

Midwestern Radioactive Materials Transportation Project Meeting Summary

Proceedings of the 17th Meeting of the Midwestern High-Level Radioactive Waste Committee

Chicago, Illinois
May 12-13, 1998

Tuesday, May 12

Project Update

The agreement with OCRWM was renewed for the 1998 calendar year, bringing a total of \$52,000 to the project in the fifth year of the 5-year budget period. Ms. Sattler said she would work with Mr. Markus Popa to renew the agreement for another 5-year period.

The EM agreement was on the verge of renewal. This agreement would provide \$50,000 to the project. Ms. Sattler noted that, combined, the two agreements still left the project over \$50,000 short compared to its last year of full funding.

Mr. Dave Crose asked whether there was any chance of DOE restoring the project's full funding. Mr. Popa indicated that he was doing all he could to hold the line, and Ms. Judith Holm noted that her program was facing a possible half-billion dollar cut in the next year. She also mentioned that there would be opportunities for specific planning activities that would bring in a small amount of funding for the project.

Ms. Sattler then reviewed project activities since the December meeting:

1. The committee had commented on DOE's Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure.
2. The regional staff had written a "letter of consensus" in follow-up to the Second Joint Meeting. Dwight Shelor from OCRWM had written DOE's response, which surprised Ms. Sattler since the regions' letter addressed all DOE shipments, not just those conducted by OCRWM. The staff had also prepared a summary of the meeting, which was distributed to all meeting participants and was posted on the Internet.
3. The committee had commented on OCRWM's revised RFP.
4. The routing subcommittee had held two conference calls, on which Mr. Frank Moussa would report later.
5. In April, Ms. Sattler and Mr. Donald Flater attended a training session on the Windows version of TRANSCOM. Ms. Sattler hoped to use that experience to help to arrange a one-day training session for the Midwestern states in Chicago later this year. Ms. Sattler said she had forwarded updated information on emergency response contacts in the Midwest to the TRANSCOM Control Center.
6. The next meeting of the TEC/WG was scheduled for July 13-15 in Milwaukee. Ms. Sattler said the committee would hear a more detailed report on the TEC/WG meeting later.
7. Several members of the committee had reviewed and provided comments on both the outlines and workbooks for DOE's TEPP training modules.
8. Ms. Sattler was putting the finishing touches on the flyer Radioactive Materials Transportation and hoped to distribute the final by the end of May. She had posted a great deal of information on the Second Joint Meeting on the project web page. She noted that CSG headquarters was redesigning its web page and that the Transportation Project page would change as well. Mr. Larry Pearce asked if DOE was making the Windows version of TRANSCOM available to all states that were current users. Ms. Sattler replied that DOE was already distributing the software. Ms. Holm added that the interval for distributing the software was May 1-May 15.

Mr. Crose asked if TRANSCOM training was moving from Oak Ridge to Albuquerque. Ms. Holm said the April training session was held in Albuquerque to accommodate the Western states that were on the corridor

for WIPP shipments and the shipments of foreign research reactor spent nuclear fuel. DOE also had people out West who needed training. She hoped to hold a course in Chicago to cover the Midwestern states and the DOE-Chicago staff that needed training. Other courses would still be held in Oak Ridge. Mr. Flater added that one of the reasons for trying to hold a training course in Chicago was to reduce the costs of travel.

Mr. Tim Runyon asked if Ms. Sattler thought previous TRANSCOM users would need the training if they were already Windows literate. She said she did not feel the training would be necessary in such a case. Ms. Carol O'Claire mentioned that there was a dry run to test TRANSCOM scheduled later in the week. Ms. Sattler asked if this dry run was in conjunction with the WIPP dry run. Ms. O'Claire said she thought it was related simply to testing TRANSCOM.

Routing Subcommittee Report

Mr. Moussa said the subcommittee had held two conference calls since the December committee meeting. The subcommittee addressed two primary issues: commenting on the routing sections of both the letter of consensus and the Routing Discussion Paper, and updating and revising the schedule for completing the routing plan.

