

**U.S. Department of Energy
Transportation External Coordination Working Group Meeting
Albuquerque, New Mexico
April 21-23, 2004**

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC) held its 22nd meeting on April 21-23, 2004, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. One hundred thirty-two participants, representing national, State, Tribal, and local government; industry; professional organizations; and other interested parties, met to address a variety of issues related to DOE's radioactive materials transportation activities. The TEC process includes the involvement of these key stakeholders in developing solutions to DOE transportation issues through their actual participation in the work product. These members provide continuing and improved coordination between DOE, other levels of government, and outside organizations with DOE transportation-related responsibilities. (See Appendix A for a listing of participants). These notes do not represent final DOE positions or policy and only summarize discussions that may help inform DOE program activities. Key action items or recommendations from the meeting include:

1. Establish TEC Topic Groups for 180(c) and Security and to consider reactivating the Communications Topic Group.
2. Hold another TEC Meeting late early Fall 2004 in the Midwestern region.

Presentations for the plenary and breakout sessions can be found on the home page of the TEC Website at <http://www.ntp.doe.gov/tec> or click on the presentation titles for each presentation provided in these notes.

The Tribal Topic Group met on April 21, 2004, prior to the start of the TEC meeting. The summary and presentation from this meeting can be found on the TEC Website at <http://www.ntp.doe.gov/tec/tribal.html>

DAY 1: April 21, 2004

INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING WELCOME

Gary Lanthrum (DOE/RW) and Judith Holm (DOE/NTPA)

Mr. Gary Lanthrum, Director, DOE Office of National Transportation (ONT), Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW), called the meeting to order and welcomed the participants. Gary commented that this particular TEC meeting was comprised of a well-rounded representation of transportation groups and over the next two days this group will help Environmental Management (EM) and RW implement the transportation decisions needed to continue forward. Gary concluded his remarks by introducing Ms. Judith Holm, DOE, National Transportation Program-Albuquerque (NTPA).

Judith provided an historical overview of TEC to give some of the newer participants a foundation of where TEC has been and where TEC is going.

For details, see [TEC 101 – Judith Holm.pdf](#)

PROGRAM UPDATES from the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) and Environmental Management (EM)

Office of Environmental Management (EM) – Alice Williams

Summary:

Ms. Alice Williams (EM) expressed her appreciation to TEC for its success over the past several years and identified three major challenges to the transportation program:

- Accelerated closure schedule
- Stakeholder and regulatory/State/Federal agency interface
- Effectiveness of organizations across DOE and the impact of EM on other DOE programs

Next, a summary of EM shipping activities was provided. As of March 21, 2004, there have been 2,371 truck shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) without a major highway incident. There have been 27 foreign research reactor (FRR) shipments (6,000 fuel elements), and over 1,700 shipments of depleted uranium hexafluoride are anticipated by the end of this year. The Nevada Test Site expects to receive a Fernald byproduct shipment early this summer.

EM has been undergoing reorganization. Mr. Dennis Ashworth is the new Director of the Office of Transportation (EM-11) and Ms. Christine Gelles is the Director of the Office of Commercial Disposition Options (EM-12).

Alice concluded her remarks with a summary of current initiatives that include the transition of the Federal Research Reactor Fuel Program from EM to elsewhere in the Department by October 1, 2004. DOE is seeking to extend the duration of this program. An accelerated closure date of 2025 for larger DOE sites has been established. It has also been determined that it is not economically feasible for EM to continue pursuit of the Rail to WIPP Program.

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) – Gary Lanthrum

Summary:

Mr. Gary Lanthrum (RW) gave a presentation introducing the Office of National Transportation. He provided information on its creation, mission, and funding. Gary then described the recently published Strategic Plan, the organization of the Transportation Program, and recent milestones. Gary discussed some upcoming decisions and activities and concluded his presentation with assurance that shipments to the Yucca Mountain repository can be conducted safely and securely; and that the path toward developing a safe, secure, and efficient transportation system for Yucca Mountain will require the participation of many interested parties.

A complete copy of the presentation, [OCRWM Gary Lanthrum.pdf](#) is posted under Program Updates.

FEDERAL AGENCY PANEL

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC): Package Performance Study Update – Amy Snyder

Summary:

Ms. Amy Snyder (NRC), Spent Fuel Project Office, discussed the proposed scope for Cask Testing (NUREG-1768), provided a status on the Package Performance Study, discussed the NRC position and the next steps on the Study. She then discussed the transportation rulemaking and the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Transportation Study.

