

**The Council of State Governments
Midwestern Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee**

**Proceedings of the Fall Meeting
November 30-December 1, 2016 • St. Louis, Missouri**

Committee Business Session

Welcome and Introductions

Senior Co-Chair Kelly Horn (Illinois) greeted the attendees and acknowledged representatives from the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), and tribal representatives Heather Westra (Prairie Island Indian Community) and Richard Arnold (Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations). He also welcomed Bryan Tuma (Nebraska), who was attending his first meeting as Gov. Pete Rickett's appointee to the committee. Mr. Horn said the committee was glad to have Mr. Tuma as a new member, but the circumstances that created the need for a new appointee were tragic, then gave a tribute to Jon Schwarz, who represented Nebraska on the committee for eight years before passing away unexpectedly in July.

Mr. Horn thanked Junior Co-Chair Teri Engelhart (Wisconsin) for arranging for a presentation from the Point Beach Nuclear Plant in Wisconsin; Tiffany Drake (Missouri) and Kevin Blackwell (Federal Railroad Administration) for organizing the Rail Field Trip that took place earlier that day; and Ms. Drake, Ms. Engelhart, and Kaci Studer (Indiana) for helping committee staff plan the meeting.

Report from the Co-Chairs

Mr. Horn said he felt there would be some movement with the nuclear waste program soon, which would make it an interesting time to be co-chair of the committee.

Ms. Engelhart agreed and said she was starting to feel a sense of urgency and the need to be ready to prepare for shipments. She added that some people may be retiring soon and it is important to leave a foundation for the next generation to carry forward.

Project Update

Lisa Janairo (CSG Midwest) reviewed highlights from the Project Update, which was given to members in a handout. She noted that all three cooperative agreements with DOE are in good shape, and CSG Midwest had just entered into a new five-year agreement with the DOE Office of Nuclear Energy (DOE-NE). She said one of the special projects the Midwest proposed under the cooperative agreement was to resurrect work that was done in the past on route identification, which would be a topic of discussion later in the meeting.

Ms. Janairo reminded committee members that travel funding was available through DOE's Carlsbad Field Office (DOE-CBFO) and DOE's Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM) for training related to radioactive waste transportation, and to contact her or Katelyn Tye (CSG Midwest) if they are interested.

She also mentioned that, in addition to Mr. Tuma, the committee had a new appointee from South Dakota, Nick Emme.

She also reported on the committee's regular activities under the agreement, including the *Planning Guide for Shipments of Radioactive Materials through the Midwestern States*; the committee's monthly e-newsletter; and a new Midwestern state and federal legislative tracker designed by Ms. Tye that is on the committee's website.

Report on DOE-NE Transportation Core Group Meeting

Mr. Horn said the summer meeting of the DOE-NE Transportation Core Group was held in Chicago in August. He said attendees heard about DOE's models and databases and, based on interest from the group, DOE agreed to set up a workshop on its Execution Strategy Analysis. He added that the meeting sparked action on a long-standing action item to give feedback on the recommendations from the National Academy

of Sciences (NAS) and the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC), and members would be discussing this during the business session of the meeting.

Ms. Engelhart mentioned that one thing attendees learned about at the meeting was a DOE effort to evaluate public opinion of the consent-based siting process called the Expert and Citizen Assessment of Science and Technology (ECAST). Ms. Janairo elaborated on ECAST and added that meetings would be held simultaneously in five different cities on a Saturday in January. She said ECAST would be separate from other stakeholder engagement work that DOE-NE has been doing and it specifically targets people who wouldn't have shown up at the consent-based siting public meetings. [Editor's note: DOE-NE terminated the ECAST work in December 2016.]

Mr. Horn added that the draft paper on consultation and cooperation was approved. Ms. Janairo thanked Ms. Engelhart, Ms. Drake, and Paul Schmidt (Wisconsin) for providing comments on the paper, and explained that it had been initiated in 2012 to clarify the relationship between DOE, states, and Tribes as partners in transportation planning. She said it will be used to hold all parties accountable in terms of what they said they'd do on consultation and cooperation.

The next scheduled Transportation Core Group meeting is March 1-2, 2017, in Washington, DC. Ms. Engelhart and the new committee co-chair would have the opportunity to attend the meeting.

NTSF-Related Reports

Planning Committee

Laura Dresen (Indiana) said she had appointed Ms. Studer to participate on the Planning Committee conference calls in her place. She told members that a save-the-date email for the 2017 National Transportation Stakeholders Forum (NTSF) Annual Meeting in Pittsburgh should be going out that week. She gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda, explaining that trainings would be held on Monday afternoon and state regional groups will hold their meetings at the end of the week. She added that the newcomer's orientation will occur on-site, in addition to a pre-meeting webinar. She also mentioned that the Planning Committee is discussing having a nominal registration fee to help offset some of the costs for food and beverages at evening networking receptions.

Information and Communications Ad Hoc Working Group

Ms. Tye said the ad hoc working group's (AHWG's) major activity is publishing the quarterly NTSF Newsletter. She explained that the first edition was published in May, prior to the NTSF meeting in Orlando, but the Newsletter Editorial Board had run into roadblocks in getting the next edition out.

Mr. Horn asked Ms. Tye to go into more detail about what roadblocks the board ran into. Ms. Tye explained that the process was being delayed in the editing phase, but it was not clear exactly what the issue was.

Mr. Blackwell asked if the problem was meeting a quarterly schedule. Ms. Tye indicated she believed a quarterly timeline was manageable, as long as deadlines were adhered to and the content is limited to NTSF-related updates, as originally intended.

Rail/Routing Ad Hoc Working Group

Mike Stead (Illinois) recapped the group's meeting that was held the previous day. He said the group heard updates from Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) staff and will have further discussion on the FRA Safety Compliance Oversight Plan during a February web-meeting. He mentioned that Erica Bickford (DOE-NE) had attended a recent meeting of state rail safety managers to get more managers interested in radioactive materials transportation. He said, since then, he has heard from three state managers and hopes to hear from more after repeating the message at a meeting in March. He said the group also heard updates on Steve

Maheras' (Pacific Northwest National Laboratory) report on derailment (which is in a revision process) and the initial site-specific de-inventory reports.

Mr. Stead added that the group participated in a rail routing workshop using the Stakeholders Tool for Assessing Radioactive Transportation (START). He said the group discussed how to continue a discussion on routing further, and considered having a workshop in DC in March, but ultimately decided to wait until a later date. He said the group hopes to eventually involve rail industry, state rail safety managers, and other stakeholders in routing discussions.

Ms. Janairo added that the routing workshop will likely be scheduled to coincide with the summer 2017 Core Group meeting in Pueblo, Colorado.

