

**U. S. Department of Energy (DOE)
Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC)
Security Topic Group
Conference Call
October 18, 2005**

Summary of Discussion:

The TEC Security Topic Group (STG) held the first of a series of monthly calls on Tuesday, October 18, 2005, starting at 11:00 a.m. Eastern time. Participants included **Alex Thrower**, Office of National Transportation (ONT), Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM), DOE; **Conrad Smith**, Council of State Governments-Eastern Regional Conference (CSG-ER); **Sarah Wochos**, Council of State Governments-Midwestern Office (CSG-MW); **Christian Einberg**, Office of Systems Analysis and Strategy Development, OCRWM, DOE; **Larry Stern**, Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance; **Deborah Dawson**, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC); **Phil Brochman**, Division of Nuclear Security, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC); **David Crawford**, Office of Security and Safety Assurance (SSA), DOE; **Scott Palmer**, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen (BLET); **Sandra Threatt**, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC); **Robert Fronczak**, Association of American Railroads (AAR); **Tim Runyon**, Illinois Emergency Management Agency (EMA); **Scott Field**, Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB); **Aubrey Godwin**, Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency (ARRA); and **Don Flater**, Iowa Bureau of Radiological Health (BRH).

Following introductions, Mr. Thrower asked for comments on the draft minutes of the group's last meeting in Pueblo, CO on September 21, 2005. Mr. Runyon noted there had been a request by participants to obtain definitions for key terms used in discussing security initiatives (e.g., what is a "design basis threat"). Mr. Thrower stated John Fitzgibbons (SSA-DOE) had provided a short listing derived from DOE Manual 470.4-7, "Safeguards and Security Program References," and he would forward that to the group participants.

Mr. Field suggested one of the more significant results of the Pueblo meeting seemed to be a recognition that there is likely a significant gap between what DOE seems to believe States want in terms of detailed advance shipment information, much of which is classified, and what States actually do want to have, most of which is not. The notes need to reflect this important finding, he said. Mr. Thrower agreed to modify the notes before finalizing them.

Ms. Threatt asked why the group was discussing issues like design basis threats (DBTs) and vulnerability assessments (VAs) when those things are classified. Mr. Thrower responded that the purpose of the group was to identify and discuss generally what kinds of elements the security system would feature, to the extent possible, to provide an improved understanding of the issues for TEC members and to help DOE improve its security planning. Classified information would never be discussed in this forum, he said.

Ms. Threatt noted that DOE's Savannah River Site (SRS) had web-based training on security issues that might assist topic group participants in learning more about DOE's general approach to security. *[Note: in subsequent discussions with SRS' office of security, that office indicated it would not be appropriate to make this specific training publicly available at this time. Suggest discussion of available alternatives at the conference call on 11/15—Alex]*

The group next examined the draft work plan which had been modified to reflect comments made at the Pueblo meeting. Mr. Thrower noted the schedule section remained incomplete because the group had not had an opportunity to prioritize activities at the meeting, and he suggested they do so today. He also noted that several of the activities involved obtaining data and reporting on State, Tribal and local practices in a number of areas, the results of which could be used by DOE to better inform its own security planning. Staff from several organizations (Lisa Sattler from CSG-MW and Larry Stern from CVSA) had offered to assist in data collection. After some discussion, participants agreed this would be appropriate as an initial approach; if obtaining information begins to consume substantial staff time and resources then the groups would discuss that with their DOE counterparts.

The group discussed planned information security tasks. Mr. Fronczak suggested the word "carriers" be specifically added to the listing of participants in the information security tasks. Mr. Field suggested addition of a task to clearly identify the DOE-State "gap" in understanding the level of information desired and needed; Mr. Godwin and Mr. Smith both supported this approach; they noted the WIPP program had provided different levels of shipment information at different times, and States expected OCRWM shipments to follow a similar approach. Mr. Thrower agreed to make both modifications to the work plan to reflect these comments. Mr. Smith suggested this item be given top priority since it is a necessary prerequisite for other items.

Mr. Godwin next asked whether information about OCRWM shipments would be protected like NRC Safeguards Information for NRC-licensed shipments currently is. He suggested the level of information provided is necessary for the States. Mr. Thrower responded that determination would depend on assessments made by DOE's Office of Security; in addition, the purpose of the Classification Guide for Transportation was to understand the similarities and differences among different Federal program that have roles in protecting shipment information. One significant difference, he noted, was that access to certain DOE information depends in part on an individual's clearance, while NRC regulations on safeguards information limits sharing that information to certain types of officials regardless of whether they have an NRC clearance.

The group then discussed security practices tasks. Mr. Field noted the Rail Topic Group had outlined a proposed task to study protective force requirements (escorts) for shipments but this activity had been transferred to the STG because of the issue's security focus. Mr. Flater stated security planning was tied closely to inspections for radiological and safety issues, because if States can be assured inspections are not necessary then

fewer stops could be required. He suggested States might want health physics personnel to escort the shipments. Mr. Thrower indicated this task is something of a moving target in terms of proposed focus; given the other priorities outlined by the STG he recommended deferring this activity in the near-term.

Mr. Palmer noted that during his presentation in Pueblo he had identified several items of concern for his members and had hoped to see some of those rail security issues addressed by the STG. Mr. Fronczak suggested he and Mr. Palmer discuss the list of issues offline and report back on the Nov. 15 call on status.

It was agreed that there are enough items to be addressed currently. Mr. Thrower said he would revise the schedule based on the priorities identified above and re-send to the STG. Mr. Flater suggested for future calls, DOE set up an 800 number so people can join in if they are on travel or at home. Several participants from the Midwest will be on a Yucca mountain tour during the next scheduled call. Mr. Thrower agreed to set the call up this way and provide information about dialing in using the DOE 800 number.

Action Items:

1. Provide listing of key terms to STG (Thrower)
2. Edit Pueblo meeting minutes to reflect additional comments and commitments made and distribute to STG (Dawson)
3. Update STG roster and provide to group (Dawson)
4. Finalize task plan and distribute (Thrower)
5. Status report on security issues identified by BLET (Palmer, Fronczak)

Submitted by: Alex Thrower, Nov. 9, 2005