



MIDWEST

The Council of State Governments Midwestern Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee

Proceedings of the Fall Meeting
December 13-14, 2017 • Cincinnati, Ohio

Committee Business Session

Welcome and Introductions

Committee co-chair Kevin Leuer (Minnesota) welcomed attendees and asked everyone in the room to introduce themselves. He extended thanks to Greg Gothard (Michigan) and Kaci Studer (Indiana) for helping CSG Midwest staff put together the agenda for the meeting. He reminded members that Teri Engelhart retired from the Wisconsin state government at the end of September, at which time she was serving as senior co-chair of the Committee. He noted that the Committee would elect a new co-chair during the closing business session on Thursday.

Report from the Co-Chair

Mr. Leuer expressed his appreciation for the Committee giving him the opportunity to network with other states and share best practices. He acknowledged that this would not be possible without the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) contributions. He added that being able to share information with other states during and after Committee meetings has been beneficial to streamlining transportation-related issues and transportation planning in the Midwest. He thanked DOE for its efforts to maintain cohesion and the core function of the group. He said maintaining that continuity was one of the priorities of the Committee, especially as DOE is impacted by the lack of budget or Congressional action.

Project Update

Lisa Janairo (CSG Midwest) reviewed highlights from the Project Update, which was given to members in a handout. She said CSG Midwest's cooperative agreements with the DOE Office of Nuclear Energy (DOE-NE) and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) were in place for the current fiscal year, but the group was about to run out of funding from the DOE Office of Environmental Management's (DOE-EM) Office of Packaging and Transportation (OPT). She explained that the OPT agreement ends on December 20, but she learned that CSG Midwest would be getting a no-cost extension until February, when they get a new cooperative agreement in place. She let OPT know that those funds are what will be used to plan the NTSF 2018 meeting and that planning would slow down without it.

Regarding Committee appointments, Ms. Janairo noted that Chris Boswell (Iowa) was attending his first meeting as a gubernatorial appointee. She said she learned last night that David Whitfill (Kansas) is leaving, or has left, state government, which means the committee will need a new appointment from Governor Brownback. She added that appointments were still pending for Indiana, Missouri, Wisconsin, and North Dakota, and that she would be following up with those governors in January. She said the Committee would also be seeking new legislative members.

Ms. Janairo reviewed other activities under the project, including the legislative tracker, an article on devalued nuclear plants that ran in *Stateline Midwest*, the new version of *the Planning Guide for Shipments of Radioactive Materials through the Midwestern States*, and the Committee's monthly e-newsletter.

Report on DOE-NE Transportation Core Group Meeting

Mr. Leuer said the Transportation Core Group held its summer meeting on August 23-25 in Colorado Springs. He explained that the Core Group is DOE's forum for discussing developments related to the Spent Nuclear Fuel and Waste Disposition Program. He said that the Core Group meetings have been beneficial because they allow states to bring up concerns directly with DOE. He said, for example, states had been trying to emphasize to DOE that the lead time needed to plan and prepare for shipments is different for different states and that protestors were changing the dynamic of shipment security.

Ms. Janairo added that the last meeting included a tour of the Transportation Technology Center, Inc. and that attendees saw the Spanish ENSA cask, which is part of a data collection project. She said she hoped to have a presentation on that for NTSF members when the project is complete. She explained that some discussions during the August meeting foreshadowed the November scale-back of DOE's Spent Nuclear Fuel and Waste Disposition Program.

Mr. Leuer added that, in November, DOE-NE announced that it would not be sending Erica Bickford (DOE-NE) to speak at the Midwest's meeting, that it was not planning to hold either of the two Core Group meetings that had been expected to take place in 2018, and that it was halting all of its work with the National Transportation Stakeholders Forum (NTSF) Section 180(c) and Rail/Routing ad hoc working groups (AHWG). He explained that there were a few factors in play that led to DOE putting the program on hold: 1) getting the new management up to speed on what transportation is and how DOE should move forward; 2) concerns regarding the legacy of the previous administration's initiatives and the desire to rebrand some of that information; and 3) the lack of a budget or program direction from Congress. He said it was positive that the Midwest's program was continuing to be funded, but acknowledged that it was unclear what would happen to funding in the future. He said, at this point, the NTSF meeting was still funded and would be moving forward, as scheduled.

Mr. Leuer mentioned that the state regional groups (SRGs) and Tribal Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee (TRMTC) held a conference call in early December and agreed to send letters to Ed McGinnis, who is DOE's Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy. He explained that the letters will highlight the value and the benefit of the groups and the difficulties that will arise if they are disbanded, will emphasize the importance of sustaining funding for the core activities of the groups, and will make an offer to either meet in person or over the phone. He explained that the SRGs and TRMTC want to push back to show that they have an impact and add value, but don't want the letters to have a threatening tone.

Ellen Edge (DOE-EM) suggested that since DOE's leadership is in flux at the moment, it could be helpful to send two waves of letters: one now to the temporary leadership and another one six months to a year later for people who are more permanent. Mr. Leuer said it shouldn't be an issue to send multiple letters.

The Committee agreed to send a letter to DOE in early January.

NTSF-Related Reports

Planning Committee

Mr. Leuer reminded members that the Midwest was hosting the 2018 National Transportation Stakeholders Forum (NTSF) Annual Meeting.

Kaci Studer (Indiana) said the NTSF Planning Committee has been very busy working on the 2018 meeting. She said a subgroup of the Planning Committee will be reviewing comments on and recommending changes to the NTSF charter. She added that the oversight of NTSF webinars has been transferred to the Western regional groups, primarily due to the increased demands on the Midwest for the NTSF meeting. She mentioned that a \$50 registration fee was proposed for the 2018 meeting to cover the costs of a networking reception, the state of the forum luncheon, speaker travel, and the tours. Ms. Janairo clarified that anyone being reimbursed by the Midwest for meeting-related travel would also be reimbursed for the registration fee.

Communications Ad Hoc Working Group

Ms. Westra said she and Katelyn Tye (CSG Midwest) took over the Communications Ad Hoc Working Group (AHWG) in August, with Ms. Edge serving as the DOE lead. She said the group's first project was to implement a set schedule for publishing the NTSF newsletter. She noted that in the upcoming January edition of the newsletter, DOE-NE would not be submitting any articles or even a note to explain that the program was on hold. She said the AHWG has a revised work plan that, so far, has been approved by the members. She welcomed feedback on the new NTSF Newsletter and explained that the process had been streamlined to make the content more timely and valuable to readers.

Management Plan Working Group

Ms. Edge said the first version of the NTSF Management Plan was still in place. She said it still needed quite a lot of work so they would be starting a second review, focusing on the TRMTC parts. She said she received revisions from TRMTC, the Midwest, and DOE-NE.

Ms. Edge added that she is leading the Planning Committee's NTSF charter revision group and is working with Chris Wells (Southern States Energy Board) to get the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Plan AHWG up and running within the next month or so. She said she had submitted a draft work plan to Demitrous Blount (DOE-EM).

Rail/Routing Ad Hoc Working Group

Mike Stead (Illinois) said the AHWG last met in August in Colorado Springs where they conducted a rail routing exercise using DOE's Stakeholder Tool for Assessing Radioactive Transportation (START) and got feedback on the routes from industry representatives from Union Pacific, CSX, BNSF, Kansas City Southern, and the Association of American Railroads (AAR). He said that the railroad representatives seemed to be largely in agreement with the routes that START identified. He said the AHWG has not met since August and that members had received notice from DOE-NE that all activities were on hold.

Tiffany Drake (Missouri) asked if START was being impacted by the DOE-NE program being on hold. Ms. Janairo said she didn't know the specific status of START, but did know that DOE-NE was continuing its work on the Atlas railcar development and the request for proposal for private transportation and storage contractors, so it wouldn't surprise her if work on START was continuing, as well. Ms. Janairo took an action item to find out from Ms. Bickford.

Ms. Janairo asked Mel Massaro with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) if changes to the FRA's Safety Compliance Oversight Plan (SCOP) were continuing. Mr. Massaro said yes, the work was continuing and the FRA hoped to have a final draft out by summer 2018. He told attendees that the AAR S-2043 performance standard regarding electronically controlled pneumatic (ECP) brakes was no longer on the table. Mr. Massaro explained the difference between normal brakes and ECP brakes, which offer

an instantaneous and more controlled stop. He said that with the use of dedicated trains, the type of braking really doesn't matter. He added that S-2043 will be an appendix to the SCOP. Ms. Janairo asked if it would be possible to have the final draft of SCOP ready by the NTSF meeting. Mr. Massaro said they would try to do that.

Section 180c Implementation Ad Hoc Working Group

Greg Gothard (Michigan) said the most recent activity related to the group was the email from Ms. Bickford notifying members that the program was on hold. He said prior to that, the last activity was a couple of webinars in June and August on Oak Ridge National Laboratory's evaluation of the 2008 proposed funding formula. From that, the members reviewed the funding formula and created a grant guidance implementation document. He said the AHWG was supposed to go over comments on the document during a meeting, but that won't be happening now. He offered to share his comments with Ms. Studer and any other Committee members who are interested.