Section 180c Implementation Ad Hoc Working Group

Ms. Studer said there was not much to report other than the Section 180c Exercise participants met with the Mock Merit Review Panel during the NTSF meeting in Orlando. There was discussion about whether the 180c recommendations report had been finalized; Ms. Janairo thought it was still in review at DOE. Ms. Studer said that may be one of the DOE activities that were on hold due to contractor issues. [Editor's note: Erica Bickford confirmed after the meeting that the lessons-learned report has not yet been cleared by the Office of General Counsel for public release, but has been added to the review queue as a priority item.]

Mr. Horn asked Ms. Studer to explain what lessons were learned from the exercise, specifically regarding the mock application. Ms. Studer said the states primarily felt a standard application template was needed and didn't think the funding formula was adequately tested.

Mr. Leuer, who participated on the Mock Merit Review Panel, added that he thought the application was administratively burdensome and requested superfluous background information from states. He said there was a huge gap in shipment planning assumptions between states and that in the future DOE needed to: 1) be specific about what a shipment looked like and 2) clearly define the planning/training versus operations phases of the grant. He also noted that DOE required a certain level of detail in the application, such as history of transportation programs, that states do not normally consider.

Mr. Horn said the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Grant was simple, but efficient, and wondered why 180c couldn't have a similar process. Mr. Leuer said he believed DOE has different, more detailed requirements than PHMSA for contracting and grants. Ms. Janairo added that the proposed 180c funding formula was modeled after the formula used to allocate HMEP grant funding.

Ms. Janairo asked Mr. Leuer if the state history section of the applications was actually read by reviewers and if any of them found it useful. Mr. Leuer said during the review process the panel realized the information they really needed from states was what they expect, how they are prepared to support a shipment, and why they made certain choices in planning and operations.

Transportation Practices Ad Hoc Working Group

Ms. Janairo said the final Transportation Practices document was completed and asked Mike Wangler (DOE-EM) if he knew where it was in the review process. Mr. Wangler said the paper didn't get into the system in time to qualify under the old DOE review process and had to be resubmitted under a new process. He added that the document containing the AHWG's recommendations doesn't have to be reviewed by DOE's Office of General Counsel (GC), but the attachment to the DOE order will.

Management Plan Ad Hoc Working Group

Ms. Janairo said the Management Plan was written to help all NTSF participants understand what their roles,

responsibilities, and expectations are. She said the document was complete (for the time being) and is undergoing review by GC. Mr. Wangler guessed the review process would be finished within a month or two.

Spent Fuel Transportation (SFT) Materials Ad Hoc Working Group

Ms. Janairo said she was co-leading this new AHWG with Ken Niles (Oregon) and Giulia Bisconti (DOE-NE). There are also participants from the other state regional groups and the Tribal Caucus. She said the group was looking forward to receiving materials from Ms. Bisconti that were promised a couple weeks ago. Ms. Janairo added that DOE-NE was aiming to host a webinar in January on transportation.

FEMA Rad Training Focus Group

Mr. Horn explained that the idea for this focus group came from Bernice Zaidel (Federal Emergency Management Agency) during a breakout session at the NTSF meeting in Orlando on planning and training exercises available to states and Tribes. He said the group members—including representatives of states, DOE, the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO)—had an initial meeting with FEMA in May and catalogued the different types of training into categories, competencies, and levels (awareness, operations, technician, specialist). He said the purpose of categorizing the training was to allow for reciprocity and equivalency between courses. He explained that they are currently working to make sure the catalogue meets National Fire Protection Association standards for hazmat training. He added that the group was meeting again in two weeks to continue that process and he hopes to have progress to report at the June NTSF meeting in Pittsburgh.

Joanne Lorence (DOE-EM) asked for confirmation that the group was focusing strictly on training for first responders because there is a different group that has the authority for DOE training. Mr. Horn confirmed that was the case. Ms. Lorence asked if FEMA would own the information on who has completed training. Mr. Horn said the thought is that FEMA will own the database, but that doesn't mean that DOE or the DNDO can't have access or keep their own records on trainings. He said the goal was to make a one-stop shop for curriculum and that would mean FEMA should have that data repository. Ms. Lorence said this process could possibly affect the way she funds the Modular Emergency Response Radiological Transportation Training (MERRTT) program if there is reciprocity with other courses.

Ms. Studer asked if there was a reason Technician Modular Emergency Response Radiological Transportation Training (TMERRTT) was not listed on the table. Mr. Horn said that was not intentional and that he would add it.

Mr. Leuer made an observation that, if this was responder based, they may consider removing the planning courses. Mr. Horn explained that, while he was working specifically on emergency responders, the Radiological Emergency Preparedness (REP) program was working on a parallel effort, which is why the planning courses were included on the table.

Ms. Bickford suggested the Radiological Assistance Program (RAP) team be involved.

Mr. Wangler asked if it would be possible to identify the owners of the courses on another version of the table. Mr. Horn confirmed that information would be added in later versions.

Ms. Engelhart asked if responders would be required to follow the training track/learning. Mr. Horn said no, that it was just meant to be a path forward that would make it easier for responders to train.

Ms. Bickford asked if the database would include geocoding so that it could be incorporated into the START and used to identify where training gaps are. Mr. Horn said he would take a note to consider that.

Mr. Wangler asked if any commercial training courses were considered. Mr. Horn said no, the group was only including federally-owned, free training.

Regional Roundtable

Illinois

Mr. Horn showed a video about the decommissioning process at the Zion Nuclear Power Station. He said Illinois would be hosting a Rad Specialist Training sometime in fall 2017, likely in September or October, and a MERRT Train-the-Trainer (TTT) course in May. He invited committee members to attend both.

Indiana

Ms. Studer echoed that Indiana would be hosting three Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program trainings in the early part of 2017—TTT in March, TMERRT in April or May, and the Rad Specialist course on July 10-14—all of which have seats available. She said the only other item was that a draft transportation plan for Indiana has been completed and they will be assembling a working group of stakeholders, per their code, to get input on the draft.

Iowa

Ron Yarkosky (Iowa) said nothing was new, except Iowa almost made an appointment to the committee, but it turned out the governor hadn't signed off on it, as required.

Michigan

Greg Gothard (Michigan) said that, as of noon that day, Ken Yale no longer worked for the State of Michigan. He said Mr. Yale was going to work for the Environmental Protection Agency in Las Vegas, and had submitted Mr. Gothard as a nominee to replace him on the committee. Kevin Hogan (Michigan) added that the state was seeing a lot of cobalt-60 shipments.

Minnesota

Mr. Leuer said they had seen twice as many cobalt-60 shipments as last year, but the total was still less than 10. A Canadian shipper sent a Highway Route Controlled Quantity (HRCQ) shipment through the state without giving adequate advance notice. He said he called the shipper to make them aware of the 10-day advance notice and route information required by the state, and was told they only communicate notifications by fax, not email.

