1, Work with CRCPD to Revise Directory of Enforcement Agencies to Include Roles and Performance Indicators

The following comment was made concerning Task Plan III-B.1, Work with Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc. (CRCPD) to Revise Directory of Enforcement Agencies to Include Roles and Performance Indicators. A representative of CRCPD indicated he had spoken with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) about having the directory placed on the Hazardous Materials Information Exchange (HMIX) bulletin board. There are currently some problems with formatting, but they should be resolved soon. Putting the CRCPD Directory on HMIX will improve the document's distribution and availability.

Task Plan III-B.5, State, Tribal, and Local Inspection and Enforcement Issues with Regard to Rail Shipments

The groups also discussed Task Plan III-B.5, State, Tribal, and Local Inspection and Enforcement Issues with Regard to Rail Shipments. The facilitator updated everyone about the ongoing communication between the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and DOE. DOE has met with FRA about these tasks and has explained the CVSA policy, 180(C), and the current requirement imposed on DOE. The facilitator had also obtained a copy of the FRA policy on inspection of rail shipments carrying radioactive material. This policy was developed in 1991 as a result of the Three Mile Island (TMI) shipments. FRA was very interested in the information provided. It seems that FRA's hazardous materials inspection

program does not include radioactive material and FRA is interested in developing a training program with DOE to be used with their existing state program. Ms. Smith will be sitting in on the next training course to get a feel for how FRA's program operates.

A participant wanted a record of all radioactive rail shipments with accidents or incidents. To his knowledge there have only been three big rail efforts, one of which was TMI. He asked DOE to task one of its contractors to assemble a report focusing on the inspection requirements for each of the three campaigns. Illinois was specifically mentioned since it was thought to have a CVSA rail inspection program already in existence.

One breakout group was very concerned with the safety of rail shipments. It wanted to ensure that DOE made rail shipments safer than they may be right now with an FRA inspection program. A concern was also raised about rail yards in urban areas. It was thought that these rail yards could represent hazardous situations with chemicals and explosives in proximity. The group also felt there may be insufficient inspections of rail beds and tracks. The group reached a consensus that DOE needs to look at real past experiences to help in the development of a rail inspection policy and a routing policy. Rail will become a much larger issue due to the potential shipments by DOE.

The third group agreed there was a lack of information on rail shipments, but would like DOE to focus on inspection numbers and types, determine "the standard," and better specify the differences between states. Once again a request was made for incident reports on rail shipments. A TEC/WG member said he had some of this information which he would share with the facilitator.

Task Plan III-B.9, Transportation Communications and Tracking System

Time was spent on Task Plan III-B.9, Transportation Communications and Tracking System. The groups said TRANSCOM has some problems. Mr. Thomas responded by saying he knew of the problems but in most cases the system worked, but users lacked the training or expertise with the TRANSCOM system. Mr. Thomas is planning to attend the upcoming Western Governors' Association meeting where the problems will be discussed in detail. Nonetheless, TEC/WG members would like to see a periodic evaluation of TRANSCOM by the current users. The members would also like to see a standardized process for TRANSCOM users.

Task Plan III-C.2, Facilitate Use of CVSA Inspection Program by Tribes

TEC/WG was updated on the recent work done in support of Task Plan III-C.2, Facilitate Use of CVSA Inspection Program by Tribes. The M&O looked into the issue and found no conclusive evidence either for or against. The facilitator explained she hoped to get a review of the case law and develop an inspection authority paper. A participant agreed with this approach, thinking it would get the tribes more involved with this issue, and it was a good

way to start. There were some questions about the involvement of the Umatilla Tribe with the cesium shipments, however, no request for action was ever stated.

Task Plan III-C.3, Have CVSA Look at Coordination to Minimize Enroute Inspection

There were no issues identified with Task Plan III-C.3, Have CVSA Look at Coordination to Minimize Enroute Inspection. According to CVSA, the activity associated with this task is on track. The M&O passed the CVSA inspection for its new light-weight truck and trailer, and cesium shipments will be brought onboard.

Task Plan III-C.5, Determine which Tribes have Inspection Authority and Interest in Joining CVSA

All groups agreed that Task Plan III-C.5, Determine which Tribes have Inspection Authority and Interest in Joining CVSA, should be combined with Task Plan III-B.5.

