

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

**Proceedings of the Fall Meeting  
December 4-5, 2013 • Kansas City, Kansas**

**Wednesday, December 4**

Major Lance Evans (Iowa) called the meeting to order at 1:34 pm. He welcomed the members, reviewed the agenda, and noted the negative impact of budget cuts and travel restrictions on the invited speakers' attendance. He welcomed Richard Arnold and Dan King to the meeting as representatives of the Consolidated Group of Tribes and the Oneida Nation, respectively. He acknowledged the absence of Melanie Rasmusson, formerly of the committee, who had left Iowa state government for a position in Louisiana. He sent well wishes from Ms. Rasmusson.

Report from the Co-Chairs: Jane Beetem (Missouri) commented on the current news about the hijacking of a cobalt-60 source shipment in Mexico. Ms. Beetem had alerted her state agency partners in case the governor's office heard about it. She added that, if the shipment had been carrying low-level radioactive waste through Missouri, the state would not inspect it or even know about it. She added that the news articles had not reported whether the shipment was placarded or whether it appeared that the theft of the source had been intentional. But if the material were used to make a dirty bomb, then the record of 50 years of successful shipments might now have a blemish.

Kevin Leuer (Minnesota) added that Mexico had filed a report with the IAEA. David Pstrak (NRC) said NRC licensees, when making shipments of moisture density gauges or radiography cameras, are required to maintain visual contact with that device or it needs to be locked down on the vehicle. He saw pictures in the news that indicated the stolen item was as big as a table and in robust packaging. He added that it was not uncommon for things like this to be stolen, but they are generally not the target and so are often recovered. Mike Snee (Ohio) said it appeared the device was a teletherapy source going from Tijuana to a waste site and likely contained a few thousand curies. Lisa Janairo (CSG Midwest) observed that this story might be a good case study to feature on the agenda for the National Transportation Stakeholders Forum (NTSF) annual meeting in May 2014.

Major Evans shared his perspectives on what the committee had accomplished during the past year. He recalled the recent exercise in Indiana, as well as other recent meetings that were all intended to help prepare the states for events like what happened with the truck in Mexico. Those who can attend these exercises, drills, and meetings benefit because, if there is an incident or accident, the state governors will look to their agencies for answers to their questions. Major Evans noted that this would be his last meeting as committee co-chair. He said his two years as co-chair had been a great experience and he was looking forward to continuing to serve as a member of the committee well into the future.

Project update: Ms. Janairo highlighted a few items from her written project update. She noted that, for the first time in a long time, the transportation project was in good shape financially – at least for the current fiscal year. Regarding appointments, she said she had not actively sought new legislative appointees because of the high degree of uncertainty facing the federal nuclear waste management program. She said she would like to have a discussion on Thursday about legislative appointments and get feedback from Senator Jay Emler regarding the value of reaching out to prospective legislative members at this time. In terms of major new activities, Ms. Janairo was spending a good deal of her time helping to plan the NTSF meeting. She also mentioned the new Section 180(c) Interregional Team, which would be active in 2014.

Information and Communication work group: Jennifer Clark (Kansas) said the big project for this work group had been the briefing packet for states to use in briefing state officials and members of the public regarding radioactive waste transportation and the federal waste management program. The task began last September and was completed in the summer after the June tour of WIPP. The packet included the new brochure on the regional

Transportation Project, fact sheets on the BRC and the states' role in transportation planning, the regional *Planning Guide*, maps, a glossary of terms, and a table of power plants in the Midwest. The group also decided there would be value in having the states include a fact sheet on the state's approach to transportation planning and oversight. This fact sheet would have to be developed by each state, but the group had prepared an outline for what should be included. Any members interested in obtaining packets should contact Lisa.

WIPP Tour work group: Kelly Horn (Illinois) reported on the June 19 tour of WIPP, which had taken months of planning. The purpose had been to take legislators and other state officials from the Midwest to see a working repository for nuclear waste and to educate them about transportation and the status of the federal waste management program. The tour was a good effort that required a lot of work on the part of committee members, staff, and DOE. Illinois had not been able to recruit any legislators to attend, which turned out to be a good thing because the legislature was called back into session starting the day of the tour. Ms. Janairo added that the people who went on the tour found it to be highly useful. The big lessons learned pertained to timing and the recruitment of attendees. Ms. Janairo said she would follow a different approach for future tours, specifically letting the relevant legislative committees know that an opportunity exists to organize tours and then leaving it up to those committees to identify workable dates and recruit members. One of the Minnesota representatives who attended the tour had expressed such interest and Ms. Janairo was hoping to work with him in 2014 to arrange a similar tour. Tony Dimond (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) mentioned that he had a contact at Union Pacific who might be willing to bring down the Operation Lifesaver training for other transportation-related educational meetings for legislators and others. The training is intended to spread awareness about grade crossings by letting people ride the rails and see the dangers firsthand. He said the training could be modified to help people understand what emergency response to an accident would be like, especially in a remote location. Ms. Janairo mentioned that the NTSF breakout session "All About Rail" might be a good opportunity to spread the word about the Operation Lifesaver training.

NTSF Planning Committee: Ms. Beetem reported that the NTSF Planning Committee was working to make the 2014 annual meeting the best one yet. The Midwest is co-hosting with the Tribal Caucus. The meeting will take place on May 13-15 at the Crowne Plaza Hotel and Suites Minneapolis International Airport/Mall of America in Bloomington, Minnesota. Attendees will be able to access restaurants and other attractions easily. Mr. Leuer has joined the Planning Committee as the host-state representative. Committee members from the Midwest and elsewhere had been consulted on the agenda topics.

Paul Schmidt (Wisconsin) commented that the draft NTSF agenda was pretty well developed. He asked whether the agenda was flexible enough to allow for changes like adding a session on the the Mexican shipment. Ms. Janairo said registration would open the week of January 27, so the agenda would need to be fairly set by then. Mr. Schmidt was in favor of having a transportation incident like the one in Mexico on the agenda, if possible.

NTSF Communications working group: Ms. Janairo reported that Ms. Rasmusson had taken on the role of group co-chair while still working for Iowa and would continue that role as a representative of Louisiana. The working group had been planning to work with the DOE Office of Nuclear Energy (DOE-NE) and the Global Threat Reduction Initiative to develop draft fact sheets, but had encountered resistance due to program redirection. Ms. Janairo hoped the work would resume in the future. The Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP) had revised its transportation fact sheet to incorporate comments from the working group. Ms. Beetem had identified a need for a new fact sheet on waste streams coming from nuclear power plants, so the group would be working on that in 2014. Finally, a subgroup of members was working on a breakout session for the NTSF meeting in May. The working group's next call would be scheduled sometime in March.

