



**Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC)  
July 25-27, 2000  
Indianapolis, Indiana**

**Meeting Summary**

The Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC) held its 17<sup>th</sup> semi-annual meeting July 25-27, 2000, in Indianapolis, Indiana. Over 110 participants representing State, Tribal and local governments, regional groups, industry and professional organizations, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), and other Federal agencies met to address a variety of issues related to DOE's radioactive materials transportation activities.

**Tuesday, July 25, 2000**

***Training and Medical Training Issues Topic Group***

This meeting highlighted coordination between Federal agencies and State, Tribal and local organizations in addressing training needs. The meeting began with a review of a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) draft plan of instruction that addresses pre-hospital patient care of contaminated injured persons. Course objectives correspond with items identified in a training needs assessment previously prepared by the training group. Assessment results favor development of a course with modules designed to instruct responders holding specific hospital positions. The FEMA course can be developed to meet this need and to incorporate some of the comments offered by group members. Most comments requested that the course provide basic information in a straightforward format.

The group also considered training related to preparing for military shipments of radioactive material but decided to cover this topic in a conference call with those responsible for protecting the shipments. Participants viewed a video that demonstrated a possible method for interacting with the carrier during a DOE Transportation Safeguards Division shipment. It was suggested the video be added to the Modular Emergency Response for Radiological Transportation Training (MERRTT) CD-ROM.

The group revisited issues concerning wording of the Emergency Response Guidebook (ERG) in terms of medical priority. The discussion centered on which responders (awareness versus operations) can legally enter the event scene to perform rescue. This issue will be presented to the Federal Radiological Planning Coordination Committee (FRPCC) training subcommittee for discussion. The Topic Group will not send any letters requesting clarification to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

The MERRTT train-the-trainer schedule, available on the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) web site, was reviewed. Appropriate State points of contact and TEPP Coordinators are identified for each train-the-trainer session. HAMMER is continuing to collect comments from end users on the MERRTT materials. If warranted, the MERRTT CD-ROM will be updated in FY 2001. HAMMER briefly presented plans for three additional tabletop scenarios and three companion videos. The video scripts and storyboards were distributed for review and comment. HAMMER is pursuing Continuing Education Units for MERRTT with Washington State University. Discussions continued on marketing of TEPP, including the MERRTT materials.

The group reviewed proposed contamination reduction procedures. Most agreed local procedures should dictate the process used, and responders should be presented with the pros and cons of each process (wet versus dry). Everyone was asked to provide comments on the procedure. It is planned to include the procedure as an annex to MERRTT module 13 for information purposes.

FEMA introduced a compendium of emergency response training for incidents involving radioactive material. The compendium compiles courses from DOE, FEMA, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Courses are listed by response activity and include the corresponding OSHA level of training for each objective. Members recommended ways to improve the document and suggested other courses for inclusion.

The process for accessing planning tools on the TEPP web site was reviewed by the group. The tools have been available for 2 years and comments generated by them have been incorporated. Members asked for rewording of the tools' definitions to mirror regulatory definitions.

A complete summary of the group's discussion can be found on the TEC working group web site at <http://twilight.saic.com/newtec/>.

### ***Training and Medical Training Issues Topic Group Action Items:***

1. Review the planning efforts required to conduct POPEYE exercise and examine lessons learned from the interactions.
2. Initiate interaction between FEMA and DOE in the development of a training course for hospital personnel who may handle radiologically contaminated patients. FEMA will continue development of their materials, and the Topic Group will review and comment on materials during development and identify current training materials suitable for use as prerequisites.
3. Present to FRPCC the issue concerning OSHA level of training required before responders are permitted to enter an event scene to perform rescue.
4. Outline a strategy for marketing MERRTT, review the provided list of possible marketing venues, and suggest additional links, as needed.
5. Review draft videos scripts and provide comments within 45 days (from date of meeting).
6. Revise draft decontamination paper to include pros/cons and model procedures for carrying out each process (comments on the paper were due by September 1, 2000).
7. Continue to pursue Continuing Education Units for MERRTT.

### ***Transportation Protocols Topic Group***

Mona Williams began the session with roundtable introductions and a brief outline of the meeting's agenda. She noted two protocols, transportation planning and emergency response, had been extensively revised and would be discussed first. She indicated the draft protocols, key issue papers and comment response matrices had been distributed to Topic Group members electronically.

Key points of discussion are identified below.

Following the review of specific protocols, Ms. Williams briefly discussed options DOE is considering for implementing the protocols. These are:

1. Secretarial policy letter—least complicated approach;
2. DOE Orders; and
3. Contract letters (most difficult to implement and usually pertain to safety practices).