Task Plan III-C.6, Contact EEI/UWASTE to have Utilities Subscribe to CVSA Procedures

John Fisher of Edison Electric Institute was not able to attend the meeting, however, no one seemed to think there would be any difficulty coordinating Task Plan III-C.6, Contact EEI/UWASTE to have Utilities Subscribe to CVSA Procedures.

Task Plan III-C.7, Look for Additional Campaigns to Test CVSA Procedures

It was recommended that Task Plan III-C.7, Look for Additional Campaigns to Test CVSA Procedures be combined with Task Plan III-C.6. Also, cesium is being brought on line, and it is hoped that spent fuels will be included.

Task Plan III-C.8, Assess CVSA Procedures for Application to FRA Inspection Procedures

Task Plan III-C.9, Compare SNF Shipment Inspection Procedures to FRA Procedures

Participants learned that Task Plan III-C.8, Assess CVSA Procedures for Application to FRA Inspection Procedures, and Task Plan III-C.9, Compare Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Shipment Inspection Procedures to FRA procedures had been added to Task Plan III-B.5.

Task Plan III-C.10, Coordinate with NCAI, CVSA, and NCSL to Review and Report on Inspection Issues

In regards to Task Plan III-C.10, Coordinate with National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), CVSA, and National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) to Review and Report on Inspection Issues, NCSL reported that they are interested in developing a standard rail inspection program for all the states. NCAI is meeting in Denver in October or November of this year and hopes to discuss this issue at that time. They hope to include NCSL and CVSA in their discussions.

Task Plan III-C.11, Develop Plan to Study Issues Related to Rail Inspection Programs

Task Plan III-C.11, Develop Plan to Study Issues Related to Rail Inspection Programs was also combined with Task Plan III-B.5. However, the group asked DOE to update the rail trends paper yearly for use by the stakeholders. The CVSA representative was concerned this activity may be perceived as a preemption issue and recommended that DOE focus on improving the standard and not promoting any preemption issues.

Task Plan III-C.12, Include State Rail Agencies on AASHTO JAD Teams

Task Plan III-C.12, Include State Rail Agencies on American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Joint Application Design (JAD) Teams, caused some confusion in the breakout sessions since no one could recall its purpose. Someone thought there was a rail committee as a subgroup of AASHTO. DOE will look into this, otherwise the group agreed the task could be dropped.

Additional Comments

The following are general comments from the breakout sessions that do not relate to a particular task. One participant would like to see someone within DOE who accepts responsibility for all transportation problems, similar to a CEO's position in a corporation. He pointed out that frequent inspections are becoming expensive issues. Large truck shipping campaigns can become very expensive for a state that should be able to inspect each shipment. A question was raised about who was responsible for enforcing regulations on government contractors. How does DOE recommend they enforce a self-inspection program? Ultimately, the participant would like to see some kind of survey put together for TEC/WG to review defining an ideal inspection program. There are too many questions about who pays and how things will be done.

Technical Assistance Task Plan Review

Task Plan V-A.1, Develop a Directory of Technical Assistance Sources

The facilitator indicated she has spoken with FEMA and it is open to discussion about developing a directory as provided for in Task Plan V-A.1- Develop a Directory of Technical Assistance Sources. The questions remaining are: should DOE be doing this work, should DOE and FEMA develop the directory jointly, or is this the responsibility of FEMA. Another problem is the NRC developed a similar document and was severely criticized for it because it was outdated by the time it was published. No conclusions were reached. The Southern States Energy Board (SSEB) has a similar document for southern states and will give DOE a copy. One group recommended the task be cancelled altogether.

Task Plan V-F.1, Prepare a List of Available Technologies for use by State, Tribal, and Local Agencies

Some confusion surfaced during the discussions on Task Plan V-F.1- Prepare a List of Available Technologies for use by State, Tribal, and Local Agencies about what was meant by available technologies. The main problem identified was whether the term refers to equipment or software. The group agreed the main question revolved around equipment. First responders need a device that will tell them to go or no-go. As one representative pointed out, the problem is that measuring radiation is a technique, not a technology. The groups agreed that Geiger counters seem very difficult to keep calibrated and are not very easily used. A piece of equipment is needed which can ride around in the trunk of a car all year and then be pulled out and tell someone how much radiation has been released and if it is safe.