Mr. Leuer said DNDO had been pressing them about a Preventive Radiological & Nuclear Detection (PRND) program because of a potential theft of radioactive materials in transportation. He said DNDO backed off after Minnesota asked to see their threat assessment. The state is currently assessing whether they should do escorts of HRCQ shipments. Mike Snee (Ohio) said his office was working with the DNDO program, too. He said DNDO wants every state and every waterway to have its own PRND program, and is up to 30 states right now. Mr. Leuer said Minnesota is working with DNDO and has agreed to coordinate on special events, but the state was not willing to do that for steady-state information because there is no threat to warrant that.

In regards to rail transportation, Mr. Leuer said Minnesota has been assessing fees as part of the Bakken oil transportation, which has reinvigorated the office of rail safety. The office has added four full-time employees and has a new emphasis on rail transportation safety. HSEM is also benefitting from the fee revenue. They have moved technician-level training to technical colleges and are providing training to those who want it. They are also looking to provide Emergency Operations Center training along the Bakken routes, as is required every three years under statute. Mr. Leuer said they are looking at this program as a model for what they'll do if and when they have to do radiological training. He concluded by saying the state is thinking about radically dropping the Bakken shipping fees because they are collecting more than they are able to spend each year. They are working with the legislature and industry to identify an appropriate fee.

Missouri

Ms. Drake said Missouri held a MERRT TTT exercise for a number of staff last summer and had four

emergency responder trainings. She said the state upgraded the system that shippers use to complete forms for HRCQ and Low-Level Waste (LLW) shipments. The process is now automated and shippers are able to pay online.

Nebraska

Mr. Tuma said that the Fort Calhoun nuclear plant had closed in November and is now ramping down operations. He explained that funding for Nebraska's REP program comes from the state's two nuclear facilities, meaning there will be a 50-percent reduction in funds with the closure. The state is working with the utilities to see what financial support they will be able to provide, but they will most likely have to scale back or reorganize REP personnel, according to Mr. Tuma. He added that the state, overall, has predicted a decrease in revenue, which will result in budget reductions and present additional challenges to all state agencies. He said his agency is taking steps to form a 24-hour "watch center" and is looking at combining operations with other emergency response agencies.

North Dakota

Dale Patrick said North Dakota had one HRCQ shipment of cobalt-60 from Canada and another that was not route-controlled. He said he received a call over the summer that there had been an accident in Minot, North Dakota, involving a truckload of uranium oxide ore, although luckily none was spilled. Finally, he said staff had discovered elevated levels of Technologically Enhanced Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials waste at one of the special state-licensed landfills, and the operator had to remove 1900 tons of waste.

Ohio

Mike Snee said FirstEnergy informed employees three weeks ago that they were going to sell Davis-Besse and two other plants. The utility said if it can't sell the plants, it will close all three because it can't compete with cheap natural gas prices. He said he received a call in February from a scrap metal plant in Madison, Ohio, that had unintentionally received four truckloads of scrap metal that had been contaminated with radium-226. The contamination was spread by plant workers to other locations, and the DOE RAP team was called in to survey over 100 individuals. He said it took 6-7 months to decontaminate the facility.

Wisconsin

Ms. Engelhart said the state had eight HRCQ and 11 non-HRCQ shipments and she feels the state finally has a good process in place for those shipments. She said the state started an interagency Transportation Work Group and she had Mr. Schmidt give a presentation to the group about different types of waste.

Ms. Engelhart also gave updates regarding Kewaunee Power Station, one of Wisconsin's two shutdown plants. Kewaunee was on track to have all spent nuclear fuel (SNF) moved into dry storage by the end of 2016, but that has been delayed by approximately six months.

Ms. Engelhart noted that she had started implementing some of the action items from the "What to Expect" session at the NTSF meeting in Orlando—such as security around notifications. She said she wants the transportation program to have a good base when it comes time for SNF shipments.

Finally, Ms. Engelhart said Wisconsin opened a brand new emergency operations center earlier that week and it should be fully operational soon.

Mr. Schmidt added that Energy Solutions has taken over the LaCrosse Boiling Water Reactor decommissioning and is now trying to condense what is a decades-long project into two years. He said this will create a large number of LLW shipments, beginning the following week, and said it was important to familiarize local responders. He said the shipments will go west by truck, then train, and told Mr. Leuer he would make sure to coordinate with Minnesota when that occurs.

Discussion: Consent-Based Siting Meetings

Mr. Horn reminded members that DOE held eight public meetings that year to gather input on what a consent-based siting process should look like. He said DOE would release a draft siting process for public comment in December. Mr. Horn said he asked Ms. Janairo to compile some comments for the committee to review when the report is released.

Discussion: Cities and Dates for NTSF 2018 Meeting

Ms. Tye told members it was the Midwest's turn to host the NTSF meeting in 2018 and explained the process for selecting a host city. Members that had submitted city recommendations ahead of time made pitches for their preferred location. Mr. Horn recommended Chicago; Mike Snee recommended Cincinnati and Cleveland; Mr. Gothard and Mr. Hogan recommended Grand Rapids, Michigan; Ms. Studer and Ms. Dresen recommended Indianapolis; Ms. Drake recommended Kansas City, Missouri; Mr. Schmidt recommended Milwaukee and Minneapolis. The committee members all reported their top three choices. Ms. Janairo said she and Ms. Tye would tally the votes and announce the results the next morning.

Day 2

Committee Business

Welcome and Introductions

Mary Lamie (St. Louis Regional Freightway) welcomed the attendees to Missouri and gave a brief overview of transportation in the St. Louis area. She noted that St. Louis was the geographic and demographic center of the U.S. and had the seventh largest highway system in the nation. Both Kansas City and St. Louis are major hubs for rail traffic (Kansas City is the second largest, and St. Louis is the third). Strategically, on the Mississippi River, St. Louis is the northern-most point that is ice free to and from the Gulf of Mexico, and the northern-most point that is lock-free. Major multimodal transportation priorities for the region include the replacement of a 126-year-old bridge (the Merchants Bridge). Ms. Lamie mentioned a Deloitte study, released earlier in 2016, that indicated that, by 2020, the U.S. would increase to #1 in terms of competitiveness in manufacturing. This was significant because previous reports had always ranked China #1. Foreign companies are now considering the U.S. for their new manufacturing plants, which explains the forecasted trend.

Mr. Horn announced the top three locations for the 2018 NTSF Annual Meeting were Indianapolis; Cleveland; and Grand Rapids, Michigan. Ms. Dresen and Ms. Studer took the action item to relay those recommendations, along with the preference for the week of June 4, 2018, to the NTSF Planning Committee during the next conference call.

U.S. Department of Energy Program Updates

Office of Packaging and Transportation

Mr. Wangler discussed operations and activities under DOE-EM, including the clean-up of 16 sites in 11 states—including the Separations Process Research Unit, Portsmouth/Paducah, Oak Ridge, and the West Valley Demonstration Project, which had shipped a melter to Waste Control Specialists (WCS) in Texas the week before. He said all of the components from the West Valley site were now in Texas.