Comments and Questions:

One commenter asked why NRC was doing a package performance study when DOT has already done the testing. Amy noted that it is to confirm and demonstrate the robustness of the casks and that DOE does not test Type B packages.

Another question was asked about the test schedule. Amy stated that the schedule would be determined once the Commission gives direction.

A complete copy of the presentation, [NRC_Snyder.pdf](#) is posted under the Federal Agency Panel.

U.S. Department Of Transportation (DOT)/Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) – Kevin Blackwell

Summary:

Mr. Kevin Blackwell (FRA), Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance, reported on the FRA Dedicated Train Study – Report to Congress; the DOT Reorganization; the FRA Safety and Security Missions; the FRA’s Safety Compliance Oversight Policy (SCOP); Inspection Disciplines; FRA Hazardous Materials and Track Disciplines; 49 Code of Federal Regulations and the State’s Regulatory Role.

As the Dedicated Train Study has not yet been released to the public, Kevin was unable to talk to the points of the study. Kevin did state that a cost benefit analysis has been started as part of the rulemaking process; however, there will be no comment period before the study goes to Congress.

Kevin did address some of the rumors and speculations concerning the DOT reorganization and noted that any reorganization, at the earliest, will probably not take place until the new calendar year.

Kevin also spoke about the safety and security mission of the FRA. The SCOP is a “living” document that encourages feedback from stakeholders. The primary point of contact for overarching rail security issues is William (Bill) Fagan. For specific security issues related to hazardous materials (HAZMAT), Ray Kasey is the point of contact.

He specifically addressed the need for the FRA to get involved with the States as they have mandated rail transportation responsibility which could create situations of duplicate efforts. Kevin stated that as far as Tribal involvement, it is non-existent and is not required by the law. A pilot program for Tribes has been put on hold. There are currently state inspectors that conduct themselves with the same authority as FRA inspectors. FRA’s inspection cadre has been stagnant for about the last ten years. This year, FRA has hired 22 new inspectors of which 6 are for HAZMAT related work and 3 are bridge safety inspectors. However, due to the spent nuclear fuel (SNF) shipments, FRA could justify hiring 10 to 12 new inspectors.

A complete copy of the presentation, [DOT_Blackwell.pdf](#) is posted under the Federal Agency Panel.

**Department Of Homeland Security (DHS): State and Local Grants Program Activities –
*Marci Larson***

Summary:

Ms. Marci Larson (DHS), a Branch Chief in the Office for Domestic Preparedness (ODP), was the presenter. She stated her office is a one-stop shop for grant development and policy established in April 1998 to improve State and local weapons of mass destruction (WMD) incident response capabilities. ODP transitioned to DHS on March 1, 2003. Each State or U.S. Territory has an appointed contact that is responsible for managing ODP grants. Detailed information about the State Administrative Agencies can be found at: www.ojp.usdoj.gov/state.htm.

The ODP approach has three components:

- State Homeland Security Assessment and Strategy Program
- Homeland Security Strategy
- State Assistance Plan/Metropolitan Assistance Plans

A complete copy of the presentation, [DHO_Larson.pdf](#) is posted under the Federal Agency Panel.

REGIONAL GROUP UPDATES ON TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES

The Council of State Governments – Eastern Regional Conference (CSG/ERC) - *Ed Wilds*

Summary:

Dr. Edward Wilds, Jr. (CSG/ERC) provided an update for the CSG-Northeast High-level Radioactive Waste Transportation Task Force. Dr. Wilds provided a brief overview of the organization and described the roles, objectives, and activities of the task force.

A completed copy of the presentation, [CSG-NE_Paull-Wilds.pdf](#) is posted under Regional Group Updates on Transportation Activities.

The Council of State Governments Midwestern Office (CSG/MW) – *Lisa Sattler*

Summary:

Ms. Lisa R. Sattler (CSG/MW) provided a background and update on the group. Lisa provided information on their mission, members, locations, and details on the Midwestern Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee.

See presentation, [CSG-MW_Sattler.pdf](#) posted under Regional Group Updates on Transportation Activities.

Southern States Energy Board (SSEB) – *Christopher Wells*

Summary:

Mr. Christopher Wells (SSEB) provided a background and update on the regional group. This included the SSEB's mission, its membership and detailed information on the SSEB Radioactive Materials Program, including the projects and activities of the Board. Christopher noted that two of the upcoming meetings of the Board include the Joint Meeting of the Radioactive Materials Transportation Committee and the Transuranic Waste Transportation Working Group, May 13-14, 2004, and the Southern Emergency Response Council Meeting, September 22, 2004.