Spent Fuel Transportation Materials

Ms. Janairo said the AHWG had gotten off to a very slow start and finally decided that since DOE was not ready to communicate with stakeholders, it would be best to take a six-month break and check back in in March. She said she felt the revamped Communications AHWG would be the appropriate forum for work on DOE-NE communications when the agency is ready to talk about shipments.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Rad Training Focus Group

Kelly Horn (Illinois) said the focus group met a few times since he'd last provided a report during the Committee's St. Louis meeting in November 2016. He explained that the group was formed about two years ago to categorize, implement, and facilitate radiological training for first responders. He said the group had identified every free federal-level radiological training and catalogued those classes by level (i.e., awareness, operations technician, specialist). He said, after cataloging the training, they cross-walked everything to the National Fire Protection Association standard and, as a result, were able to organize the classes into awareness, operations, technician, and specialist siloes. He said the group was at the point at which they're trying to work through how the federal agencies are going to reciprocate with each other so that, for example, a person would be able to take an awareness-level class through the Department of Homeland Security class, then take an operations- or technician-level course through DOE. He explained that reciprocity would require the federal agencies to work out an MOU or Intergovernmental Agreement. He said the group anticipated that FEMA's learning management system would house training records from the various federal agencies.

Mr. Horn said there was a chance that FEMA would want to come to the NTSF meeting this summer, but all of the agency's resources were currently focused on Texas, Puerto Rico, and Florida, so Bernice Zaidel (FEMA) hadn't been working on the training project.

Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) Working Group Update

Mr. Horn said the goal of the Used Fuel Transportation Task Force was to evaluate moving fuel from storage to transportation, back into storage (also known as 71/72/71). He said the task force is looking to develop a white paper on the regulatory basis for dry cask storage, into transportation, back into storage; optimize that process; identify options and needs; and establish a unified industrial position. He explained that NEI was the industry leader and were coming at it from that perspective. He said he was asked to join the task force to give a state or regulatory perspective.

Mr. Horn mentioned that he was also on a subcommittee for shipment planning and operations, which had its second call the day before. He said, in his opinion, industry is well behind the curve when it comes to how they see shipments happening, whereas states have been talking about the issue for the past 10 years. He said he's been trying to keep them from re-creating the wheel. He said the industry has a lot of the same questions and requests as the states have because DOE is supposed to take title to spent fuel at the shutdown reactor sites.

Regional Roundtable

Illinois

Mr. Horn said Illinois was not in the queue for any WIPP shipments, however, Argonne National Laboratory (ANL) is purchasing, or has purchased, some of the new shielded containers. Mr. Horn said because of this, there had been some indication from DOE's Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO) that ANL would get moved up in the shipping queue, so there was a chance that ANL would have some shipments one or two years out.

Mr. Horn said a uranium hexafluoride (UF6) conversion facility in Metropolis, Illinois, was going into an idle state for three years because of global markets being flush. He explained that there are four UF6 facilities in the world and Honeywell is the only one in the United States. He said the facility plans to cease operations and enter a maintenance-only mode, however they will still receive uranium ore and continue their quality assurance and sampling process to have feedstock materials on site, should the operations resume early or the global market demands UF6. He said once any UF6 cylinders they have on site are shipped out, there would be limited shipments of UF6 and any other waste out of Honeywell.

Mr. Horn said he'd had some discussion with U.S. House Energy and Commerce staff to discuss the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017. He said he'd been informed that, right now, the bill (HR3053) had not changed since October and is currently in the House Appropriations Committee. He said he was told the committee has an issue with some of the language in the bill that doesn't require annual appropriations to a third-party entity that would take control of the Nuclear Waste Fund. He said he didn't get the sense that it would be a game changer. He recommended to the Committee that either the Midwestern committee or the four regional groups draft a letter of support, strictly for the parts of the bill that relate to transportation. Mr. Leuer asked if a letter of support would violate the Committee's anti-lobbying restrictions. Mr. Horn said he felt it would be okay if the letter said that we support the bill because it assists local communities. Ms. Janairo said the letter would be carefully worded to pass legal muster before it went out. She added that the new bill included a change that made Section 180(c) more like WIPP funding in that it would go beyond training to cover transportation safety programs, which was an issue Mr. Horn raised in his 2015 testimony. She said the letter would be a "thank you" for hearing that message and acting on it.

Indiana

Ms. Studer said she completed the Indiana Radiological Transportation Plan and it was currently on her director's desk to be signed. She said Indiana also held their first instructor-taught Modular Emergency Response Radiological Transportation Training (MERRTT) course in November and are planning another one in March so a new set of instructors can be certified. She added that in July the state held a successful Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) Radiation Specialist course with 31 attendees.

Iowa

Christopher Boswell (Iowa) said he finally received Governor Kim Reynolds' appointment to the committee. He said he attended a MERRTT training in Illinois. Angela Leek (Iowa) added that the appointment delay was due to former Governor Branstad being nominated as U.S. Ambassador to China. She said the state was awaiting word on when shipments to WIPP would be resuming through Iowa. Ms. Janairo said she had language to give to CSG's attorney for review and hoped she would be able to finalize the contracts by the end of the year. The states would be able to bill for expenses back to July of 2017. Ms. Leek said she had a pile of invoices ready to go.

Michigan

Mr. Gothard said Michigan was working with DOE on having a MERRTT training, even though the state does not see WIPP shipments. He said it was his understanding that DOE had the okay to do a training once a year in Michigan, but it had been three years since they did the last one. He said he was trying to get permission to write an official transportation program for the state. He said Michigan planned to have a regular MERRTT training and then talk with the state police training center about having an actual program.

Kevin Hogan (Michigan) said they were seeing a lot of mostly highway route controlled quantity (HRCQ) Cobalt-60 (Co-60) shipments, including some coming across Sault Ste. Marie. He said he'd expressed a strong opinion against allowing that because that route goes over U.S. Highway 2, which is a two-lane highway. He said he felt I-94 and I-69 were better. He said he didn't know if his recommendation would carry much weight, but that it didn't seem like the carriers from Canada were listening.

Mr. Gothard asked Mr. Hogan if he needed an additional voice asking the shippers not to use U.S. 2. Mr. Hogan said that his requests to the carriers had been informal, thus far. He said he thought it was an issue with getting the shipment to Idaho.

Minnesota

Mr. Leuer said Minnesota had seen 14 HRCQ Co-60 shipments. He mentioned that they are required to submit an annual report to the Legislature on the state's readiness for shipments and they are currently working on that. He said they are transitioning to WebEOC for their emergency operations center software and will be moving their radioactive materials transportation into that system. He explained that they will be able to build a "board" that sends a notification when there is updated information like a route or date change.

Mr. Leuer also discussed preparations for Minneapolis hosting the upcoming Super Bowl. He said they have notified licensees that they must coordinate with the state on any shipments because there will be a "net" of radiation detection capabilities in the surrounding area. He said from a public safety perspective, the Super Bowl is a \$50 million expenditure. The process will bring in federal radiation detection capabilities and three civil support teams from other states.

Mike Snee (Ohio) suggested Mr. Leuer reach out to industrial radiographers, too, because they might not get notified and need to be aware of the radiation "net."

Missouri

Ms. Drake said she had been given a week to provide comments on the final environmental impact statement (EIS) for a proposed Northwest Medical Isotopes facility at the University of Missouri that

would make Molybdenum-99 (Mo-99) using the university's reactor. She said her team read through the EIS and noticed that it didn't include Missouri's radioactive transportation fee. She said the project would result in one million pounds of Class A, B, and C low-level waste (LLW) shipments per year. She said the developer commented that the transportation plan "won't be a big deal." She said she found it interesting that there didn't seem to be a lot of awareness of the proposal among the people who would normally oppose similar projects.

Ms. Drake said the fund Missouri uses for radiation protection work had a lot more appropriations from it than the money coming in, so there was a meeting with the agencies showing that the fund would be in the hole if expenditures continued at current levels. The involved agencies are considering a final MOU, which hadn't been in place for a number of years, that would determine the priorities for the fund and provide a plan for reasonable expenditures from the fund.

Ms. Drake said part of the MOU discussion centered around the fact that Missouri's statute says they "can" inspect shipments to Level VI and provide an escort. She said the state has escorted every single shipment, but wasn't sure if the new governor would want them to continue this approach. She said a highway patrol representative felt shipments were being made a bigger target by providing a police escort. She said she would like to hear other states' thoughts on escorting every shipment.

Ms. Drake said also, when they wrote the statute, they had used the other state fee laws as a model, but since then the NRC came out with reportable or "cause for concern" amounts. She said Missouri is considering that if they changed the legislation to reference that, they would be charging for many more shipments.

Ms. Drake said they were holding a MERRTT course the next day for emergency responders and were looking at the equipment being provided by the state to determine whether it was being used sufficiently.

Finally, Ms. Drake mentioned that the Committee's former chair, Jane Beetem, was running for state representative.

Nebraska

Brian Folts (Nebraska) said he was sitting in for Bryan Tuma, Nebraska's gubernatorial appointee to the Committee. Mr. Folts said they had been dealing mostly with personnel changes. He said he had taken over Jon Schwarz's position and they finally hired someone to replace their equipment calibrator who had retired in September. He said in September they met with agency stakeholders to review Nebraska's radioactive material transportation plan and made a few minor changes. He said they are starting an active campaign to get MERRTT courses throughout the state, especially along I-80.

North Dakota

Dale Patrick (North Dakota) said the state had seen some HRCQ shipments out of Canada. He said they are also in the process of moving an Fluorine-18 cyclotron that was being decommissioned and a large cesium irradiator, both from the University of North Dakota.

Mr. Patrick said the oil pipeline has reduced the number of shipments going by train, but they still move 1.1 million barrels a day. He said they have a fairly significant technologically enhanced naturally occurring radioactive materials (TENORM) issue that was affecting the state. He said some TENORM was being shipped back from metal recyclers to its origin.

