

**U.S DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE)  
TRANSPORTATION EXTERNAL COORDINATION (TEC)  
WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**March 14-15, 2006 Washington, DC**

**WELCOME AND MEETING OVERVIEW**

Judith Holm (Director, Operations Development Division, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management/Office of National Transportation -- OCRWM/ONT) welcomed the crowd of approximately 130 attendees, and asked everyone to complete and submit the meeting evaluation form before leaving the 2-day meeting.

Next, she previewed the agenda and announced the new TEC Website: [www.tecworkinggroup.org](http://www.tecworkinggroup.org). She then introduced Eric Knox (Director, OCRWM). Ms. Holm then reminded attendees that individual Topic Groups are formed around specific issues of interest and then closed down once their objectives have been met. She announced that the second plenary session on the afternoon of March 15 would discuss Topic Group product integration.

**PLENARY SESSION I: DOE PROGRAM UPDATES**

Office of Environmental Management (EM) Update

Dennis Ashworth (Director, EM, Office of Transportation) provided an update on the EM program. EM is a service organization whose scope includes remediation activities. On a daily basis, EM remediates, processes, and transports approximately 1.3 million cubic meters of low-level waste (LLW). EM understands the risks associated with cleanup and is working towards being a leader in achieving transportation safety and operational excellence. The areas in which EM is achieving operational excellence in radioactive material transportation include:

- Protection of the public and the environment,
- Regulatory compliance,
- Risk management,
- Knowledge/expertise dissemination,
- Standard operating procedures,
- Inspections,
- Continuous process improvements,
- Technology exploitation,
- Data and reporting, and
- Integration.

Mr. Ashworth stated that major areas of emphasis have been in developing standard operating procedures and in ensuring compliance on a daily basis. The organization measures its success, in part, by the fact that EM shipments are safer; its services and expertise are sought by other organizations inside and outside of DOE; and Federal, State, Tribal and local officials actively support and participate in its work. He noted that shipments are decreasing as EM completes its mission. For FY 2005, EM had a total of 20,500 shipments, while in FY 2006, there is projected to be approximately 15,700 shipments. The Prospective Shipment Module is issued every six months to provide planning information to states and tribes on planned Departmental shipments in accordance with DOE M 460.2-1. He then provided data on specific sites:

- Rocky Flats -- All buildings and structures have been removed and all shipments have been completed. In the next 2-3 years, a significant portion of the site will transfer to the Department of the Interior to be used as a wildlife refuge.
- Fernald Silos 1 and 2 -- 1,325 shipments will be completed by June 2006.
- Fernald Silo 3 -- 112 truck shipments to Envirocare are now complete.
- Oak Ridge -- 115 LLW truck shipments to Envirocare are planned for FY06.
- West Valley -- EM is currently shipping LLW to Envirocare by rail and highway.
- Savannah River -- Expected to have 157 TRU shipments to WIPP in FY06.
- Brookhaven National Laboratory -- Completed the LLW shipments by rail to Envirocare for this fiscal year.
- Mound -- On track for closure in 2006. They have completed all their TRU shipments to SRS.
- Paducah and Portsmouth -- will be making 300 and 377 LLW shipments, respectively, by truck to NTS in FY 2006.

EM has conducted a transportation risk review and has prioritized the transportation ranking factors into three categories: movement ranking factors, hazard ranking factors, and prior year incident rates. As part of these reviews, EM has been asking the questions:

- What are we doing now?
- What could go wrong?
- What if it does?
- What could we do different?

Areas for consideration for the transportation reviews include: package selection and review, material characterization, loading and securement procedures, pre- and post-load inspections, mode, carrier, route, and emergency preparedness. Mr. Ashworth announced that there will be a free best practices workshop on April 18-20 in Boulder, Colorado.

Mr. Ashworth then discussed emergency preparedness and outreach support. EM's Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) trains hundreds of individuals every year. Ella McNeil is the point of contact for this program. As part of TEPP, there are Modular

Emergency Response Radiological Transportation Training (MERRTT) courses available at no cost.

As part of EM's outreach support, commodity flow surveys have been conducted along EM transportation highway and rail routes. One such commodity flow survey was conducted in August 2005 in Flagstaff, Arizona. This was a very positive experience for the community to show what hazardous materials are being shipped through their community. The next commodity flow survey will be April 12 on the Louisiana/Texas I-20 corridor. Mr. Ashworth concluded his presentation by stating that EM has achieved a 30 percent reduction in transportation incidents from 23 reported off-site incidents in FY 2004 to only 16 in FY 2005.

### Comments and Questions

One participant asked if EM uses a metric of incidents per shipment mile for each year. Mr. Ashworth responded that to use this metric, every shipment would have to be broken out separately, which would require a large commitment of resources. The participant proposed that EM should consider funding this effort in the future so as to provide more meaningful incident rate data.

Another participant commented that they thought the commodity flow survey conducted in Flagstaff did not accurately reflect shipments of other types of hazardous materials, such as hospital waste, because of the relatively short timeframe (24 hours) of the survey. Mr. Ashworth agreed that the survey was too short in its timeframe but unfortunately a longer timeframe would require more staff.

### OCRWM Update

Eric Knox (Associate Director, Systems Operations and External Relations, OCRWM) provided a status update of the program. He stated that Yucca Mountain is the solution to the spent nuclear fuel/high-level waste (SNF/HLW) problem that has been approved by both the President and Congress and it is still needed under any fuel cycle scenario. OCRWM is proceeding assuming a best case scenario to address current and planned SNF and HLW inventories.

Mr. Knox stated that OCRWM has a strong, defensible license application and scientific and technical work that is traceable, transparent, and in compliance with all requirements. He added that OCRWM has a culture that is ready to assume responsibilities inherent in nuclear operations. The FY 2006 OCRWM objectives include:

- Develop a license application for submission to the NRC based on an approach known as the clean-canistered approach;
- Develop a nuclear safety culture of the highest standards;
- Develop the transportation infrastructure;
- Improve the Yucca Mountain site infrastructure; and
- Expect to publish the schedule for License Application submittal this summer.

The program has redirected itself towards a canister approach. The canister for Transportation, Aging and Disposal (TAD) minimizes handling assemblies and limits need for multiple complex surface facilities. SNF will be delivered to the repository primarily in canisters for spent fuel aging and emplacement underground. Yucca Mountain key activities include:

- Continue design of clean-canistered based repository facilities;
- Work with industry to complete the preliminary design for the TAD standard canister;
- Conduct additional pre-closure and post-closure safety analysis work to support the design basis;
- Update License Application as clean-canistered modifications mature; and
- Continue upgrades to communication, emergency response and workplace infrastructure.

Transportation key activities include:

- Complete the Nevada Rail Alignment-Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD);
- Continue procurement process for truck and rail casks; and
- Continue to work with stakeholders on Section 180(c), routing, security and operational practices.

