

TRANSPORTATION EXTERNAL COORDINATION (TEC) WORKING GROUP
SECURITY TOPIC GROUP
MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 14, 2006

INTRODUCTION

The Security Topic Group (STG) of the Transportation External Coordination (TEC) Working Group met in the afternoon of September 14, 2006 in Thunder Bay, Wisconsin. On behalf of the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM), the Chairman of the STG, Mr. Alexander Thrower of the Office of Logistics Management (RW-10), presided over the meeting. At the outset, Mr. Thrower introduced himself and the STG members participating. The STG agreed that the meeting agenda would include confirmation of conference notes from August 17, 2006 and discussion of the STG Work Plan.

AUGUST 17, 2006 CONFERENCE CALL

Mr. Thrower requested additional comments on issues raised in the August 17, 2006 conference call. During the call, participants discussed the open charter of the TEC organization relative to remaining STG areas for consideration. It was determined that the STG had discussed issues appropriate for the TEC forum, but consideration must be given in the future to security communication strategies.

STG WORK PLAN

- *Lessons Learned*— Mr. Thrower circulated an updated STG Work Plan and initiated a discussion on the status of items and topic group products. The *Security Related Lessons Learned Report* subsequently posted on the TEC website reflects information from the final STG Work Plan.

Mr. Thrower noted that the lessons learned report encompasses the operational focus of the transportation of spent fuel. He emphasized that security matters were a part of overall operational topics, and that security must be viewed as an integral part of an integrated transportation system.

Comments provided by Bob Fronczak of the Association of American Railroads were incorporated into the Report. Mr. Thrower asked STG participants to provide any remaining comments on the lessons learned report by the end of September.

- *State Security Experience* — In emphasizing that security training was a topic addressed by State Regional Group Task Force, Lisa Janairo (CSG-MW) noted that several security tasks identified STG Work Plan involve gathering information from States and that these might best be assigned to the State Regional Groups. Examples of these security topics are: State experiences in handling classified information; information requirements for transportation of spent fuel; procedures and State capabilities; and resources, roles and responsibilities.
- *State Survey* — Lisa Janairo presented an update to the STG on the status of the on-going State Survey for assessing security practices for Yucca Mountain shipments. The Survey consisted of 10 questions distributed to each region via “survey monkey,” an online survey tool. Regional groups worked with individual States to collect data and provide ‘blind’ input. By September 14, 2006, there was an 80 percent response rate from three of the four State Regional Groups. Consolidated responses to the Survey were intended to provide a national representation; however, because not all States sent the Survey had responded, there was no complete representation of security practices or preferences for Yucca Mountain shipments to report. October 2006 was the announced deadline for the State Survey completion.

The purpose of the State Survey was to determine DOE expectations from States and to assess whether or not the States are equipped to handle DOE spent fuel shipments. Among the Survey results discussed during the meeting were:

- *Security Training:* Mid-West States polled indicated that their States conduct informal training for local authorities in 30 percent of cases. Several reported that security training was not currently available and suggested that DOE may need to provide or finance training.
- *Safeguards Information Protocols:* Respondents said that they can receive safeguards information; however, classified information would require additional measures. All indicated they have in place active emergency response plans, but need additional information sharing in the event of an emergency. States prefer to receive sensitive information by certified mail.
- *Spent Fuel Shipment Information:* States indicated a strong interest in obtaining transportation plans with an opportunity for review in advance of shipments. Other types of information, such as cask model, were reported of average importance. Generally, States requested more information on who will respond to an event.
- *Protocols for Shipments:* All State respondents indicated they have current hazard plans for accidents.
- *Preference for Inspections:* Forty percent of State respondents prefer inspections at origin sites for rail shipments, and 60 percent prefer origin site

inspections for trucks. Of the States responding, 40 percent would like end-route inspections. States commented that they will honor DOT decals. A few States may inspect rail or truck shipments and suggest that DOE must pay for these services, while some States said that they would charge the shipper. Most States anticipated that they will need more staff and resources planning.

- *Survey Trend and Summary Comments* — States need more developed emergency response plans and information-sharing regimes. It was emphasized that DOE and Tribes interactions must become more consistent. It was suggested that a Yucca Mountain Project Overview presentation should be presented in each State capital.
- *Classification Guide and Information Sharing* — Mr. Thrower provided a status report on release of the *Classification Guide for the Transportation of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High Level Nuclear Waste* and discussed plans for developing an information-sharing protocol between DOE and external organizations based on the approved Guide. It was noted that final comments from Federal agencies involved in drafting the Guide were incorporated and that the document would soon be circulated for approval by senior agency officials. The agencies included are: the Department of Energy; the Department of Homeland Security; the Department of Transportation; the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program of the Department of the Navy.

As part of the STG information-sharing, Mr. Thrower discussed the future availability of spent fuel transportation related information through the Bibliography of Publicly Available Documents being assembled through TREX at the University of New Mexico. Mr. Thrower announced that the final compilation of documents is expected to be made available on a compact disk (CD) and distributed in a traceable format to STG members. Mr. Thrower noted that he would accept documents for inclusion in the bibliography from the STG.

- *Shipment Inspection Interfaces* — STG participants discussed CVSA inspection of spent fuel shipments. One member proposed that inspection issues might be addressed by the Rail Topic Group (RTG). Questions were posed about whether Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) certified inspectors can operate in more than one State and about their span of control. While the STG acknowledged that safety inspections will occur at utilities, there was interest in knowing how inspections would be handled when shipments stop en route. The STG agreed that shipment inspection regimes must be well understood, especially how shipments will be handled when threat levels change during transit. The STG identified this as a high-priority issue.
- *Future Agenda and Sunset of the STG* — Discussion about the future direction of the STG was held at the conclusion of the STG meeting. Mr. Thrower proposed consideration by participants of the future role of the STG and whether remaining STG issues might be appropriately consolidated into a TEC

Operations Topic Group (OTG) or the RTG. It was recommended that the scope of activities of the OTG or the RTG could address current security matters. While some STG members expressed the view that the STG should be summarily terminated, others identified issues that while not currently ripe, were deserving of considerable future attention by a dedicated Security Topic Group.

For the near term, it was suggested that the frequency of STG conference calls and meetings could be modified or reduced, and potentially scheduled to coincide Council of State Governments (CSG) programs. Scott Field stated that while security issues would surface again, the STG, as an open forum, might not be the appropriate venue for resolving sensitive issues. He also stressed the importance of compiling a brief report outlining all security-related issues still requiring attention. Another participant commented that most issues of concern to the States are potentially operations related and might best be considered by the OTG.

Mr. Thrower recommended that while some operations discussions may involve STG concerns, the continuity of the STG might best be preserved through a temporary “sunset” with the opportunity to reconvene the STG as necessary. Earl Easton discussed National Academy of Sciences security studies and the need for the STG to review them. STG members stated that they did not want transportation security matters of concern to be absorbed by other topic groups entirely, because there are distinctly security-pertinent topics which will require future attention and resolution. Examples cited include physical security technologies and enforcement for protecting shipments.

In closing, it was agreed that as soon as active security issues and tasks were concluded and a report was compiled outlining all security-related issues left unresolved, the STG would temporarily sunset.