He said the group had had mixed progress on the model legislation. Three states introduced the legislation. It died in both Kansas and Indiana, although it passed the Senate in Indiana. Mr. Crose thought the bill would have a good chance of passing in Indiana in 1999. The bill was still alive in Michigan. After the committee discussed some of the specific provisions of the model legislation, Mr. Moussa said he would like to see the routing subcommittee revise it and resubmit it to the committee as a whole.

Continuing his report on the routing subcommittee, Mr. Moussa said none of the Midwestern states had designated alternate routes in the previous six months. The subcommittee was hoping to move onto rail routing, including better coordination with the TEC/WG rail topic group. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) was preparing to issue a memo on the authority of states to stop and inspect rail shipments. Mr. Moussa said the subcommittee had contacted Oak Ridge National Laboratories (ORNL) to obtain hypothetical rail routes from Midwestern reactors to Yucca Mountain, but ORNL had declined due to a lack of funding. The subcommittee was therefore working with the outdated maps produced by the Nevada Nuclear Waste Project Office.

Mr. Moussa added that the subcommittee was working on a planning checklist for the Midwestern states. As a guide, the subcommittee would use lists already developed in Kansas and Michigan.

Mr. Moussa noted that the TEC/WG routing topic group had completed its routing issues discussion paper and had decided to disband. Ms. Sattler mentioned that the routing subcommittee had helped her to develop the recommendations that went into the paper, one of which was a broad distribution list including members of Congress and officials in the Midwestern states. She said she would like the committee to consider distributing the paper to Midwestern members of Congress. Mr. Robert Owen said he thought doing so would properly demonstrate that states do have and want an active role and that they are deeply committed to the route-identification process outlined in the paper. Ms. Holm said in addition to the routing paper, the group might also want to let Congress and the states know about the committee's work with the model legislation. Ms. Sattler said she would distribute a proposed mailing list along with the paper to each member of the committee for review and comment. She said she would not mail the paper to any Midwestern officials without the committee member's consent.

Finally, Mr. Moussa reviewed the timetable for completing the routing plan. The goal was to submit the final plan to DOE in June 1999. Mr. Owen voiced his concern over the June 1999 deadline and the implications of labeling the plan and the proposed routes as "final." He worried that DOE would regard the plan as final and the routes it would identify as absolutely acceptable.

Mr. Pearce asked for clarification on whether DOE would be legally bound to use a state-designated route if, for example, Nebraska were to adopt the Indiana legislation and begin designating alternate routes. Ms. Holm explained that if the state filed the route with DOT according to its regulations, then DOE — like any other shipper — would have to abide by the route designation. Mr. Pearce asked if legislation or decisions at the state level would supersede DOT regulations, and Mr. Carlisle Smith said they would not. If they did, DOE could petition DOT for a preemption determination. Mr. Flater commented that twice during the previous five months the NRC had approved a route through a major population center in Iowa despite a by-pass being available.

Mr. Owen suggested that the plan should differentiate between routes that had actually been designated and those that were only potential routes. Mr. Flater asked the committee to look at the draft highway routes and to see whether they could accept these potential routes. Ms. Sattler said Mr. Owen had a valid point about being cautious. She said the routing subcommittee had always regarded the routing plan as a "living document" subject to change as states made decisions regarding routes. She said she believed the committee could easily find the right wording to convey to DOE, when it submits the plan, that the department should treat the plan as a guide but recognize that it will evolve with time.

TEC/WG Update

Mr. Crose said the Mechanics of Funding topic group had closed up shop, so he was now participating on the Communications topic group. During its first conference call April 30, the group developed goals and objectives for the full TEC/WG to review at the July meeting. Ms. Holm said the point of the group was to look at making DOE more uniform in its approach to communicating with stakeholders about transportation. The group was doing some fact finding and gathering information on the materials states and other stakeholders have developed. The group was also trying to tie in with what the Senior Executive Forum was doing. The Forum has its own internal communications group looking at the same kinds of issues.

Ms. O'Claire asked how the communications group would contact the states for samples of their public information materials. Ms. Holm said Ms. Sattler was the TEC/WG's point of contact for the Midwestern High-Level Radioactive Waste Committee.