One of the key program management and integration activities is to utilize Sandia National Laboratories to manage and integrate scientific studies for the program. Mr. Knox noted while DOE is not an applicant to NRC yet, it is important to develop a nuclear safety culture that includes improving design configuration control, effective issue resolution processes and encouraging employees to identify issues. He concluded his presentation by highlighting the budget for Nevada Rail. DOE has requested \$544.5 million for FY 2007. The budget for Nevada Rail will be closer to \$30 million over the next two years.

#### Comments and Questions

A participant commented that he was concerned that military waste will be utilizing Yucca Mountain at a higher percentage than non-military waste. Mr. Knox responded that there are 55,000 metric tons of HLW, 13,000 metric tons of military waste, and 2,500 metric tons from naval reactors to be sent to Yucca Mountain.

Another participant asked about the impacts TAD would have on handling at the facilities. Mr. Knox responded that the most experienced worker should handle the waste and therefore there would be a reduction in the handling of the waste.

Another participant asked how much the Department of Defense (DoD) is paying DOE for development costs of Yucca Mountain. Mr. Knox responded that DoD is responsible for 10 percent of the cost and will have 10 percent of the repository occupied by defense waste.

A participant commented that DOE tried to recycle nuclear waste 25 years ago and it was not well-received by the public. Mr. Knox stated that the world has changed and many other

countries are bringing several nuclear reactors on line within the next few years. As a result, reprocessing will become more commonplace.

### OCRWM/ONT Update

Gary Lanthrum (Director, OCRWM/ONT) gave a brief overview of the status of OCRWM transportation logistics. Currently there is \$20 million in the budget for stakeholder interactions. He emphasized the need to have the stakeholders such as the cask vendors, railroad constructors, and others engaged in these interactions. There are still many decisions to be made concerning security; however, there are no major technical hurdles to prevent transportation of the waste, a conclusion that was supported by the NAS study.

### Comments and Questions

One participant commented that DOE should not be procuring casks until they have a cask system. In addition, 20 to 25 percent of the SNF will be converted over to dry storage and will not need a cask. Mr. Lanthrum responded that there is a long lead time (i.e., about 5 years) for cask testing.

Another participant asked why DOE does not force the nuclear industry to come up with one cask design and therefore eliminate the hardware problem. Mr. Lanthrum responded that DOE is trying to streamline and reduce handling of the waste. He also noted that the industry is moving towards standardization.

## **TRIBAL TOPIC GROUP**

Jay Jones (DOE/OCRWM) opened the meeting by acknowledging the presence of Tribal Leaders and Elders. He then previewed the session agenda and attendees went through a round of introductions. Randall Vicente, 2<sup>nd</sup> Lieutenant Governor of the Pueblo of Acoma, offered the invocation.

### Update on DOE/Headquarters Tribal Activities

Kristen Ellis (DOE Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs) gave a brief overview of current activities at DOE Headquarters.

- On January 20, 2006, Secretary of Energy Bodman reaffirmed the DOE Tribal Policy with one change: “annual Tribal summit” has been changed to “periodic summits with Tribal leaders.”
- Title 5 of the Energy Policy Act created a DOE Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs.
- A DOE Tribal Steering Committee (chaired by the DOE Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs) has been formed to address cross-cutting issues of Tribal interest; the first meeting was held on March 13, 2006. Representatives from the National Congress of American Indians and the Council of Energy Resource Tribes met with the Tribal Steering Committee earlier this month.

Ms. Ellis asked that any questions on these activities be directed to her at [Kristen.ellis@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Kristen.ellis@hq.doe.gov) or by phone at (202) 586-5810.

### Tribal Interactions with OCRWM

Jay Jones described the OCRWM program for new members. He mentioned the letter that was sent to leaders of the 39 Tribes along potential Yucca Mountain shipping routes and that DOE and contractor staff have been following up with calls and meetings. He encouraged members of the Tribal Topic Group to participate in other TEC Topic Groups of interest to their Tribes. He also told the group he recently presented a paper on Tribal outreach and interactions at Waste Management in Tucson, AZ. He also mentioned the increased Tribal participation in the last Topic Group conference call and encouraged continuation of the trend. Finally, he told the group that the Transportation Frequently Asked Question Brochure is available from OCRWM.

### Yucca Mountain Update – Interactions with Yucca Mountain Native American Interaction Program (NAIP)

Greg Fasano (BSC) distributed a one-page set of talking points that will be placed on the TEC website ([www.tecworkinggroup.org](http://www.tecworkinggroup.org)). These points covered the following:

- The American Indian Writers Subgroup (AIWS) recently authored *American Indian Perspectives on Proposed Rail Alignment*, which will be included in the *Caliente Rail Line Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)*.
- An AIWS fieldtrip and meeting is scheduled for the week of April 3, during which time the group will evaluate the onsite portion of the rail line leading to Yucca Mountain, discuss the AIWS EIS reference document, and evaluate areas associated with the Environmental Assessment concerning onsite infrastructure development. A letter report will be prepared by the AIWS following these activities.
- During the spring of 2006, a Tribal update meeting will be held to recommend formal comments on the *Yucca Mountain Infrastructure Draft EA*.

Responding to a question on Tribal involvement in the Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations (CGTO), Greg indicated that Tribes were selected on the basis of a series of ethnographic studies and included those with historic and cultural ties to Yucca Mountain. A participant reminded attendees that a consolidated group of Tribes has no legal obligation or authority over individual Tribes.

### Tribal Commentary

The floor was opened to comments from individual Tribal representatives. Key overall issues included:

- A request for additional consultation with DOE senior management;
- Yucca Mountain will impact more than the half-mile corridor;
- Mother Earth is sacred – economics should not be the only factor in decision making; and

- Tribes are sovereign nations – each Tribe speaks for itself.

Calvin Meyers, Moapa Band of Paiutes: Calvin Meyers said that when his Tribe invites Federal representatives to come, they always have something else to do and that upper management does not meet with the Tribes; other Federal employees have no power to say “yes.” He also told the group that the Caliente route does impact his Tribe even though it is 20 to 30 miles away. The impact of transportation on Tribal pathways and cross-overs needs to be considered; Tribal impacts are not set by boundaries and lines on a map. Tribal people have a connection to the land. Tribes don’t understand radiation basics.

Stanley Paytiamo, Pueblo of Acoma: Stanley Paytiamo said he is a member of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) Nuclear Waste Policy Committee and has been to Yucca Mountain. He expressed concern over the contamination of the ground at Yucca Mountain, and its associated impacts on medicinal plants and wildlife; reminding the group that Mother Earth is sacred and that if a Native American says something is important to them, others should respect that. He also said that on the issue of consultation, just because a Tribe listens to what the Federal Government has to say doesn’t mean the Tribe will do what the Government tells them. He concluded by reminding the attendees that there are more important things than economics when dealing with nuclear waste.