Mr. Wangler briefly described continuing EM activities related to nuclear materials and SNF (at the Idaho National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Richland, and Savannah River Site), and gave updates on LLW and mixed low-level waste (MLLW). He gave an overview of the packages shipped to the Nevada National Security Site for disposal in FY16, and added that DOE waste is also being disposed of at two commercially-owned facilities, EnergySolutions in Clive, Utah, and WCS. He showed a route map for the shipments, in which the Midwest was heavily impacted.

Finally, Mr. Wangler discussed disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) LLW and GTCC-Like Waste. He said in February 2016, DOE published the *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste*, and delivered the report to Congress. Congress will have to grant DOE certain statutory authority before the Secretary of Energy can make a final decision on where to dispose of the waste.

Ms. Lorence then took the floor to discuss the reorganization within DOE-EM. She said President-elect Trump's transition team has been notified the Office's priorities are: 1) resuming operations at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP); 2) getting the transuranic (TRU) waste being stored above-ground at WCS; 3) getting the TRU waste from other sites, and 4) getting the TRU waste as required under the Idaho Settlement Agreement. She said DOE-EM established an operations contract for Los Alamos National Laboratory to address the issue of the drum that caused the conflagration. She concluded with an overview of DOE-EM operations, including packaging certification, outreach and emergency preparedness, regulations and standards support, transportation risk reduction, and program and site support.

DOE-NE Nuclear Fuels Storage and Transportation (NFST) Planning Project

Ms. Bickford said in October 2016, the NFST was reorganized into the Office of Spent Fuel and Waste Disposition, of which Andy Griffith (DOE-NE) is deputy assistant secretary. Under the new organization, storage, transportation, and consent-based siting activities will be under the Office of Integrated Waste Management. There is also a new Office of Program Operations, which is directed by Kelly Markum. Ms. Bickford added that the Office has new detailees working on storage and transportation—Steve Reeves is the program manager for storage, John Orchard is providing support for the storage program, and Giulia Bisconti is handling communications outreach. Additionally, she said the program plans to move away from “laying the groundwork” toward becoming an “operational program,” but this is dependent on appropriations and availability of staff resources.

Ms. Bickford said the Office's FY17 funding will likely stay at the FY16 level (\$22.5 mil) under a continuing resolution. This made things difficult because they were originally told to plan for a \$56 mil budget and operated the first couple months of the fiscal year with that in mind. She said they are still unsure what the FY 17 appropriations will ultimately be.

Ms. Bickford reviewed the FY17 program priorities, which included continuing the efforts of the Section 180c and SNF Rail/Routing AHWGs, completing shutdown site visits and de-inventory studies, continuing the development of the START tool, and developing the Atlas railcar. She also discussed the Department's consent-based siting initiative and said a defense repository plan and final summary of public input report would be forthcoming. She added that a draft siting process would be coming out in December 2016.

Regarding the deep borehole field test, Ms. Bickford said DOE had issued a new Request for Proposals for interested hosts in October 2016, and proposals were currently under evaluation. She said awards were anticipated in January 2017 and the plan is to include multiple awards at the outset. After one year, DOE will downselect grant recipients based on progress made on required public outreach and the community's level of support for the project.

Carlsbad Field Office

Tim Runyon (CBFO) gave a status update on WIPP and said they are getting close to resuming waste emplacement operations. He said currently, workers were readying the site for operations by doing ground control, increasing ventilation, ensuring procedures are updated and workers are trained and prepared, and performing readiness reviews.

Mr. Runyon explained that clean-up activities and waste certification had continued at TRU waste sites during the shutdown. He said a new set of WIPP Waste Acceptance Criteria was issued in July 2016, and between

now and May 2017, all previously certified TRU waste will be evaluated to determine if additional documentation, characterization, or treatment is required.

Mr. Runyon said when waste emplacement begins, the waste in the Waste Handling Building at WIPP will be emplaced first—which is expected to take 90 days. He said this could start later this year, or the first week of 2017. Next, they will emplace the waste from WCS that can already be certified for acceptance (another fraction of that waste will require treatment). He said they are expecting five shipments a week, at first, compared to the 25 shipments per week they received at the peak of operations. He said the shipping schedule for the first six months of operation is currently being developed, but he did not think anything was planned for the near future that would go through the Midwest. He explained that most of what Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois has is remote-handled (RH) waste, and since they still have contaminated surfaces in Panel 7 (where the RH waste is being emplaced), they are not able to drill into the walls, as would be required.

Mr. Runyon said DOE was reviewing proposals for a new transportation contract that is anticipated to begin in May 2017 and run until July 2017. The new contract structure will be the same as the current two contracts, which are fixed price contracts requiring dedicated resources.

In regards to future projects at WIPP, Mr. Runyon said adding surface storage and installing a permanent ventilation system will be necessary to ramp back up to previous operating levels.

Jim Williams (Western Interstate Energy Board) asked if WIPP would be expanding its underground footprint, to accept GTCC waste, for example. Mr. Runyon replied eventually WIPP would need to expand, but DOE was strictly focused on restarting waste emplacement right now.

Case Study of a Multi-Modal Shipment: Point Beach Steam Generator Shipment

Ed Posivak (WMG, Inc.) and Gene LeClair (NextEra Energy Point Beach) discussed a 2014 shipment of four radioactive steam generators from Point Beach Nuclear Plant in Wisconsin to the WCS disposal site. Mr. Posivak began the presentation, explaining that the steam generators had to be removed from the on-site storage facility to make room for emergency response gear. He said the goal was to have the emergency gear in place by July 2014, but they were able to mobilize earlier, in April.

Mr. Posivak described the various aspects of the shipment, from obtaining the necessary licenses/permits, preparing the generators for shipment, and determining the available modes of transportation. He said they were aware of public perception surrounding this type of shipment and took that into consideration when determining what package to use and the type of permit to apply for (some trigger public input requirements). He mentioned one of the lessons learned from the shipment was the importance of developing a Transportation Emergency Response Plan (TERP) with local responders.

David Pstrak (Nuclear Regulatory Commission) asked what the dose rates of the packages were. Mr. Posivak said they measured 15 mR/hr inside the mausoleum and 8 mR/hr when they were removed.

Mr. Leuer asked what the total cost of the shipment was. Mr. Posivak said it was between \$5 and \$10 million, including disposal, which was over half of the cost.

Mr. Horn asked how long it took to plan the route from the plant to WCS. Mr. Posivak said it took about a year, and they took into consideration rail locations, road conditions, and residential areas, among other factors.

Ms. Engelhart asked if they needed to get any special permits for barging. Mr. Posivak said no, but they notified the captains of the port and it had to be a nuclear qualified barge.

Ms. Engelhart asked if they had to notify anyone before shipping on the Great Lakes. Mr. Posivak and Mr. LeClair responded that they only had to notify the Coast Guard because the IP-2 packages didn't require a special permit.