Mr. Flater reported that most of the state representatives on the Training topic group felt there was still work to be done on matters related to training first responders along the routes. At the January meeting, however, the group appeared to be headed in a completely new direction, namely training hospital personnel. He said he and other states were dissatisfied with this change in direction. He noted that the briefing materials contained a copy of a letter he wrote to Ms. Holm complaining about the change and urging DOE to continue working with the training topic group in its original incarnation. Mr. Flater said it was his understanding that the group was reverting to its original focus of training responders.

Mr. Runyon commented that Fernald had sponsored radiological response training in Illinois through the International Association of Fire Fighters. The training failed to mention that the State of Illinois had a department of nuclear safety. He suggested that the states should be allowed to propose a training program to DOE that would cover WIPP, spent fuel, and high-level waste shipments, with funding available from DOE for that training. Mr. Flater agreed that would be a good idea.

Mr. John Kerr asked whether the committee had compiled a listing on a state-by-state basis of what they envisioned as the type of training needed. He said he was curious about the approaches the different states were taking. The committee decided it would be beneficial to survey the Midwestern states regarding their preparations for shipments.

Ms. Holm reported that the Rail topic group had completed its matrix and would have a conference call prior to the July meeting. Ms. Sattler added that the group was also going to review the WIPP Program Implementation Guide (PIG) to see if it could be modified for rail transport. She said the topic group had concluded there was no need for additional procedures or requirements related to rail inspections.

Ms. Sattler then reported that she was one of the first non-DOE TEC/WG members to participate on the TEC/WG planning committee. She and Mr. Ken Niles from Oregon had requested membership on the committee, which resulted in UETC and DOE adding three seats. She asked for feedback from the committee on a possible agenda item, namely a panel on security and civil disobedience. The committee discussed the matter and concluded that such a panel could be useful given the right speakers.

Mr. Crose mentioned that he and Ms. Audrey Adamson (UETC) had discussed having someone speak about the napalm shipment. Ms. Holm suggested Bill Rudy of the La Grange Fire Department as a possible speaker. He sent DOE a list of things that went wrong with the shipment from a risk-communication standpoint.

CVSA Inspection Procedures

Mr. Runyon said one of CVSA's goals or missions was to develop an inspection program that would be consistent across the United States. The State of Illinois recently had CVSA training for the Illinois State Police (ISP) in preparation for WIPP shipments. DOE provided a truck with TRUPACT II containers, and the ISP officers received training in using pancake GMs to survey TRU waste, spent fuel, and high-level waste shipments. Two staff people from the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety (IDNS) attended the training to observe. They were concerned that the troopers now felt IDNS had provided them with the wrong instruments. (ISP consulted with IDNS on technical issues and IDNS selected, calibrated, and maintained the survey instruments for ISP.)

Mr. Runyon said that a thin-window GM instrument was not the type of instrument to use to make regulatory measurements on packages that contained mixed fission products or that emitted varying gamma energies because there would be no consistency. Mr. Runyon said if one were to use a pancake or thin-window GM to survey the surface of a package, it would be impossible to tell whether a reading was due to surface contamination or an internal source. He said he had raised this concern with CVSA several times during the past three years but had not received any satisfaction from the response.

Mr. Runyon then asked Mr. Smith to give his opinion of the matter. Mr. Smith said Ohio did use the CVSA procedures, however it did not use the pancake GM probe. He had mentioned to CVSA that, after talking with Mr. Runyon and other health physicists, Ohio had decided the pancake probe did not work for the purposes of these inspections. His own research into various probes showed that if the surface of the package registered 200 mR, then there was a problem. The GM pancake probe, however, did not go to 200 mR. The PUCO said the probe would be fine for alpha or beta, but not for gamma, so they chose to use a different probe.