The groups also identified a need for some way to identify the type of emitter. A request was made for a one point source contact for emergency responders, or basically, one person who can help take care of the situation or phone the call to someone who can. In response, a recommendation was made to see if TRANSCOM could be updated to include information on the type of emitters and contact numbers.

Two conclusions were reached. First, DOE needs to begin some R&D efforts into the development of a rugged, user-friendly Geiger counter. The R&D effort may be done solely by DOE, or jointly by DOE and FEMA. Second, DOE should develop a directory of equipment currently available or a standard equipment list for first responders. Communities need to know what exists now, what they can obtain, and where.

Task Plan V-G.1, Refine Definition of Technical Assistance

In the breakout discussions of Task Plan V-G.1- Refine Definition of Technical Assistance, the groups agreed there should be a strawman definition of technical assistance. A TEC/WG member thought the existing FEMA definition was a good starting point, but the definition

should remain very broad. He wanted to be sure funds would be available for training, despite the source of the training. For example, if a private group had a training program that was useful to state first responders, DOE should provide funding for the training. Ms. Smith will combine the definitions from the Transportation Coordination Group (TCG) minutes and the three newly crafted definitions and send a strawman definition for the TEC/WG to comment on.

Additional Comments

A TEC/WG member said he wanted everyone to know that 90 percent of all responders are volunteers. Many of these volunteers are getting out of the hazardous materials business because they cannot keep up with the training and because they use the information they learn so infrequently. He wants DOE to develop a profile of what is needed for a typical response capability. He also said DOE should define an amount of any fee for pass through. If DOE does not put in a pass through, no funds will get down to the actual first responders. Another point he mentioned was tribes may receive money for training, but are not allowed to use the funds for planning. There is also a need for funding that will allow tribes to plan for emergency response.

Emergency Management and Training Breakout Session

Wally Weaver, Director, Emergency Management Division, facilitated the breakout sessions on emergency management and training. He began the sessions by explaining the format for the breakout session. First, the section's goals and related objectives would be briefly discussed followed by a short presentation on each of the task plans that applied to get TEC/WG validation or evaluation effort. Finally the floor would be opened to any new business as time permitted

Emergency Management Goal and Objectives Review

General comments were given on the emergency management goal and objectives. Concern was expressed over the Emergency Management Goal as stated in the TEC/WG *Work Plan*. It was also felt that the linkage between Emergency Management and Safe Routine Transportation (SRT) was inaccurately stated (i.e., Emergency Management does not enhance SRT, but only kicks in when SRT fails). However, because SRT is defined in Section 180(c) and emergency management is not, the TEC/WG cautioned that the definition of emergency management should maintain a clear interdependency between emergency management and SRT to not jeopardize possible funding streams.

Emergency Management Task Plan Review

Task Plan IV-A.1, Revision of DOT ERG

The groups discussed Task Plan IV-A.1, Revision of DOT Emergency Response Guide (ERG). Mr. Weaver informed participants that the original activity suggested by the TEC/WG was split into two separate tasks; this is the first part of it. The focus of the activity is the inclusion/improvement of radiological data in ERG. Since the Chemical Transportation Emergency Center (CHEMTREC) uses ERG for its radiological data, DOE linked ERG revisions to updating CHEMTREC. The facilitator indicated that DOE has worked it through and considers the task closed. He informed the groups that a new task plan could be written for the 1996 revision of DOT's ERG.

The participants concurred and the task plan was validated.

Task Plan IV-A.2, Identification and Improvement of Basic Source Material for First Responders

The groups spent time discussing Task Plan IV-A.2, Identification and Improvement of Basic Source Material for First Responders. The groups were informed that this was the second part of the original activity.

It was noted that CHEMTREC needs other improvements (beyond ERG updates). Participants suggested DOE negotiate with CHEMTREC to carry more detailed radioactive materials (RADMAT) data or appropriate DOE POC listings. The groups were not fully receptive to the task plan as written. They indicated a compendium of RADMAT reference sources for first responders would be valuable. Furthermore, they wanted to keep the survey to identify reference materials first responders are currently using.