A decision is expected from DOE management in late September and Ms. Williams will inform the group as soon as a decision is made. She also reviewed the current schedule, which is to have a completed package and path forward by the time the Administration changes. Ms. Williams asked the Topic Group to get the package out to their constituents for review and comment. A draft introduction and appendices are planned for late September with a Topic Group conference call in October. Lisa Sattler asked to have the call in November, after the Western States meet in late October. Following a final internal review, DOE will release the full package of protocols, including the glossary and introduction, to the group in midwinter. The Topic Group will have its final meeting in February 2001.

***Protocols Topic Group Action Items:***

1. Topic Group participants will circulate drafts to their constituents and submit comments to DOE by September 15, 2000.
2. Mona Williams will obtain an answer to the transuranic waste transportation issue by the next meeting.
3. The Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management will provide clarification why the National Waste Policy Act, Section 180 (c) does not require training and technical assistance to prepare for potential private fuel storage shipments.  
***Action: The DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management is only authorized to transport spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste to a facility constructed under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as Amended.***
4. Writing Group will review protocols language to ensure States are not being committed to actions outside their roles.
5. NTP will review the Program Managers' Guide to ensure consistency with the protocols.
6. For the Section III Rail Carrier Requirements in the Carrier/Driver Requirements Protocol, Kevin Blackwell and Bob Fronczak will provide language for rail that is similar to the highway portion of this section.
7. Lisa Sattler will provide a suggested rewrite of Section II in Operational Contingencies Protocol.
8. Bob Fronczak requested that the writing group check with DOE legal counsel regarding the Price-Anderson discussion in the rail section of the Recovery and Cleanup protocol, specifically, clarification of the financial liability requirements under Price Anderson. The way the Section currently reads, it implies that the railroads would go bankrupt before Price Anderson indemnification starts.

### ***Tribal Issues Topic Group***

A final draft DOE Indian Policy was distributed in July 2000. Comments on DOE's final draft Cultural Resources Management Policy are due to DOE's Office of Environment, Safety, and Health by the end of August 2000. EM has developed a *Guide to Working with Tribal Nations*, which should be available on the web site soon. The comment period for the NRC Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Tribal prenotification comment period ended July 5, 2000, with a high level of input from Tribes. Concern was expressed over the Washington Republican Party draft policy that would eliminate government-to-government relations with Tribes. Information was distributed.

Case study reports dealing with Minnesota Tribes and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) were presented. The group suggested a set of lessons learned about Tribal relationships with other jurisdictions be developed.

A new Waste Isolation Pilot Plant shipping route from California and Nevada (along I-40) is under development. Additional Tribes that could be impacted include Acoma and Laguna Pueblos and the Navajo Nation.

The recent Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) inspection letter was summed up to say that States and Tribes are preempted from stopping trains and conducting inspections outside the State Rail Participation Program. Tribes are not mentioned in the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 and are precluded from participation in that program.

In regards to the proposed Consolidated Grant, Judith Holm asked participants to consider how DOE should treat Tribes in relationship to States, equity of funding, needs assessments, etc. The Grant package is in the Secretary's office awaiting approval.

### ***Tribal Issues Topic Group Action Items:***

1. Continuation of case study development related to Tribal interactions with other government agencies.
2. Distribution of Environmental Management's (EM) *Guide to Working with Tribal Nations*.
3. Summarizing coordination of NRC, EPA, and other interactions with Tribes and looking at their GIS capabilities relative to Tribal lands, Tribal POCs and transportation routes.

### ***Consolidated Grant Topic Group***

Judith Holm introduced Carol Peabody, DOE-HQ, who has been coordinating HQ input concerning an action memo to the Secretary (see discussion below). Members briefly reviewed suggested updates to the task plan.

A State member asked which other stakeholder groups had been briefed on the proposed grant and whether DOE had received comments from them. Judith Holm reported that DOE had discussed the concept with several groups but that no written comments had been provided. She agreed to provide a list of groups that had been briefed.

Carol Peabody reported that all DOE programs that currently ship, or plan to ship, radioactive material have concurred on an action memo to the Secretary requesting his approval to develop the grant concept. The memo is now in the Secretary's office. If a positive response is received, an internal working group will be established and a draft implementation plan drawn up in 45 days. The plan will identify major issues and concerns identified to date (both internal to DOE and issues provided by the Topic Group), propose a plan for interaction between the Department and States and Tribes (including the Topic Group), and propose a schedule for overall development of a proposed grant mechanism. Tracy Mustin stated that a positive Secretarial response to the memo is expected but that there are many issues to be discussed internally. [The memo was signed on August 22, 2000]

The group discussed issues focusing particularly on factors for allocating what might be proposed as the impact component of the grant.

Most of the detailed discussion focused on factors that might be used to determine how funds would be allocated among recipients.