NTSF Security Communications Protocol ad hoc working group: Major Evans said the group had met in Buffalo in May 2013 and had a lengthy discussion. Ella McNeil, of DOE's Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM) had suggested developing a draft and sending it to her for review. Major Evans had met with Josh Downing in Denver when he was there for a CVSA meeting in September. They reached an agreement to go from being an ad hoc working group to a standing committee because of what the task involved. After the holidays, the plan was to get together via conference call to finalize the protocol language and plan an exercise. The Colorado state patrol was

interested in hosting the exercise. If everything goes as planned, the exercise should be able to take place in the summer or fall of 2014. Ms. Beetem asked what the exercise might entail. Major Evans cited the incident in Wyoming involving a WIPP shipment, which was the impetus for this group organizing in the first place. The focus would be to coordinate communications among all involved parties to correct the breakdown in communication that had occurred when the suspected event took place. The working group will meet in Minnesota.

NTSF Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) Training ad hoc working group: Ms. McNeil was unable to attend to give a report. Ms. Beetem encouraged committee members to contact Ms. McNeil if they were interested in MERRTT train-the-trainer courses. Greg Gothard (Michigan) seconded her recommendation, citing a good experience in Michigan with an October training session. Two people from TEPP and Mr. Gothard had done the training. DOE had indicated that the TEPP program could support Michigan with training once per year, even though the state is not affected by DOE shipments. Major Evans reminded Ms. Beetem that both Iowa and Missouri were interested in training. Mark Linsley had followed up with a message to Major Evans, but no training had been scheduled. Major Evans will follow up. Ms. Janairo added that Tim Runyon, formerly of the committee, was now teaching some of the MERRTT courses.

NTSF Section 180(c) Implementation ad hoc working group: Laura Dresen (Indiana) reported that the ad hoc working group had been reviewing the 10 recommendations previously made regarding Section 180(c) implementation. The working group had held several conference calls since the start of 2013. How the funding would be provided had been a big topic of discussion. Ms. Dresen encouraged members to read through the summary of the recommendations to prepare for the discussion on Thursday. The working group had deferred working on the funding allocation approach because it was the only issue the regions had not agreed on in the mid-2000s. A new interregional team would be addressing funding allocation in 2014.

U.S. Nuclear Infrastructure Council meeting: Mr. Horn represented the Midwest at this meeting, which took place in July. He said it was excellent and the agenda was full of valuable content. DOE was heavily represented, with department representatives sharing information on interim storage project plans, design concepts, and systems architecture. An elected representative of a Texas county had spoken about the community's interest in hosting an interim storage facility. Ms. Beetem asked whether DOE had indicated whether it was continuing to work on interim storage plans. Mr. Horn said that had been the case, but the meeting had taken place before the court ruled on the need to resume work on the Yucca Mountain licensing. He speculated, though, that DOE would be ready with "Plan B" if needed.

Mr. Pstrak commented that the November meeting of the NWTRB had involved discussion of numerous ideas as to what direction DOE could go in. Package size, repackaging, other environments besides Yucca Mountain – everything was on the table. He thought it would be awhile before anything is settled.

Radiation Specialist Training: Ms. Clark reported on the TEPP training that had taken place in Overland Park, Kansas, on August 12-16. The training attracted 38 participants, including eight from Overland Park Fire, six from State of Kansas agencies, one from the FBI, and one from Fort Riley. The rest of the seats were filled by representatives of other states (MO, IL, FL, NY). The training was for advanced students, covering theory and mini-exercises. One student likened it to the RERO course in that the exercises got more complex, but said it was more advanced. The training used high-activity sources that students typically do not encounter in other training, and Ms. Clark said that was good for them to experience, e.g., what happens when instruments get saturated and what they should do to get around that. Neutron sources were there, too. Another student liked all the mathematical calculations that were part of the class. Attendees were encouraged to bring their own instruments, and some people found out their equipment was not working properly. TEPP did bring some instruments for those who did not have them. Ms. Clark said committee members should understand that, if they wanted to bring this training to their states, a classroom setting would not work. The fire tower used for the Kansas training was a nice location because people were able to go up the stairs and search several floors. Tiffany Drake (Missouri) said four or five people from her unit attended and they were very impressed.

PATRAM: Ms. Beetem reported on the Packaging and Transportation of Radioactive Material (PATRAM) conference put on by DOE, the NRC, and DOT. The conference is held every three years, alternating between the U.S. and overseas. She thought the conference was excellent, with over 40 countries in attendance. Ms. Beetem and Ms. Janairo had both presented papers. Ms. Beetem presented on the state's role in radioactive waste transportation. She noted that some of the federal agency people were not aware of what states do in connection with shipments. She recommended that people consider attending in 2019, when the conference will be back in the U.S. She added that a big takeaway from the meeting was the industry's strong desire to improve its messages about the success story of transportation. Every plenary speaker had commented on the problem of public acceptance and the industry's poor track record with telling its story. This running theme had prompted the NTSF Planning Committee to include this topic on the agenda for the 2014 NTSF meeting.

Mr. Pstrak added that the movie *Pandora's Promise* was shown on the last day of the conference. He thought the movie did a nice job explaining the misunderstandings about nuclear power. He described as "compelling" the story of environmental activists who had changed their minds about nuclear power in the face of the growing threat of climate change. He agreed there was a need to get the message out about how nuclear materials had been moved extremely safely – i.e., there is great risk but that risk is managed properly.

Ms. Janairo added that the conference was similar to the Waste Management conference, but with a greater focus on transportation. She found it interesting to see the representative of TEPCO in Japan apologize for the problems created by the Fukushima accident, because such admissions and acknowledgements were not common in the U.S. She seconded Ms. Beetem's comments about the common frustration expressed by speakers regarding the need to improve communication with the public. One speaker had called for the formation of an advisory group to try to develop a plan for public outreach.

Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program exercise: Ms. Dresen reported on Indiana's experience hosting the NNPP exercise. She had attended the exercise in Denver a few years ago. She had been impressed with the Denver exercise as a very educational, orchestrated event. She said, though, that she would have liked to have observed the practice round in Denver when the responders were being educated. Planning for the Indiana exercise began about a year out. NNPP handled all the arrangements. The program asked the state for connections and for assistance in getting one of the rail lines to participate. Norfolk Southern did a fantastic job and was very supportive, providing the site for the exercise without any funding assistance. The Indiana Department of Homeland Security provided some space for meetings, but NNPP arranged for one hotel venue to be used repeatedly and provided food. Ms. Dresen said the NNPP staff were very organized and stayed focused on what they wanted to accomplish.