See presentation, [SSEB_Wells.pdf](#) posted under Regional Group Updates on Transportation Activities.

Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB) – Doug Larson

Summary:

Mr. Larson (WIEB) provided an update on the Board (including what guides the Board), their activities and information on their recently signed cooperative agreement with RW. Mr. Larson also discussed the program uncertainties that still continue to hamper state preparations and the unique priority they have in working with other States and RW.

See presentation, [WEIB_Larson.pdf](#) posted under Regional Group Updates on Transportation Activities.

Western Governors' Association (WGA) – Bill Mackie

Summary:

William B. Mackie (WGA) provided an update on the Western States' integration with DOE's transportation activities as well as some unresolved issues.

See presentation, [WGA_Mackie.pdf](#) posted under Regional Group Updates on Transportation Activities.

DAY 2: April 22, 2004

MORNING BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Communications/Lessons Learned Study of DOE FY03 SNF Shipments – Dorothy Brown, Judith Holm and Jay Jones

Communications Sessions Summary:

Mr. Jay Jones (RW/ONT) opened the session with a discussion of objectives and expectations, in which he outlined the RW communications approach for Yucca Mountain shipments. The Transportation Strategic Plan was released in November 2003 and detailed anticipated collaborative efforts with stakeholders and two-way interactions with program participants and the public. RW is currently developing a more detailed communications strategy that will identify how stakeholders will be informed and engaged on national, regional, State and Tribal levels. RW is seeking input from the TEC members on the RW communication approach and needs.

Jay then presented a brief history of the Communications Topic Group (see presentation, [Communications_Jay Jones.pdf](#)) which convened in April 1998 and played an important role in the development of many transportation-related information products, a National Transportation Communications Plan, and a survey of transportation information users and providers before its "sunset" a couple of years ago.

Ms. Dorothy Brown (EM) summed up the results of a recent information product survey she and Judith Holm (NTPA) conducted. The purpose of the survey was to assist DOE in planning for revision of existing information products and development of new products to best meet stakeholder needs in a cost-effective manner. General findings included:

- The majority of information products were distributed during training (about 6,150 copies in FY 2003).
- Some of the more useful products included the Spent Fuel fact sheet and the NTP Q&A Booklet. A version of "Whiz Wheel" was requested.
- The Q&A Booklet should be updated and include information on security.

- Security is the most popular topic for consideration in the development of new products.
- Primary audiences should include State and local organizations, regional groups, the public, emergency responders, elected officials, and the media.
- TEC should be involved in any revision or development of products.

EM and RW are in the process of deciding which products should transition to RW. Examples of transportation-related information products (from DOE, stakeholder groups, and other organizations) were displayed for review by meeting attendees.

The University of New Mexico's Alliance for Transportation Research Institute (ATRI) presented an overview of their services and introduced a survey they will be conducting on their services and inventory of transportation-related materials. Ms. Judith Espinosa (ATRI) gave meeting participants the Transportation Resource Exchange Center (T-REX) phone number (1-877-287-TREX). T-REX will accept transportation-related documents and scan them into the system so other users may have access to them. RW will fund T-REX to continue its support of the DOE transportation program in providing a source of public information started under contract with DOE NTPA. The survey being conducted by ATRI will help define information needs and serve as a Website user assessment. An interactive version of the survey will be available on the T-REX Website after April 26, 2004. T-REX staff will follow up with the participants of this breakout session.

The session closed with a discussion of next steps for the RW communications program. An immediate priority is the augmentation of existing materials in the T-REX Website for the next 2-to-6 years. As part of this effort, RW will be reviewing existing materials from NTPA and the Office of Repository Development as possible models for information materials. Nevada's Website (<http://www.state.nv.us/nucwaste>) was provided.

Comments:

- Limit full-size documents on the Website – link to them from the main site. Summarize the most frequently used documents.
- Engage marketing expertise.
- The process of getting transportation-related information products across the array of DOE programs can be “miserable.” Finding out what is available can be a challenge. A clearinghouse approach to transportation documents was recommended.
- Bob Halstead (Nevada) told the group he has received good service from the T-REX staff, but the research process is lacking.
- Another participant suggested that the T-REX should make all nuclear transportation documents available instead of users having to order from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).
- NAC International has a report on radioactive materials shipments.
- Nevada presented a paper at Waste Management 2003 on radioactive materials shipments.