Joe Kennedy, Chairperson of the Timbisha Shoshone: Joe Kennedy opened his remarks with a reference to the recent meeting of the Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination held in Switzerland. He distributed a copy of the Timbisha Shoshone “Early Warning and Urgent Action Procedure – Decision 1(68),” regarding the situation of the Western Shoshone indigenous peoples in the United States. He went on to discuss the lack of due process and the lawsuit against DOE. He stated that drilling at Yucca Mountain and storage of waste there is not allowed under the Ruby Valley Treaty of 1863, and urged DOE to consider what is best for all people in resource management. He also addressed the need for true consultation with Tribes.

Willie Preacher, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes: Willie Preacher expressed his concern over the potential impacts of transportation and waste storage at Yucca Mountain. He also asked if any of the SNF will be coming out of Yucca Mountain for reprocessing in the future and what will be done with the waste from that reprocessing.

#### Discussion of Section 180(c) Approach

Following commentary from Tribal representatives, Corinne Macaluso (OCRWM/ONT), led a discussion on the paper that was distributed by e-mail prior to the Tribal Topic Group meeting. The paper will also be made available on the TEC website. Key considerations of the paper include: optimal allocation method for use providing funds to Tribes.

Ms. Macaluso said that past discussions indicated that a needs assessment approach to Section 180(c) funding might be better than a formula approach for Tribes. She indicated that DOE will work with Tribes to develop a Needs Assessment Survey.

## Comments and Questions

Ms. Macaluso indicated that Tribes will receive direct funding. The attendees continued to stress the point that a Tribal Peer Group for review of the Section 180(c) grant applications was desirable. This Group will identify approaches for maintaining funding over the life of the Yucca Mountain shipment project. She summarized the Tribal input received so far, including:

- Is population an appropriate measure for determining funding for Tribes?
- Aboriginal lands must be protected.
- Tribes do not want the half-mile measure used to determine funding.
- There is a 3 percent set-aside for the U.S. Department of Transportation's Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) grant program, whereas they understand there is at least a 6 percent set-aside for training funds
- What factors are appropriate for determining funding?
- Who has authority for emergency response in the event of an accident? This would be key in determining Tribal eligibility for funding.

In response to questions from Tribal representatives, DOE offered the following:

- HMEP will continue to exist within the auspices of DOT.
- No Tribal funding match will be required for Section 180(c) funding.
- The needs assessment approach would preclude the need for census numbers.
- DOE has a trust responsibility to work with Tribes on Section 180(c).
- The online application process for funding works. Ms Macaluso encouraged Topic Group members to attend the March 15 demonstration of the online application process.
- DOE will work with Tribes over the entire length of the Yucca Mountain transportation program (about 24 years in life of program).
- Funding will be available 3 to 5 years before shipments begin.

Ms. Macaluso said comments from this meeting would be incorporated into a revised Section 180(c) paper that would be distributed for review among the Tribal Topic Group members. Topics identified for discussion on the next teleconference included a definition of jurisdiction and funds distribution.

## **MANUAL REVIEW TOPIC GROUP**

Ella McNeil (EM, Office of Transportation) brought the meeting to order and introduced the members of the Writing Group. The Group has been working on revisions to DOE Order 460.2-1 *Radioactive Material Transportation Practices Manual*. The Group met and developed a revision schedule that was presented at the September TEC in Pueblo, Colorado. Recent internal changes in several DOE departments led to the creation of the Manual Review Topic Group, which will now be responsible for the review of this document.

The Writing Group shared the new schedule for completing the Manual. They requested that members of the Manual Topic Group submit comments by May 1, 2006. After the Writing Group has reviewed, incorporated, and distributed all comments, they will refine the wording of the draft through a series of conference calls with the Manual Topic Group members. The Group intends to have the Manual ready for entry into REVCOM by DOE's deadline of September 2006. The revised Manual will then be issued to members by December 2006. Participants next discussed the significant changes that have been made to the Manual, including:

- Clarifying and updating information relative to OCRWM shipments;
- Including the use of enhanced fact sheets for LLW shipments not requiring transportation plans;
- Including a statement of TEPP training compliance with NIMS & NFPA standards;
- Incorporating input from the Security Topic Group including a discussion on protection of information, DOT security requirements (49 DFR 172.800, particularly for LLW), and references to DOE equivalency with NRC additional security measures; and
- Revising the attachment on Additional Resources. It references additional resources including fact sheets available from NTP. The revision will contain a listing of current documents and web sites that will take the place of printed fact sheets.

A participant asked if the comments submitted by the states in September had been incorporated into the redlined version of the manual distributed to the group today. Ms. McNeil indicated that they had. She further explained that general comments were first handled by the committee members who would then address more specific topics. For example, the comments relating to YMP shipments will be handled by RW because many of these issues were too complicated to be addressed at the TEC meeting. Participants suggested the following specific changes to the manual:

- Incorporate references to shipments by barge.
- Clarify situations in which shipments are not subject to NRC safeguards. Alex Thrower noted that NWPA shipments are covered under DOE safeguards and security regulations. Cask licensing would be under the purview of NRC.
- Clarify when DOE takes control of a shipment. Mr. Thrower noted that DOE would take ownership when the shipment leaves the utility property. NRC representatives confirmed the Commission has agreed to this point as the transfer of ownership. Skip Young (NRC Nuclear Security) noted that if a shipment is an NRC shipment, then NRC regulations apply; however, since DOE takes title of the material prior to the material leaving the property, DOE security requirements and Orders apply. NRC will still certify casks and the shipper will still complete notifications. For material shipped under NRC regulations, NRC will decide on security.
- Clarify the section on inspections. Ms. McNeil stated that for EM shipments, states and Tribes can inspect the shipment at the receiving site. However, Mr. Thrower noted that if state and/or Tribal inspectors were not available for a given shipment, the sites would not need to alter their operations.

- Insert a statement indicating, “Although not required, DOE will strive to meet NRC requirements.” Members of the Writing Group noted that to be DOT compliant, it is necessary to follow NRC requirements, so the intent of the comment was already captured; however, they agreed to review the wording and clarify it as necessary.

Participants also made several general comments about the Manual and suggested the following revisions:

- Use more consistent language and avoid using different words to mean the same thing. Ms. McNeil noted that once the manual is complete it will be subject to a rigorous internal consistency review.
- The Manual contains excessive passive voice.
- The terms “must” and “will” are not used sufficiently. Many participants commented that they interpreted other terms as non-binding.
- A glossary exists but it needs to be updated.
- The Manual has a great deal of specificity with respect to truck transport but very little with respect to rail. Members of the group requested more detail on rail for situations like adverse weather or releasing shipment after an incident.
- Outdated references to a single transportation contract have been revised.
- Ms. McNeil relayed to the group that the attachments and resources section was still being prepared.
- One member noted that there has been some talk that DOE/DOT are working on legislation to exempt DOE from having to follow paper requirements. Mr. Thrower indicated this issue was raised on the last Security Topic Group call. He added that it was best to discuss legislation once it has been proposed, not before.