Ohio

Mr. Snee said transportation-wise, shipments had been mostly irradiator-related. He introduced Pasquale Razzano, who was new to the Ohio Emergency Management Agency, but would hopefully be a more regular participant in the Committee as he gets more involved in transportation.

Mr. Razzano added that he had started in May and received the first notification for an HRCQ shipment that Monday. He said Ohio had completed two MERRTT trainings and a radiation specialist class since he started.

Wisconsin

Paul Schmidt (Wisconsin) said Wisconsin had seen a lot of LLW and HRCQ shipments from Canada. He explained that the LLW was coming from decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) at Zion and the Lacrosse Boiling Water Reactor (LACBWR) and said he would share some statistics on those with the Committee later in the meeting.

Mr. Schmidt said two facilities in the state, SHINE and Northstar, are planning to be major Mo-99 manufacturers, with feed stock coming from the Missouri research reactor. He said, originally, Shine was going to be fully regulated by the NRC and Northstar by the state. However, SHINE now wants to build a pilot facility, which would be regulated by the state. He said the state is still trying to determine the amount of radioactive materials and waste that will be shipped to and produced by these facilities. Ms. Drake asked if SHINE had completed an EIS with the NRC because that is where she found the information about waste quantities for the Missouri facility. Mr. Schmidt said they had and that was good to know.

Mr. Schmidt said the timeline for Kewaunee's decommissioning could be on an accelerated pace, similar to what occurred with the LACBWR.

Dwight Field passed along well wishes from former Committee co-chair Teri Engelhart. Mr. Field explained that he was in the Wisconsin radiological emergency preparedness program and was serving as the state's interim gubernatorial appointee to the Committee. He said they were filling Ms. Engelhart's position that week, so the Committee should be getting an official appointee soon. He said Wisconsin finalized its joint escort plan for HRCQ shipments. He said he was interested in the AHWGs, especially the Rail/Routing AHWG because he has a background with GIS.

Tribal Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee

Ms. Westra explained that the Prairie Island Indian Community (PIIC) had about six miles of the transportation route to and from the Prairie Island nuclear plant. She said it wouldn't be a big deal if the Tribe chose not to be involved in shipments from the plant, but that she had been involved in the mock Section 180(c) exercise. She said that process had been an eye opener because it required a lot of work for a minimal benefit. She said the Tribe was waiting to see whether the Prairie Island plant will undergo its 20-year renewal.

Ms. Westra introduced a new TRMTC staff member, Tanksi Clairmont, who had started at the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) a couple of months prior to the meeting.

Kim Tyrell (NCSL) mentioned that one of the reasons TRMTC was holding its January meeting in Omaha, Nebraska, was to reach out to the four tribes in the area that could be affected by shipments. She said one tribe was definitely going to participate and the three others indicated they may be interested. She

said TRMTC is also working on a letter to DOE-NE about the drawback in engagement with states and tribes.

Dan King (Oneida Nation) said he hadn't been too involved lately, but in Wisconsin some tribes had requested information about transportation through the state because they had not received any notification. He explained that there were 11 tribes in Wisconsin, mostly covering the roads in northern Wisconsin.

Ms. Janairo asked Mr. King if there was any indication that the tribes were seeing the shipments coming from Canada through Sault Ste. Marie in Michigan. Mr. Hogan clarified that the carriers had not actually used those routes for shipments, yet.

Reports on Other Meetings Attended

NRC Division of Spent Fuel Management Regulatory Conference

Mr. Schmidt reported on his attendance at the NRC's Regulatory Conference. He explained that he had represented the Committee on a panel about transportation of radioactive materials and was one of just a few state government attendees. He said the NRC had asked him to speak specifically about Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) inspections, the Midwest's Committee, and its *Planning Guide*. He said he gave an example of how Wisconsin had used the Committee's resources and the *Planning Guide* to plan for a shipment of used research reactor fuel from Madison.

Mr. Schmidt said he had provided some gentle encouragement to the NRC to continue to be involved in the Committee. He mentioned that Earl Easton from NRC headquarters had been heavily involved and was a great source of information prior to his retirement. Mr. Schmidt said the feedback he got from the NRC suggested that they had no plans to do that. He expressed his hope that the NRC would extend an invitation to attend the meeting next year.

Melanie Snyder (Western Interstate Energy Board) asked Mr. Schmidt if he had a sense about why the NRC did not to attend the Committee's meeting. Mr. Schmidt said he felt it was related to funding, work load, and lack of awareness of what the group does and how the NRC could contribute to it.

Ms. Janairo expressed her disappointment at the NRC's reaction because Tony Hsia had attended the past few NTSF meetings, which suggests the information about the state regional groups was not being filtered up through NRC management. She said the Midwest had asked for someone from the NRC to give an update as well as a speaker to be on the meeting's panel on decommissioning. Ms. Leek added that she had found, with the Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, that they have to go to the NRC in the D.C. area rather than having them meet in the regions.

Mr. Schmidt noted that the NRC's Regulatory Information Conference was less technical and has a broader audience. He said the NRC was talking about combining that and the Regulatory Conference into one meeting. Mr. Wells added that he had found it effective to go directly to Mr. Hsia and explain the importance of having David Pstrak (NRC) at his meeting and present a list of specific issues for Mr. Pstrak to discuss.

WGA WIPP Technical Advisory Group

Ms. Janairo reported on her attendance at the meeting, which was held in Salt Lake City in November. She said Mr. Mason had mentioned to the group that he'd been asked what considerations would go into a decision to have WIPP funding awarded using a formula, which is the funding model proposed for

Section 180(c). She explained that the Midwestern, Northeastern, and Southern regional groups had been okay with a needs-based funding formula for Section 180(c), but the Western groups had advocated for a model similar to WIPP, which awards funds based on a state's reported need. She explained that because only three Midwestern states have WIPP shipments, any change to the funding method would likely be small.

Ms. Janairo said another issue that came up during the meeting, and would be dealt with by the Planning Committee's charter group, was participation on the NTSF AHWGs. She explained that first, at last year's NTSF meeting, a consultant to the state of Nevada who was there representing the state was barred from entering an AHWG meeting room, and second, a member of a Nevada county was interested in participating on the Rail/Routing AHWG.

Mr. Gothard asked if anyone had calculated how funding levels would change if WIPP adopted a formula-based approach. He explained that he was interested in how that might apply to the proposed Section 180(c) approach. Mr. Mason said they had not run numbers yet, but thought that would be the next step. He said the questions arose during the budgeting process because WIPP was not able to quantify why states received the levels of funding they did, other than those being the negotiated amounts. He said he didn't have a lot of information about how WIPP and Section 180(c) funding would be interdependent.

Other State Regional Group Meetings

Ms. Janairo reported that Ms. Tye had attended the Northeast High-Level Radioactive Waste Transportation Task Force meeting in Portland, Maine, in November. Ms. Janairo referred attendees to a handout of Ms. Bickford's presentation at the Northeast's meeting, which detailed changes in management, the program's budget, and status of certain projects. She mentioned that the Northeast had selected John Giarrusso (Massachusetts) and Jerry Humphreys (New Jersey) as the task force's co-chairs.

Ms. Janairo explained that the Midwest had not be able to attend the Southern States Energy Board (SSEB) or Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB) meetings because of limitations in her and Ms. Tye's schedules. She asked Committee members to consider attending future meetings of the regions and TRMTC as they were great opportunities to learn more about what those groups are doing.

Committee Discussion

Results of the Member Survey

Mr. Leuer told attendees that only seven of twelve states had responded to the Committee member survey. He expressed the need to get a higher completion rate for future surveys to show DOE that the states value their participation on the Committee.

Ms. Janairo reviewed the results of the survey, which was distributed to members in a handout. She mentioned that this was the first time the Committee had administered the survey as a requirement under its cooperative agreement with DOE.

Ms. Janairo explained that the Committee had not done outreach via webinars or public information materials to governors or state legislators because of the lack of a repository or transportation program. She said that the Committee could update the brochure that explains what it does and mentioned that

there could be a need to share that information with an even broader audience that includes NRC and DOE management. She and Ms. Tye would look at updating the brochure in 2018.

Ms. Janairo said they had not received any survey responses from the Committee's legislative members. She explained that if a legislative member does not attend two meetings in a row, that the Committee could thank them for their service and look for a replacement. She said the plan was to start looking for new members to take those seats in January. She said she felt it would be a good idea for a subcommittee to consider the best way to engage legislators in the Committee's work.

Ms. Leek asked how legislative members are approached to serve on the Committee. Ms. Janairo explained that the Committee asked for recommendations from the appointing authorities of each legislative body. She and Ms. Tye then look at those recommendations to determine if they are on a shipping route, are members of a relevant committee, or have a nuclear power plant in their district, and seek official appointments through the Midwestern Legislative Conference (MLC).

Mr. Leuer asked if now was the right time to push for legislative participation. Ms. Janairo said if members were interested, the Committee could suggest to the MLC a new approach to legislator involvement, then change the Committee's rules accordingly. Ms. Janairo said the new approach could be to have separate webinars or legislator-specific meetings. Ms. Leek suggested having the MLC appoint just one or two legislators from the region to participate.

Mr. Schmidt mentioned that in the past there had been issues getting legislators oriented to what the Committee does and suggested providing a formal orientation for that whoever ends up being appointed. Ms. Tyrell suggested the Committee reach out to legislative staff because they tend to outlast legislators and a lot of them have subject matter expertise. She said staff could be a good resource to communicate information to the legislators.

Next, Committee members discussed whether they would like to continue meeting twice a year. The members expressed their preference for having two meetings because not every member can make each meeting and because the one held in conjunction with the NTSF is much more condensed.