1. How can DOE make the process/allocation factors equitable, while achieving the basic goal of public health and safety related to radioactive materials transportation?
2. How can the process be kept simple, yet equitable? Several members expressed the view that a basic requirement should be to keep the process simple and to reduce the number of factors to a few key ones which could be easily quantified and on which most participants could agree. The group discussed other questions under this general topic:
  - a. Can some of the factors be subsumed under others in order to reduce complexity?
  - b. Can some of the concerns about special issues be addressed through the discretionary component of the grant?
  - c. What is the balance between keeping the process simple and addressing particular concerns?

Members provided additional comments on the allocation factors:

1. A definition section and planning assumptions section should be part of the information provided.
2. Schedule projections need to be accurate and routes need to be defined in order to assess training needs.
3. Should there be a Tribal set-aside? Should this question be postponed until after allocation factors are better developed?
4. One member recommended that DOE adopt the approach used in the U.S. Department of Transportation/Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Program (The program sets aside 3% for Tribes. Both planning and training grants allocate a base amount to States and Territories and variable additional amounts that are based on three allocation factors: total population; Hazmat miles; and location of those chemical facilities which report the presence of extremely hazardous substances (SARA 302). The training and planning portions of the grant assign different weightings to these three factors.)
5. Factors could be subject to review and change over time (as for Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program).
6. An assessment of capabilities and resource levels could result in a means test.

The meeting concluded with an exercise in which participants placed colored dots on the list of 12 factors to indicate general priorities. Participation was limited to external stakeholders—no DOE or contractor staff participated. The following factors received the most dots from the members who participated (only three Tribal members participated).

- Level of capabilities/resources
- Number of shipments
- Mileage along routes
- Population ½mile each side of the route
- Accident rates

It should be noted that the intent of this exercise was not to eliminate any factors from future consideration. It was solely an exercise to gain the general impressions of participants at this particular meeting.

### ***Consolidated Grant Action Items***

1. NTP will provide a list of stakeholder groups that have been briefed on the proposed consolidated grant
2. All members are reminded to email to Judith Bradbury a list of administrative conditions applying to their State/Tribe (e.g., Fiscal Year, time/procedures required for receiving and distributing Federal funding). This input will be helpful in future DOE discussion of the proposed grant.

### **Wednesday, July 26, 2000**

#### ***Plenary I***

James Carlson, TEC Co-Chair, began the first plenary session by making some introductory remarks. Next, he introduced Mr. Patrick Ralston of the Indiana Emergency Management Agency.

Mr. Ralston, Executive Director of IEMA, welcomed TEC participants to Indianapolis on behalf of Mayor Bart Peterson and Governor Frank O'Bannon. He said that Indiana realized that nuclear waste was not going away, so the State had taken a "get the message out" policy. Although Indiana is not a nuclear waste generating state, it does generate other types of hazardous materials. As nuclear waste is shipped through the State, it therefore must be dealt with in the safest way for its residents. Mr. Ralston informed the group that the State of Indiana worked with a Citizens Advisory Committee to plan and project evacuation routes, as well as containment and clean-up procedures. They met with the first responders along shipping routes to assess needs. The number of HAZMAT teams was increased from 2 to 14 along shipping routes. In all, the State has 32 HAZMAT teams that have received significant funding from the Department of Justice, Counter Terrorism funding (Nunn-Lugar Act). Also, the State began assessing a fee of \$1000/shipment to offset increased costs of emergency management.

Indiana has taken a "proactive" as opposed to "reactive" manner in educating and dealing with public opposition. Mr. Ralston used the POPEYE exercise as a good example that tested a unified command system for Lake County, Indiana. Indiana has also set up a bipartisan foundation composed of government officials and citizens to appropriate the dollar revenues collected from selling the State environmental license plates. He emphasized the need to keep the public fully informed about shipments of nuclear waste and other HAZMAT material.

Grace Plummer, DOE Privatization and Contract Reform Office (PC-1) spoke about the DOE low-level waste study. She emphasized the study's leveraging resources; better business practices and procurement strategies that would help identify innovative approaches. The study is process oriented and will explore industry views and experiences. It is being conducted in coordination with Tracy Mustin, DOE Office of Transportation, and Mona Williams, DOE/National Transportation Program/AL.

Tom Hughes, Radiological Officer of the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency (PEMA) discussed the TRANSCOM 2000 system. This is an improved GPS TRANSCOM system that has been used for tracking materials for Waste Isolation Pilot Program, DOE Environmental Management foreign research reactor spent nuclear fuel, Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology laboratory spent fuel and university reactors programs, Defense Programs mixed oxide (MOX) fuel program and the Defense Programs Lead Test Assembly program, among others. DOE Order 460.2 requires tracking of these materials in transit. System security is an important issue and will take an additional 6 months to test. TRANSCOM 2000 is an Internet-based system, while the existing version is accessible via modem.