Ms. Dresen said the dry run or "dress rehearsal" was very necessary. She traced the evolution in responders' thinking from "it's radioactive and I don't want to go near it" to "why would we even need to call the state because we know what to do?" This change in reaction came about because of the training the responders had received. Ms. Dresen said everyone was brought in for an overview of the program, then headed out to the site for the exercise, came back for lunch, and then did a hot wash. NNPP followed up with an after-action report. She encouraged the other states to consider hosting a future exercise.

Major Evans commended Ms. Dresen for doing a wonderful job with the exercise. He said the meeting room had been full, it was a good learning experience, all the arrangements were excellent, and observers were made to feel welcome. Ms. Dresen added that the NNPP brought out a whole movie crew. She managed to get some great pictures from her own photography crew.

Ms. Janairo asked whether there were any lessons learned. Ms. Dresen said the training piece was a big lesson learned for her agency. She suggested contracting for training as far in advance as possible to allow time to get through the complicated negotiations and arrangements. Also, the exercise was done on a border between municipalities within the state, which was definitely beneficial to more individuals. Ms. Beetem agreed with Ms. Dresen that it would have been great to be there for the dress rehearsal to see where improvements might need to be made. Ms. Dresen said she had told the responders that, if the governor wants the chain of response to

stop, she would stop it. But until she gets the word from the governor, one level after another would respond, in order. Ms. Janairo said she had heard feedback from other states that it would be useful and more beneficial for the states if the exercise were to put more of an emphasis on training. Ms. Dresen said that was something the states would have to do themselves because, for NNPP, the demonstration was the real purpose of the activity. Ms. Janairo added that NNPP was thinking of doing the next exercise in 2015, possibly in North Carolina. For the Midwest, Missouri might be up next as early as 2017.

WIEB/WGA meeting: Ms. Beetem had represented the Midwest at the fall meeting of the Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB) High-Level Waste Committee and Western Governors' Association (WGA) Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Transportation Technical Advisory Group. One highlight was a presentation by Mike McBride about the state of the nuclear waste management program, including how judges think about the legal theory behind the many lawsuits that are shaping the federal program. Also of interest was a presentation on the Western shutdown sites – Trojan, Rancho Seco, Humboldt Bay, and San Onofre.

Shutdown plant site visits: Teri Engelhart (Wisconsin) reported on the July visit to the LaCrosse Boiling Water Reactor in western Wisconsin. The DOE team that came from the national labs looked into the physical layout of the plant. LaCrosse is between a river, a highway, and a railroad. The storage casks are a smaller than those at other sites. Mr. Arnold said he had gone on the site visits in the Midwest and the West specifically because of his interest in how tribes would be involved. A study done by a contractor years ago identified no tribes impacted by lots of these sites. But at a meeting of the DOE-NE Core Group, the decision was made to look at a 100-mile radius for planning purposes. Mr. Arnold said the site visits were a good opportunity for him to identify potentially affected tribes so that he could get information to them. He and Mr. King were attending the Midwest's meeting as one of their efforts to help build capacity for the tribes.

Ms. Janairo commented that, originally, the states and the tribes were both left out of the planning process for the site visits but were added after a Core Group meeting. She had found it difficult to help the DOE team understand the reasons for including state and tribal representatives on the visits. Mr. Gothard relayed Ken Yale's observation that three state people attended the Big Rock Point site visit, accompanied by 15 DOE people. Ms. Janairo agreed that there was an imbalance and, for the DOE team, perhaps a lack of understanding regarding the role of the states and tribes and the value of including the representatives in the visit. For Big Rock, Mr. Gothard said the team had driven the heavy haul route that would be needed for shipments. Responding to a question about barge shipments, Ms. Janairo commented that, at Zion, the team was advised not to ship any nuclear waste by barge on Lake Michigan. According to one of the site representatives, shipping by barge on the Great Lakes would, "politically, be a dumb thing to do."

Regional roundtable: Major Evans asked the members to report on activities in their states.

Illinois: Mr. Horn said Illinois continued to have its usual WIPP shipments from Argonne National Laboratory (ANL), as well as around 75-80 HRCQ shipments and one spent fuel shipment. He had attended the NRC's Waste Confidence hearing in Oak Brook, Illinois, after receiving a phone call from a concerned citizen. Around 150 people attended the meeting, and most had something to say. Regarding spent fuel storage, as part of the Zion decommissioning, during third week of December, the company was planning its first transfer of spent fuel from pool storage to the new dry storage pad. Decommissioning is on schedule to be wrapped up by 2018.

Indiana: Ms. Dresen said Indiana had been working on permitting for HRCQ shipments and was working with Nordion so the company can make electronic payments. Illinois and Missouri both invoice shippers, but Iowa is starting to accept electronic payments. Ms. Beetem said Missouri charges a percentage fee for credit card payments, but Ms. Dresen said Indiana charges a processing fee of \$3 for HRCQ shipments and \$1 for low-level waste shipments. The state will be participating in Vibrant Response, an exercise simulating response to a 10-kiloton nuclear detonation. Her agency will be very much involved in the exercise, which includes working with the U.S. military. The exercise will take place at the end of July and the beginning of August.

Iowa: Major Evans said Argonne shipments continue to affect Iowa. The state will be sending someone to the CVSA train-the-trainer course at the end of February. Major Evans had attended the Indiana NNPP exercise. He will work with Mr. Linsley to schedule MERRTT training.

Kansas: Ms. Clark said a handful of non-HRCQ shipments had gone through the state during the year. The big events in the state had been the Radiation Specialist training in August and also a summer MERRTT train-the-trainer course in Crisis City, which is a good venue for training local first responders.

Minnesota: Mr. Leuer reported a decrease in Nordion shipments. He was not sure whether the shipper had gone back to the old routes. There was a great deal of interest in the steam generators coming out of Prairie Island nuclear plant, including some media attention because of the large oversize shipment.

Missouri: Ms. Beetem introduced Ms. Drake, who leads the Hazardous Waste Program in Missouri. She explained that a lot of the planning related to radioactive waste had moved from the DNR director's office to the waste management program, which already oversees federal facilities like Weldon Spring and the Kansas City Plant. The program also handles the database of shipments and fees. One rather interesting shipment had come up recently. The shipment had passed through, been inspected and escorted, then gotten to Oklahoma and turned back. Ms. Beetem had to scramble to get the escort and inspection arranged again on short notice. Mr. Horn added that the shipment's application for entry into China was rejected. Ms. Beetem also reported that a few of her main points of contact in the State Emergency Management Agency and Highway Patrol had retired. She was still hoping to maintain good ties to these agencies.