The participants then conducted a section-by-section review of the revised Manual during which individual grammatical and technical comments were incorporated. Significant points of discussion included:

- The Transportation Planning section does not specify timeframes for activities. Ms. McNeil explained that such wording was not in the document because different DOE programs have varied guidelines and timelines. Topic Group members reiterated that there should be a statement to that effect in the Manual.
- Include crew change points.
- An emergency response issue exists regarding state access to railroad property. It was suggested that DOE take the lead in developing MOUs with railroads so responders were ensured access. Participants noted that states have responsibility to respond to incidents on railroad property. States already have authority to enter railroad property in emergencies. Some participants commented that it was not always clear to responders that they have authority. Mr. Thrower commented that if state responders cannot respond to a railroad hazmat incident the states need to work that out with the railroads regardless of what DOE is shipping. Another participant added that during exercises conducted by NNPP, the railroads have always cooperated with the local

responders and the local response organizations maintain the role of incident commanders at the scene.

- A participant suggested that the funding discussion be reworded so that it reads, “funding will be initiated 5 years prior to commencement of shipments.” OCRWM will provide this funding.
- A participant suggested that the manual should specifically incorporate language indicating OCRWM’s intent to use TRANSCOM or an equivalent alternative. In response, Mr. Thrower stressed that it is important for the final language convey OCRWM’s willingness to consider alternatives.
- One participant noted that independent audits of carriers worked well for WIPP. Ms. McNeil referenced section 7.2.1 which states that all carriers must be subject to evaluations. The participant then asked if this would be an appropriate place for DOE to indicate that the Safety Compliance Oversight Plan (SCOP) will be implemented to facilitate safe shipment practices.
- One participant asked why one of the columns in the Table in Section 8 contained Tribal points of contact while the other two did not. Ms. McNeil stated that 10 CFR does not require Tribal notification, although DOE does notify them.
- Participants discussed the ramifications severe weather would have on shipments. Ms. McNeil noted that if weather conditions were predicted to have a negative impact on shipments, they would be postponed. A participant added that in the event dangerous conditions present themselves while the shipment is en route, an impromptu plan of action will need to be developed.
- A participant suggested that the intentions behind the Level 6 inspection program required clarification.
- Participants asked DOE to clarify the terms “safe parking,” “secure parking,” and “safe haven.” Ms. McNeil noted that “safe haven” was a term reserved for OST shipments.
- One participant noted that in some cases, state notification may not be motivated by an emergency. Ms. McNeil stated that section 13.2 provides for notifications to state and Tribal points of contact for events that do not meet the emergency criteria.
- Another participant asked that a reference to DOE Order 151.1 be included to clarify timelines for notifying states and Tribes. Ms. McNeil answered that Section 13.3.2 provides that information.
- A participant asked for definitions of the terms “closed” and “shut down” in relation to an emergency event. The Writing Group replied that these terms are taken directly from 49 CFR. The term “closed” refers to transportation arteries while the term “shut-down” applies to facilities. Another participant suggested that these terms be added to the glossary.
- In response to a question posed by one of the participants, the Writing Group clarified that OST requests updates to state point of contact lists every two years.
- During discussions about section 15.2.1a, one participant asked whether or not DOE was required to have measures in place that would authorize it to take action against carriers who do not have their clean-up procedures properly documented. This

provision is based on a DOT requirement, and therefore, DOE is responsible for verifying the existence of an action plan, but is not responsible for ensuring compliance with it.

## **SECURITY TOPIC GROUP**

Alex Thrower (OCRWM/ONT) welcomed the attendees to the Security Topic Group meeting and introduced new participants. He then initiated a brief discussion of two documents that had been submitted to members for review and comment – the current version of the Topic Group Workplan and the minutes from the most recent (February 21, 2006) conference call. He indicated that some comments had already been received and incorporated and he welcomed any additional comments.

Mr. Thrower discussed the issue of security clearances within the TEC context. He acknowledged that there is a basic tension between the concept of TEC as an open forum and some security-related topics; however, he reiterated DOE's position that TEC will remain an open forum and that the Department does not intend to form a subgroup of Security Topic Group members with clearances. He also indicated that if such a group were formed, it would occur outside of TEC.

The next topic of discussion was the recently published National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study on the transport of SNF and HLW. Mr. Thrower distributed an excerpt of the study relating to security issues. He indicated that the Department is presently reviewing it in detail and has not yet formulated any position. Several participants suggested that the Security Topic Group make a formal recommendation in support of the NAS study finding that an independent review of security issues take place.

A representative from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) commented that when the NAS panel was formed, its focus was primarily limited to safety issues; however, its scope subsequently expanded to include security topics. Unfortunately, only four of the original 16 panel members had appropriate security clearances. Therefore, the NAS panel concluded that they were unable to adequately assess security issues, which is why they recommended that an independent party conduct a security review. He commented therefore, that circumstance was the reason for the NAS recommendation, rather than some sort of deficiency in DOE or NRC security requirements.

A participant stated that he wanted the group to endorse an independent review of security issues not because of a deficiency, but because the NAS recommendation was presented as being important. He also noted that states are somewhat skeptical of Federal intentions, and that having an independent review might help allay their concerns. Another participant observed that NAS heard both general and specific issues of concern with respect to security and he was looking forward to the NRC response.

Sam Callahan (DOE/OCIO) observed that the Design Based Threat Study being conducted by DOE may not be "independent" but it will ensure that security issues are examined and addressed. Another participant stated that the results of performance tests are presented directly to the Secretary of Energy, rather than through the Undersecretary level, which, at the very least, should promote independence from OCRWM and other DOE Offices.

Several participants responded that the term “independent” meant independent of the government, not independent of OCRWM or of DOE. They argued that Security issues should be reviewed by a fully independent body and any findings from this review should be shared with the public. Participants acknowledged that the Security Topic Group was not a parliamentary body, and holding some sort of vote on the NAS study recommendations would only serve to polarize the members; however, these participants made the following suggestions:

- All parties in attendance should complete a thorough review of the NAS report;
- The Security Topic Group should obtain input from Kevin Crowley (Sp?) or other individuals who were familiar with the deliberations that contributed to the NAS study recommendations; and
- DOE should place the report prominently on the next TEC agenda and devote sufficient time for it to be discussed.

Chris Einberg (DOE/OCIO) then provided an update on the status of the Transportation Classification Guide and the Information Sharing Protocol. He said the Guide was completed and was currently undergoing internal concurrence review. Once approved, it would be distributed to other agencies; returned to DOE for any final changes; and then released some time in late September. Once the Guide was completed, DOE would focus on the Protocol document.

A participant asked if DOE could describe what was in the Guide. Mr. Einberg indicated that it was organized according to standard government-issued guidance and included discussions of topics such as: generator facility types, casks, transportation modes, levels of required protection, communication systems, and physical security. However, because most of the information contained in the Guide was for Official Use Only, he could not discuss it in greater detail. In response to questions about the Protocol document, Mr. Einberg reiterated that DOE would not even begin preparing it until after the Guide was issued.