The facilitator responded that the task plan will be rewritten to create a bibliography of currently available publications, hot-lines, databases, etc., on RADMAT emergency preparedness. The bibliography will be broken out by types of resources and topical areas and will identify the sources for procuring copies/access.

The groups concurred with writing a new task plan for a bibliography. The facilitator indicated that DOE will be sending TEC/WG members a request for the data in February 1994 with responses due in June 1994. [Editor's Note: The distribution date and deadline for comments were revised after the meeting. Comments are now due by June 17, 1994.]

Task Plan IV-C.2, Transportation Incident Response Role and Capabilities of the DOE's Radiological Assistance Program (RAP)

Time was spent discussing Task Plan IV-C.2, Transportation Incident Response Role and Capabilities of the DOE's Radiological Assistance Program (RAP). It was explained that the requested task was to help responders understand DOE's support role. DOE TEC/WG members invited the Office of Defense Programs (DP-23) to become a member and give a presentation on the programs' capabilities and the RAP presentation on opening day of this meeting was the result. The facilitator asked if TEC/WG considered the task complete or was the request to bring this awareness to the response organizations themselves?

The groups agreed that this task was closed, but stressed that DOE response teams should make certain that state notifications were made as a part of the request for RAP resources.

The facilitator assured groups that the Transportation Emergency Training for Response Assistance (TETRA) courses for DOE RAP personnel fully covers notification and requests for assistance.

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

The groups discussed Task Plan IV-D.1, Standardized Transportation Emergency Action Levels (EALs). The groups were informed that this task was initiated by TEC/WG interest. The facilitator indicated that the expected difficulty and level of effort required made this task somewhat unappealing. He explained the many diametrically opposed positions (i.e.,

insistence on using and not using NRC fixed facility classification schemes) hindering development of a universal/unified transportation EAL system. The facilitator also discussed the task plan's three phased approach:

- I. Data Collection; TEC/WG members to report the various criteria and schemes currently employed by constituents. DOE to similarly collect EAL data from its own programs and other federal agencies
- II. Assimilation; compare the collected data for similarities in approaches and/or criteria
- III. Development; try to develop standardized terms and generalized graded or stepped transportation emergency classification criteria

There was not universal support for this effort. The members fell into two fairly distinct groups:

- A. Those that felt like localities will do as they are going to do, regardless of whether standardized transportation incident clarification schemes exist or not; and
- B. Those that felt standardized transportation incident clarification schemes makes perfect sense and are sorely needed.

The groups validated the first two phases of the task plan.

The facilitator said he was looking to have TEC/WG members identify the criteria used in existing schemes, not just the classifications themselves. He agreed to proceed with phases I & II (data collection and assimilation). That effort may show:

- A. Several "common" aspects of schemes, and development of a graded approach to transportation incident classification may be easier than thought; or
- B. Little common ground exists, and development of standardized criteria/scheme is impossible

Either way the task will be started, and the task plan will be revisited before entering into Phase III.

The groups were informed that DOE will be sending TEC/WG members a request for the data in March 1994. Data from TEC/WG on existing transportation classification schemes will be due back by the end of June 1994.

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

The final Emergency Management task plan the groups discussed was Task Plan IV-F.1, Emergency Response Issues within Mutual Aid Agreements. The facilitator briefly discussed the history of the issue and explained the task plan. He informed the groups that DOE will collect input from TEC/WG and other sources, then compile a list of questions that should be considered whenever developing Mutual Aid Agreements (MAA) and/or Memorandums of Understanding (MOU). He also told participants that DOE will be sending TEC/WG members a request for the data in March 1994. Sample MAAs and any other relevant information from TEC/WG will be due back by end of June 1994.

The groups validated the task plan.

Training Goals and Objectives Review

The groups then focused on the topic of training and the related task plans. The facilitator explained how, to date, input to the *Work Plan* Training Section has almost exclusively focused on emergency preparedness topics. Participants were asked to think of training in a larger sense, including training for all of the *Work Plan* topics. The facilitator briefly covered the four objectives in the Training Section and the related task plans. He noted that Objectives B and D have no task plans at this time, but Objective B was covered by an existing effort to develop a National Curriculum (with performance standards) under the Hazardous Material Transportation Uniform Safety Act (HMTUSA), and Objective D needs refinement from TEC/WG.