Mr. Smith said CVSA had conducted refresher training in Ohio, and that EMA had observed. He had explained to the instructor that PUCO had chosen to use their own instruments. He acknowledged that the pancake probe worked fine for finding the sources that the instructors planted during the training. Mr. Runyon responded that

the sources were probably cesium 137 and the probes were probably calibrated to that isotope, which would produce consistent, accurate readings. Mr. Smith said the CVSA program was designed to be flexible enough to allow states to use their own instruments or to have two different agencies perform the radiological and safety portions of the inspection.

Mr. Runyon agreed that the safety inspection procedures were fine. He also acknowledged that the ISP troopers relied on IDNS staff to perform the radiological part of the inspection. But he voiced his concern that the procedures called for a regulatory measurement, which was the dose rate at one meter from the surface of the package. Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Runyon agreed that one could not calculate a transport index using the GM survey meter. Mr. Runyon suggested that CVSA was teaching inspectors to do just that.

Mr. Runyon also noted that, in Illinois, the inspectors would check the original shipping papers and compare the readings to see if anything had happened to the package. The decision as to whether something had occurred would be based on whether the readings were consistent with those taken at the point of origin. Without consistency in approach, there would be no comparability.

Mr. Smith asked if the measurement taken with a GM probe would be significantly different from that taken with an ionization chamber and, if so, if there were a consistent adjustment one could make. Mr. Runyon said that with spent fuel it could be significantly different — as much as 100 percent. This matter would not really apply to TRU waste, because there would be little in the way of a dose rate at the surface of the package anyway.

Ms. Holm commented that this discussion raised some important issues — to her knowledge for the first time. She said the instrumentation and the protocols were established with CRCPD and with health physics professionals from different states who advised CVSA. Because the protocols were designed initially for WIPP shipments, they settled on the GM probe because it was more sensitive and therefore would detect something. Mr. Runyon said the CVSA training manual referred to TRU waste, spent nuclear fuel, and high-level waste. Mr. Smith suggested consulting with Mr. Rich Swedburg from DOT, who was involved in developing the procedures. Ms. Holm said she had been involved from the start, with Illinois providing the model. Mr. Runyon said his inspectors used the GM probe for spent fuel shipments, but they would then take wipes and check those. CVSA had suggested doing wipes, but DOE felt that, for en route shipments, that would be unnecessary since the real purpose was the safety inspection. The standard health physics inspection would take place at the origin and destination.

Ms. Holm said she wanted to come to closure on this program, which received funding from EM and OCRWM. She said she would like to have the protocols agreed upon both from a technical standpoint as well as by the committee as a whole. Mr. Runyon suggested that, if the inspections were to require one universal instrument, it would have to be an ionization chamber. He said he thought that was what DOT intended when it designed the transport index as a dose rate.

State Roundtable

Iowa: Mr. Flater commented on available routes in Iowa. He said he would discourage the use of the northern route that cuts across the state and goes through Ames. This area was the one place that had ever seen trouble, back in the 1980s when material from Brownsville, Nebraska, went to Morris, Illinois. During the shipments, some protesters threw fruit at the train. Mr. Flater also noted that the Ames reactor was being downloaded.

Mr. Rick Bamsey added that Iowa was expanding its rad shop. The state hoped to charge fees, and Ms. Ellen Gordon (director of emergency management) was trying to get legislation to begin charging fees for repair and calibration of instruments.

Nebraska: Mr. Pearce said he was pleased with the draft legislation in Indiana. He talked about the possibility of introducing such legislation in Nebraska. He noted that his agency regularly published a newsletter, and he handed out an issue that dealt with nuclear waste. The state Emergency Management Agency was drafting an updated response plan, which would soon be available for internal review, followed by external review. Ohio: Mr. Owen said the state had an active consortium of eight state agencies looking at the selection of routes. This group was developing a framework, a study, and set of recommendations to send to the PUCO, which had the authority to designate alternate routes. Mr. Owen anticipated this activity would take at least one year to complete.

Mr. Owen also noted that one of the nuclear power plants was having some problems with the vendor of a dry storage system (Vectra).

Mr. Smith added that the PUCO had previously had the authority for designating routes for hazardous materials, therefore it made sense to expand this authority to include routes for radioactive materials.