Dave Crose, Technical Hazard Division, Indiana State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA), reviewed Indiana's latest experience on transportation of nuclear waste. He reemphasized the importance of keeping elected officials and the public current on shipments. The Indiana SEMA has taken an aggressive role in training first responders.

Following the plenary session, three concurrent breakout sessions were held: one on Transportation Protocols and Communications issues, another on the Consolidated Grant and Tribal Issues, and a third on Resources for Emergency Preparedness. Key points from each are summarized below.

### ***Transportation Protocols and Communications Issues***

Mona Williams, DOE National Transportation Program, provided a viewgraph presentation entitled "*DOE Transportation Protocols: Development and Implementation.*" The purpose of the DOE Protocols Topic Group is to streamline and coordinate internal practices related to radioactive materials transportation and consolidate Departmental policies into one document for better stakeholder interaction.

Beginning in 1998, DOE's Senior Executive Transportation Forum (SETF) directed staff to develop a series of protocols that would govern procedures related to DOE radioactive materials transportation and emergency response activities. An internal Writing Group was convened to review existing DOE transportation activities and protocols, to draft corporate protocols and circulate them among DOE programs and key stakeholders for review. The SETF also directed that TEC serve as a primary stakeholder interface for gaining input on the protocol development process. The development, writing, review and comment process has multiple stages. Every external comment has been tracked throughout the process and the coordination among programs has been extensive.

The participants on the Topic Group represent a variety of organizations interested in radioactive materials transportation and emergency response activities from Federal, State, Tribal and local groups. Some of the numerous issues covered by the Topic Group are transportation planning, prenotification, project shipment planning, routing, inspections, tracking shipments, safe parking, carrier/driver requirements, security, emergency planning and notification, emergency response and recovery/clean-up.

Drafts of all 14 transportation protocols are currently undergoing the second Topic Group review and will be finalized by January 2001. Full implementation is expected by March 2001.

The remaining issues of the Topic Group are to determine the preferred method of implementing the protocols. Six options have been put forward and final determination will be made by the SETF

Communications Topic Group co-chair Patricia Armijo (NTP/AL) welcomed session participants and briefed them on the group's purpose to assist DOE in identifying ways to improve its communication with external stakeholders and as a means to be provided information on DOE transportation-related issues and concerns.

Martha Crosland (EM-22) provided a history of TEC activities, including creation of an external review procedure for DOE communication packages and information materials, local government notification survey and white paper, drafting communication protocols and submittal to the protocols writing group.

***Ongoing and New Action Items:***

1. Review of the Sandia web site on transportation packaging;
2. Review of low-level waste brochure written by the National Safety Council;
3. Key message development;
4. Ways to improve risk communication, including development of a risk communication bibliography and a research project on environmental impact statement (EIS) questions and answers to help ensure consistency in responses, review the quality of responses and provide standardization for best practices when responding to similar or identical questions in EISs.

The Topic Group will review a presentation being developed on radioactive materials transportation for State and local officials, and is developing a shipping campaign communication program best practices/lessons learned document.

Nancy Bennett of the Transportation Resource Exchange Center (T-REX) gave a presentation on risk communication research being conducted for DOE/NTAA for Transportation Research (ATR) Institute. T-REX (part of the University of New Mexico's Alliance for Transportation Research) has prepared an annotated bibliography of over 60 risk communication publications. It is divided into five areas: recommendations on calculating risk and how to communicate quantitative risk to the public in a meaningful manner; risk communication from a regulatory standpoint; how to provide information to the public; successful risk communication; and consensus-building. The entire bibliography is available on the web at <http://trex-center.org/testrisk.asp>.

The group was then briefed on T-REX's research on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) comment/response pairs. Recurring themes have been identified; i.e., the most common types of comments and how these comments are answered. This research will be made available to DOE programs to assist in writing sections of EISs, to help standardize responses and communicate risk more effectively. The bulk of this research is expected to be completed in October. Ms. Bennett completed her presentation by providing information on T-REX's TRAM (Transportation of Radioactive Materials and Wastes virtual directory). The TRAM is a search engine through which over 400 groups involved in the transportation of radioactive wastes and materials can be searched by their major work function, minor work function, geographical scope, and internal or external DOE status.

Elizabeth Helvey, JK Associates, moderated the last Communications Topic Group agenda item, asking participants which DOE transportation communication programs have worked and which ones have not. The information will be placed into one “reference” document for use by DOE managers and the public and posted on the NTP, main DOE TEC and T-REX web sites.