Training Task Plan Review

Task Plan V-A.3, Establish a Train-The-Trainer Course for States

The groups discussed Task Plan V-A.3, Establish a Train-The-Trainer Course for States. It was noted that TEC/WG recommended task for states' Train-The-Trainer program was unclear. The facilitator explained that the task plan incorporates an existing effort to make a Radiological Emergency Response Operations (RERO)-like exportable course and informed participants that the new training is tentatively dubbed Radiological Emergency Training for Local Responders (RETLR). It is targeted for small, local response organizations to help bring additional training to the volunteer organizations. DOE will be sending TEC/WG members a request for the data in February 1994 and asked that TEC/WG identify additional curricula requirements for the Train-The-Trainer program by the end of April 1994. [Editor's Note: The distribution date and deadline for comments were revised after the meeting. Comments are now due by June 17, 1994.]

The groups validated the task plan. They also questioned if DOE courses have evaluation modules. The facilitator responded not yet, but DOE is moving to performance-based training.

Participants asked if 1910.120 is to become the standard requirement and evaluation for training. The facilitator responded that the HMTUSA National Curriculum focuses on training requirements, but certification/evaluation of its required training is still being worked. However, all efforts to date utilize 1910.120 and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards.

The groups validated the task plan.

Task Plan V-A.6, Identification of Opportunities for Improvement in TEP Training

The groups also discussed Task Plan V-A.6, Identification of Opportunities for Improvement in TEP Training. The facilitator had the participants look over the Chicago, Training Problem Statements. He explained this was distillation of discussions from the previous TEC/WG Training breakout session and stressed that this was not DOE's answer and should not limit the scope of their thinking. He indicated that the field is wide open to all input on training needs—still scoping the issue. The National Curricula on RAD/HAZMAT training will have to be considered when published. Members were asked to take the Chicago document home and refine it from their perspectives.

The groups questioned the desired degree of specificity for issue/problem statement. A majority of comments favored more generalized training over campaign specific initiatives.

The facilitator said DOE will be sending TEC/WG members a request for new problem statements in March 1994. TEC/WG to respond by end of June 1994.

The groups validated the task plan.

Task Plan V-C.2, Rail Transportation Issues Awareness Training

The final task plan the groups discussed was Task Plan V-C.2, Rail Transportation Issues Awareness Training. The facilitator began with a general discussion of the Transportation Emergency Training for Response Assistance (TETRA) program. He noted the target audience is DOE RAP personnel. TETRA emphasis is placed on integrating RAP Teams with the local responders' Incident Command System (ICS). TETRA includes a rail module that is currently under development with the Transportation Test Center in Pueblo, Colorado. It will be piloted in May.

The groups validated the task plan.

General Discussion

The groups also spent some time discussing new business. The main topic was Objective E, Address Medical Preparedness from the Training Section. The facilitator indicated a need to better define this objective and encouraged all input.

The participants had the following comments. Training for pre-hospital and hospital professionals are completely separate issues. It was noted that medical personnel access/awareness to DOE radiological training, data, and contacts is very limited and needs to be expanded. Train-the-trainer courses for pre-hospital and hospital personnel are needed. Publicizing the availability of RADMAT information and training to the medical community at their various regional and national conferences was suggested. Another suggestion was to include RAD certification within existing hospital and Emergency Medical Technician training and accreditation programs. It was noted that generalized medical awareness training is more valuable than campaign specific initiatives. Regardless of the RAD source, basic health physics and decontamination procedures apply across the board. It was recommended that REAC/TS and other RADMAT information/training be made available to Poison Centers, the initial contact points for many medical facilities. Members felt that DOE should explore the possibilities of RADMAT information and/or training session at the various regional and national conferences held by the medical professionals. Finally, a suggestion was made not to separate RAD hazards out from other HAZMAT training and accreditation programs.