Finally, Ms. Janairo reminded Committee members to let her know if they were interested in attending either the Waste Management Symposium in March or the Used Fuel Management Conference in May, because there were travel funds to cover both.

Presentation: Nuclear Plant Decommissioning and What It Means for the States

Mr. Leuer introduced the session and explained that nuclear plants in the Midwest, and across the nation, had been shutting down prematurely due largely to competition with cheap natural gas. He said the session was intended to help states understand the process of nuclear plant decommissioning, the regulations that apply, and the transportation impacts that can be expected as the result of a plant shutting down.

Kelly Horn, Illinois Emergency Management Agency

Mr. Horn introduced his presentation on the impacts on Illinois' LLW management program resulting from the decommissioning of Zion Nuclear Power Station. He reviewed the NRC and State of Illinois' definitions of LLW and mentioned that not every state defines LLW in the same way. He explained that NRC has regulatory authority over producers of LLW, as do NRC Agreement States, such as Illinois. He shared the history of federal LLW management policies, specifically the Low-Level Radioactive Waste

Policy Act of 1980 (LLRWA) and the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985. He explained that the LLRWA put the burden of LLW disposal onto the states, created a compact authority, gave states or compacts the authority to embargo imports of waste, and set a time frame for disposal facilities. He added that Illinois' LLW embargo does not prevent LLW from moving through the state, but it cannot be brought in for the purpose of disposal. He said Illinois considers TENORM to be LLW and, therefore, does not allow it to be disposed of in the state.

Mr. Horn explained that Part 61 facilities were not being created in a timely manner and states, through the National Governors Association petitioned the federal government to amend the LLRWA. In 1985, the Act was amended to extend the timeframe for siting disposal facilities; extend the availability of operational disposal sites, establish incentives for compacts and states to create disposal facilities, and create a "take title" provision that says if a state doesn't meet the deadline for a disposal facility, that the state the waste was generated in would have to take possession of it. He said the "take title" provision was ultimately found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Horn reviewed the different LLW waste compacts and explained that Michigan and Nebraska were not part of a compact. He said Illinois was part of the Central Midwest LLW Compact with Kentucky, which was founded in 1984. He explained that the compact lives by a Regional Management Plan that governs how the states are to manage and dispose of LLW. He said the authorizing Compact Act designated Illinois as the host state since Kentucky does not generate much LLW.

Mr. Horn explained that the compacts themselves are sovereign units of government and are neither a federal nor a state agency. He said Illinois entered into a statutory agreement that gave the compact authority to be run at the state level and created the Illinois Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Act, which gave rise to Parts 620 and 609 of the Illinois Administrative Code. He explained that Part 620 required registration of LLW generators, set up annual reporting requirements for LLW generators and brokers, and established a fee structure for LLW generation of \$3 per cubic foot of waste generated or \$30,000 per operating reactor. He said Part 609 requires shippers of LLW to report to the Illinois Emergency Management Agency's (IEMA) tracking system various parameters about the material being shipped. He said IEMA will crosscheck that with their generator information. He reviewed an example of the Electronic Data Transmission (EDT) file that is created when a shipment is reported in the tracking system.

Mr. Horn said Illinois analyzes all of the data entered into the tracking and generator systems and had seen a steady decline in the number of LLW generators in the state. He noted on a bar graph, however, a spike in the activity of the LLW that was shipped in 2014, as the result of Zion decommissioning.

Mr. Horn explained that the decommissioning of Zion has led to an increased workload for the state because of the number of LLW shipments, decommissioning oversight, and changes in radiological environmental monitoring. He recommended that states make sure their rules apply to shut down and operating reactors. He said some fee-based activities needed to be renegotiated with Zion because Illinois' statute referred to "operating" reactors.

Mr. Horn also discussed the issues associated with being the "host state" in a LLW compact. He said because of compact requirements, when Exelon announced the potential closures of the Clinton and Quad Cities nuclear plants, Illinois had to analyze whether it would need to site a LLW facility. He said,

fortunately, the Illinois legislature provided subsidies for nuclear energy that allowed the two plants to remain operational.

Mr. Gothard asked if Illinois changed its training for first responders in the communities around Zion when it decommissioned. Mr. Horn said no, the training stayed the same.

Mr. Massaro asked if the information gathered in the EDT was used as data for the compact or if it was for transportation. Mr. Horn said an EDT is required for anyone who ships any volume of LLW. He added that if a shipment requires an NRC Form 540 or 541, Illinois requires the information in an electronic format. He said shippers use a computer program called RADMAN that creates the 540 and 541 forms and sends them to Illinois.

Ms. Studer asked if Illinois requires an EDT for shipments passing through the state. Mr. Horn said no, EDTs are only required for Illinois generators and shippers, or if a shipment's destination is Illinois (if they were to have a disposal facility in the state).

Ms. Drake asked about the destination of the LLW shipments coming out of Illinois. Mr. Horn said TENORM goes to U.S. Ecology in Deer Creek, Colorado, but most goes to Waste Control Specialists' (WCS) facility in Clive, Utah.

Mike Wiskerchen, EnergySolutions

Mr. Wiskerchen told attendees that he'd spent the last seven years at Zion as Waste Operations Manager and was now Vice President of Site Restoration. He began his presentation by discussing the establishment of the Zion Community Advisory Panel (ZCAP), the purpose of which was to allow open communication between the public and Zion's decommissioning entity, along with the local regulators and any non-public entities that were interested. He said the local community was invited to attend the ZCAP meetings, which were initially held once per quarter, then three times per year, and now twice a year. Mr. Giarrusso asked who the panel members were. Mr. Wiskerchen said there were about 10 people on the panel, including community leaders, first responders, and local government officials.

Mr. Wiskerchen discussed transportation infrastructure and said, historically, the majority of the sites have had rail service, but that it had usually been abandoned. He said EnergySolutions knew they wanted to transition to rail as soon as possible, so they looked at the existing rail to determine whether it could be reworked and then planned an on-site layout. He mentioned the importance of getting input from whomever would be servicing the facility, in their case Union Pacific (UP), to ensure all requirements are met. He said they determined redoing the existing rail wasn't an option because it ran through protected wetlands. Additionally, the curve was too tight to meet UP's standards, so they ended up welding the rail together instead of bolting it, and used concrete ties to secure it. He said that method ended up working well and that there was only one derailment on site of a car that was empty at the time.

Mr. Wiskerchen said while they waited for rail to be an option, they had to make some truck shipments. He emphasized the importance of communicating with the entities along the shipping route prior to shipment. He said during one shipment, there was a lapse in communication with the community of Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin (one of the ZCAP members), which caused some problems because they were along the shipping route. He said EnergySolutions completed that shipment, but agreed not to ship through Wisconsin communities again.

Mr. Wiskerchen showed a photo of the Unit 2 reactor head shipment and described the long transport consist. He explained that, because it took up two lanes of the road, they had to ship between 9 to 10:30 in the morning or wait until 1 to 3 in the afternoon.

Mr. Wiskerchen explained that the initial shipments were of dismantling waste via truck and, other than the large components, were low-density materials like plant interferences and radioactive asbestos. He then described the process of transitioning from highway to rail shipments, which involved modifying the site to allow for rail service, consulting UP, and notifying the Transportation Security Administration of the hazardous materials shipments. He explained that the larger rail packages allowed for more efficient dismantling and removal.

Mr. Wiskerchen showed photos of the rail line that goes into Chicago. He said people had a lot concerns about running a freight train with radioactive materials on a passenger rail line. He said Positive Train Control is in place, however, and is run by UP's headquarters in Nebraska. He showed attendees photos of two rail packages; one with eight intermodal freight containers that could hold 177 tons and another with high-sided "super" gondolas that were about 2600 cubic feet and could hold around 100 tons. He said decommissioning accelerates with rail service because rail utilizes the largest packaging available and it is also a cost-efficient mode of transportation.

Mr. Wiskerchen next discussed the removal and shipment of reactor vessel internals (RVI). He said they transported RVI segments via cask for disposal. He said the NRC established its Part 37 security requirements for transportation of Category 1 and 2 quantities of radioactive material in the middle of decommissioning, but the site was given exemptions, provided it had a contingency plan. He showed a picture of the RVI transportation cask, which was oversize and overweight. He explained that the activity spike Mr. Horn showed during his presentation was due to a huge campaign of that shipment type. He said they had such a large campaign because they wanted to get the waste to WCS before the contract ended.

Mr. Wiskerchen said the site had 98 shipments in 2015, 193 shipments in 2016, and 1,350 in 2017. He said in 2017 they typically did between 40 to 50 shipments per week using the gondola cars.

Mr. Field asked if they ran into any roundabouts doing truck shipments. Mr. Wiskerchen said yes, the head shipment did in Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin, and a couple sets of wheels actually went onto the curb. He said, if needed, the trailer could be disconnected and remote controlled to maneuver through tight turns.

Ms. Westra asked how long the truck shipment was on the road and how fast it went. Mr. Wiskerchen said it went a maximum speed of 55 miles per hour and was on the road for nine days en route to Utah. He explained that at 14 feet in diameter, the head shipment was too big to be shipped by rail.

Ms. Westra asked if the ZCAP was an NRC requirement or something EnergySolutions decided to do on their own. Mr. Wiskerchen said that was the company's decision to get the public involved to keep an open line of communication. He added that people who are uninformed about the issue tend to get worried about radioactive materials transportation. Mr. Giarrusso mentioned that Pilgrim, which was still running, had a 21-person advisory panel.