Ms. Tye asked how many local jurisdictions they developed TERPs with. Mr. Posivak said they developed plans with Kewaunee, Chicago, Houston, and Andrews, Texas.

Mr. Maheras asked if they had to notify the Coast Guard in advance of the shipment. Mr. Posivak said they told the captain of the port in Kewaunee that they anticipated a shipment within a range of dates, and welcomed him to come down and take a look when it occurred.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Update

Mr. Pstrak gave an update on NRC transportation, storage, and decommissioning activities. His report covered six topics: reactor decommissioning activities, the draft Managing Aging Processes in Storage (MAPS) report, the WCS application, GTTC waste, safety of spent fuel transportation, and the NRC issues paper on revisions to transportation regulations.

First, Mr. Pstrak discussed decommissioning activities in the Midwest and elsewhere across the country. He explained the different reactor decommissioning options (DECON, SAFSTOR, ENTOMB) and which of those options were being used at decommissioning sites in Illinois, Michigan, Nebraska, and Wisconsin.

Next, Mr. Pstrak discussed the draft MAPS report, a guidance document for NRC technical reviewers and applicants that is part of an updated storage renewal framework. MAPS addresses a variety of designs and near-term renewal applications, and provides licensees with information about the storage systems that are available. It puts all the information the staff needs, and all the information the applicant needs, in one place. The draft guidance for public comment will be issued in spring 2017 and the final guidance will be published in winter 2017.

Mr. Pstrak then gave attendees an update on the WCS license application. He said the NRC is on the fourth of five rounds of requesting supplemental information from WCS and the final input is planned for mid-December 2016. He added that it is the NRC's intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and conduct a scoping process. If the license application is docketed, it will be open for a 45-day public comment period.

Mr. Pstrak briefly touched on how GTTC waste is treated under NRC regulations. He explained GTTC requires additional maintenance because of its higher radioactivity over time. If it is stored in an interim spent fuel storage installation it needs a 10 CFR 72.212 assessment. Examples of GTTC are irradiated metal components coming out of a reactor or, in a processed form, resin coming out of nuclear power plants.

Finally, Mr. Pstrak mentioned a new brochure on Safety of Spent Fuel Transportation, NUREG/BR-0292, that came out in August 2016. He said the brochure clearly indicates the roles of NRC and DOE in spent fuel transportation and presents a strong safety message for transportation of *all* radioactive materials, as well as spent fuel. He also discussed an NRC issue paper on a proposed revision to the transportation regulations. He said there would be a public meeting held the next week and a comment period would be open through January 20, 2017.

State Regional Group and Tribal Caucus Updates

Prairie Island Indian Community (PIIC)

Ms. Westra said the Tribal Caucus Mid-Year Meeting would be on January 24-26, 2017, in Charlotte, North Carolina. She said she participated in the Minneapolis consent-based siting meeting in July, and DOE officials met with members of the PIIC Tribal Council in conjunction with that. She said the PIIC has not experienced shipments on tribal land, but are engaged in the issue through the Section 180c exercise. She said

she, too, felt the application was unnecessarily burdensome and, because of that, they may not bother with applying for the real grant. She hoped the process could be streamlined and not treated like a competitive grant.

Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations

Mr. Arnold spoke about importance of the state regional group meetings in keeping an open dialogue between states and Tribes. He said the Tribal Caucus is looking to expand participation, and is in the process of drafting letters to engage tribes that will be affected by shipments, but are currently underrepresented in the Caucus. He said the Catawba Indian Nation in South Carolina has expressed interest in being involved, and will be presenting at the upcoming Southern States Energy Board (SSEB) meeting about tribal emergency response. He suggested a similar type of approach (asking tribes to share background information or information on transportation-related topics) could be used to engage tribes in other regions. He added that, during a meeting in Washington, DC, Canada's Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) expressed interest in having further discussions with tribes about concerns with siting, transportation, or related issues. He suggested this could be a topic for future NTSF annual meetings. Finally, he said he and Ms. Westra made a presentation to the NRC on its Tribal Policy Manual, which was an enlightening experience for both parties.

Southern States Energy Board (SSEB)

Chris Wells (SSEB) said he had briefed SSEB's executive committee on radioactive materials transportation during the organization's annual meeting over the summer. He said the governor of Arkansas was very interested in nuclear energy and cleanup technology, and the committee had many questions about WIPP and high-level shipments being transported by rail. He added that the South held a WIPP Transportation Emergency Exercise (WIPPTREX) in Big Spring, Texas. He said no states have volunteered to host an exercise in 2017, but Mississippi is planning to host in 2018. He added that the SSEB Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee would be meeting next week. In addition to the Tribal participation Mr. Arnold had mentioned, Chris Boyle (NWMO) will speak about radioactive materials transportation from a Canadian perspective. He said the committee is also looking to get as much information as possible about the Canadian shipping campaign from Chalk River, Ontario, to the Savannah River Site, which is currently pending due to a lawsuit.

What to Expect When You're Expecting a Rail Shipment of Spent Nuclear Fuel

Mr. Runyon gave an overview and history of the "What to Expect When You're Expecting" session, which first took place at the NTSF 2016 Annual Meeting in Orlando, Florida. He said the goal of the exercise is to determine what states do from the point they receive the 7-day advance notification of a SNF shipment to the shipping day.

The state and Tribal participants on the panel were Ms. Dresen, Ms. Studer, Ms. Drake, Mr. Leuer, Aaron Kallunki (Minnesota), Ms. Westra, Ms. Engelhart, and Mr. Horn.

Mr. Runyon started by asking panelists to give an **overview of their transportation programs, including responsibilities, statutory requirements, and objectives or mission statements.**

Mr. Horn said three agencies are involved in transportation of SNF, TRU, and HRCQ through Illinois. The Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA) mission statement is "to protect the public, the worker, and the environment from the potential ill effects of radiation." The Nuclear Safety Preparedness Act mandates that the Illinois State Police (ISP) and IEMA inspect and escort all shipments of SNF, HLW, TRU waste, and HRCQ. IEMA, ISP, and the Illinois Commerce Commission are the three primary agencies involved in transportation security.

Ms. Engelhart said oversight of the transportation of radiological materials is split evenly between Wisconsin Emergency Management (WEM) and the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (WDHS). She said Wisconsin's transportation program is on a much smaller scale than Illinois', and has dealt only with HRCQ shipments since 2010 or 2011. Now that the state has a transportation program, the primary agencies with responsibility are WEM, WDHS, and State Patrol. The Fusion Center/Department of Justice is also included on a transportation work group. She said the WEM transportation program does not have a specific mission statement. Mr. Schmidt said his agency, WDHS, has the authority to protect the public from unnecessary exposure to ionizing radiation so they provide technical assistance to WEM.

Mr. Runyon asked which agency provides the inspection enforcement in Wisconsin. Ms. Engelhart said State Patrol has the inspection program, but if the shipment has been federally-inspected somewhere else, that is considered sufficient and they won't reinspect.