Participants provided the following positive examples of communication programs and practices:

1. Foreign Research Reactor campaign: extensive public, emergency response personnel and elected official involvement; training; materials were timely, easy to use and accurate.
2. WIPP: public and elected officials outreach early and often, truck visibility, road show.
3. PECO/Shoreham: State and local governments provided substantial information on a regular basis.
4. Maine-Yankee power plant dismantlement: activist groups involved in planning and were able to affect the process.
5. MOX shipments: DOE responded quickly when informed that Northeast States needed information and training.
6. General: Inform and provide information to State, agency, Tribal and elected officials well ahead of controversial shipments and involve them in the process; TRANSCOM re-vamp shows what’s being done to respond to stakeholder concerns; speaking the same “language” as the target audience, i.e., keep jargon and acronyms to a minimum, use easy-to-understand terms; and use CD ROM as means to provide raw video, photos, graphics and other stock information materials. (Action: Ms. Crosland to let the group know when photo library is digitized.)

Examples of communication programs and practices that could be improved:

1. MOX shipments: Little or no interaction with State and local officials along transportation route, re-routing shipment request was mishandled.
2. WIPP: Need better coordination with States when announcing changes in shipping dates, releasing information to the media – lack of timely and accurate shipment notification makes it difficult for States to notify their constituents; insensitivity to concerns raised during presentations, inform States of changes in policy, for example no Fernald shipments to WIPP; better inform States of outreach activities that are taking place in a given State.
3. General: Planned burn at Rocky Flats not communicated with officials prior to its occurrence; misinformation provided concerning air sampling; don’t spend a lot of time arguing a position based on science: shipping information and dates not coordinated through DOE system – could overload State resources; public hearings or meetings not scheduled in appropriate locations; DOE flip-flopping on rail or truck transportation; issues such as not allowing States access to TRANSCOM during shipping campaigns “disappear” when States have expressed concerns; written materials out of date.

### ***Proposed Consolidated Grant and Tribal Issues***

Judith Holm reported on the following five key activities currently underway:

1. Discussion related to a letter from the FRA concerning State and Tribal authority for safety inspection of rail shipments. Mike Calhoun, FRA, attended the Topic Group meeting the previous day and offered to serve as liaison between States and Tribes on rail safety issues.

2. Topic Group members are currently compiling case studies on Tribal interactions/coordination with other jurisdictions on transportation issues.
3. DOE-EM is developing a *Guide to Working with Tribal Nations*. The guide should be available in the next 30-60 days.
4. The group is also examining Tribal relations with other Federal agencies.
5. An initial meeting has been held with EPA and NRC to explore GIS initiatives currently underway.

Judith Holm and Carol Peabody reviewed the work of the Consolidated Grant Topic Group and efforts underway within the Department related to this issue.

The three breakout groups conducted a prioritization exercise in which they were asked to identify the top five allocation factors from their perspective. The top five factors were the same for each group. However, the ranking varied slightly. The priority factors across all groups (three breakouts and the Topic Group) were:

1. Level of capabilities and resources
2. Number of shipments
3. Mileage
4. Population within 2 mile each side of the route
5. Accident rates

It should be noted that this exercise was not intended to eliminate any factor from further consideration. Other factors received much lower priority.

### ***Resources for Emergency Preparedness***

#### **DOE Radiological Assistance Program (RAP) Assets**

Ken Keaton presented the RAP response capabilities and other DOE assets for assisting Federal, State, and local responders. He covered the structure and deployment of the RAP teams, the Federal Radiological Monitoring and Assessment Center, Aerial Measuring System, Atmospheric Release Advisory Capability, Radiological Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site, Accident Response Group, and Nuclear Emergency Search Team.

Mr. Keaton clarified the roles and responsibilities of RAP. Each RAP team is deployed at a regional level and consists of seven volunteers. They include public information resources for relaying information about RAP. One participant questioned how the RAP team could get close enough to the incident and reach a conclusion. The railroad industry faces these types of problems when cars derail. Participants also wanted to know who determines when the RAP team calls in additional resources.

The participants agreed that Federal resources are good for recovery and should not be expected to arrive earlier than four hours after being notified. Federal responders may also be delayed because they require permission from the State team to enter the area. The local responders should be trained how to implement scene control and protective measures for an incident involving hazardous materials. For incidents involving shipments of classified radioactive materials, the Federal response time differs. Participants were told to notify the National Response Center to activate the Federal Radiological Emergency Response Plan (FRERP).