Mr. Schmidt noted the huge variety of containers used for LLW shipments and the issues that go along with that. He said he had staff contact Zion and LACBWR to get an idea of the sheer amount of waste

that was involved in decommissioning. He said, as of the end of October 2017, 37 Class B and C casks and 234 million pounds of Class A waste had been shipped from Zion. He said the shipment from LACBWR started by truck to a rail head in Minnesota, then by rail to Clive, Utah. He noted that Wisconsin and Minnesota had some initial difficulties attempting to coordinate around the shipment. He said, as of November 2017, LACBWR had shipped 680 intermodal vehicles by truck to the railhead in Minnesota for a total of 25 million pounds of waste. He added that Kewaunee, which shut down in 2013, is a single unit plant, but is much more sizeable and shipments will have to cross the whole state. He said Wisconsin will have to do a lot of planning and preparation at the state and local levels prior to those shipments taking place.

U.S. Department of Energy Program Reports and Discussion

Mr. Leuer reminded attendees that the Committee exists to help the states engage with DOE on shipments. He added that, while CSG Midwest staffs the Committee, the funding for all of the Committee's activities comes from DOE. He expressed his appreciation for the ongoing support that the region receives from DOE. He noted that representatives from two of the three DOE offices were in attendance. He explained that DOE-NE declined to send a representative for the reasons mentioned earlier during the Transportation Core Group discussion.

Office of Packaging and Transportation

Ms. Edge explained that OPT covers packaging certification and transportation for DOE-NE as well as DOE-EM. She said the DOE-EM budget request for Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 was \$6.5 billion and represented 20% of DOE's entire budget. She reviewed the Office's cleanup progress and said there had been a 90% overall reduction in the defense-waste footprint since they began in the 1980s. She said there are 16 sites in 11 states with remaining cleanup activities.

Next, Ms. Edge showed a DOE route map and noted that it was different from the one they used in the past. She explained that they switched to a system called ArcGIS that will let them update their routes in real time. She said once the program goes live it will allow people to zoom in and see route details. She said in FY17, DOE transported materials 1.8 million miles with no reportable incidents related to packaging or transportation.

Ms. Edge highlighted recent cleanup activities at the Oak Ridge, Portsmouth/Paducah, and Savannah River sites. She reviewed a breakdown of DOE-EM's shipments in FY17, 72% of which were of LLW. She explained that the "other" category, which accounted for 20% of DOE-EM shipments, included some spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste and was basically a catch-all for waste that doesn't fall into another category.

Ms. Edge reviewed the DOE-EM organization chart and explained that the EM-1 (Assistant Secretary) position was currently unfilled. She said James Owendoff, the previous acting EM-1, was now the official EM-2 (Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary).

Ms. Edge shared OPT's new mission statement and said, currently, management remained interested in engaging with stakeholders. She said they were working to get DOE-NE management to understand the importance of stakeholder engagement. She said at least four levels of management above her agree that stakeholders are crucial to their project.

Ms. Edge then reviewed the five pillars of OPT: packaging certification, outreach & emergency preparedness, regulations & standards support, transportation risk reduction, and program & site support. She said they were working to redesign the TEPP website to work with other programs, like START. She said OPT was charged with three DOE Orders: 460.1D, 460.2B, and 460.3. She explained that an attachment to DOE Order 460.2B (Departmental Materials Transportation and Packaging Management) had been the focus of the NTSF Transportation Practices AHWG, but had gotten held up by the administration. She said Joe Martinez (DOE-EM) was working to get the transportation practices attachment moving again.

Mr. Leuer asked if DOE ever provided public outreach on its shipping campaigns and history. He said he felt there was an important story to be told about the safe transportation of radioactive materials and was interested in inviting DOE to speak at a gathering of state emergency management stakeholders. Ms. Edge said she had been doing outreach work through the TEPP program, but there wasn't an official Departmental policy on that subject.

Ms. Edge mentioned that the person in charge of the Prospective Shipment Report (PSR) was retiring and those duties had been transferred to Mr. Martinez, who had just sent out the October PSR. She explained the PSR process of gathering information about high-visibility shipments and campaigns from DOE sites.

Ms. Edge said she had a handout about the HAMMER training facility. She said she would be in Richland, Washington, in March and can find out more about the facility so she can speak in more detail about it.

Ms. Janairo complimented the new route map and asked Ms. Edge to confirm the name of the program used to create it. Ms. Edge said the program was ArcGIS and explained the benefits. Ms. Janairo asked what the colors on the map represented because there was no legend. Ms. Edge explained that red lines were major highways and interstates, black lines were truck routes, and blue lines were rail routes. She said there were some limitations to the routing software, for example, there is a rail route that appears to end in the middle of nowhere, when there is actually a rail spur there.

Ms. Janairo asked what still needed to be done with the 460.2B order. Ms. Edge said they've decided to get rid of the process DOE used to use for getting an order revision approved through the system. She said the new process involves getting a group of experts from different DOE offices together to determine if the language NTSF submitted is appropriate and correct with the order change. If so, they can move forward with the NTSF recommendations, but if there are any disagreements there will have to be a reconciliation process. Ms. Janairo asked if NTSF members would be involved in the reconciliation process. Ms. Edge said she did not think so, but that no order had actually gone through the new process, yet.

Ms. Janairo asked if OPT was represented on the FEMA Rad Training Focus Group. Ms. Edge said yes.

Ms. Janairo asked if it would be possible to have a webinar on Greater-Than-Class-C since the report to Congress was recently issued. Ms. Edge said she had been told that this was not the time for a webinar, but that she would continue to bring it up.

Ms. Westra asked Ms. Edge to explain the difference between the Transportation Routing Analysis GIS (TRAGIS) and START programs. Ms. Edge said they were still putting time into TRAGIS, but it wasn't being

funded. She explained that START is an out-of-the-box program that has been modified for DOE-NE's needs.

Mr. Field asked if everyone had access to the DOE route map. Ms. Edge said a URL would be sent out as soon as she's able to get all of the routes appearing correctly.

Carlsbad Field Office

Mr. Mason said the emplacement rate at WIPP was five to six shipments per week, but the goal for FY18 was to ramp-up to eight to 10 shipments per week. He explained that ground control (efforts to keep the mine from collapsing) and ventilation (how many miners they can have underground doing things like mining and ground control) were the two things holding up the emplacement rate. He said an interim ventilation system will carry them through to FY22. While they're using that, they're digging a new ventilation shaft that will triple the amount of air they can put through.

Mr. Mason said no shipments were planned from ANL for the upcoming year (August 2017-18). He said he did not have a route map with him, but out of ANL, shipments would essentially take I-80 all the way across Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska. He said those shipments would be in shielded containers, if they can get that together. He explained that what they pull out of the sites is dependent upon a "basis of knowledge," which is the standard by which they're allowed to emplace the waste. He said a new "basis of knowledge" was created after the incident at Los Alamos National Laboratory and each site is responsible for meeting that.

Mr. Mason discussed long-range planning assumptions. He said they were planning for 10 shipments per week until FY21, then would jump up to 17 per week for about 42 shipping weeks per year. He explained that FY21 was when the new ventilation shaft will go in.

Mr. Mason reviewed some of the site's milestones. In November, they received the 100th shipment since shipping resumed and received the 12,000th shipment since WIPP first started up. He showed an illustration of the various factors that affect WIPP's shipping and emplacement rates. He noted that transportation was not a factor.

Mr. Mason said Ron Macaluso was retiring January 31 and Marsha Beekman had retired.

Mr. Mason said the FY18 WIPP Transportation Exercise (WIPPTREX) would be held in Mississippi. He said they try to do one exercise per region per year, but could do up to three per year. He said he would like to do a demonstration project at one of the Midwest's meetings next year. He said they were looking to do another WIPP exercise in New Mexico. He said they just did one there, but traffic associated with the oil field in the Permian Basin had caused four accidents where shipments lost their windshields and five fatal non-WIPP crashes. He explained that they had gotten tentative approval from New Mexico and Texas to change the southern route. He said they have temporary authorization to use that route and expected it to become official next year.

Ms. Janairo suggested to Mr. Mason that they schedule a conference call with representatives from Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska in early 2018 to discuss readiness for WIPP shipments. Mr. Mason said he would like to do that.

Ms. Janairo asked Mr. Mason if there was support from CBFO management for state and tribal engagement. Mr. Mason said he was receiving support, but noted that the budget was tight, especially for travel.

Ms. Janairo asked if the WIPP Communications Work Group would be resuming its activities and suggested the group meet at the NTSF meeting in 2018. She added that it would be much appreciated to have the press releases on WIPP milestones acknowledge the involvement of the states and tribes in transportation. Mr. Mason said an article in the DOE newsletter that announced the 12,000th shipment was republished from an internal Nuclear Waste Partnership announcement, which is why it didn't mention state and tribal involvement. He said he suggested they modify similar articles in the future to include recognition of states and tribes.

Cooperative Agreement Group Reports

CSG Eastern Regional Conference

Mr. Giarrusso reported that the Northeast Task Force held its fall meeting on November 1 and 2 in Portland, Maine. He said the task force was able to fill a long-standing vacancy from Delaware with the appointment of Freida Fisher-Tyler. He noted that the presentations from the meeting were posted online. He added that Eric Howes of 3 Yankees gave an update because they have three power plants in the ISFSI stage. He said he and Mr. Humphreys submitted comments to Uldis Vanags (CSG/ERC) on the Northeast's letter to DOE. Finally, he mentioned that he was chairing the 2018 National Radiological Emergency Preparedness Conference in Seattle on April 16-19. He encouraged people to attend and said that registration was open.