Kevin Blackwell (FRA) said the FRA does a complete inspection at the shipping origin, and asked, when reciprocal rail inspection protocols are in place [similar to the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) inspections for truck shipments], if those would be acceptable to states. Mr. Horn said Illinois was hesitant when CVSA inspections first started, but now accepts reciprocity from the origin state, unless there is a political storm.

Mr. Runyon asked which FRA regional office is closest to Madison, Wisconsin. Mr. Blackwell said Chicago. Mr. Runyon asked where an inspector would come from for inspections at the shutdown sites in Kewaunee and Point Beach. Mr. Blackwell said, they would use the nearest hazmat inspector, which is why it's important to get state and Tribal entities involved in the inspection program. He encouraged states without inspectors to develop relationships with regional inspectors.

Ms. Engelhart said if Wisconsin were to model a railroad program closely to what they do for highway, they would feel differently about shipments initiating in-state. She added that she just developed a relationship, and has an initial meeting planned, with the rail commissioner in Wisconsin.

Ms. Westra said the PIIC is a federally-recognized Tribe, so the state does not have oversight of their land. Because the Prairie Island power plant is next door, she said they would probably work any inspection through the utility. She said that the Tribe's involvement in a shipment would depend on the available resources. The Tribe has an all-hazards plan and they participate in the REP exercise, because of the proximity to the power plant, but she was not sure how involved the Tribe wanted to be in transportation since there are only six miles of impact.

Mr. Leuer said Minnesota Homeland Security and Emergency Management (HSEM) is charged with the coordination of the entire state response, no matter what the event is. He said the director of HSEM is the governor's designee and delegated authority for emergency operations, which is unique. The basic HSEM mission is to help Minnesota prevent, respond to, prepare for, and recover from disasters. Minnesota does not have an ongoing shipment program for radioactive materials; nuclear fuel has a permitting requirement, but there is no structure in place for that. He said they do have a framework for what they'd need to do if they have shipments. Minnesota gets HRCQ shipments, and does not charge a fee or permit them, but they receive notification and validate the routing and areas of refuge with the State Patrol. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Transportation have full hazmat response groups; the job of HSEM is to coordinate state response with the local response.

Mr. Runyon asked Mr. Leuer if Minnesota has a rail safety program. Mr. Leuer said they are building the state's rail program because of Bakken oil shipments. Mr. Runyon asked Mr. Blackwell if the FRA would fund training of an inspector if they are not part of the rail safety program. Mr. Blackwell said, if they want to be certified, then yes, the FRA would put them through the certification process that would be overseen by the FRA region that state is in. Mr. Leuer said he didn't know if new hires had been certified. Mr. Blackwell confirmed Minnesota had four certified inspectors.

Ms. Drake said a number of agencies are involved in transportation—the Missouri State Emergency Management Agency, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Natural Resources, and State Patrol. Missouri has five rail safety inspectors in track, operating practices, and signal/train control. Mr. Runyon asked if there was the potential to add others if shipments occur. Ms. Drake said the state would probably talk about that further down the road.

Ms. Studer said the responsibility of radiation is with the Department of Health (only electronically-induced radiation) and the Indiana Department of Homeland Security. She said, when it comes to transportation, she is the program. She works with the state police and has a list of entities she is required, by statute, to coordinate with, including the Departments of Natural Resources, Environmental Management, and Health. Indiana does not escort shipments and does not have rail inspectors.

Each of the participating states charges at least one shipping fee: Illinois (SNF, HLW, TRU, HRCQ), Wisconsin (HRCQ), Minnesota (SNF, HLW), Missouri (for LLW, SNF, TRU, HLW), and Indiana (for SNF, HLW, HRCQ, LLW).

Next, Mr. Runyon asked the panelists how they handle **safeguards information (SGI) training, and the receipt and distribution of 7-day advance notifications**.

Mr. Horn said IEMA cross-trains ISP and ICC in SGI receipt handling. When IEMA receives the shipment notification, it is logged, and shared with a small distribution list. Externally, they notify ISP, and if it is a train shipment, ICC. In total, for a rail shipment the distribution list would be five people. After the information is distributed, they'll talk about how to do the inspection and escort. Mr. Runyon asked if there was annual refresher training for SGI. Mr. Horn said approximately 90 highway inspectors (in ISP) have to do annual refreshers, including in SGI, but nothing major.

Mr. Runyon asked Mr. Horn if there has ever been someone who is not on the “need-to-know list” that thinks they need to be. Mr. Horn said yes, in the past, some counties have felt they should be on that list. He said IEMA agreed to do some public outreach explaining what would happen if there is an accident.

Ms. Engelhart said, like Illinois, there are five people who receive shipment information. WEM receives the notification and sends it, by email, to individuals within the Department of Health Services, the state fusion center, Wisconsin State Patrol (WSP), and the Civil Support Team (within the Department of Military Affairs). She did not anticipate WSP and the Civil Support Team would be involved in rail shipments. Mr. Runyon mentioned that, in some cases, state patrol will provide security for shipments.

Mr. Runyon asked Wisconsin how they train on handling SGI. Ms. Engelhart said the “What to Expect” session at the NTSF in Orlando led to some decisions that “tightened up” how they share SGI. She said Wisconsin is a strong home rule state and county sheriffs want to know everything, but the state declines to send them the information. They are notified a shipment will be coming through their county within the next several weeks, and are directed to contact Ms. Engelhart if they want more information. Mr. Schmidt added that when they had a SNF shipment in the past, one of the areas they spent a lot of time on was controlling the SGI. They brought the NRC in for training, but since they don't have the same infrastructure as Illinois,

they did not continue training on a routine basis. Training would have to be kept up more if shipments were to occur.

Mr. Pstrak commented on the difference between “need-to-know” versus “interested in knowing,” and said that states need to establish how far down the need applies because it affects control over the security of shipments. He offered to reprise the SGI Training session he gave at last year’s NTSF meeting, at the upcoming 2017 meeting. Mr. Leuer asked if it was possible to create an online version of SGI training and certification, similar to one used by DHS for their Protected Critical Infrastructure Information Program. Mr. Pstrak said he is not sure if the security office has the capability to do that type of training, but took a note to talk to someone about it.

Regarding shipment notification for tribes, Mr. Pstrak said two tribes have completed the NRC process for receiving advance notification (Seneca Nation in New York, and the Morongo tribe in California). Ms. Westra said if the PIIC was receiving the 7-day advance notice, it would mean they’ve opted-in to receive notification, done the required training, and have the means of safeguarding the information they would be receiving. She anticipated the distribution list would include no more than four people—the tribal council president, chief of police, emergency manager, and possibly the tribal administrator.

Mr. Leuer said Minnesota is not set up to receive and share SGI; a program would have to be created.

Ms. Drake said HRCQ shipment notifications go to SEMA, and would be hand-carried to a rail specialist in DOH, the director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the head of emergency response in DNR. The information is placed in a safe location and has to be destroyed 10 days after.