Action Items:

- Mr. Bob Halstead (Nevada) said he would compile a list of 200 radioactive materials transportation documents and send to Judith Holm.
- Participants should send a listing of their transportation documents for ATRI posting to Judith Espinosa (ATRI).
- Invite NRC to identify available transportation-related documents (addressing information access) at the next TEC meeting. Nancy Bennett (T-REX) will bring some documents to that meeting for a discussion on security information.
- Specify DOE criteria for Operational Security (OPSEC) (to be discussed in this meeting's Security breakout).

- Develop a subset of references from the Yucca Mountain Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for transportation and place on CDs.
- If building an information set, clearly define or categorize it so that information can be easily retrieved using search engines.
- Users need to be able to get a 10-year projection of shipments.
- Users need an information product on historical shipment numbers – giving the basis for the numbers.
- Use a common set of numbers.
- Develop an information product on Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) inspection rates versus other heavy trucks. (Larry Stern, CVSA, can provide information on this).
- When developing products, keep the user in mind.
- Revive the TEC Communications Topic Group.
- Develop information products on other-than-high-visibility shipments.
- Develop a primer on radioactive materials overall.
- Coordinate with TEPP program on information materials.
- Make videos available.
- Participate in the T-REX User Assessment.
- Address safety and security information in printed products.
- Explore loading State emergency response information on T-REX site so that individual States could share information when needed, with limited access to more sensitive information.

Lessons Learned Study of DOE FY03 SNF Shipments Sessions Summary:

Ms. Judith Holm (NTPA) provided background on the Lessons Learned Study, including definitions for benchmarking, best practices, lessons learned, the goals of the study and the session purpose (See: [Best Practices_Holm.pdf](#)). Judith described DOE's current protocol for identifying and sharing best practices. This included criteria for whether or not a best practice would be suitable to consider for complex-wide application, how to identify a best practice, and how to describe a best practice.

Judith then described the 2002 Benchmarking Study, including its purpose and what it evaluated and analyzed, and she provided a summary of the results. Comments received on the 2002 Study indicated that DOE should consider completing a Lessons Learned Study for FY03 Shipments

DOE has drafted a survey questionnaire to obtain data for the FY03 Lessons Learned Study. Judith noted that the target date for completion of the survey is September 2004 (by next TEC meeting). She passed out the draft survey questions and asked that each participant look at the questions and provide feedback. It was noted that the survey questions reflect the categories in the Transportation Practices Manual. The protocols will remain as the benchmark for the shipments. She noted that the 2003 information would be gathered through the use of a team to interview and to survey the participants in the actual campaigns. It is anticipated that the participants will include: DOE site representatives, contractors, carriers, State regional groups, Tribal officials and others. The team would then be used to review the final document.

Summary of Issues:

- The key is to decide what the RW study will focus on and to be up front with stakeholders. Define the study purpose and be sure the scope and resources are adequate for its proper completion.
- Study participants should be expanded to include the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and environmental justice communities in South Carolina, as well as someone in New Mexico with interaction on WIPP shipments (to cover cultural sensitivity issues). Suggest including Spanish liaison.

- Some concern was expressed about shipments becoming “routine” – that this could result in complacency and safety issues. Once commenter (a Tribal representative) expressed continuing concern about the WIPP shipments.
- Comments concerning the scope of the FY03 Study:
 - Make sure representative ranges of shipments are included. Shipments proposed by DOE for the Study are not conducive to drawing conclusions for Yucca Mountain shipments.
 - The current scope of the study is good for EM – expanding it would be better for RW shipments.
 - Consider expanding scope to include Naval, Commercial, and European shipments and FRR shipments prior to 1996. (A Naval representative noted that Navy shipments are National Security shipments and there are few of them. He also pointed out that DOE’s Naval shipment program stays in contact with RW. In regard to commercial shipments, DOE responded that there are not that many commercial shipments and DOE would need the cooperation of the utilities to get the information needed to answer survey question.
 - Include West Valley lessons learned.
 - Add a survey question as to the type of rail service, i.e., was it dedicated train?
 - Consider shipments of large reactor components.
 - Ensure that Tribal concerns are addressed in the Study.
 - Include data on cleanup and recovery – where available.
 - Consider all shipment waste types, including those that have been long-term to ensure that routine does not lead to “sloppiness”.

Training – Ella McNeil

Summary:

Ms. Ella McNeil (EM) opened the meeting by thanking participants for their contributions to the success of the topic group over the past six years. She noted the significant time commitments made by members of the group which resulted in the high quality program that the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) is today.