Southern States Energy Board (SSEB)

Mr. Wells said the incoming chairman for the SSEB was Mississippi Governor Phil Bryant. He said the governor is interested in nuclear, cyber security, and technology jobs. He mentioned that the South was holding a WIPPTREX in Mississippi on March 22-24, working with a different group of first responders on each of the three days. He gave a brief recap of the SSEB committee meeting that was held the prior week. He mentioned he had speakers from the FRA and CVSA and said he been encouraging CVSA Level VI training in his states because of low numbers; Mississippi, for example, only had two inspectors and they were not close to the I-20 route used for WIPP shipments. He said other speakers included Lillie Lane with the Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency; a representative of FEMA's RadResponder Network; Terry Soulsby with Nordion; and a representative of Canadian Instruments, which has an app that turns a smart phone into a dosimeter. He said the SSEB Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee was led by Alan Jacobson (Maryland), chair, and Roger Thompson (Tennessee), vice chair; the Transuranic Transportation Working Group was chaired by Denise Brooks (Texas) and Mark Wyland (Georgia) was vice chair. Finally, he mentioned that former Arkansas Sen. Eddie Joe Williams was appointed SSEB's new federal representative in Washington. He said Sen. Williams was a former SSEB member and had worked for UP for 30 years. He said his boss and Sen. Williams were in D.C. meeting with several federal officials and that he had briefed them on what was going on with DOE-NE management.

Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB)

Ms. Snyder reported on the WIEB HLW Committee's fall meeting in October. She said presenters included Mike McBride (Van Ness Feldman), Per Peterson (UC Berkeley), and Bob Halstead (Nevada), who presented on Nevada's opposition to the Yucca Mountain licensing project. She said Matt Feldman

(Oak Ridge National Laboratory) presented on the Used Nuclear Fuel-Storage, Transportation & Disposal Analysis Resource and Data System tool. She noted that there was some pushback from the committee on the assumptions that went into the tool. She said the committee re-elected Ken Niles (Oregon) as chair and elected Rich Baker (Arizona) as vice chair. She mentioned that all of the meeting presentations were posted online. She said the HLW Committee approved a set of policy papers that were now being reviewed by the WIEB executive board to hopefully become official WIEB policy.

Western Governors' Association (WGA)

Lauren DeNinno (WGA) reported that funding for the WGA WIPP Transportation Advisory Group from WIPP was under control, but the group was still waiting for funding from DOE-EM. She said the DOE-EM funding was important to them because WGA was interested in hosting the 2019 NTSF meeting and had planned to start looking for a hotel in the new year.

Ms. DeNinno said the resumption of WIPP shipments had gone relatively smoothly. She said some of the Western states observed that, because of the hiatus in shipping, it was difficult to maintain the interest of first responders along the routes. She said Nevada wanted to have a road show to drum up interest, but that other states didn't want to start that until shipments are imminent.

Ms. DeNinno mentioned that Mr. Niles was organizing the opening plenary session of the 2018 NTSF Annual Meeting on WIPP Transportation Safety and the origin of WIPP.

Ms. Westra asked Ms. DeNinno to explain the difference between WGA and WIEB. Ms. DeNinno explained that they were separate organizations and were funded by different DOE offices. Ms. Janairo added that her understanding for the bifurcation was Nevada's position in opposing DOE on Yucca Mountain but wanting to cooperate with DOE on shipments to other sites (e.g., WIPP).

Committee Discussion

DOE-NE Information Requests

Ms. Janairo explained that DOE-NE was looking for information from the SRGs and tribes on three topics. She said the first request was for historical input on past privatization proposals and the region's current position. She shared a four-page summary of the Midwest's past comments and concerns about the prospect of having a private contractor manage the transportation system.

Next, Ms. Janairo skipped to the third research request, which was for a "summary of legal frameworks by state for Class 7 HRCQ shipments that would apply to spent nuclear fuel shipments conducted by rail, highway, or barge (where applicable), including any fee structures, requirements to escort or other security measures, and requirements to conduct safety inspections." She mentioned that this request should be relatively easy for the Midwest because the *Planning Guide* has a lot of the same information.

Ms. Janairo said the second request, due May 15, 2018, was for "economic and social considerations for removing spent fuel from nuclear power plant sites, accounting for public perceptions, pressures, and economic conditions relating to tax revenue, employment, site redevelopment, and public services. Of primary interest are communities around shutdown sites, but input from communities around operating sites is also welcome." She said she had requested more information from DOE about what they were looking for because the request seemed like a significant data gathering request and didn't relate much to transportation. She said Ms. Bickford explained that DOE wants to know what they can expect from communities when they are ready to ship. Ms. Janairo said she was comfortable completing the first and

third requests, but the second one was concerning because she didn't see the value to the Committee or how it related to the cooperative agreement. She added that she felt it was a gesture to the regions to demonstrate value to DOE management, but there are other ways to do that. She said, with the Committee's support, she would push back on the second request.

Mr. Schmidt said he had specific information about Kewaunee that he could share, if it would be helpful. He also noted that local communities tend to be very supportive of nuclear plants when they're operating, but not after they're shutdown because of lost tax revenue and land that can't be repurposed.

Mr. Snee said he didn't feel that anyone would object to spent fuel leaving the site. Mr. Gothard said he had actually encountered the exact opposite sentiment at a public service commission meeting in Michigan. He said organized anti-nuclear groups were talking about transportation of SNF. He said he questioned them offline about their concerns and determined that the groups were essentially against the very existence of the waste and would attempt to block anything to do with transportation.

Ms. Westra suggested looking at the NRC's generic EIS for decommissioning plants, as it contained information about socioeconomic issues, such as the impact on a community's tax base.

Mr. Giarrusso said the issues in the second request are what the plant community advisory panels are focused on and they have nothing to do with transportation.

Mr. Leuer said the second request seemed like mission creep and was not within the scope of what the governor authorized him to participate in when he was appointed to the committee. Mr. Gothard agreed.

Ms. Janairo said she would let Ms. Bickford know that the Committee was declining to complete the second research request, as it was outside its scope, but that she would offer to work over the summer to turn the request into a more relevant project to be completed during Year 3 of the cooperative agreement.

DAY 2

Presentation: DOE's DUF6 Conversion Project

Mr. Leuer reminded attendees that, back in 2007, the Committee visited Piketon, Ohio, to see the D&D going on at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant and also see the new facility DOE was building for converting the department's enormous inventory of depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF6). He added that, at the time, the region was expecting DOE to begin shipping uranium oxide from the conversion process through the Midwest (a rail shipping program that would last 18-25 years), however, delays in deciding on a disposal facility kept those shipments from materializing. He introduced Reinhard Knerr, the Federal Project Director for DOE's Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office (PPPO).

Mr. Knerr provided background on DOE's three gaseous diffusion plants (GDP), located in Portsmouth, Ohio; Paducah, Kentucky; and Oak Ridge, Tennessee. He explained that the uranium hexafluoride (UF6) at the sites was converted into two waste streams: an enriched stream, which was shipped offsite to other DOE facilities for further reprocessing, and a depleted stream of DUF6, which was stored on site or

repurposed. He said all three GDP were shut down by 2013 and DOE was now focusing on the cleanup of those sites.

Mr. Knerr said the PPPO was established in 2002 to focus on cleanup activity at the Portsmouth and Paducah sites, specifically, D&D of legacy facilities, environmental cleanup work, and remediation of legacy burial grounds. He said, additionally, the project began working on the conversion of DOE's inventory of DUF6 into uranium oxide and constructed two virtually identical conversion facilities, one at each site.

Mr. Knerr explained that, after 50 years of operation, the inventory of DUF6 at GDP was approximately 65,000 cylinders, all at Portsmouth and Paducah. He said they had processed some of that material, so the remaining inventory was 62,000 cylinders. He showed photos of the DUF6 cylinders and explained that the typical canister was 48 inches in diameter, approximately 12 feet long and can hold 10 tons of DUF6.

Mr. Knerr explained that the DUF6 needed to be converted because, in the event of a release, it can react with the moisture in the air and form toxic gas. He said uranium oxide, on the other hand, is an insoluble powder that does not react with either water or air.

Mr. Knerr said DOE broke ground on the two conversion facilities in 2004 and the plants began initial operations in late-2010 and early-2011. He said operations were expected to continue at the Portsmouth site until the mid-2030s and at the Paducah facility until the mid-2040s. He said, afterwards, DOE may use these facilities for processing commercial DUF6, which it is obligated to do under current law, if requested.

Mr. Knerr went into more detail about the DUF6 conversion process. He explained that there are four production lines at Paducah and three production lines at Portsmouth, and each line has two autoclaves. He said it takes roughly 48 hours to load one cylinder into an autoclave, remove the material, and empty the cylinder, which means they are able to process one cylinder per day per line. He explained that the cylinders are the most radioactive when they come out of the autoclave, so they are placed on an aging pad for 30 to 60 days while the short-lived decay products decay. He said the cylinders are then brought back into the facility, neutralized, and modified with a flange, so they can be used to store and ship uranium oxide.

Mr. Knerr explained that the UF6, once it is removed from a cylinder, goes into a conversion unit where it is mixed with steam and hydrogen. He said, as a result, uranium oxide drops out of the conversion unit and is vacuumed into a powder hopper, while hydrogen fluoride (HF) gas rises to the top of the unit. He said when the powder hopper is full, it compacts the uranium oxide into briquettes, and then gravity feeds it into the modified cylinders. He said the hydrogen gas is condensed into a liquid, put in very large tanks, and sampled, before being loaded onto railcars or trucks for shipping offsite.