Ms. Studer said there is no SGI protocol developed for rail, but it probably would be similar to HRCQ, though likely more stringent. For HRCQ, the notification goes from Ms. Dresen to state police and to Ms. Studer. Ms. Studer decides which locals need to be involved.

Mr. Maheras said, back in the Yucca Mountain days, there was a joint classification guide between DHS, NRC, and DOE. That was rescinded when it was clear the project would not move forward and could no longer be used for class determinations. He suggested that if shipments were to resume, those ought to be regenerated. Ms. Janairo said the MRMTC had been briefed on the draft classification guide at its meeting in November 2007. The regional groups had discussed the guide in the context of the NAS recommendations on security. She would try to resurrect this issue as a possible topic for discussion by the Transportation Core Group.

Mr. Tuma said, as a state police official, he was responsible for making sure the appropriate people along a 450-mile transportation route knew about a shipment. He said determining “need-to-know” requires discretion and judgment about how to address the security, escort, and inspection process.

Mr. Hogan noted that, after he had SGI training, he didn’t get to exercise it and after a while was worried about having to do an inspection. He ended up going back to redo the training.

Mr. Runyon then moved onto the next category, and asked the panelists what they do regarding **pre-shipment preparation and day-of coordination**.

Mr. Horn said, in Illinois, they would know the date and approximate time of the border crossing or rail yard stop and work with rail carrier to coordinate the necessary IEMA and ICC inspections. This occurred in

Indiana during the last rail shipment. He said ISP would be set up for security, identify rail sidings that could be used for checkpoints or safe havens, and would be pre-staged to have sight of the train at all times. In addition, they would report the movements to the fusion center. He could see accepting other state inspections and likely federal inspections, as long as reciprocity is there.

Mr. Runyon asked Mr. Horn if the shipment fee covers operational costs. Mr. Horn said IEMA had to fight off legislation to eliminate fees for cobalt-60. He said the fee does cover operational costs, but isn't enough for them to go out and train.

Mr. Runyon asked if Illinois uses TRANSCOM to track shipments. Mr. Horn said not really, because they are with it all the time, but said it was useful to track movements in other states, and will be useful with rail shipments.

Mr. Schmidt says Wisconsin doesn't have the infrastructure at this point in time, and would need to consider if state would have to add to inherent security. Mr. Runyon asked whether, for a hypothetical route that went west, the state would consider prestaging a civil support team. Mr. Schmidt said truck shipments are escorted and they could do that route for rail, but following would not be as easy as it is for a truck.

Mr. Runyon asked if Wisconsin was likely to use TRANSCOM. Ms. Engelhart said they might, since both have contact with the shipment until it leaves the inspection site, then they have to track it remotely.

Mr. Runyon asked if their shipping fee would cover operations. Ms. Engelhart and Mr. Schmidt said no, the fee is highway-specific and only covers state patrol.

Ms. Westra said PIIC does not have inspection authority, and would rely on the results of the state inspection. The tribe has a person who participates in emergency response exercises, and Ms. Westra assumed there would be some communication between the plant and the state government. She noted that PIIC wouldn't want to build a new infrastructure for just a couple shipments.

Mr. Leuer said Minnesota's fee would not cover operation costs, and said the statute would need to be restructured for a shipping campaign based on what the package is and what track inspection is necessary. Mr. Leuer noted that armed escorts probably wouldn't deal with protestors, leaving that responsibility with the state. He said inspection of shipments originating in the state would be done hand-in-hand with FRA, and Minnesota would accept reciprocal inspections from other states if the inspection results were shared with them. He said the state would include the county and PIIC in the plans.

Mr. Runyon asked if there would be costs associated with extra staffing on shipment day. Mr. Leuer said yes, they would also have to consider what training is necessary along the route, and what DOE is providing as far as detection equipment or health physicists. He said people along the route will want to know what the emergency response plan is. For Bakken shipments, they went through the Homeland Security Information Network to safely share the railroad's response plan with locals. He said they would track shipments using TRANSCOM either through the state emergency operations center or fusion center.

Ms. Drake said she thought there was a risk of running out of funds within the next couple years, but they were maintaining current operations. She said it's unpredictable because the HRCQ shipment fee covers the escort and other costs, which the LLW fee barely covers anything. She said the state would monitor shipments via TRANSCOM and coordinate with Illinois for a handoff at the border. Inspections would depend on the level of trust with other states.

Ms. Studer said Indiana would definitely use TRANSCOM to track shipments, possibly through the 24-hour emergency operations center. She said inspections would more than likely rely on neighboring states, like

HRCQ shipments. Shipments will be escorted if Ms. Studer and Ms. Dresen are able to get legislative changes. She thought the fee would cover operational costs, but that would also require a change in statute because they can't use the fee revenue for operations, currently.

Mr. Runyon moved forward with the discussion and asked panelists about **planning and response to hypothetical events**.

Mr. Horn said Illinois has a response plan, but it is not rail-specific.

Ms. Engelhart said the Wisconsin emergency response plan revision will expand to transportation, but doesn't cover SNF or rail shipments.

Ms. Westra said PIIC has a REP appendix, but nothing related to transportation of SNF. She doesn't believe they have the capability to respond to an incident, other than making a call.

Mr. Leuer said Minnesota has an all-hazard plan that would apply. They would look at the rail shipment as one of the "other" categories. He said a lot of what is in the state's radiological plan for power plants would cross over. The state would create a unique supplement to the all-hazards plan to address planning, training, and exercises specific to SNF shipments. They did this for avian influenza; the supplement will stay alive for three years before being incorporated into the state plan. He thought the same thing would happen for spent fuel shipments. Mr. Runyon suggested a presentation from Kevin on how to do this without having to reinvent the wheel, overall.

Ms. Drake said any incident would come through the 24-hour line at DNR. She was not aware of a response plan specific to SNF by rail, and said it would be helpful to know what resources Union Pacific has.

Ms. Studer says Indiana does not have an overarching response plan. They have a radiological materials transportation plan, but not specifically for rail shipments.

Finally, Mr. Runyon asked panelists how they would respond to a **hypothetical communication from the governor's office**, complaining that the governor was unaware of a shipment.

Mr. Horn told a story about a shipment that wound up going through Peoria. He said they barely got into the city before he got a call saying the governor wanted to know what they were doing there. He said it was important to not only have broad communication to outside parties, but also a broad, strict means of internal communication. He said components of homeland security fall under one director, who is always aware of the programs, though not each shipment.

Ms. Engelhart said the governor's office should be briefed ahead of time on the program in general, and if someone wants to know about each shipment, Wisconsin has a process for that. As it stands, the governor relies on his homeland security advisor, the adjutant general, to know that for him.

Ms. Westra said PIIC has a smaller governmental structure, and likely wouldn't be caught off-guard.