The participants had the opportunity to have an open forum discussion. They had the following comments: advertise RAD training opportunities on electronic bulletin boards; training programs (including self-paced video training) should include an assessment to see if desired information was imparted; and look into value/effectiveness of campaign specific versus generic training. It was suggested that request to TEC/WG for review or input should be:

- stand alone;
- capable of being easily retransmitted to constituents under a new cover letter from TEC/WG members; and
- simple check-off or fill-in-the-blanks formats.

A final comment was that the TEC/WG's usage of the term transport should be changed to transportation to match the verbiage from Section 180(c).

Reports on Status of Existing Task Plans and Introduction of New Draft Task Plans Breakout Session

Friday, January 28
9:45 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.

The session began with reports by the facilitators on the discussion from each breakout session. Following are consolidated lists summarizing the groups' comments that were compiled from the viewgraphs used during the presentations.

General Planning and Public Information Breakout Report

General Comments

- Purpose of TEC/WG not to establish policy but to provide input at an early stage to:
 - identify issues
 - assess what will work
 - provide an appeal process
- Distinction should be made between DOE's decision-making authority and the need for accountability
- Documents provide DOE's broad strategies and goals and are ideally suited to TEC/WG's purposes/needs
- Presentation on spent fuel was appreciated, allows for early TEC/WG involvement
- *Work Plan* viewed as a concise, useful document which should be published for the general public
- Clarify what is required from TEC/WG for comments on documents
- TEC/WG members should review documents with their constituencies and provide comments within 60 days
- DOE should identify one person to contact when comments are to be provided
- What is the status of:
 - Glossary
 - DOE Transportation Road Map
- Full phrase should be used in place of acronyms each time (acronym to be provided in parenthesis)
- Request for organizational road-map (i.e., brief description of roles to accompany organization charts)
- Communication with the media identified as a problem. Review of literature on news media and disasters may be helpful
- Need identified for greater emphasis on interacting with railroads and with eastern states that will be affected by introduction of the MPC

Task Plan I-B.2, Transportation Institutional Policy

- Include a definition of the roles of broader group of stakeholders (anyone interested in the outcomes) and TEC/WG members
- Clarify the use of "affected" which has a specific connotation under NWPA
- Provide entire document to TEC/WG members
- Valuable document which should be published

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

- Clarify the use of "affected" which has a specific connotation under NWPA
- public participation should be written into managers' job performance requirements
- greater emphasis on video production needed

Task Plan I-B.1, TEPP Strategy Document

- include more discussion of role of private organizations (e.g., hospitals, physicians)
- include discussion of training for state, local, and private organizations in Section 3.6

Task Plan I-B.4, *Program Manager's Guide to Transportation Planning*

- Will lead to discussions with TEC/WG on needed interactions

Task Plan I-A.1, Section 180(c) Policy Options Paper

- Comments received only from WIEB
- Comments requested from TEC/WG members following review with constituents
- Schedule for 180(c) requested by TEC/WG member in view of imminent release of Nevada routing document
- Request for DOE to provide deadline for comments

Safe Routine Transportation Breakout Report

Task Plan II-A.1, Definition of Safe Routine Transportation

- Agreements
 - definition is a good beginning
 - much discussion regarding specific words (safe, incident/incident free, routine)

- Objectives
 - review task plan
 - provide RW with alternative definitions for consideration and application of 180 (c)
- -Issues
 - limit definition to RAM or expand to HAZMAT

Task Plan II-B.1, Hazardous Material Routing Policy

- Agreements
 - policy should state DOE's intention to comply with and not challenge state designated alternate routes that have cleared DOE process
- Objectives
 - review task plan
- Issues
 - RAM below HRCQ
 - rail

Task Plan II-C.1, Tribal Notification

- No comment on task plan

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

- Objectives
 - review task plan
- Issues
 - expansion to all HAZMAT

Task Plan II-C.3, Escorts

- Objectives
 - review task plan
- Issues
 - definition (purpose)
 - who escorts
 - divorce from 180(c)
 - cost/benefit ratio
 - effect/efficacy