Ms. O'Claire said the Emergency Management Agency (EMA) was equipping the state's major North-South and East-West routes with CDV-700s and CDV-710s. EMA was also trying to certify its lab for radioactive materials so that it could repair and calibrate equipment for Ohio and some contiguous states. Ohio used TRANSCOM and was preparing to participate in the dry run. The agency had prepared factsheets on WIPP shipments and on low-level waste. The state also had plans for a June 12 outreach program involving the NRC.

Michigan: Mr. Strong reported that the draft legislation was still in the works, and might be coming to a vote by June. He was working with an ad hoc committee of state agencies gearing up for various transportation activities. The committee met on a couple occasions with representatives of Big Rock Point, located in a rural area in the northern part of the state. The plant was shut down and undergoing decommissioning. For shipments, the tentative approach in Michigan was to establish an escort system rather than train responders. Since Big Rock Point was a small plant, Consumers Power projected a total of seven casks. Mr. Strong said the state's experience with shipments from Big Rock Point would help in making decisions regarding how to proceed with shipments from the southern plants, which were very close to the border.

Minnesota: Mr. Kerr reported on developments at the Prairie Island plant. First, dry storage had dropped out of site as an issue and Northern States Power (NSP) was no longer obligated to find a site elsewhere. Second, the Private Storage consortium of eight utilities was trying to develop a storage site in Utah on land owned by the Goshute tribe. NSP applied for an NRC license in June 1997. NSP anticipated the NRC would complete its Safety Analysis Report by December 1998 and an environmental impact statement (EIS) by June 1999. NSP further anticipated formal hearings on the site by mid- to late-1999, followed by approval by 2000, and operation by 2002.

Mr. Kerr said the state was finding it difficult to prepare for shipments not knowing the destination, mode, number of routes, etc. He had met with NSP and asked for a best estimate based on the utility's current plans. He hoped to hear back from the utility later in the summer.

Missouri: Mr. Lange reported that things in Missouri had been quiet relative to transportation. The napalm issue, though, had several lessons to be learned. Public and Congressional reaction, for instance, was very indicative of what might be in store for shipments of radioactive materials. Missouri tried to obtain information

for almost two years on the napalm shipment, however it was completely stonewalled by the Navy and Battelle. He suggested that DOE could learn two things from this incident: 1) the Navy's attempt at secrecy was the primary fault, and 2) the Navy erred in attempting to completely relinquish authority to the contractor.

Illinois: Mr. Runyon said the state was revising its statutes regarding the fees for shipments. He said the revised statute would apply to transuranic waste. He noted that DOE planned to conduct 46-50 shipments from Argonne, and that more shipments would pass through the state on their way from Mound in Ohio. Mr. Runyon added that the state had received the Windows version of TRANSCOM, and that state personnel were likely to train themselves.

Mr. Runyon said he had attended a workshop for local governments put on by UETC and had heard some interesting feedback from the local government representatives. He learned that no state or legislation could serve as "the model," and that new programs must take into account the different attributes and response infrastructure in the various states.

Indiana: Mr. Crose said he also attended the local government network workshop. Regarding route designation, the state was waiting to see what Ohio would do. He reported that, at the last NASTPO meeting, there had been a discussion about different funding streams for hazmat training. The plan was to survey all HMEP program managers in the country.

Mr. Crose said the Departments of Health, Environmental Management, and Transportation, the State Police, and SEMA worked together on transportation issues and all agencies agreed on the legislation proposed in the state.

Mr. Roger Andrews said he had conducted a statewide equipment survey of all 92 counties. The survey asked about the stock of CDV-700s — e.g., where they were located and what was the status with calibration. Indiana shut down its shop 3-4 years ago, and was currently in a contract with Ohio to calibrate state-level instruments. The counties, however, had been left to handle their own arrangements.

Mr. Andrews was reviewing training modules from DOE. Lake County had some radiological training from DOE and one of its contractors. Indiana would probably reimburse the county for some of the expenses using its HMEP grant. The state routinely passed 100% of the planning and training money to the locals.

Mr. Andrews added that he was working on a plan for transportation. The plan would address issues such as escorts and training for hazmat teams.