Ohio: Mr. Sneer had been interviewed by a reporter from the *Toronto Star*, who called about an accident involving a UF<sub>6</sub> shipment that occurred in Ohio in August. Mr. Sneer had not heard about the accident, and after checking around discovered that no one else knew about it, either. The reporter had gotten the story from the truck driver but was unable to verify anything. By the end of October, the reporter had confirmed the story and written the article. It turned out the incident was not reportable under federal or state regulations.

Mr. Sneer also reported on Ohio's experience with the Vibrant Response exercise. He encouraged the other states to participate in it if given the chance. Ohio EMA director Nancy Dragoni was a big advocate for the exercise, which involved 5,000 people. The exercise ran for 12 hours a day for eight straight days. Mr. Sneer described it as the most intense exercise he had ever been through. Eight different state agencies were involved. FEMA paid much of the bill.

Tom Breckenridge added that UF<sub>6</sub> shipments generate great interest at the local level. Local Emergency Management directors had complained about the state not notifying them, and it is difficult to explain there is no notification because the shipments are considered ordinary commerce.

Michigan: Mr. Gothard reported that the MERRTT train-the-trainer course in Michigan was outstanding and had attracted Level VI inspectors. Coming from the South, Mr. Gothard observed that there was more public awareness of and interest in radioactive waste issues in the Midwest compared to the South. He had attended the Ohio public meeting on the NRC's Waste Confidence rulemaking and said there might be a need for better communication materials to help state personnel cope with concerned citizens.

The Southern states have the Southern Mutual Radiological Assistance Program (SMRAP), which is endorsed by the governors. SMRAP bands all the states together in a mutual aid agreement. Mr. Gothard said SMRAP was used often for drills and exercises. He had been trying to get the ball rolling in the Midwest because it seemed like a good thing when he was in the South. Several members wondered whether the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) serves the same purpose. Mr. Gothard said SMRAP was different in that it was specifically for radiological assistance. Mr. Leuer said one of the challenges with EMAC is that a governor's declaration is needed. For smaller emergencies, states often have agreements so that they can tap resources in other states. Mr. Breckenridge added that EMAC is kind of like a bidding process – states have to pay for the

services and equipment they use. Mr. Gothard said, in Louisiana, people would come in from all the neighboring states for drills and exercises and they would pay their own way.

Wisconsin: Mr. Schmidt reported on a bill (AB 513), introduced in November, that would require a public utility with spent fuel in dry storage to make annual payments to the city, village, town, and county. Similar legislation had been introduced in recent years. Mr. Schmidt said that, with the closure of Kewaunee, it was possible this time the bill would pass.

Ms. Engelhart had gone on the WIPP tour in June along with Captain David Pabst from the motor carrier division. Captain Pabst was very impressed by the tour, and now he has been promoted to Bureau Director. The WIPP tour and the LaCrosse site visit had generated interest in radioactive waste transportation. Last year, she had started a paper on fees that did not even make it out of the department. But with a higher level of interest, Ms. Engelhart is doing some research and putting together some information. In addition, she has a new legislative liaison who might be able to help draw some attention to a fee bill.

The state had experienced eight or nine non-HRCQ shipments. Mr. Schmidt added that the FEMA regional office had not officially reached out to Wisconsin yet about the Vibrant Response exercise. He said it would make sense for Wisconsin to participate because, if Chicago had to be evacuated, people should head north because they are accustomed to doing that. Ms. Dresen said there was a tabletop planned for December 5, with a larger-scale planning exercise in May. Ms. Engelhart had gone to the first two planning meetings, but had not received any notifications afterward. Ms. Dresen said she was in the same boat. The members speculated that there might have been a miscommunication with FEMA.

Nebraska: Lieutenant Schreiber reported that the graded exercise at Fort Calhoun had taken place this past week. The plant remained shut down. She mentioned some of the communication problems that had affected WIPP and EM shipments and said these problems were being addressed. As an example, she cited the case of a WIPP shipment that had turned around; notifications came to the states and WGA in a very timely manner. Also, Jon Schwarz is back at work after having been on medical leave for a while. Mike Brown (DOE Carlsbad Field Office, or CBFO) added that the shipment that had turned around was a shipment from Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) to Idaho National Laboratory (INL) using the 10-160B container. The CBFO had warned LANL that Wyoming had a weather advisory, which meant that – under the WGA WIPP Program Implementation Guide – the shipment should not take place. LANL made the right decision to turn around.

Committee discussion of NTSF activities: The members discussed the draft agenda for the 2014 annual meeting of the NTSF. Major Evans will give the report on regional activities on May 13. The group agreed to invite the governor to give the welcome to Minnesota. Mr. Leuer will facilitate the invitation. For a keynote speaker, the members recommended inviting Lake Barrett, former director of the DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM), or Eric Knox, also formerly of OCRWM. The members discussed the idea for a plenary panel discussion assessing the NTSF after five years. Mr. Horn was tapped to be the Midwest's candidate for the state representative. Whoever speaks for the states will be representing all the states, not just one region. Ms. Dresen agreed to speak about the NNPP exercise during the breakout session on emergency response exercises. The members also discussed other ideas for the professional development session. The states were interested in learning about best practices in using social media like Twitter and Facebook. Ms. Dresen recalled seeing a good presentation on this subject from a public information professional at the NRC. Several participants noted that their own state agencies are encouraged to use social media, but the personnel were not able to access social media sites from their work computers. The members agreed to recommend adding this topic to the breakout session agenda.

The next NTSF webinar is tentatively scheduled for February. The focus will be CVSA and the DOT HM-ACCESS program. Major Evans said he would provide Ms. Janairo with contact information for an HM-ACCESS speaker. Ms. Janairo mentioned that she would be putting together a webinar for the Great Lakes Legislative Caucus in March about nuclear waste disposal in the region. While it would not be an NTSF webinar, she would be happy to open it up to the committee members if there was interest.

No members identified emerging issues for handling by ad hoc working groups. Ms. Janairo wondered whether the emergency response breakout session at the NTSF meeting might spark interest in forming a group to gather lessons learned from WIPPTREX, TEPP, and NNPP lessons and help DOE, states, and tribes incorporate those lessons.