Mr. Thrower then asked participants for their thoughts and comments on the Security-Related Lessons Learned document from previous SNF shipping campaigns. He indicated that INEEL took the lead on identifying lessons learned and that they had reviewed a large number of state documents from generated from West Valley, Foreign Reactor Research, and WIPP campaigns. He asked that comments be submitted by March 31, 2006.

Representatives from the State Regional Groups (SRGs) led a discussion on the upcoming survey of states on their security practices and preferences in connection with shipments to Yucca Mountain. The purpose of the survey was to get feedback from the states and localities that DOE could use to inform its decisions on how to develop appropriate security protocols. Sarah Wochos reminded participants that the survey document was a draft that would be piloted in just one state within each region, and then revised, as necessary, and distributed to the remaining states. Alex Thrower indicated that the survey could conceivably trigger OMB review/approval, but he stated that DOE was exploring this possibility and would get back to the CSGs with a definitive answer.

A participant commented that getting state input on security issues was fairly straightforward, but getting input from the Tribes could be much more complicated. He asked

whether NRC had issued a formal security policy with respect to Tribal organizations. NRC representatives indicated that a policy was under development but a deadline for its completion had not been established.

Participants then reviewed each section of the CSG draft questionnaire and provided specific comments. One participant suggested that the introduction should mention all waste shipments, not just those related to Yucca Mountain. Another suggested that questions should refer to “classified” as well as “safeguards” information so as to avoid unnecessarily limiting the scope of responses. A participant commented that the questions in the matrix should be reworded slightly to ask respondents if they received the information, how useful do they find it to allow for the possibility that some respondents might not get the information, and thus would be unable to rank its importance. There were no comments on pages 4-6 of the questionnaire. Participants were asked to provide any further comments by the end of the week.

Alex Thrower concluded the Security Topic Group session with a discussion of next steps. A participant asked if the group was going to base its scope of activities on the original workplan. Mr. Thrower said that the 3/13/2006 version of the workplan that he had distributed to the Topic Group represented the official version. Another participant asked if there would be a need for additional subgroups. Mr. Thrower responded that he hoped to address this issue, at least partially, during the second day of the TEC meeting. He noted that there were a number of “ill fitting” issues that needed to be discussed to determine the most appropriate forum in which they should be discussed. Some of these might involve the formation of new Topic Groups or Subgroups. Another participant suggested that the results of the CSG survey might suggest areas for new Topic Groups.

## **RAIL TOPIC GROUP**

Jay Jones welcomed participants and asked them to introduce themselves. He reviewed the agenda for the meeting and added three more items -- an update from Paul Johnson (Oak Ridge National Lab) on TRAGIS, an update from Doug Osborn (Sandia National Lab) on RADTRAN, and an update from Kevin Blackwell on the Federal Railroad Administration’s (FRA) Safety Compliance Oversight Plan.

Since the last TEC meeting in September 2006, the Rail Group has formed six subgroups. Currently, the Rail Topic Group holds conference calls every two months. The subgroups hold calls on a monthly basis, or as necessary, and report back to the full Rail Topic Group. Subgroups are encouraged to develop their own workplans and schedules. Once the subgroups have submitted their products, the Rail Topic Group reviews them. The subgroups and their team leaders are as follows:

- Inspections Subgroup -- Leads: Tim Runyon and Carlisle Smith
- Tracking and Radiation Monitoring Subgroup -- Leads: Sarah Wochos and Bill Mackie
- Planning Subgroup -- Leads: Ken Niles and Lisa Janairo
- Legal Weight Truck Shipments Subgroup -- Lead: Bob Halstead (on hold until further discussion)

- Lessons Learned Subgroup -- Lead: Jane Beetem
- TRAGIS Subgroup -- Leads: Sarah Wochos and Paul Johnson (on hold until system updates are completed)

### Inspections Subgroup Update

Tim Runyon (CSG) stated that this has been a fairly contentious topic. The subgroup has had two conference calls and has developed a scope of work. On the first conference call, the subgroup identified four areas to pursue:

- Work jointly with FRA, Association of American Railroads (AAR) and individual railroad companies to develop rail inspection criteria and standards that may be parallel to a Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) level standard;
- Take the criteria as well as route studies and identify where inspections could take place;
- Research the potential technology currently available (e.g., remote sensing) that would aid in reducing the number of inspections; and
- Identify potential financial assistance to Tribes.

The subgroup's second conference call included more discussion of how inspections are conducted. The subgroup plans to use CVSA and rail inspection comparisons to help identify the components necessary for Yucca Mountain shipment inspections. A participant suggested that the subgroup form writing groups, while another felt that they were not quite ready to take that step. The next conference call for the Inspections subgroup is March 27, 2006.

### Comments and Questions

A participant commented that he was surprised that the Lessons Learned subgroup has not started, since there was a whole list of documents available from West Valley. He also asked if there should be a separate subgroup for Radiation Monitoring. Jay Jones stated that there is an overlap between subgroups.

A participant stated that Nevada would likely require every incoming train, railcar, and cask receive port of entry inspections for radiological material. If Caliente is the entry-point, then it is a long journey within the state of Nevada and there may be the need for additional inspections. Another participant commented that the S-2043 AAR standard deals with maintenance of on board detection equipment. He also noted that there are not "welcome stations" at each state border for inspections.

A participant observed that he does not want canisters going through Native American land without an agreement in place. It is imperative for the Federal government that the sovereignty of the Tribes not be compromised. A representative of the FRA commented that from a safety standpoint, FRA will be looking into whether any rulemaking will be needed. The S-2043 standard will affect this decision by FRA. A participant commented that 49 CFR is the official standard for inspections and CVSA provides an extra set of requirements to be considered. He also views the inspection standard for Illinois as allowing the State to inspect anywhere within the State's borders.

Another participant noted that rail crews have twelve hour shifts and can only do what they can during those twelve hours. A second participant observed that because of the shift limit, Arizona would probably wait until the usual crew change point to schedule inspections. He added that a lot of inspections can be done with remote sensing. Arizona is more concerned with the mechanical safety of the train. A third participant commented that Pennsylvania would be happy with a similar system to CVSA for radiological material. Several participants commented that one of the purposes of the CVSA standard is to have reciprocity between states for inspections. This allows inspections to be done at the most logical point, not necessarily at the state line.

### Tracking and Radiation Monitoring Subgroup

Sarah Wochos (CSG) gave the update report for this subgroup, which has grown from five to ten members. The subgroup has reviewed lessons learned and different technologies. This subgroup will ultimately be recommending to DOE what the stakeholders would require from a tracking system. She stated that the subgroup will be receiving input from stakeholders via the Security Topic Group state survey. After the subgroup receives this input, AAR and rail industry input will be included in their recommendations. She commented that they would like to submit their recommendations to the Rail Topic Group by the next TEC meeting.