Kansas: Mr. Moussa also attended the UETC meeting and found it to be helpful. He said the napalm shipment was a very big problem for Kansas. The Navy snubbed the governor by refusing to provide information on how long the shipment would stay in the rail yard in Kansas City. Mr. Moussa said he had contacted numerous offices and never received an answer, despite the fact that the state requested the information for internal purposes only.

The state was looking at establishing regional hazmat teams as a way to control costs. The goal was to submit a plan to the governor by June 1. The state was conducting radiological training already, and it was looking at opening up its rad shop for contract with other states to calibrate and repair mainly civil defense equipment.

Regarding Wolf Creek, Mr. Moussa reported that it was a young plant with storage capacity until 2005.

Mr. Jon Lawritson from WGA noted that the Western states were preparing for the opening of WIPP by conducting a performance dry run this week with two trucks, one from INEEL and one from Los Alamos National Laboratory. The dry run would test all the procedures in the WIPP PIG, as well as state procedures. The states had some major concerns regarding TRANSCOM, especially with the recent release of the Windows version. They had experienced difficulty accessing the system, which was not up 24 hours.

Mr. Lawritson added that the states were working on letters from the governors in the initial corridor states indicating that the states were ready for shipments. WGA was reviewing the third version of the Transportation Plan. Mr. Lawritson said a revised version of the video Safe Way Out (regarding the TRUPACT II transportation system) was available. WGA was also working on transportation planning for the first West Coast shipment of foreign research reactor spent nuclear fuel, which was scheduled for July.

Mr. Christopher Wells from SSEB reported on some of the Southern states' activities. He noted that bills regarding spent fuel transportation had been introduced in Georgia and Tennessee. The Georgia bill had died, but he was not sure of the fate of the Tennessee bill. Ms. Sattler mentioned that the Nuclear Energy Institute's newsletter contained an article on bills throughout the U.S. The article had described the bills introduced in Georgia, Tennessee, New Hampshire, and California as "obstructionist," whereas the Michigan, Indiana, and Kansas bills were all regarded as useful.

The SSEB Advisory Committee on Radioactive Materials Transportation had commented on OCRWM's RFP. Primary issues raised by the group included the need for a single transportation plan, the use of CVSA enhanced standards, and the use of TRANSCOM for tracking. The TRU Waste Transportation Working Group had commented on the draft transportation plan for WIPP, and was continuing to work with the states along the Savannah River Site corridor to prepare for these shipments. The group was also working on a Southern version of the PIG.

Regarding the foreign research reactor spent fuel shipments, Mr. Wells noted that the Southern states had a good working relationship with the Savannah River Site. The planning process had progressed from a 2-day intensive meeting in 1995 to a conference call for each shipment, indicating that the shipments had become very routine.

DOE Program Updates

Ms. Holm reported on the activities of the National Transportation Program (NTP). The NTP provided an infrastructure for other departmental programs, as well as a forum for transportation planning. The program's goals were to reduce costs as the Environmental Management program started to move larger volumes of material. As part of downsizing and reorganizing, three offices would be responsible for NTP activities: INEEL, headquarters, and the Albuquerque Operations Office. A steering committee, composed of personnel at the assistant manager level from the three sites, would report to Deputy Assistant Secretary Gene Schmitt, who was also responsible for the "Accelerating Cleanup" plan. The Senior Executive Transportation Forum was looking at a more integrated approach to transportation. The TEPP program had shifted its focus to state, tribal and local concerns, whereas at the beginning it focused on DOE internal customers.

Ms. Holm mentioned that an EIS on the disposition of plutonium residues would be out this year. The EIS could indicate a need for shipment of material from Rocky Flats to the Savannah River Site. She also noted that DOE would like to close the West Valley site as soon as possible, which would entail the movement of glass logs from the site to Savannah River.