### **Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Resources**

Bernice Zaidel explained the broader role of FEMA in supporting State and local organizations. First, she introduced the FEMA grant program. The Emergency Management Preparedness Grant (EMPG) permits the States to retain one third of the grant for administrative purposes or other items deemed necessary. The other portion goes to the local emergency management directors to support salaries and expenses related to planning and training. EMPGs are block grants with essentially no strings attached. The money can be used for planning, training, or equipment. To get the money, the State must justify their program. This year, the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) program allocated approximately \$700,000 to Tribal programs.

Session participants asked questions about the distribution process and the matching funds requirements. Ms. Zaidel explained the initial request goes to the FEMA regional office for review. Each FEMA regional office determines the distribution within its region. A formula is used to determine how the funds are distributed. The formula considers all hazards and overall risk factors. There is a matching requirement which may be 50/50.

Ms. Zaidel gave information about the Emergency Management Institute (EMI) and the National Fire Academy. When responders enroll at either facility, FEMA reimburses travel expenses and provides free lodging. The student pays for meals. FEMA publishes brochures that describe training provided at each facility. The training supports specific hazards including radiological. In many cases, the training materials have been given to the States for delivery as [Afield@courses](mailto:Afield@courses).

FEMA also offers independent study courses that almost anyone can take. These courses can be obtained through the FEMA web site or from EMI. These courses usually present training only at the awareness level.

One session participant asked why the Federal agencies do not have a consolidated training program to eliminate duplicate courses. Ms. Zaidel mentioned the draft compendium of courses related to transporting radioactive materials. It will be presented to the Federal Radiological Planning and Coordination Committee (FRPCC) training subcommittee. Through the FRPCC, other Federal agencies will be asked to include courses. The compendium identifies similar courses and may eliminate the development of duplicate training.

### **Environmental Protection Agency Resources.**

Bill Belanger reviewed the FRERP and how it provides assistance to States. When an emergency occurs, the State is responsible for taking care of its people (except when a disaster is declared). States may request Federal support which may arrive about six hours after notification. The FRERP designates one Federal agency as the Lead Federal Agency (LFA) to coordinate support. The LFA varies based on the incident. EPA serves as the LFA only for incidents involving nuclear weapons from a foreign country or emergencies related to Superfund.

EPA recently revised its radiation response capability plan. The EPA response does not preclude the use of the RAP team - especially for anything owned by DOE or when you need a quick response. EPA responds in concert with other Federal agencies usually focuses on consequence management. Because EPA on scene responders receive only basic radiation safety training, they are usually more adept in a chemical response. An EPA team may need assistance from DOE RAP teams that specialize in radiological incidents.

When other funding mechanisms are available for conducting clean up activities, then EPA does not get involved. However, if needed, the EPA responder can commit up to \$200,000 to pay a contractor to perform clean up duties without further approval. With verbal approval, the amount can be increased to \$2,000,000. This funding ensures clean up activities get started right away.

Mr. Belanger explained when the information from the manifest is known, then the LFA is the NRC. The NRC orders the licensee to do the cleanup. When the licensee cannot do a cleanup, the State can call a RAP team or EPA can be called in tandem with the RAP team. When it is not known who owns the material, then the LFA is the EPA, which begins a Superfund response.

Mr. Belanger described an incident that illustrates the manner in which EPA can assist States. The incident began with the detection of 40 cubic yards of radioactive automotive waste. The local responders called in the State radiological health department who determined the source. The State contacted the regional DOE RAP team that responded, confirmed the source, and provided additional information. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) was contacted because the source is a regulated isotope. A long distance telephone conference call served as the unified command and the various agencies decided on a plan forward. With the help of Los Alamos National Laboratory and NRC, they were able to determine the make, model, and serial number for the source. With this information the owner of the source was determined and the NRC became the LFA.

**Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency (PEMA) State Radiological Training Mix.** Tom Hughes outlined the steps taken to develop the PEMA Radiological Preparedness Program (copies were distributed). Through coordination with numerous agencies across Pennsylvania, PEMA determined the training format, developed training categories, identified the appropriate training for radiological assistants, compiled the training required for the radiological response team members, and ensured the radiological monitors trained by the industry received support during a response. It also required providing MERRTT to the State Police and the Department of Environmental Protection, plus adding Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance training for State inspectors into the training circular. From feedback, PEMA determined some training could be revised. For all classes, a proficiency check is done and sometimes the MERRTT tabletop is used when unable to conduct a drill.

To benefit the responders, PEMA has teamed with the Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Frederick Community College (EMI Courses), DOD military retirement points, Pennsylvania Department of Health, and Resident Course to issue continuing education units for training. The accreditation is determined on a case by case basis.

The training covers the Radiological Is, II s, and III s. Radiological Is can teach the first four modules of MERRTT. State fire academy pays for students to take the adult methodology course. PEMA certified instructors follow the materials PEMA tells them to use and they must meet Pennsylvania certification requirements. Only courses offered through PEMA can be taught. PEMA's course list matches the fire academy's list. In January 2001, the trainers will gather to determine and discuss concerns that have arisen.