Mr. Knerr said the designed production of the two sites is 31,500 metric tons (MT) of DUF6 per year, but the maximum they have achieved is 22,000 MT per year. He said they are still working to understand the nuances of the sites and get the desired throughput. He said, at the designed production rate, they should generate 3,000 cylinders of oxide and 145 rail tank cars of HF per year.

Mr. Knerr told attendees that offsite shipments of uranium oxide can be made by rail, in modified gondola railcars, or by truck. He said since the start of conversion operations in 2011, DOE has converted approximately 4,650 cylinders. He said the goal for FY18 is to convert 1,800 cylinders.

Mr. Knerr explained that the HF byproduct was collected for commercial reuse. He said recycling is beneficial to DOE because it avoids further processing and additional commercial production, and it offsets a portion of operating costs for the plants. He said since the initial operations, the facilities have collected almost 10 million gallons of HF in 480 rail tank cars.

Mr. Knerr said that DOE continues to seek reuse opportunities for the DUF6 inventory, including processing to retrieve usable fissile uranium. He said about 40% of the DUF6 inventory is suitable for further enrichment, depending on the price of uranium and the operational costs associated with re-enrichment. He said DOE has a contract in place with a commercial company for re-enrichment, however the contract has several off-ramps and may not be viable under current market conditions. He said in the event that the sales contract does proceed, the DUF6 resulting from re-enrichment would be returned to DOE inventory at Paducah, which will extend conversion operations. He said DOE is limiting the conversion of DUF6 to the 60% that is not suitable for re-enrichment, which will take around 10 years at Portsmouth and 14 years at Paducah (versus 17 years and 27 years, respectively). Mr. Knerr said there are no plans for re-enrichment activities at this time.

Mr. Knerr explained that the NEPA process must be completed prior to initiating the transportation and disposal of converted oxide. He said Phase 1 of the process, the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, was completed in 1999, and Phase 2, the site-specific Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), was completed in 2004. He said they were now working to complete Phase 3, a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) updating the FEIS analyses to include the disposal facility WCS. He explained that the original FEIS decision excluded WCS because they were not a licensed facility at the time. He said, following the completion of the SEIS, the Project's Records of Decision will be amended and shipment information will be finalized.

Mr. Knerr said the DUF6 project has 90 gondola cars that were previously modified to hold six cylinders of oxide each. He said it is anticipated that, once shipments begin, up to 3,000 cylinders would be shipped per year. He said a truck shipment would be able to accommodate up to two cylinders per truck.

Mr. Knerr reviewed the three potential disposal sites for the oxide cylinders that are being considered in the SEIS. He said the first, WCS in West Texas, is able to receive rail shipments. He said the next, the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS), would require trans-loading rail to truck or direct truck shipments. He said the third, EnergySolutions in Utah, can receive shipments by rail.

Mr. Knerr showed maps of the rail and truck transportation routes to the three potential disposal sites. He described additional transportation and disposal challenges, which include the NRC's pending decision about how DUF6 should be classified (it is Class A currently, but the NRC is reevaluating and the decision may impact disposal facility requirements); the completion of performance assessments at NNSS; a moratorium in Utah on the bulk disposal of uranium oxide by the NRC; and the availability of funding for transportation and disposal activities.

Mr. Knerr talked in further detail about the potential for the sites to be used for the processing of commercial DUF6. He explained that DOE has an obligation from the USEC Privatization Act of 1995 to receive and process commercial DUF6. He said, at this time, no commercial entities have notified DOE of their intent to do this, but several have asked about cost estimates for these services. He said the known commercial inventory projections are about the same as the initial DOE inventory.

Jeffrey Moore (FRA) asked Mr. Knerr what the anticipated timeline for rail shipping was. Mr. Knerr said it was dependent on budget, but that he would target 2024 for rail shipments so they would have enough inventory to make shipments routinely.

Ms. Janairo asked where the potential re-enrichment facility would be built. Mr. Knerr said Global Laser Enrichment (GLE) was proposing to build the facility immediately off the DOE reservation in Paducah, Kentucky. He said if that happens, cylinders from Portsmouth would be put into overpacks and shipped to that facility, and at Paducah, the plan would be for the conversion and re-enrichment facilities to abut one another. He added that GLE would be responsible for packaging and transporting the cylinders from Portsmouth to Paducah. Ms. Janairo asked if GLE would coordinate with the states, similar to how DOE would. Mr. Knerr said he would assume so, but could not speak for GLE commercially.

Ms. Janairo asked if there was a reason for the two different types of cylinders. Mr. Knerr explained that, back in the day, the thin-walled cylinders were preferred, but commercial enrichers currently use thick-walled cylinders, as required by the NRC.

Ms. Janairo asked if DOE planned to coordinate with the states prior to shipping the uranium oxide. Mr. Knerr said yes, they would be very engaged with stakeholders, and offered to host another tour for the Committee.

Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance Report

Carlisle Smith (CVSA) explained that CVSA began in 1980 as an informal gathering of Western state agencies and Canadian provinces. He said, today, voting members include representatives of all 50 states (state police, public utilities, public service commissions, and departments of transportation), Canadian provinces and territories, and Mexico's federal government. He said they also have non-voting members from local police departments, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMSCA), the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), DOE-CBFO, Transport Canada, and industry. He added that the federal members are ex-officio, have a say in what the Alliance does, and are part of the committee structure.

Mr. Smith reviewed CVSA's core activities, which include the roadside commercial motor vehicle inspector certification process, the North American Standard (NAS) Inspection procedures, the NAS Training Program, the CVSA decal program, NAS out-of-service criteria, outreach and education, policy development, and the Level VI inspection program.

Mr. Smith explained that CVSA was made up of nine special committees, each run by a committee chair, vice chair, and voting members. He mentioned that the CVSA executive director acts as a lobbyist on Capitol Hill and will advocate on behalf of members based on the policy positions developed by the committees.

Mr. Smith said, in addition to committees, CVSA also has a series of programs, three of which are operated as "program committees". He said Todd Armstrong with the Illinois State Police is the Level VI

program committee chair and Rion Stann from the Pennsylvania State Police is the vice chair. He explained that the CVSA Level VI committee oversees the out-of-service criterion and any updates to training. He said they also have a Cooperative Hazardous Materials Enforcement Development (COHMED) Program that holds an annual conference, usually the last week in January, where they have sessions on different hazmat training. He said they received a PHMSA grant that year to hold two-day, topic-specific COHMED courses in the regions.

Mr. Smith explained that the Level VI inspection was a stricter, enhanced version of the NAS inspection. He said the 2018 version of the Level VI inspection procedures and out-of-service criteria was on its way to the printer and he hoped to have it back in January. He said states could get a copy at no cost and to email him or Ms. Janairo if they were interested.

Mr. Smith said there were currently 716 CVSA Level VI certified state inspectors, six FMCSA certified Level VI inspectors, and 10 Canadian certified Level VI inspectors. He said, in the Midwest, South Dakota is the only state that does not have a certified inspector.

Mr. Smith explained that there was a national team of CVSA Level VI instructors, which included Mr. Horn and Rob Rohr (Ohio Public Utilities Commission) in the Midwest. He said every two years, states are required to send one to two people to a Level VI train-the-trainer (TTT) refresher course. He said in 2017, they certified 71 new Level VI inspectors, including individuals with the Iowa Department of Transportation and Missouri State Highway Patrol.

Mr. Smith said in calendar year (CY) 18, they were funded for eight Level VI classes. He said they would be in Jefferson City, Missouri, on May 14-17 and in Springfield, Illinois, on June 18-21. He said Minnesota had asked for a class, but he needed to confirm that no WIPP states were interested, first.

Mr. Smith reviewed the Level VI roadside inspection data from CY17, which he said came from the FMCSA Motor Carrier Management Information System (MCMIS). He said Michigan had conducted 37 point of origin inspections, which were all related to the Co-60 shipments from Nordion. There were no en route inspections in the Midwest.

Mr. Smith said he expects inspection data for CY18 to increase. He said he was most interested in the Level VI inspections with no violation (over 96% in CY17), with violations (over 3%), and with out-of-service violations (just over 2%). He said the data shows violations are trending down.

Mr. Smith said reviewed the types of violations found during CY17. The majority were classified as “no shipping papers,” but this really meant that information in the shipping papers was missing, not the papers themselves. He said this was an issue with the FMCSA system that makes violations appear worse than they actually are. He said the rest of the violations were mechanical issues. He said the MCMIS system is available to the public.

Ms. Janairo asked if the CVSA Midwestern region matched up with the Committee’s. Mr. Smith said it did not and that he would send her a map.

Ms. Janairo asked Mr. Smith to clarify CVSA’s funding restrictions for Level VI refresher training. Mr. Smith said he was funded to do TTT courses, but that any state could send someone to the refresher training at the COHMED conference.

Ms. Janairo asked if Minnesota could send people to other states' training. Mr. Smith said, yes, but he limits the class to 25 students. He said some states require registration for out-of-state attendees, but others are more casual. Ms. Janairo reminded Committee members that there was funding in the cooperative agreements to send people to trainings.

Ms. Janairo asked Mr. Smith to send her a link to FMSCA's online data. Mr. Smith said he would, but noted that it runs 30 days behind.