Mr. Lange asked about the listing of TRU waste shipments from Argonne in the latest prospective shipments module (PSM). Ms. Holm said Mound, ANL-E, and other TRU waste generator sites were listed on the PSM, but there was not a plan to move the waste in the coming year. Mr. Lange commented that DOE documents often contained inaccurate information. Mr. Lawritson agreed, citing the schedule in the WIPP transportation plan as an example. Ms. Holm said once DOE put this material on the Internet, quality control would obviously need to increase.

Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel Program

Ms. Tracy Mustin provided an overview of the program. Under President Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace Program, the U.S. provided highly enriched uranium to foreign countries for their research programs in return for their commitment not to develop nuclear weapons. In all, 41 countries received U.S. support. An original part of the program was the return of radioactive material to the U.S. Starting in the late 1950s until 1992, the U.S. did accept this waste into the country for management. The policy lapsed, however, and to renew the policy DOE first had to prepare an EIS. In May 1996, the department completed the EIS process by publishing its record of decision (ROD). The new acceptance policy had been in place since that time.

Two ports of entry were identified in the ROD: the Charleston Naval Weapons Station (South Carolina) and the Concord Naval Weapons Station (California). Five or fewer shipments were planned through Concord, with the majority of shipments arriving in South Carolina. It was possible that some material would enter the U.S. from Canada. DOE would accept a total of approximately 20 MTU of material.

To date, DOE had conducted five shipments: four through the east coast and one by land from Canada. The department used a dedicated charter ship to bring the material overseas. All land shipments had been by rail so far.

As part of a separate EIS on spent fuel management, DOE's TRIGA fuel would be managed at Idaho, while aluminum-clad fuel would be sent to the Savannah River Site (SRS). As a result, the department anticipated, in mid-1999, conducting the first cross-country shipment of European TRIGA fuel from SRS to INEEL. Detailed planning for this shipment had not begun. Bill Clark from SRS was the lead. Mr. Crose asked why DOE was bringing the TRIGA fuel in through SRS rather than using the Concord port of entry. Ms. Mustin said the dispersion of TRIGA fuel in Europe made it cost ineffective to charter a ship to transport just one or two TRIGA-filled casks. She said DOE estimated a total of only 40 casks of TRIGA fuel would be transported cross-country over the 10 remaining years of the program.

Ms. Mustin said that, throughout the transportation planning process, DOE would solicit input from the Midwestern states. The mode and route had not been decided for the cross-country shipment.

OCRWM

The budget request for FY 99 amounted to \$380 million, including \$10 million for the cooperative agreement groups and other transportation activities.

At Yucca Mountain, DOE was conducting thermal testing to see how the rock unit would react to long periods of heating and cooling. OCRWM was also working on a viability assessment that was due later this year. The repository EIS was scheduled for release in FY 2000, followed by a recommendation to the president in 2001, a license application in 2002, and waste emplacement in 2010. The viability assessment was a check point at which OCRWM would review all the data to date and make a decision as to whether it would be worthwhile to proceed.

Mr. Popa reviewed the status of the waste acceptance litigation. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on May 5 that the utilities could not escrow their payments to the Nuclear Waste Fund and that all parties to the contracts should use the process identified in the contract to handle disputes over damages due to OCRWM's delay in starting waste acceptance.

Regarding interim storage, Mr. Popa noted that OCRWM had submitted to the NRC for review a design for a non site-specific storage facility. OCRWM had also designed and was in the process of licensing a dry transfer system, which would allow shutdown of a number of pools much earlier than currently planned.

Mr. Popa commented that the revised policy and procedures on Section 180(c) were available for comment. He reviewed some of the major provisions of the policy and said the revised version would be "put on the shelf" until the date for starting shipments was closer.

Mr. Popa commented that OCRWM originally wanted to do a rulemaking with regard to Section 180(c), but the General Counsel suggested doing a policy and procedures because it had a less rigid timeline associated with it. Ms. Sattler noted that, if the earliest shipment date is 2010, time would not seem to be a factor. The committee discussed the merits of issuing rules on the Section 180(c) program.

Wednesday, May 13

Federal Railroad Administration Update

Mr. Ed Staehlin, a hazmat specialist with Region IV in Chicago, presented information on the FRA's States Participation Program. The program began with the passage of the 1970 Railroad Safety Act. The program had grown since then, with most states participating to varying degrees. Currently, a total of 18 states participated.