Task Plan II-C.4, Transportation Operations Manual

- No comments on task plan

Emergency Management and Training Breakout Report

Task Plan IV-A.1, Revision to DOT ERG

- Issue
 - improve the existing basic source guidance, specifically DOT ERG and CHEMTREC
- Discussion
 - CHEMTREC uses ERG info, thus covered by this effort (new objective identified for CHEMTREC in Task Plan IV-A.2)
 - closed 1993 ERG revision task
 - new task plan for 1996 revision planned (DOE to carry TEC/WG input to DOT)

Task Plan IV-A.2, Identify basic source materials for first responders

- Issue
 - survey responders to identify other source documents or basic source materials that need revision
- Discussion
 - CHEMTREC still needs fixing; include RADMAT info/appropriate DOE POCs
 - compile bibliography of RADMAT data and how to obtain copies
 - identify those resource materials carried/used by first responders
 - look at NIOSH and other documents for RADMAT content (a la ERG)

Task Plan IV-D.1, Standardize Transportation EALs

- Issue
 - standardize levels of response
- Discussion
 - validated task plan and phased approach
 - not universal support for task
 - looking at criteria not just the classifications
 - to proceed with data collection

Task Plan IV-F.1, Mutual Aid Agreements

- Issue
 - develop guidance for mutual aid agreements
- Discussion
 - validated task plan

Task Plan V-A.3, Train-the-Trainer

- Issue
 - establish a train-the-trainer course for states
- Discussion
 - validated task plan
 - RERO/RETLR - existing action

Task Plan V-A.6 TEPP Training

- Issue
 - develop issue/problem statements to improve TEPP training opportunities
- Discussion
 - validated task plan
 - still scoping issue
 - national curricula on RAD/HAZMAT training
 - degree of specificity for issue/problem statement (campaign specific) (training required for escorts vs. volunteers)
 - validation/evaluation of training effectiveness

Task Plan V-C.2 TETRA Rail Module

- Issue
 - a rail awareness course needs to be developed for DOE personnel
- Discussion
 - validated task plan

Scoping of Emergency Management Objective E Medical Preparedness

- Discussion
 - pre-hospital and hospital care are separate (train-the-trainer course for hospital and pre-hospital personnel) (take RAD training to national/regional medical profession conferences)
 - medical personnel access/awareness to DOE RAD hazards data/contacts
 - include RAD certification within EMT HAZMAT training
 - medical technician access to emergency preparedness training (academics)

- cost sharing with other federal agencies for RAD/HAZMAT training for medical personnel
- generalized medical training vs. campaign specific
- RAD hazard info/training available to Poison Centers
- medical awareness training for RAD as part of HAZMAT (accreditation of RAD within ACEP and other programs)
- training on patient decontamination
- Issue
 - there is a lack of knowledge and training concerning aspects of radiological emergency response within the hospital and pre-hospital communities
- Suggested Tasks
 - publicize availability of information and training materials at national conferences and appropriate forums (e.g., Poison Centers)
 - offer train-the-trainer courses for health care instructors at national conferences and other appropriate forums
 - incorporate RAD certification or accreditation into existing programs
 - explore the possibility of unified federal training curricula for chemical and HAZMAT training for medical personnel

Technical Assistance and Inspection and Enforcement Breakout Report

Task Plan III-A.2, Computer Data Collection (TRANSNET)

- Assess naval reactor spent fuel shipment data

Task Plan III-B.2, Discuss an ideal enforcement program

- Got ideas for developing task plan
- Scope out purpose of enforcement program
- Methods of enforcement
 - DOE personally liable
 - frequency of inspections
 - contract carrier negotiations
 - cost of enforcement program
- Recommended survey of TEC/WG to determine what would be considered an ideal enforcement program

Task Plan III-B.5, Rail Issues

- Develop executive summary of studies
- Provide info on rail RAM incidents
- Provide status on 10 inspectors mandated by HMTUSA

- Look at inspection done on previous SNF/HLW rail shipments (look at Illinois inspection program)
- Need to reduce redundant inspection - health safety
- Transportation planning needs to always consider proximity to other HAZMAT shipments

Task Plan III-B.9, TRANSCOM

- Conduct periodical assessment of system

Task Plan III-C.10, NCAI, WIEB, NCSL, CVSA look at inspection issues

- NCAI/NCSL work with state, tribal, local groups to look at standard procedures
- States look at standardized state inspection procedures for rail inspection