Pam Weeks said most of PEMA's training funds come from grants. PEMA partners with other Pennsylvania agencies to save money and pool resources. Pennsylvania has problems getting training to its more than 2,500 municipalities and 67 counties. The grants force the groups to plan for future training.

Conducting a RODEO at Fort Indiantown Gap brought the radiological instructors and personnel together. The terrorism grants support conduct of the RODEO. The Vigilant Lion exercise CD-ROM is available through the TEPP web site or on CD-ROM.

### ***DOE Program Update Session***

For the first time, this meeting included a poster session program update during the midday break. Topics included a TRANSCOM demonstration, an update on WIPP, the Yucca Mountain project, the naval nuclear propulsion program, defense programs, spent fuel shipments from West Valley, and the DOE Tribal Oral Histories Project. The following synthesizes those presentations.

### ***TRANSCOM Demonstration***

Gene Carnes, TRANSCOM Operations Manager, provided information about the new TRANSCOM 2000 system that is now operational. The overall consensus is that there are no duplications and it is less expensive to operate than the existing TRANSCOM system. The TRANSCOM 2000 system's first screen is a map of the actual location of the shipment. The second screen is a 19-second message page for the vehicle and TRANSCOM. The third screen is an update of the Bill of Lading in standard Automated Transportation Management System (ATMS) format (TRANSCOM 2000 is expected to be completely integrated with ATMS next year). The fourth screen is a calculation worksheet that allows the shipper to "plug-in" a known value so TRANSCOM 2000 can calculate and print out answers. TRANSCOM 2000 allows for uniformity of "on-line" transportation systems. For additional information, please contact the TRANSCOM Control Center at (423) 576-0982.

### ***Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)***

Greg Sahd, DOE Intergovernmental Program Manager for WIPP, provided a program update. He stated that WIPP is operational and doing well with 62 shipments of contact handled, non-mixed TRU waste received to date from Los Alamos, Idaho, Rocky Flats, and one shipment from Richland. WIPP currently has approximately 1,800 "fifty-five gallon drum equivalents" stored underground. A second panel of seven, 100-meter-long storage rooms have been mined and are near completion. For additional information, please contact: 1-800-336-WIPP or [www.wipp.carlsbad.nm.us](http://www.wipp.carlsbad.nm.us)

### ***Yucca Mountain Project***

Max Powell and Jozette Booth, Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office, stated that the Yucca Mountain Project is on schedule to release the Site Recommended Consideration Report (SRCR) in late 2000 and to submit the SRCR to the Secretary of Energy in June 2001. The site is currently undergoing a recompetes for the M&O contractor. The new contractor is expected to be announced in August 2000 and transition completed by February 2001. If the Secretary of Energy determines the site to be suitable, he will submit his recommendation to the President of the United States in July 2001. The President would then make the recommendation to Congress within 60 days, followed by DOE's submittal of an application license to the NRC (probably by early 2002). For additional information or to request a copy of the EIS on CD-ROM, please call 1-800-967-3477.

### ***Naval Nuclear Propulsion***

Ray English, Transportation Officer, Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP) facilitated the naval spent fuel shipment update. Since 1957, the NNPP has safely and successfully coordinated, with the nation's railroads, the movement of 727 containers of naval spent fuel from east and west coast locations to the Naval Reactors Facility at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL). Naval spent fuel shipments are deemed safe for the following reasons: 1) The rugged nature of naval reactor fuel, 2) The formidable and robust nature of the Type B containers in which the spent fuel is packaged, and 3) The proven shipping practices followed by the NNPP - escorting every shipment, use of government-owned rail equipment, satellite tracking, close coordination with railroad operational and police departments, etc. The shipments are classified, national security shipments so no prenotification is provided; but the NNPP works with State, Tribal and local officials to ensure that there is a good understanding of the shipments. The periodic accident exercises that NNPP coordinates with stakeholders is one example of its outreach efforts in this regard. On September 14, 2000, at INEEL such an exercise and is currently being coordinated with several Idaho State and local agencies, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, DOE's regional Radiological Assistance Program (RAP) team, and the Union Pacific Railroad. Western and Midwestern stakeholders were encouraged to come and observe the exercise.

### ***Defense Programs***

Mike Hickman (DOE-SRS) reported that the Department of Transportation is comfortable with DOE defense program shipments. He also reported that some commercial carriers are concerned about being subject to the same requirements as DOE carriers.

### ***West Valley Nuclear Fuel Shipment***

Mike Tyacke and Marsha Keister, INEEL, reported that the primary concern expressed by the public was about the routing, communicating about the shipment, and emergency response training. He also mentioned that there is a need to help set up dosimetry capabilities with other railroads.