The subgroup has not started reviewing technologies for radiation monitoring. The subgroup would like to first receive input from the states via the Security Topic Group survey. The subgroup is planning to have another conference call in two weeks.

### Comments and Questions

A participant observed that there are already simple radiation detection and satellite tracking systems available. He volunteered to have the subgroup examine his personal vehicle that is equipped with these systems. Gary Lanthrum commented that it is important to integrate these systems before they are brought forward to the larger Topic Group and TEC. He emphasized that it is also important to do a cross-cutting technology review.

Another participant mentioned that at the last TRANSCOM users group meeting, there was a group comprised of representative from DOE, DOT, NRC, and DHS who were looking at radiation monitoring. He suggested that this subgroup may want to have a state regional group representative on this intergovernmental group. Participants noted that the Security Topic Group is also looking at radiation monitoring. A participant asked if the Rail Topic Group could receive a report from the intergovernmental group. Cort Richardson responded that it was his understanding that the intergovernmental group was composed of very senior level officials, so he was uncertain if they would report out to the TEC; however, he noted that the contact person for DOE on this group was Casey Gadbury.

### Rail Planning Subgroup

Since Ken Niles was unable to attend the meeting, Anne deLain Clark (WGA) presented the update report for this subgroup. This subgroup has drafted a rail planning timeline. The subgroup was unable to find a comprehensive timeline previously created by FRA, rail road industry, or states. The subgroup would like the Rail Topic Group to review the timeline and

send comments via e-mail to Ken Niles or Lisa Janairo by March 24, 2006. The next conference call for this subgroup will be open for any of the Rail Topic Group members to discuss their comments on this timeline.

### Comments and Questions

A participant commented that he was unsure of the port of origin of inspections currently being done. He also asked what this subgroup envisions being done concerning inspections. As a utility representative, he registered concerns over whether this timeline favors an increase in the number of inspections and whether these inspections are to be done within the fence line. He commented that if the number of organizations increases for inspections, this would be difficult for utilities to comply with due to security concerns. A second participant commented that from the rail standpoint, there is usually one DOT HAZMAT inspector and one mechanical inspector at the point of origin for SNF shipments. A commenter suggested that utility representatives may want to contact individuals involved with West Valley or Concord shipments to get an idea of how inspections were conducted. Another participant stated that the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be represented in these inspection areas.

### Legal Weight Truck (LWT) Shipments Subgroup

Jay Jones stated that there have been internal discussions about whether this subgroup should continue. The general consensus was that the issues that this subgroup would address have already been adequately addressed in the EIS and will be addressed in the other subgroups. One option for this subgroup would be to have the activities that were planned for this subgroup to be divided among the other subgroups as appropriate.

Bob Halstead (Nevada) provided the update report on this subgroup. The subgroup has had no conference calls partly due to the issue of whether this subgroup will continue as constituted. In addition he stated that the lawsuit Nevada has against DOE involves an issue concerning the supplemental analysis proposing LWT to Yucca Mountain since Yucca Mountain currently has no rail access. In addition, he stated that another issue for this subgroup could be to examine intermodal transport. Twenty-four shipping sites do not have rail transport capability accounting for 30 percent of the nuclear power plant sites. Mr. Halstead stated there are several reasons that LWT is a contentious issue. First, Yucca Mountain has no rail access and achieving rail access would be difficult and costly. Second, the town of Caliente, lobbied for an intermodal facility within Lincoln County. Third, LWT is only a subset for the larger issue of intermodalism. This could be a potential shipping problem for more than 20 reactor sites. There could be 40 trucking shipments a year through the same states that also will have rail shipments on a weekly and/or monthly basis.

### Comments and Questions

A participant asked what would be the product for this subgroup. Mr. Halstead responded that the product would be a report to other subgroups. He also added that peculiar safety issues could arise from the subgroup's research, such as if there are smaller casks that could potentially pose a greater safety issue. The participant commented that the NRC is still working on the smaller cask safety issue. Accident reviews have been done and no evidence shows that a smaller cask would have higher safety risks. The more intense accident fires have

happened in tunnels such as the Baltimore tunnel incident. He commented that tunnels act like an oven and can increase the intensity of a fire.

Another participant commented that most of the spent nuclear material from utilities would be in dry cask storage and there would be very few if any truck casks used for spent nuclear material. In addition, all the casks would be rail compatible. The trend across the utility industry is to have more dry cask storage. Judith Holm stated that this discussion was taking on a more logistics and operations focus, which should be limited to a separate forum. A participant commented that the key is to balance the overall risk for operational control of SNF. No decision was made by the Topic Group as to whether the LWT subgroup should continue.

#### Lessons Learned Subgroup

Jane Beetem (Missouri Department of Natural Resources) gave the update for this subgroup. The focus of this subgroup has been compiling existing documents. Most of the documents thus far have been from West Valley. She would like to have a more balanced report and asked the Topic Group members to forward to her any documents they may have that are lessons-learned related.

#### TRAGIS Subgroup

Jay Jones briefly stated that this subgroup is on hold until system updates are completed. The original intent of this subgroup was to do data runs of train shipments from five different geographic areas to Yucca Mountain. In addition, there may also be a table-top exercise using TRAGIS that the Rail Topic Group could convene. The subgroup may be activated by the next TEC meeting.

#### Midwest Route Identification Project

Sarah Wochos presented an overview of the CSG/MW's Route Identification Project. The CSG/MW has been working on this project for the last two years. The project work was delegated to a smaller workgroup from the Midwest region. The approach was regional because the states believed they would have a better indication of which routes could be used during the campaign. The goal was to develop a suite of highway and rail routes throughout the region that the Midwestern states found acceptable as the starting point for the national route identification discussion. Originally, CSG/MW thought all the regions would conduct route identification projects. However, the Northeast is still in the beginning stages of their route identification project and the West and the South have chosen not to pursue the project and instead will wait for DOE to propose routes.

The methodology for this project was based on primary factors from US DOT's *Guidelines for Selecting Preferred Highway Routes for Highway Controlled Shipments of Radioactive Materials*. The primary factors are divided into three areas: 1) risk to the public during normal transport; 2) risk to the public in the event of an accidental release; and 3) the economic risk to the area in the event of an accidental release. The workgroup for this project decided to weight each of these factors equally in the analysis and use the factors for both highway and rail routes.

Secondary factors were used to evaluate routes if comparison using the primary factors did not distinguish a clear preference. These factors were developed by the workgroup and weighted according to Midwestern policy. These factors included urban areas traversed, accident rates along the route, road or track quality, and traffic density along the route. One of the factors not included was time in transit since this factor was included in each of the primary factors with the use of length and speed variables.

Potential routes were generated using TRAGIS. All reasonable routes were included in the analysis. Routes that directed shipments eastward, far to the north or far south were not included. In addition, judgments were made to exclude routes that had excessive carrier changes and therefore seemed operationally undesirable.