Task Plan III-C.11, AASHTO JAD Team

- Clarifying task suggestion
- Talk about participation in TEC/WG
- Recommended annual update of something like Rail Trends Report

Task Plan VI- A.1, Directory

- Wait until technical assistance is defined
- Provide DOE assets for review by TEC/WG
- Look at regional work already done
- Consider dropping task-cost of fully implementing vs. benefit

Task Plan VI-F.1, List of Technologies

- Establish a baseline of resources needs for response
- Look at R&D needs
- Use 1910.120 as baseline
- Check minutes for clarification
- Develop "go-no-go" meter

Task Plan VI-G.1, Definitions of technical assistance

- DOE develop strawman using letters and TCG minutes
- Keep specific to program - i.e. Section 180(c)
- Define parameters of need for technical assistance
 - who is "who"
 - what is "technical" - information

- what is the "need" - response
- Develop profile of effective response capability
- Ensure required appropriate pass-through or use escorts
- List of what DOE can provide as technical assistance could include:
 - develop "do all" RAD meter (R&D)
 - add material for response to TRANSCOM (source type)
 - develop and provide smart cask technology
 - provide easy access to quick assistance
 - does not mean funds (separate area)
 - capability to have plans prior to training
- Use broad, flexible definition
- Address each of the seven TEC/WG *Work Plan* categories
- Funding should allow states and tribes the option to obtain technical assistance from sources other than DOE

Closeout Plenary Session

Friday, January 28
10:30 am - 11:30 am

The meeting concluded with a review of actions from the Issue Prioritization Results, *Process Plan* and *Work Plan* breakout and an open discussion that largely focused on the issue of membership.

The following actions were presented in regard to the prioritization of tasks.

- DOE will send letter again with calls and produce final results;
- DOE will use prioritization surveys as guides, re-issuing for updates annually prior to DOE budget preparation;
- Priorities will remain flexible to accommodate upcoming shipping activity;
- DOE will restructure survey by issue, action, and information tasks; and
- TEC/WG still needs to know more on how DOE budget matches task prioritization.

Action items on the draft TEC/WG *Process Plan* were:

- DOE will clarify TEC/WG role in final version—change in TEC/WG Charter and *Work Plan*;
- DOE will revise flow chart—feed back loop in Step II and change wording in step 5—agreement may not resolve issue;
- DOE requests formal comments (60 days) if concern was not discussed here;
- final to be sent out before next TEC/WG meeting;
- DOE will add the need to look at previous experience to identify issues; and
- Letters from groups will be distributed to groups as they want.

Action items highlighted for the *Resource Notebook* were:

- DOE will look at electronic distribution;
- Procedure for sending next update will be written;
- Reference material to include in notebook will be sent:
 - appropriate legislation,
 - glossary,
 - paragraphs on member organizations and DOE offices
- TEC/WG will provide comments to DOE in 30 days.

Actions that were of interest to TEC/WG members included:

- TEC/WG and DOE will look at what role comparative risk plays in TEC/WG deliberations;
- Discussion needed on weighing TEC/WG members' role in working the issues and tasks and level of effort expected;
- DOE will distribute material earlier (60 days);
- DOE will prepare material describing upcoming DOE shipments;
- DOE will look at reducing DOE travel costs to increase travel funds for external participants; and
- DOE will send out a mailing after the meeting that will contain all the requests for responses from TEC/WG members discussed during the meeting.

Most of the closing discussion focused on the issue of membership. Comments included the suggestion for representation from environmental groups and the media, with a representative from the National Association of Science Writers being suggested. The need for future consideration of additional host state representation was also raised. Low participation from industry groups and tribal organizations was noted. It was pointed out that there are three tribal member organizations (NCAI, CERT, and the Columbia Intertribal Fishery Commission). Other groups are being contacted as the group needs to explore ways to get increased participation from these organizations. A tribal representative commented that he had been unable to make a commitment to bring more representatives because of administrative problems with the cooperative agreement. DOE agreed to work on getting greater tribal participation.

The meeting concluded with several participants commenting on the time and effort that had been put in to make the meeting a success.