New projects for 2014: Ms. Janairo referred to the new Interregional Team on Section 180(c) as a big project for 2014. In addition, the NTSF would be developing a management plan to explain roles and responsibilities for members who host meetings, lead working groups, and otherwise participate in NTSF activities. Also, the Communications working group would be developing a fact sheet on waste streams coming from nuclear power plant decommissioning. The suggestion had come from Ms. Beetem. Ms. Janairo asked members to share any information they have or have seen regarding waste streams. Mr. Horn said he would share with Ms. Janairo the information he had on Zion's decommissioning. Ms. Janairo said there were no plans to update the transportation project brochure, given the stagnation in the federal waste management program. There was possible interest from legislators in Michigan and Minnesota to tour WIPP. Finally, Ms. Clark, Ms. Beetem, and Mr. Schmidt volunteered to work with Ms. Janairo on updating the recommended practices in the *Planning Guide*. Ms. Janairo said she would like to kick off this activity in March, with the goal of having a draft for the committee to review at its meeting in May. Mr. Arnold suggested adding to the *Planning Guide* information on the tribal points of contact as well as holidays or other key dates. He said he was considering the need for a tribal document similar to the *Planning Guide*, but in the meantime it would be good to add this information to the Midwest's document.

#### **Thursday, December 5**

Major Evans called the meeting to order and introduced Kansas State Senator Jay Emler, who welcomed the committee to Kansas. Senator Emler commented on the importance of the transportation issue to Kansas and other states, especially in light of the incident in Mexico. He observed that legislative budget discussions seldom address the need to recover the costs to the state of providing escorts and conducting inspections, but these were needs that should be met. He encouraged committee members to reach out to their homeland security committees to make sure such costs were considered as measures to protect public safety, because that is what they are.

DOE-EM Update: Ellen Edge from the DOE-EM Office of Packaging and Transportation (OPT) spoke via telephone about "Transportation in Environmental Cleanup." Ms. Edge acknowledged the work the committee does to support transportation as being extremely important to the OPT. She reported that the Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) environmental impact statement (EIS) was in the final stages of review with the final document to be out in 2014. Also in 2014, after the report is issued, DOE will submit a report to Congress as required by the Energy Policy Act and the Low-level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act. In the report, DOE will propose actions to ensure safe disposal, identify options for disposal at federal and non-federal facilities, and evaluate costs and options for covering the costs. Congress will need to make a decision, and then DOE will issue a record of decision. Ms. Janairo asked what sites DOE had considered in the EIS. Ms. Edge said she would send Ms. Janairo a full list later in the day.

Ms. Edge reported that, because of funding and staffing constraints, there was not much to report on the DOE orders and manuals. Ms. McNeil had completed a draft of the transportation order and Mike Wangler was working on the physical protection order. Until the continuing resolution and staffing issues were resolved, all work on the orders would be on hold.

In shipment-related news, Ms. Edge reported on the ConEd Uranium Solidification Project (CUSP) shipments of uranium-233 material created from the irradiation of highly enriched uranium (HEU)-thorium fuel at Indian Point in New York. The spent fuel had been reprocessed and then the U-233 material shipped to Oak Ridge in 1969. A total of 403 cans of material remain at Oak Ridge. DOE had hoped to send this material to the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS), but Governor Sandoval had concerns that the material would not comply with the waste acceptance criteria for the site. A working group of DOE and state officials would meet in January to determine

whether the CUSP shipments will occur. Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Waste Management, will be the DOE-EM representative on that working group.

The Canadian shipments had been postponed until the spring of 2014 pending NRC approval of the shipping package. DOE is analyzing the disposition options for the West Valley melter and was awaiting news of the continuing resolution to determine funding options. The shipment could take place in either FFY2014 or FFY2015, depending on the options. Finally, the uranium oxide shipments from Portsmouth and Paducah were still on hold as DOE analyzes its options. Originally, the hope was to send the material to NNSS, but the CUSP shipment dispute had presented a potential obstacle.

Ms. Edge entertained several questions, which she answered either on the spot or through e-mail later in the day. In response to a question from Mr. Williams, Ms. Edge said DOE was currently resolving comments submitted during the GTCC comment period. It seems unlikely that it document would be put back out for public comments. She also addressed the Canadian shipments, saying there would be fewer than 50 shipments over a 12-month period to DOE's Savannah River Site (SRS). Ms. Beetem asked about outreach on the Canadian shipments and added that the Communications working group's development guide would be useful for any new fact sheets DOE might develop. Ms. Edge reported that DOE had been doing extensive outreach with the Northeast and Southern regions and the Tribes, as the shipments would be moving through those areas. TEPP had also been doing additional training on emergency response in those areas, especially among the Tribes.

Mr. Breckenridge asked about the classification of the West Valley melter shipment and the Canadian shipments. Ms. Edge said the West Valley melter was LLW, which would be grouted and shipped as DOT-compliant IP-2. The Canadian shipments involved HEU in liquid form. Mr. Gothard asked about proposed routes for the Canadian shipments. Ms. Edge reported the route that is preferable to the United States goes through Buffalo, NY, but would go through some Tribal lands in Canada and through some heavily populated areas in Canada. The Canadians prefer a route that is further to the east. That route goes through a number of Native American lands on the U.S. side and moves through more heavily populated American regions. Both are NRC-approved routes. Timing-wise, the NRC also would need to finish the packaging certification process for the NAC LWT casks that will be used to ship the drums of HEU.

CBFO and TRANSCOM Update: Mr. Brown reported on activities regarding the CBFO and TRANSCOM. Mr. Brown reviewed the organization at the CBFO and noted that Bill Mackie's former position as institutional affairs manager was still open but would be filled eventually. Mr. Mackie was now the director of the Business Office within the CBFO. Mr. Brown said the CBFO's goals in 2014 highlighted the need to move transuranic (TRU) waste from LANL, which was deemed a priority because of some high-profile fires that had occurred near the site in recent years. SRS, INL, and Oak Ridge were also priorities, as well as shipments from ANL. To do the required helium leak test, the temperature has to be at least 40 degrees F. The test is conducted outdoors at ANL, so shipments stop in the winter. DOE's goal for FFY 14 is to complete 44 shipments from ANL.

WIPP will also be undergoing maintenance and infrastructure revitalization, with an outage scheduled for February 14 through March 10, 2014. WIPP also needs to submit its five-year renewal application to the EPA in March of 2014. On the business side, WIPP was transitioning to DOE Fednet, so the e-mail addresses would change to a "dot-gov" address.

In June 2013, the CBFO received approval to use the Criticality Control Overpack (CCO) for shipments from SRS, INL, and LANL. The CCO is similar to the pipe overpack except it is made from standard components with a cost reduction from \$4,100 for the pipe overpack to less than \$2,000 for the CCO, with 10 or 15 thousand containers estimated. With pipe overpacks, DOE can ship 14 drums representing 2800 fissile gram equivalent (FGE) per shipment, but the CCO will allow DOE to ship 5320 FGE per shipment, so there will be less repacking at the sites and fewer shipments. From the outside, the shipments will be identical to TRUPACT II shipments.

In addition, the classification of the TRUPACT-II/HalfPACT outer vessel was changed from containment to confinement. This change, too, would save costs.