The results from this analysis produced a suite of routes that met regional criteria for ensuring the selection of safer routes. These routes are not “accepted” or “preferred” routes, and do not necessarily reflect the routes that DOE will ultimately use nationally. The CGS/MW hopes that the suite of routes will be a primary input into the development of the national suite of routes, along with other stakeholder input and operational considerations.

### Comments and Questions

A participant asked if the CSG/MW compared the Midwest routes with the EIS routes. Ms. Wochos replied that they did not compare the routes. A second participant asked for a clarification on the use of “preferred routes.” Ms. Wochos responded that these routes are preferred starting points for discussion and they are not “preferred routes.” Another participant asked how the interchanges looked along the Midwest routes. Ms. Wochos replied that most routes only had one interchange.

### Northeast Routing Project Update

Cort Richardson (CSG) gave an update on the Northeast’s routing project. There has been much discussion about conducting this project for the northeast, and at their December meeting, the CSG/NE decided to pursue this effort more seriously. This routing project will be similar in approach to the Midwest’s routing project. The goal is to have a completed product by the end of the fiscal year.

### TRAGIS Update

Paul Johnson (Oak Ridge National Lab) reported that he is in the process of a large update on the rail network. The new version of TRAGIS will be available before the end of the fiscal year. FRA’s Office of Safety is funding additional upgrades to TRAGIS, including a routing and visualization application that identifies accident and inspection locations. He is in the process of intersecting data files with routes and enhancing the GIS capabilities for TRAGIS. He also mentioned that there will be TRAGIS training for SSEB at the end of April.

A participant commented that he originally thought that the rail interchanges identified were connected, but they were not. This was an update to TRAGIS due to the Midwest’s routing project and analysis. Mr. Johnson replied that he was open to any suggestions anyone might have to improve and/or enhance TRAGIS.

## RADTRAN Update

Doug Osborn reported that there are several enhancements to RADTRAN. The program now has the ability to import the web TRAGIS routing data. They are also currently working on version 5.6, which will have more graphical output and version 6.0 should be completed by the end of the fiscal year. The probabilistic risk assessment model has been completed and rail modules have been sent to the TEC Rail and Tribal Groups. He also mentioned that RADTRAN training sessions are offered at no cost.

## FRA Safety Compliance Oversight Plan (SCOP)

Kevin Blackwell (FRA) gave a brief update on the SCOP. He indicated FRA is in the process of updating this document, which was last updated in 1998. The goal is to have it serve as a workable policy. This effort is being coordinated with the Rail Topic Group and the Planning subgroup. FRA anticipates having a final update proposal to FRA management by the end of FY 2006.

## **SECTION 180(C) TOPIC GROUP**

Corinne Macaluso welcomed the attendees. She then gave an update on the two *Federal Register* notices pending at DOE regarding Section 180(c) and the proposed pilot program to test the Section 180(c) policy and implementation process. She did not have an anticipated publication date for the *Federal Register* notices; however, the Draft Policy and the Draft Grant Application Package were still undergoing management review. The proposed pilot program was delayed until 2007. The implementation of the pilot program will depend on funding for transportation institutional activities in the FY 2007 budget.

Ms. Macaluso introduced Reggie James from OCRWM's Office of Procurement, and Paula Walker and Matt Belleri from Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc. Ms. Walker and Mr. Belleri gave a presentation on how to use grants.gov and demonstrated the steps to register and then use grants.gov as a tool to apply for Federal funds.

## Comments and Questions

A participant asked when the pilot is implemented who will be allowed to apply and what will the application process involve. Ms. Macaluso responded that the pilot has not been developed, and therefore any decisions regarding who could apply and the structure of the application process have not been made.

A participant requested that DOE send hard copies of the *Federal Register* notices and other materials to Tribal chairmen and councils. He also suggested DOE consider extending the comment period of *Federal Register* notices to accommodate Tribal input. Tribal governments often have smaller staffs than state government and have more bureaucracy, making responding to such notices more time-consuming. Ms. Macaluso indicated that she intended to send both electronic and hard copies. She also responded that if she received a written request to extend the comment period, DOE would likely accommodate that request.

Another participant asked if paper grant applications would be acceptable under the Section 180(c) program. Mr. James indicated that DOE would no longer be accepting paper applications by the time Section 180(c) grants become available. The participant asked if the registration process for grants.gov negate the governor's designation of the appropriate state agency to apply for Section 180(c) grants. Ms. Macaluso indicated that nothing within the grants.gov process changes the process agreed to through the Topic Group's work.

A participant raised the issue of security measures. Mr. James answered that his office verifies DUNS numbers and the CCR number of a submitter's agency before responding to an application. These measures allow DOE to know if any unauthorized users have accessed the system. Another participant suggested that their experience with the Department of Homeland Security grants program suggests that the grants.gov system does not work. He indicated that there are conflicts when registrants are in districts with overlapping jurisdictions within county governments. The registration process cannot accommodate the overlapping information. Mr. Elgin Usrey (State of Tennessee) responded that, in this case, the grants only go to the state and Tribal level so that wouldn't be a problem for Section 180(c).

## **TOPIC GROUP SUMMARIES**

### Tribal Topic Group

Willie Preacher (Shoshone – Bannock) presented a summary for this Topic Group. At the DOE Headquarters level, Title 5 of the 2005 Energy Policy Act established the Office of Indian Energy Policy. In addition, DOE formed a Tribal Steering Committee to address cross-cutting issues of Tribal interest. At the DOE OCRWM level, much work is being done to increase Tribal participation in the Topic Group. Follow up continues regarding the March 2005 letter that was sent to the 39 Tribes. Several calls and visits have been made to generate increased participation from tribal members.

In regards to the YMP Native American Interaction Program, the American Indians Writers Subgroup has authored the "American Indian Perspectives on Proposed Rail Alignment." Meetings with the Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations continue to take place as issues and activities warrant. During the Topic Group meeting, Tribal representatives addressed concerns and provided insight on their perspective regarding the OCRWM program. Some of the issues raised included:

- Tribes requested additional consultation with DOE senior management;
- Yucca Mountain will impact more than the half-mile corridor;
- Economics should not be the only factor in decision-making. Native Americans view Mother Earth as sacred; and
- Tribes are sovereign nations and each Tribe speaks for itself.

The Topic Group also included a discussion of Section 180(c). Some of the key discussions focused on optimal allocation methods and eligibility criteria. The Topic Group concluded that the needs assessment was a better approach for Tribes than the formula approach.

Participants suggested that a Tribal Peer Group be established for application review. Topics for future teleconferences include the definition of jurisdiction and distribution of funds.

### Security Topic Group

Sarah Wochos presented the summary report for this Topic Group. DOE has determined that the Security Topic Group will not form a subgroup of cleared members. The Topic Group will continue to maintain the open forum. In regards to the NAS study, some members would like this Topic Group to formally recommend a fully independent review of security issues. DOE is in the process of reviewing the NAS study and has not formulated a position on this issue.