State Rail Safety Managers Program Report

Mr. Stead explained that the FRA's State Rail Safety Participation Program was established under a cooperative agreement with the FRA and states under 49 CFR 212. He said the program provides free training and federal certification for state inspectors in the following disciplines: Hazardous Materials, Motive Power & Equipment (MP&E), Operating Practices, Signal & Train Control, Track, and Highway-Rail Grade Crossings (smaller component). He noted that Positive Train Control (PTC) has made it necessary to have more signal & train control inspectors. He explained that Illinois was in a unique situation because, in addition to installing PTC, Union Pacific was implementing segments of high-speed rail. He explained that Illinois spends significantly more state money (\$39 million per year) to improve grade crossings than most other states that rely only on federal money available under the Section 130.

Mr. Stead said the program requires states to designate an agency to have jurisdiction over the safety practices of the facilities, equipment, rolling stock, and operations of railroads. In addition, state inspectors must be bona fide state employees. He said it was challenging for the state to find and keep inspectors because the railroads and FRA offer the same job at a significantly higher salary. He said Illinois' salary is much higher than most (\$75K to \$110K per year) because they are unionized, but other states pay as little as \$35K per year for inspectors. He said there are over 180 federally-certified state inspectors, which represents 33% of the national railroad inspection force.

Mr. Stead said the Association of State Rail Safety Managers (ASRSM) is made up of 31 state representatives (14 from DOTs and 17 from regulatory agencies). He said railroads would prefer to see all the inspection programs managed by DOTs because they'd see less regulation. He explained that public utilities commissions tend to expect more and have higher standards for railroads (e.g., walkways for personnel so they'll be less susceptible to trips and falls; facilities for personnel, like showers and bathrooms). He said he'd seen several attempts to move programs to the DOTs and that Missouri and Texas had both done so recently. He said he didn't expect this push to change.

Mr. Stead said, in the Midwest, South Dakota, Kansas, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Indiana don't participate in the ASRSM program, but that Wisconsin might join. He said North Dakota and Minnesota started programs recently, in response to the crude oil shipments. He explained that it often takes a significant incident, like the Lac Megantic crude oil disaster, for state legislatures to begin funding rail inspection programs. He said the average number of inspectors per state was between 15 and 18. He showed a breakdown of the state inspectors by discipline and noted that Track and MP&E were the most heavily populated.

Mr. Stead reviewed the activities under the Track discipline. He said inspections require the annual check of all main line, siding, and yard tracks, and are conducted by walking the track or riding hi-rail vehicles. Any deviations from the Federal Standards will result in railroads being cited for defects or violations. He explained that track inspectors are looking specifically at the following components: rail,

ballast/drainage, crossties, alignment, gauge, crosslevel, vegetation, switches, and frogs. He showed photos of ideal versus defective track components.

Mr. Stead said the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), the FRA, and the state are all involved in rail accident investigations, with NTSB being the lead agency for severe accidents.

Mr. Leuer asked if rail inspectors were cross-trained or if they had a single discipline. Mr. Stead said they were primarily focused on a single discipline, but do have some cross training on certain aspects. He said he would be hesitant to have a signal inspector inspect the track.

Ms. Westra asked how tracks, signals, and crossings were inspected on tribal lands. Mr. Moore explained that wherever a Class 1 railroad operates, the FRA has authority to go there to inspect.

Ms. Westra asked if the FRA did inspections at the same frequency as that states do theirs. Mr. Moore said, without complete knowledge, he'd say yes. Mr. Stead added that the ASRSM wanted to ask the FRA to adjust legislation so that tribal members would be recognized as states and could become certified inspectors. Ms. Westra said she appreciated that and said to let her know if TRMTC could help push the issue. Mr. Moore said he believed the issue would be how to define a tribal group's territory.

Mr. Stead asked Committee members to reach out to the rail program managers in their states and encourage them to get involved. He suggested inviting them to exercises or meetings so they can learn, like he did, why it was important to be involved in the planning for shipments of radioactive material.

Committee Business Session resumes

Election of Co-Chair for 2018-2019

Mr. Gothard volunteered to serve as co-chair. Mr. Leuer nominated him and Mr. Schmidt seconded the nomination. The Committee unanimously elected Mr. Gothard to serve as co-chair in 2018 and 2019.

Committee Discussion

DOE-NE Research Request on Privatization

The Committee returned to the discussion about DOE-NE's research request on privatization. Mr. Leuer reviewed the Midwest's past position on the issue and the Committee agreed to keep that position.

NTSF Meeting Planning

Ms. Janairo asked for two or three volunteers to help with planning the NTSF Newcomers Orientation webinar and on-site session. Ms. Studer and Mr. Gothard volunteered to help.

Ms. Janairo let Committee members know that they may get invitations from session organizers to participate in other panels, such as the opening plenary on the WIPP transportation safety program, or the closing plenary on best practices in collaboration. She encouraged the members to participate in these sessions.

NNPP Exercise Planning

Mr. Leuer reminded members that the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP) holds exercises every two or three years in connection with its shipments of naval spent nuclear fuel. He asked Ms. Drake to report on Missouri's interest in hosting the next NNPP exercise.

Ms. Drake said she talked to Barry Miles (NNPP) and Mark Salomon (NNPP) at the NTSF meeting in Pittsburgh about Missouri potentially hosting an exercise. She said she contacted Mr. Salomon in

September to let him know the state was interested. She said he got back and told her that NNPP was in internal discussions about whether to do the full exercise every two years or every three years. He told her they would be deciding in January 2018, and by February 2018 Missouri would know whether they'd be hosting an exercise in the late summer of 2019 or 2020. She said the exercise will likely be on the BNSF rail lines in Moberly or Macon.

Ms. Janairo said CSG Midwest would build in travel funding in the cooperative agreement for members to attend. She said it might be possible to hold the summer Transportation Core Group meeting in conjunction with the exercise.

Spring 2018 Meeting

Mr. Leuer asked Committee members to let Ms. Janairo know if there were any topics or speakers they'd like to see on the agenda at the spring meeting in Omaha. He asked members to consider whether to have the DOE office and NRC staff stop by to visit with the Committee during the meeting. Ms. Drake said that would be nice to have them if there were specific topics the Committee wanted to address with them. Mr. Leuer said he would like to have DOE-NE talk about the future of the SRGs. The Committee indicated they would like to have NRC there to impress upon them the importance of having a representative at all meetings.

The Committee discussed whether it should try to recruit SHINE and NorthStar as speakers. Mr. Schmidt said it might be better to have them at the fall 2018 meeting, depending on where it is. Ms. Janairo said Indiana was scheduled to host the next fall meeting, but it would be possible to have it in Wisconsin instead.

Mr. Field asked if state legislators would be invited to either the spring or fall meetings. Ms. Janairo said she would ask Mike McCabe (CSG Midwest) about giving a presentation during the MLC Executive Committee meeting in Winnipeg about nominating legislators to the Committee.

Committee Work Group Assignments

Ms. Janairo reviewed the work group assignments for 2018. Mr. Stead was added to the Regional Routing work group. Mr. Boswell and Mr. Horn were added to the Regional Outreach work group that will look into planning a tour of WIPP in 2018.

Ms. Janairo said she would send a Doodle poll to schedule a conference call with the co-chairs and past chair to discuss ideas for legislator engagement.

Committee Outreach

Ms. Janairo asked members about their internal processes for communicating information from the meetings to their colleagues in state government.

Mr. Snee said he prepares a trip report for his upper management.

Ms. Studer said she and Laura Dresen (Indiana) write up a report on what they learned at the meeting.

Mr. Schmidt said he had no report-writing requirements. He said he and Mr. Field are part of a transportation work group and they share their perspectives there. Mr. Schmidt said he would invite Ms. Janairo to attend the group's next meeting, which would be held in early 2018.

Ms. Drake said Missouri has a rad group that she shares information with during meetings. She said this was the same group that will be planning the NNPP exercise.

Mr. Folts said they also had a working group in Nebraska. He said he was going to write a report for Mr. Tuma and would share it with colleagues from Nebraska's departments of health & human services, environmental quality, transportation, and state patrol.

Mr. Leuer said he briefs his management, and his agency's director and deputy director on any highlights or issues that impact Minnesota. He said occasionally that information will make its way up to the commissioner or governor's office.

Mr. Gothard said he had no requirements, but he volunteers a report to anyone who is interested. He said he tries to raise awareness that there are other activities because his office tends to be siloed into nuclear plants. Mr. Hogan said he gives a very brief write-up to his captain and he passes it along to their deputy director. Mr. Gothard said there was a lot of interest in Michigan about TENORM because of public attention that has raised awareness at the governor's level. He said there was a TENORM committee.

Mr. Boswell said he meets with his supervisor and lets him know what took place at the meeting. He said there was a hazmat core group that he keeps updated. Ms. Leek said Iowa needs a working group like Wisconsin has. She said advance notification goes to the governor's appointee in the Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Boswell is the appointee for the Midwestern Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee, and the radiological regulations and fees go through the Iowa Department of Public Health. She said those three big stakeholders will come together when there is a shipment, but don't routinely communicate. She expressed interest in having at least quarterly meetings.

Wrap-Up

Action Items Review

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

Ms. Drake confirmed the NNPP exercise would be held in Moberly. She also requested an NRC presentation on the moly-99 sites if they end up presenting during the Midwest's spring meeting. Ms. Leek said she would send Ms. Janairo the name of the state liaison officer from NRC Regions 3 and 4 who spoke at a recent meeting.

Closing Remarks

Before closing the meeting, Mr. Leuer thanked the Committee members and tribal partners for attending the meeting and CSG Midwest staff for their work. Ms. Drake thanked Ms. Edge for attending the meeting and said she appreciated the chance to sit down and talk with her at a less hectic meeting than the NTSF.

Mr. Leuer adjourned the meeting at 11:30 am.