The FRA had five disciplines: track, signal and train control, motive power and equipment, operating practices, and hazardous materials. Each FRA office had a specialist in each of these disciplines.

Mr. Staehlin introduced Mr. Brad Cachera and Mr. Rick Hand with the State of Illinois. He said Mr. Cachera had been with the state for awhile and Mr. Hand was currently in training to be a hazmat inspector, likely to happen in June. The FRA would pay for all the formal training for state inspectors. In Illinois, the Commerce Commission handled rail inspections, whereas the Department of Transportation covered the highway inspection. Mr. Smith noted that, in Ohio, the PUCO handled both rail and highway inspections.

Mr. Strong asked how the FRA operated in states that did not have their own inspectors. Mr. Staehlin said the FRA's Chicago office had six hazmat inspectors who performed inspections throughout the region.

Union Pacific Risk Management Communication Center

Mr. Larry Wilder from Union Pacific Railroad (UP) presented information on the company's Risk Management Communication Center (RMCC). He said the center, located in Denver, came about as a result of people not knowing whom to call in the event of an accident. The RMCC handled system-wide notification of all major railroad incidents. The RMCC's goal was to notify all parties within a half-hour time frame. Mr. Wilder said that, to respond in a timely fashion to an emergency, he had the authority to use company planes or to charter a plane, if necessary. He commented that UP had a good working relationship with the FRA and state inspectors.

The RMCC would accept calls for all types of railroad incidents — even those that did not involve the UP system or its equipment. UP had 11 people with hazmat training, but only one person who was a specialist in radioactive materials.

DOE Center for Risk Excellence

Ms. Mary Jo Acke Ramicone presented information on DOE's Center for Risk Excellence (CRE), located at the Chicago Operations Office. The center was created in 1997 to provide support to the National Risk Policy Program. The goal was to help field offices incorporate risk management into their cleanup strategies. The center also served as a clearinghouse for getting people in touch with one another regarding risk management.

Ms. Ramicone said the center was revising its newsletter to move from a technical, DOE-focused publication to one that would be more useful to the broader risk-management community. Mr. Crose suggested that the editorial board for the newsletter include a representative of the regional cooperative agreement groups, and Ms. Ramicone said she thought that would be a good idea. Mr. Owen asked if the CRE would work with professional organizations such as the National Academy of Sciences or the CRCPD. Ms. Ramicone said the management and assessment divisions of the center would work with these groups.

Committee Discussion

The committee discussed several topics, which resulted in the following action items:

TRANSCOM Training: Several Midwestern states requested access to TRANSCOM. Ms. Sattler said she would work with Ms. Holm and other DOE staff to distribute software to the appropriate users and to organize a training session in Chicago for the Midwestern states.

1999 Appointments: Ms. Sattler agreed to seek comments from the committee on the draft appointment letters prior to sending them to the governors in January.

TEPP Training Modules: The states agreed that DOE should use the TEPP modules to provide information to the states for incorporating into their own training programs. Distance learning was a sound concept for awareness-level training, but not for emergency responders. Both Indiana and Ohio expressed interest in participating in any beta testing of the modules.

Letter of Consensus: The committee considered DOE's response to the regions' letter of consensus to be "too generic." At Ms. Holm's request, the committee agreed to wait until after the July TEC/WG meeting to write to DOE regarding the response.

Model Legislation: The committee agreed to try to revise the model legislation and submit it for consideration to CSG's national committee on Suggested State Legislation

For more information, contact:

Lisa R. Sattler, Senior Policy Analyst
The Council of State Governments
P.O. Box 981
Sheboygan, Wisconsin 53082-0981
Phone: 920-803-9976; Fax: 920-803-9978
e-mail: lsattler@csg.org

or

The Council of State Governments
Midwestern Office
641 E. Butterfield Road, Suite 401
Lombard, IL 60148
Phone: 630-810-0210; Fax: 630-810-0145
e-mail: csgm@csg.org