The Classification Guide has been completed and is undergoing internal concurrence. It is targeted for a late September 2006 release. Once the Guide is issued, the Information Sharing Protocol will be completed. DOE has compiled a security-related lessons learned summary and distributed it to the Topic Group members. Comments on the summary should be submitted by the end of March 2006.

### Section 180(c) Topic Group

Anne deLain Clark presented the summary report for this Topic Group. Since the Topic Group will be phased out, the discussion primarily consisted of the presentation on grants.gov by DOE support contractor staff. The grants.gov is the vehicle that DOE will require for electronic submission of grant applications.

With respect to the Section 180(c) *Federal Register* notices, they are still undergoing concurrence within DOE and there has been no date set for publication. DOE has made the budget request for FY 2007 for the pilot phase of this program.

### Rail Topic Group

Cort Richardson presented the summary report for this Topic Group. Since the last TEC meeting, this Topic Group has divided into several subgroups to address activities important to the Topic Group as a whole. The Rail Topic Group subgroups are:

- Inspections,
- Tracking and Radiation Monitoring,
- Planning,
- Lessons Learned,
- TRAGIS, and
- Legal Weight Truck Shipments.

Each subgroup has a workplan and will produce a product for the Topic Group to review. There will undoubtedly be some overlap, and as a result any cross-cutting issues will be

reconciled after the initial products are drafted from each subgroup. During this TEC meeting, each subgroup gave an update on their efforts to date. The Inspections subgroup has been working jointly with FRA, AAR, and rail industry to develop rail inspection criteria and standards. The Tracking and Radiation Monitoring subgroup has been reviewing the different technologies that exist for tracking. The Planning subgroup distributed a draft timeline to the Topic Group for review and comment. During the Legal Weight Truck Shipments subgroup, a lively discussion took place as to whether this subgroup should continue. One suggestion was to transform this subgroup into an Inter-modal subgroup. No decision was reached on this issue. The Lessons Learned subgroup has been focusing on compiling existing documents primarily from West Valley. The TRAGIS subgroup is on hold until system updates are completed.

Two routing projects were presented to the Topic Group at large -- the Midwest Routing Project and the Northeast Routing Project. The CSG-MW has been working on the Midwest Routing Project for two years and used DOT guidelines. The CSG-NE is in the beginning stages of their route analysis and they anticipate having a product by the end of the fiscal year.

The Topic Group also received updates on TRAGIS, RADTRAN and the FRA SCOP. A new version of TRAGIS will be available before the fiscal year end. For RADTRAN, this program now has the ability to import TRAGIS routing data. The probabilistic risk assessment model has been completed. Version 6 of RADTRAN will be available by fiscal year end. The FRA SCOP is currently in the process of being updated. FRA anticipates having a final update proposal to FRA management by the end of the fiscal year.

## **PLENARY II: TOPIC GROUP PRODUCT INTEGRATION DISCUSSION**

Judith Holm conducted a summary discussion during which she described the purpose and status of the Topic Groups. She said that TEC benefits from a variety of information sources and experiences. Topic Groups offer TEC members the opportunity to put ideas on the table, exchange information, and conduct research on DOE transportation-related issues. They also provide a venue for holding discussions on a “level playing field.” The basic steps involved in forming a Topic Group include:

- DOE, with input from stakeholders, identifies an issue.
- If more than information exchange or program updates are needed, a Topic Group is formed with a DOE staff member as lead.
- DOE develops a task plan for the Topic Group and it is reviewed by Topic Group members.
- Together, DOE and the Topic Group members decide the issues to be addressed.
- Topic Groups provide feedback to DOE and the program makes the final decision.

Ms. Holm noted some recent success stories from the Topic Groups, including:

- As the result of Topic Group efforts, DOE issued a policy on Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act regarding State grants. A revision of that policy is pending and DOE is working with the TEC Tribal Topic Group and other Tribal contacts to obtain their input on the revised policy.

- Program decisions such as the one on training that resulted in development of the Modular Emergency Response Radiological Transportation Training (MERRTT) were based on TEC Topic Group discussions.

The results of Topic Group efforts like those cited above, is incorporated into DOE program activities and the decision-making process.

Next, Ms. Holm asked attendees for suggestions on new directions for TEC. A participant responded that the State Regional Groups have asked DOE to evaluate the Department's position on developing a "suite" of routes. The potential implications of such an approach on security, as well as other issues, suggests that DOE needs to develop a clear definition of this term. Ms. Holm replied that DOE is assessing the issue, including the rationale underlying the "suite" approach and the number of routes to be included.

Next, Ms Holm discussed overall action items resulting from the current TEC meeting. She mentioned that representatives from the Bureau of Indian Affairs might need to be invited to participate in TEC in the future. In addition, she commented that TEC needs to consider adding other government agencies such as the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Department of Homeland Security), and the U.S. Department of Transportation, to obtain transportation and security-related information.

A participant said members need to think about how cross-cutting issues can be identified and incorporated into the next TEC meeting. She observed that some stakeholders are currently not active in the Topic Groups, but undoubtedly could contribute valuable important to TEC. She also noted that the draft 180(c) issues paper should be presented to all TEC members before the fall meeting, which, Ms. Holm indicated, was tentatively planned for August 2006.

The meeting was adjourned.

## **SUMMARY OF TEC MEETING EVALUATION FORMS**

A total of 23 evaluation forms were received (21 percent of the participants). The overall ratings for the March 14 and 15 TEC meeting were “good.” The majority of the agenda sessions were ranked between “very useful” and “somewhat useful.” Respondents particularly liked the group participation, open discussions, and general format for the meeting. Several respondents disliked that lack of productivity achieved through the topic group discussions. During the Plenary I session, several respondents commented that the presentations were lengthy (particularly for EM), too general, and did not provide any new information. One respondent disliked that the Tribal Topic Group was used as a “political forum.”

Regarding the group’s next focus, respondents suggested immediate and future-based plans of action and more time spent in breakout groups to resolve issues. Other suggestions included continued concentration on tribal issues and security, having manufacturers present at the meetings (including cask and railcar builders), and discussion of the NAS study recommendations. Respondents cited that the TEC should address such emerging issues as truck versus rail requirements and locations, possible implementation of NAS recommendations, more information on inter-modal issues, and the security-related issues of tracking and communications.

Regarding logistics, the majority of respondents agreed that the electronic distribution of pre-meeting announcements, registrations, and information dissemination worked well, but respondents would have preferred the option of inviting others to register and to view those who had already registered. The meeting rooms were generally viewed as “acceptable;” however, the hotel guest rooms were viewed as just “average” or “okay.” Possible improvements to the meeting location would be to use a hotel that is located in proximity to a Metro station and one that provides a “business center” or free access to the internet.