Mr. Leuer said they've had situations where the information made it to the governor's office, but not actually to the governor. He thought a spent fuel shipment would be sensitive enough that it would require a direct call to the governor, possibly through Capitol Security, in addition to a call to a liaison in the governor's office. He said he's seen demand for instantaneous information from the governor's office and other elected officials' offices because of social media.

Mr. Runyon closed the session by thanking everyone for participating. He said it was important for states to consider what they can do to improve current operations and ask themselves, “What does it cost me to do this? Is there value added in what I’m spending? Am I meeting my agency’s mission? Am I fulfilling what that need is?”

Closing Committee Business Session

Election of Co-Chair for 2017-2018

Mr. Horn introduced Ms. Engelhart, who explained the role of committee co-chair, a two-year position. She noted that now was a good time to get involved.

Ms. Studer nominated Mr. Leuer and Ms. Drake seconded. Mr. Leuer accepted the nomination.

Mr. Gothard nominated himself and Mr. Leuer seconded his motion. Ms. Janairo explained that, unfortunately, under the committee rules, Mr. Gothard couldn’t serve as co-chair because Michigan’s governor hasn’t appointed him to the committee.

The committee voted for Mr. Leuer to serve as the committee’s 2017-2018 co-chair.

Discussion: Transportation Recommendations from NAS/BRC

Ms. Janairo explained the history of the NAS/BRC recommendations and the action item taken by the regions during the August Transportation Core Group meeting. She said that regional staff had looked at the recommendations and used a flow chart with four questions to determine which activities should and could be undertaken at this time. Staff assigned each recommendation to one of four categories: 1) be assigned to an existing AHWG; 2) be monitored or addressed through the Core Group; 3) get picked up with the time was right, or 4) no need for the states to address at all.

Mr. Horn asked why “Transportation Security” got assigned to the Core Group. Ms. Bickford explained it was because the NAS recommendation specifically called for an independent examination, which rendered it not within state or DOE control. Ms. Janairo agreed, and said that was a good example of why the staff used the verbatim NAS and BRC language to decide how to follow up on the recommendations.

Ms. Janairo asked if the committee members needed more time to review the recommendations before reacting to them. Committee members indicated that they were comfortable moving forward with the current prioritization.

Ms. Westra asked where the action item for the recommendations originated. Ms. Janairo reminded Ms. Westra of the conversation at the Core Group meeting in Chicago in August 2016. Ms. Janairo explained that she came up with the color-coding by walking through the four questions listed on the flow chart, and that members of the Northeast Task Force came to the same prioritizations independently.

Ms. Janairo said she would pass the Midwest’s recommendations on to the SSEB for consideration at the South’s meeting the following week.

Discussion: Progress on Priority Issues

Ms. Janairo reminded members how the 2016 committee rankings were developed. She gave the following updates on each priority that the Midwest and other regions had identified for DOE:

1. Work with the states to reach consensus on the role states will have in planning, preparing for, and overseeing shipments of spent nuclear fuel from shutdown sites: Ms. Janairo said this issue was addressed in the Consultation and Cooperation paper, which was currently under review by DOE management and GC.

2. Identify potential shipping routes from shutdown sites to future facilities for storage and/or disposal: Ms. Janairo said the Midwest proposed a project during the first year of new cooperative agreement to look at routes to WCS in Texas, Eddy-Lea in New Mexico, or even Yucca Mountain.
3. Undertake outreach activities to help inform the public, government officials, and first responders about the transportation of SNF and the federal waste management program: Ms. Janairo said the Midwest had two webinars on nuclear waste management earlier in the year, and she hopes to work on new transportation materials (fact sheets, webinars) with Ms. Bisconti through the SFT Materials AHWG.
4. Develop a reciprocal rail inspection procedure similar to the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance's enhanced inspection for truck shipments: Ms. Janairo said this is being handled by Rail/Routing AHWG.

Fund state training and exercises to begin the long-term preparation for shipments: Ms. Janairo said the committee has some funding that could be earmarked for this, and had offered financial assistance to Illinois and Indiana for the exercises they have planned. She added that the committee also has travel funding available.
5. Develop a comprehensive transportation operations plan for shipments of SNF from shutdown sites: Ms. Janairo said this is on hold.
6. Identify shipping modes for removing SNF from each of the shutdown sites: Ms. Janairo said this will be addressed by the Rail/Routing AHWG.
7. Conduct a pilot of the Section 180c assistance grant program to test the proposed implementation plan: Ms. Janairo said there are no plans to do this yet. Ms. Bickford said there are certain needs that have to be met first.
8. Organize a working group to begin examining issues related to shipment security, with the possibility of a briefing for state personnel on cask vulnerabilities: Ms. Janairo said there are no plans to do this yet, but added it could pertain to the NAS recommendation to consider hazards along shipping routes.

Discussion: Committee Work Group Assignments

Ms. Janairo reviewed committee members' assignments on the various NTSF and committee work groups.

Mike Snee (Ohio) was taken off the Information and Communications AHWG, leaving Ms. Tye to represent the Midwest.

Tonya Ngotel (Nebraska) will represent the Midwest on the new SFT Materials AHWG.

Ms. Studer will replace Mr. Schwarz on the new TEPP Training AHWG and all other Midwest representatives will remain.

Ms. Drake volunteered to be the Midwest's fourth representative on the Rail/Routing AHWG since two of the three current representatives (Mr. Horn and Mr. Stead) are from Illinois. Ms. Drake, Mr. Horn, and Mr. Stead also agreed to serve on the new Regional Routing Work Group. Ms. Janairo said she would check with David Whitfill (Kansas), the fourth Midwesterner on the Rail/Routing AHWG, to see if he would like to volunteer, as well.

Ms. Janairo said the Section 180c AHWG would be fine without Ken Yale (Michigan), who retired at the beginning of the month, because Mr. Gothard is on there.

Ms. Janairo thanked Ms. Studer, Ms. Engelhart, and Ms. Drake for all their help putting the fall meeting together. She said the committee would put together a fall 2017 meeting planning group at the next meeting.

Next, Ms. Janairo moved on to Regional Outreach, which she said could include outreach to legislators, an update to the committee's brochure, or one or two webinars. She said Tonya Ngotel (Nebraska) had already volunteered, but she welcomed one additional volunteer on the group.

Ms. Janairo said the committee also needed three volunteers to review the *Planning Guide for Shipments of Radioactive Material through the Midwestern States*. Mr. Hogan, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Kallunki volunteered.

Finally, Ms. Janairo said she would be scheduling a conference call with Mr. Horn, Ms. Engelhart, and Mr. Leuer to gather input on the committee's activities.

Action Items Review

Ms. Tye reviewed the action items and said they would be emailed to everyone after the meeting.

Closing Remarks

Before closing the meeting, Mr. Horn expressed his thanks for being able to co-chair the committee and said he looks forward to continuing to participate as a member. He adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.