### ***DOE Tribal Oral Histories Project (videotape series)***

Three videotapes created as part of DOE's Tribal Oral Histories project were presented.

## **Thursday, July 27, 2000**

### ***Indiana Model Transportation Legislation***

Senator Beverly Gard, Indiana State Senator, District 28, discussed State legislation that designated the lead agency involved in emergency preparedness and described the process involved in emergency planning for high-level waste. Next steps would extend the legislation to transuranic waste, evaluate alternate shipping routes, and address the issue of levying shipper fees to supplement funding for emergency preparedness training. Federal funds for emergency preparedness funding are not adequate to meet State needs.

### ***Breakout Group Summary***

### ***Communications Topic Group***

A review took place of key action items from the breakout sessions such as review of the Sandia web site on transportation packaging, review of the National Safety Council's low-level waste brochure, development of a risk communication bibliography and a research project on EIS questions and answers.

### ***Training and Medical Issues Training Group***

Available training courses and exercises through Emergency Management Institute (EMI) as well as funding options and coordination between Federal agencies were reviewed. The group reiterated the suggestion of using the Superfund for funding contractors to clean up radioactive incidents, not for grants for State or local government. MERRTT will be updated by January 2001 (if warranted), the brochure will be revised and a MERRTT video is being made to assist instructors.

### ***Tribal Issues Topic Group***

*Action items from the Tribal Issues session included:*

- Develop liaison for rail safety in a rail safety panel (Calhoun/FRA-Alan Lusby/AAR).
- Compile case studies on Tribal interactions with other jurisdictions.
- Distribute EM's "Guide to Working with Tribal Nations", which should be available within 30-60 days.
- Continue GIS initiative with other Federal agencies, initial meeting has been held with EPA and NRC to explore initiative currently underway to map Tribal lands, State boundaries and highways.
- Explore data available from the Census Bureau.

### ***Consolidated Grant Topic Group***

Proposed Key Issues:

1. Eligibility
  - Should there be a threshold of a minimum number of shipments?
  - Determining eligibility requires accurate projections for schedule and number of shipments.
2. Impact Component: Allocation Factors
  - Twelve total factors considered
  - Participants emphasized KISS principle
  - Key factors identified (in order of priority)
    - Level of capability/resources
    - Number of shipments
    - Mileage along routes
    - Population within 1/2 mile of route
    - Accident rate
3. Potentially Allowable Activities
  - Agreement on broad categories of allowables: transportation planning and coordination, emergency preparedness, accident prevention, public information and awareness
  - Need to include explanation of definitions and planning assumptions
  - Discussion centered on degree of specificity
  - Should there be a Tribal set-aside?

- Relationship to 180 ( c ) funding
- Identification of other involved stakeholder groups

**Action Item:**

NTP will provide a list of stakeholder groups with whom they have discussed the proposed grant.

***Suggestions for Next TEC Meeting***

A suggestion was made that program exhibits be set up in a central area outside of the meeting rooms where they would remain for the duration of the meeting.

A survey indicated that the TEC participants like the Topic Group format.

Judith Holm requested the participant's review the TEC action items provided in the registration handout and provide feedback.

The next TEC meeting will be held the first or second week of February. Suggested cities were San Diego, Phoenix, and Houston.

***Summary of TEC Meeting Evaluations***

The TEC July 2000 meeting was rated as "excellent" or "good" by all of the participants who returned evaluation forms. Agenda topics were rated as either "very useful" or "somewhat useful." The use of electronic distribution and registration were deemed efficient and very helpful. Other comments included: Indianapolis was a great host city; attendees enjoyed the downtown location close to shopping and restaurants. Participants particularly liked Topic Group meetings where time was allocated for discussion of issues, and break out sessions that provided information for all of the Topic Groups and the roundtable arrangement. Attendees liked the format for the Program Reviews, also the displays, written information material, and support staff availability. They would like to see displays and posters set-up for the entire meeting with more space provided for observation and discussion at future TEC meetings.

Overall consensus indicated Topic Groups provided good general discussions, presentations and activities/exercises. The Consolidated Grant was of primary concern to the States and regional groups who felt more time was needed for discussion and answering questions. TEC participants would like the Consolidated Grant Topic Group to focus on allocation factors and finalize the guidance. It was suggested that the Tribal Topic Group use visuals for all presentations.

At a future TEC meeting participants would like to see a bigger training picture for emergency preparedness, an OSHA review of the MERRTT and the Land Withdrawal Act training requirements. And a presentation on both DOE and private contractor resources available to clean up a transportation related spent nuclear fuel release.