The CBFO is seeking approval for two additional disposal panels. In addition, the Salt Defense Disposal Initiative is ongoing to determine how salt performs at high temperatures. Some heat tests had occurred at WIPP before it opened, but the temperatures tested were not as high as those anticipated for disposal of defense-related high-level radioactive waste (HLW). Two rooms had been mined with canisters containing heaters emplaced. This effort began when the state leadership sent a letter expressing support for disposal of defense HLW if the science were suitable.

Shipments from Oak Ridge had shut down temporarily because the CBFO was determining that much of the waste shipped was actually LLW. Shipments from the site were set to resume after the maintenance outage ends in March.

In recent accomplishments, WIPP had received its 700<sup>th</sup> shipment of remote-handled TRU waste. In addition, the site received its first shipment of waste in shielded containers, with ANL sending the first one on September 9. Waste in shielded containers is shipped in HalfPACTs and can be disposed of like contact-handled waste underground. WIPP has a disposal capacity of 6.2 million cubic feet and is currently about half full. To move all this waste, shipments have traveled over 14 million loaded miles. DOE expects shipments to continue until around 2050. To date, 22 generator sites had been cleaned of all their legacy TRU waste.

Regarding training, Mr. Brown encouraged states to contact the CBFO if they were interested in MERRTT training. If the location is on a WIPP route, the CBFO will provide training. If not, the training would be contingent upon funding being available. Mr. Brown relayed the story of the Andrews, Texas, fire department having training in connection with a planned WIPPTREX exercise on December 5. As it happened, on November 22, an accident involving a spilled cobalt source had occurred in the vicinity, and the hazmat training the responders had received was put to good use.

The CBFO conducts annual carrier audits. In 2013, there were no findings, but it was recommended that Cast Specialty Transportation institute changes to its records organization and storage. The Colorado State Patrol and Tennessee Highway Patrol conduct their own carrier reviews and are also invited to observe the CBFO's audits. Audits in 2014 will be scheduled for March-June. Mr. Brown emphasized that the point of the audit is to help the carriers improve. Mr. Brown briefly reported on the change to the hours-of-service rules as of July 1, 2013. WIPP drivers travel in teams and it is required that one driver maintain "constant surveillance" with the vehicle at all times. This requirement was making it difficult to comply with the hours-of-service rule, so DOE sought an exemption similar to what is allowed for shipments of explosives. The exemption is valid through 2015.

Next, Mr. Brown reported on TRANSCOM. The TRANSCOM Communication Center (TCC) is separate from the WIPP Central Monitoring Room (CMR). The TCC tracks WIPP shipments but also other DOE shipments of spent fuel. A total of 430 users, including personnel in 41 state agencies and three tribal governments, access TRANSCOM. In November, a new five-year contract was awarded to Ma-Chis LCITE to manage the TRANSCOM system and the communication center. Among other improvements, TRANSCOM 3.0 is compatible with mobile web devices. Online training is available on the TCC Help Site. In 2014, classroom training will be reduced, and if users come to Carlsbad for training, they will need to bring their laptops. Mr. Brown encouraged users to contact the CBFO if they experience recurring problems with TRANSCOM because, while Ma-Chis is the contractor and can help, DOE wants to know how well the system is functioning for users.

Finally, Mr. Brown reported that there were 17 transportation incidents and accidents involving TRU waste shipments from September 2012 through September 2013.

TEPP Update: Via telephone, Tom Clawson reported that, in FFY2013, TEPP had conducted eight classes in the Midwest with a total of 166 students attending. Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, and Wisconsin had all had training. Many more courses were offered in the other regions, including a significant number in the Northeast and the South because of the Canadian shipments. Mr. Clawson said TEPP was getting more requests for the Radiation Specialist Course, which is an advanced-level 40-hour class aligned with the competencies in NFPA 472. Mr. Clawson credited Tom Hughes in Pennsylvania with spurring DOE to develop this course.

DOE strives to update MERRTT modules every three years. As in the past, each regional group had been asked to provide one representative to participate on a working group to help with the revision. For this past round, approximately 65 comments had been compiled from MERRTT users, with 14 additional comments submitted after the release of the 2013 version of NFPA 472/473. In response, TEPP is updating references and videos to include the 2012 ERG and adding pictures and graphics portraying equipment and responses. In addition, the Incident Command Module 15 had been streamlined with the Incident Control Module 7 to carve out additional time, which made room for a Case Histories Module. The revisions had been completed and the DVDs were in the works.

TEPP had sponsored exercises in South Carolina and Port Arthur, Texas, in October 2012 and participated in a North Carolina Tabletop Exercise in September 2013. In addition, Mr. Clawson was working to update the TEPP Emergency Response, Pre-Hospital, and Decontamination videos. The working group had an opportunity to review the draft scripts. Mr. Clawson noted that Mr. Schwarz, the Midwest's representative, had submitted comments. TEPP had printed copies of the FEMA Q&A booklet. Mr. Clawson also encouraged the members to visit the TEPP website, which is an excellent source of information including the training schedule and model procedures.

Mr. Breckenridge asked whether copies of the FEMA Q&A booklet were still available. No more printed copies are available, but there is a PDF available on the TEPP website. In response to a question from Mr. Williams, Mr. Clawson said TEPP trains both career and volunteer fire departments.

NTSF Tribal Caucus: Mr. Arnold said the tribes had been trying to formalize their involvement in the transportation planning process. He was finding it very helpful to attend the regional meetings to get a sense of how the states are involved and what processes they follow to organize their work. With regard to co-hosting the NTSF meeting, Mr. Arnold noted that it might be difficult for a tribe to serve as sole host, especially given the remote location of many tribal lands. Funding was proving to be difficult as the tribes tried to figure out how to have parity with the regional groups. He emphasized that it was not the tribes' intention to have DOE reduce funding for the regions in order to bring in the tribes. He also noted the need for an improved flow of information to and from the tribes. For example, tribes might be interested in the Midwest's briefing packet or the Operation Lifesaver training mentioned the previous day, but they are not yet receiving information on how to tap these resources. Mr. Arnold hoped to see more Midwestern tribes participating in the NTSF process.

Mr. King added his appreciation for being able to participate in the regional meeting. He cited the example of DOE not realizing there were tribal lands in northern Michigan near the Big Rock Point shutdown plant, but Mr. King knew there were tribes in the area. He considered two-way communication to be essential and expressed hope that, with greater participation by tribes, those lines of communication would open. Major Evans agreed and said the situation was similar to what the states face. He looked forward to fostering closer relationships. Ms. Janairo added that, if Mr. Arnold would send her the information on points of contact, she would make sure the information was added to distribution lists for NTSF announcements, regional mailings, and other resources. Mr. King mentioned the movement by tribes to return to their ancestral homelands.

WIEB Update: Mr. Williams provided a report on WIEB's activities. He explained that WIEB focuses on spent fuel and HLW shipments, while WIPP shipments are handled by WGA. No one from DOE had attended the fall meeting of the WIEB High-Level Waste Committee, since the meeting took place during the federal shutdown. Mr. Williams commented on the scope and degree of the reformulation of the federal waste management program that was going on. He also agreed that the 180c interregional team was a significant undertaking and had an important and difficult job to do. Mr. Williams expressed interest in the route assessment tool that DOE is developing. He hoped the tool would be useful to the regions and the states as they prepare for shipments and assess the options for 180c implementation. Mr. Williams mentioned that the West would be submitting comments on the NRC's draft EIS on Waste Confidence.

NRC Update: Mr. Pstrak provided an update on the NRC's activities. After providing some background information on the NRC and its mission, Mr. Pstrak addressed the new rule on "Advance Notification to Native American Tribes of Transportation of Certain Types of Nuclear Waste." The rule went into effect on August 10, 2012, with a

compliance date of June 11, 2013. He said the catch was that the 565 federally recognized tribes would have to sign on to receive the advance notification. The reason for the "opt-in" approach is that the information would be safeguards information that requires protection. The NRC is prepared to train tribal personnel as needed. The annual listing of the state governors' designees will be expanded to include a list of the tribes that have signed up to receive notification.

Another rule that recently went into effect is the rule on Physical Protection of Irradiated Reactor Fuel in Transit. The NRC had issued orders and additional security measures (ASMs) after 9/11. The new rule, which went into effect on August 19, 2013, codified these orders and ASMs as rules.

Regarding extended storage, Mr. Pstrak noted the predicament of the nation not having a repository but having nuclear power plants that need room to store spent fuel. The NRC's mission is to ensure the safe and secure use of radioactive materials while protecting people and the environment. Mr. Pstrak read about a new cask that would hold 89 BWR assemblies, which would make for a very large, heavy container. DOE might specify that it wants much smaller disposal casks, which would conflict with the power plants' desire to minimize the number of storage casks by maximizing the casks' capacity. The NRC is seeking to enhance the technical knowledge for regulating extended storage and identify needed revisions to the regulatory framework. He acknowledged the Midwest's comments on the draft report "Technical Information Needs Affecting Potential Regulation of Extended Storage and Transportation." The final report is expected out later this year. Mr. Pstrak thought this report would be a good topic for an upcoming NTSF webinar.

Mr. Pstrak also provided an update on the NRC's Waste Confidence draft generic EIS (GEIS), which was published in September 2013 after the court ordered the NRC to consider spent fuel pool fires, pool leaks, and the possibility of a repository not becoming available. The NRC had completed the draft GEIS within two years. The draft describes the environmental impacts of continuing to store spent fuel beyond the licensed life for operations of a reactor, dividing the time period into three scenarios: short term (60 years beyond shutdown), long term (100 years beyond the initial 60 years), and indefinite (no repository available). The NRC had conducted extensive outreach, including a 75-day comment period that would end on December 20, 2013. At the end of the previous week, the NRC had received about 25,000 comments, the bulk of which were form letters from people expressing their dislike of nuclear power.

The NRC is considering requiring licensees to expedite the movement of spent fuel from pools into dry storage casks, specifically the spent fuel that has cooled for five years or more. The commission had recently completed a report entitled "Consequence Study of a Beyond-Design Basis Earthquake Affecting the Spent Fuel Pool for a U.S. Mark I Boiling Water Reactor" and had held a meeting the previous day to discuss the findings. The purpose was to determine whether it would enhance safety to expedite removal of the spent fuel. The authors, however, had concluded there was a low likelihood of release and that, currently, the pools provide adequate safety. It was unclear whether the NRC would accept the recommendation or pursue a different path.

Mr. Pstrak concluded with an overview of Yucca Mountain-related activities at the NRC. In 2008, the NRC had received the license application from DOE and had assembled the staff to work on the application review. In 2010, DOE filed a motion to withdraw the application and the NRC staff was told to stop working on the Safety Evaluation Report. In 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit ordered the NRC to continue its review using existing funds. In November, the commission ordered the staff to complete the Safety Evaluation Report.

Mr. Pstrak mentioned that the NRC is coming out with a new tribal policy to increase interactions with the tribes. The policy is still being reviewed by the NRC's General Counsel. Mr. Pstrak suggested this topic might be a good one to include on the agenda for the Tribal Caucus meeting in May. Ms. Janairo has inquired about the NRC's outreach to tribes regarding advance notification because she thought it would be useful to share with DOE the NRC's list of tribal points of contact. Mr. Pstrak said he did not know what kind of outreach the NRC had done. Mr. Arnold added that the tribes had expressed frustration about having to opt in to something that the states would receive automatically.

FRA Update: Via telephone, Mel Massaro provided a report on the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) activities. He began with an update on the Safety Compliance Oversight Plan (SCOP), which dates back to 1998. The tasks in the SCOP address operational integrity, emergency response, route infrastructure integrity, highway-rail grade crossing safety, security, and miscellaneous activities such as investigating complaints and encouraging state participation in FRA's rail safety program. Everything in the SCOP is covered daily by FRA inspectors and their state partners. Mr. Massaro said he and Kevin Blackwell planned to update the SCOP in 2014. He cited advancements in railroad technology, like Positive Train Control, as things that need to be incorporated into the new SCOP. Mr. Williams asked about the process for updating the SCOP. Mr. Massaro said he and Mr. Blackwell would develop an updated draft to share with the railroads, the states, and the regional groups to review. Mr. Williams asked if the SCOP could lead to regulations. Mr. Massaro said it was based on regulations, but it addressed special implementation of the regulations. Mr. Dimond asked how many inspectors were dedicated to each of the six FRA subgroups associated with the SCOP. Mr. Massaro said there were approximately 160 or 170 inspectors, not including FRA-certified state inspectors.

Moving on to the Strategic Rail Corridor Network (SCRACNET) system, Mr. Massaro explained that, in the 1970s and 1980s, the nation's rail system was in deplorable condition. The Department of Defense was concerned about not being able to deploy equipment immediately given the limited capacity and poor condition of the rail system. So DOD looked at the rail system and picked out major routes that should be ready at all times. The FRA is responsible for making sure these routes are maintained. Mr. Massaro said incorporating the secondary lines – the regional ones and the short lines – remained an important task.

Regarding rail routing, from an infrastructure perspective, Mr. Massaro said routing would have to consider the infrastructure at the site, the near-site carrier, the intermediate carrier, and the line haul infrastructure. Given the interest in Carlsbad, New Mexico, as a possible location for a storage site, Mr. Massaro showed the BNSF railroad map of New Mexico and noted that the line that heads from Clovis to Loving was a Class 2 line that appeared to be in fairly good condition.

Mr. Massaro reported on the visits to the shutdown reactor sites. He had not accompanied the DOE team to the initial visits to the three sites in the Northeast, but had been invited to go to the Midwestern and Western sites. In the near future, DOE would be looking at both Oyster Creek and Vermont Yankee. In the spring or summer of 2014, he expected the DOE team to visit Crystal River in Florida, Kewaunee in Wisconsin, and San Onofre in California. One of the team's purposes in visiting the sites was to get a complete inventory of the spent fuel being stored and its condition. Mr. Massaro had participated to help evaluate the rail service, infrastructure, and railcar loading capabilities at the sites.

Zion has Class I railroad service by Union Pacific, has a recently rebuilt facility rail system, and will make LSA/SCO shipments by rail during decommissioning. He said the new rail infrastructure was outstanding and described the site as setting the standard for what on-site infrastructure should be. LaCrosse is also served by a Class I railroad, in this case BNFS. The on-site infrastructure has been abandoned, however. Only two cars would be able to fit on the siding that is on the site, which limits the ability to assemble trains inside the gate. This presents a problem because the mainline track is used by 25-40 trains per day. It would be very costly to shut down that line in order to assemble a train, which could take a couple of weeks. Finally, the DOE team had visited Big Rock Point in northern Michigan, which does not have direct rail access. Thirteen miles away, the Great Lakes Central Railroad in Petoskey runs on Class 1 track that is not in the best of condition. [The "Class 1" track designation is not to be confused with "Class I" railroads. Class 1 track is better only than "excepted" track.] In Gaylord, 50 miles away, the Lake State Railway maintains Class 2 track that is in much better condition.

Mr. Massaro moved on to the topic of reciprocal rail inspections. The idea was to create a reciprocal inspection program for rail shipments that would be similar to the CVSA Level VI truck inspections, utilizing the FRA State Rail Safety Participation Program as much as possible. The effort involved point of origin, en route, and final destination inspections. Mr. Massaro said he was looking for potential campaigns on which to pilot the inspection procedures. Possibilities included using the USEC shipments from the Paducah facility or the ongoing LLW shipments resulting from the decommissioning of Zion 1 and 2. A less ideal option would be to inspect unit trains

of either crude oil or ethanol, which would not involve a radiological inspection but could be helpful for testing out the mechanical inspection procedures.

Ms. Janairo asked whether DOE was actively planning the site visit to Kewaunee. Mr. Massaro said no date had been set but DOE was working on it. Regarding the pilot testing, Ms. Janairo asked whether Mr. Massaro was planning to pilot the same forms that were developed a few years ago. Mr. Massaro said yes, but there would be some additions made once the AAR's S-2033 and S-2034 standards are issued.

Business session:

Co-chair election: The members elected Ms. Dresen to be co-chair in 2014-2015. She and Ms. Beetem will make up the leadership team in 2014.

Section 180(c) discussion: The committee reviewed the summary of the Section 180(c) implementation draft recommendations and made several changes, particularly to the allowable activities. Ms. Janairo will update the file and share it with the other regions in preparation for the January 28 meeting of the new 180(c) Interregional Team.

Member recruitment: In parting, Senator Emler thanked the committee members for the work they do and encouraged them to recruit legislators to represent their states on the committee. He offered his assistance in reaching out to legislators and suggested the committee members work through Ms. Janairo to identify possible candidates. Ms. Janairo can then work through him to generate interest.

Engagement discussion: The committee discussed its level of engagement with DOE-NE on the waste management program. Ms. Janairo described the current situation as representing the lowest level of interaction between DOE and the states that she had ever seen – at least during times when cooperative agreement funding was available. She did not think the level of engagement was good for the states and their future work with the program. Mr. Leuer reminded the members that, in years past, the committee and its counterparts had asked DOE to fund the regional groups to keep the groups operating at a minimum level for the sake of continuity. He said the states were further ahead in the planning process than DOE was, largely because the department's political world had been turned upside down. He thought there was a great deal of value in keeping the regional group together even though DOE-NE does not have a lot of work for the states to undertake.

Ms. Janairo clarified that she was not suggesting the committee disband, nor was she critical of the engagement with WIPP and DOE-EM. She wanted the committee's guidance on the extent to which they would like her to push DOE-NE to be more forthcoming about things like planning a site visit to Kewaunee. Ms. Beetem said she thought DOE-NE needed to understand that, timing-wise, it would not be workable to drop a bunch of work on the regions and expect them to turn it around quickly when the program finally gets the go-ahead to move forward. Mr. Williams observed that DOE-NE is working on a number of things, but is doing so in the absence of state input. He was in favor of tapping the cooperative agreement money to stay on top of developments in the program, including the political environment. Ms. Janairo mentioned that Ms. McNeil had proposed instituting quarterly conference calls of all the regional staff and DOE project managers, using the occasion of new hires in the Northeast and at WGA as a reason to kick off the idea. Ms. Janairo will follow up on this idea and ask that the regional co-chairs be included on the calls, or at least the first one, so that the states can express their views directly to the DOE staff.

Spring meeting plans: Ms. Janairo said the committee would have five hours on the agenda in Minnesota. The agenda will include a briefing from the 180c interregional team and a discussion of the draft *Planning Guide*. She asked if the states would like to reprise the visit from the DOE leads, as in Buffalo. Ms. Beetem suggested it would be better to have a more interactive discussion. She said it would be more productive to give the DOE representatives a specific topic to discuss with the states. Ms. Janairo will rework the visit with

DOE at the spring meeting. She encouraged members to let her know about other agenda topics that they would find interesting.

Training and exercises: Mr. Gothard will look into holding a MERRTT training session in northern Michigan. Major Evans and Ms. Beetem will coordinate on training in Iowa or Missouri and reach out to Mr. Clawson. Ms. Beetem will hold Missouri's place in line for the NNPP exercise in five years. Ms. Janairo reminded the members that CSG Midwest has travel money available if anyone wants to attend or send someone to attend training and needs travel funding. Ms. Dresen said Indiana was planning to offer the Radiation Specialist course in Indianapolis in the spring of 2014. She said she might have space available to other states that wish to send staff for training. She will send Ms. Janairo the information when the time comes.

Major Evans thanked the members for their participation and for their confidence in him as co-chair. He adjourned the meeting at 2:34 pm.