Mr. Larry Stern (CVSA), presented background information on a training and inspection cooperative agreement between CVSA and DOE. Included in the presentation were findings of a study his organization conducted on the number of enhanced inspections needed for maximum safety of WIPP shipments. Results of the study showed that with the enhanced inspections, WIPP shipments have “no violations” for findings more than three times higher than the national average and that the enhanced inspection at point-of-origin is adequate to ensure safety, except when an obvious defect is observed. He added that there is some discussion about states’ desire to perform random inspections of the shipments, which goes beyond the CVSA guidelines. See presentation, [CVSA.pdf](#).

Next, Mr. Doug Walker, State of Idaho Bureau of Radiation Control, described his state’s refurbishment of its radioactive materials transportation training for State and local responders. He said they began with a needs assessment, identified areas of improvement, and developed an Idaho-specific training program based on the Modular Emergency Response Radiological Transportation Training (MERRTT). Additions to the MERRTT-based training were made in the areas of first responder/hospital integration to include the critical requirements during transport of patients to the hospital, training information on naval spent fuel, and other state-specific information. The program is known as Idaho Modular Emergency Response Radiological Training (IMERRT). See presentation, [Idaho.pdf](#).

Ms. Marci Larson (ODP) presented information on training programs offered through ODP. She said her agency's training opportunities range from generic to performance-based training. ODP utilizes the capabilities of a number of specialized institutions in the design and delivery of its training programs. These include private contractors, other Federal and State agencies, the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium, the National Terrorism Preparedness Institute at St. Petersburg Junior College, the U.S. Army's Pine Bluff Arsenal, Louisiana State University, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, and DOE. One of ODP's goals is to complete the process for approval of other agencies' training to be eligible for ODP grants in order to integrate and streamline training offerings by the Federal government. See presentation, [ODP Training Overview.pdf](#).

Mr. Ken Keaton, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, summarized TEPP accomplishments in 2003, discussed the latest revisions to MERRTT, and reported on the history of the TEPP and its partnership with TEC. He highlighted the now-operational nation-wide database of those who have taken the training, including where and when; the revision of TEPP planning tools; the addition of a two-hour practical exercise to the MERRTT train-the-trainer program; and the addition of two new modules on rail and Office of Secure Transportation shipments. He said three training modules were combined into one so the training time remains the same as in past years. During his overview on the TEPP/TEC relationship, Ken said that the decision was made in 1998 to support development of a responder training program with a goal of assisting in development of a comprehensive program that is specific to responder needs, easy to understand, and easy to use. Since that time, MERRTT has been continuously revised and merged with the WIPP first responder training, and 7,047 law enforcement, fire, EMS, and HAZMAT professionals have been trained at DOE-sponsored MERRTT sessions. See presentations, [MERRTT.pdf](#) and [MERRTT Chrono.pdf](#).

Ella then said that consideration should be given to "sunsetting" this TEC topic group because of the maturation of the TEPP program. Members agreed, but needed assurances that certain measures would be in place (see Comments below):

Comments:

- A process needs to be in place to ensure the quality of TEPP planning products, that training is maintained, and that updates to the training are made on a regular basis.
- Continue working with other Federal agencies to streamline training integration and reduce the duplication of training programs that are currently available and planned.
- Ensure updated MERRTT materials are provided on a regular basis to all instructors who have successfully completed the train-the-trainer program.
- Resurrect the Training Topic Group in a timely manner should future situations and concerns warrant.
- Consideration should be given to the establishment of an Exercise Topic Group.

Ella closed by saying that reviews will continue and that any revisions to the program will be vetted through state organizations and TEC membership. She said that she would continue to work with ODP on training integration and approval for ODP grants. Ella believes that the new database should help keep MERRTT instructors up-to-date in the program, especially because the new database tracks issuance of training certificates and includes the instructor's name. TEC members agreed to provide input on "if and when" the Training Topic Group needs to be reinstated and also provide input on the need for an Exercise Topic Group. All concluded that the Training Topic Group had accomplished its mission and could disband.

Transportation Infrastructure Acquisition – Ned Larson

Overview:

The purpose of this session was to describe the transportation infrastructure and the requirements that will drive the procurement process. Mr. Ned Larson (RW/ONT) outlined RW's current thinking on the procurement process for the major components that include truck and rail transportation cask systems, rolling stock, support and maintenance facilities, and Nevada rail.

Summary of Issues:

- RW must design a flexible system to be able to transport a variety of fuel types from many locations.
- RW will rely on the private sector to the maximum extent possible.
- Establishing lines of communication with the utilities is imperative.
- RW should not “reinvent the wheel” and use the experiences of other entities and industries in developing the transportation infrastructure.

Comments:

- Clarifying questions were asked to establish the number of casks in each category and rail versus truck casks. Ned responded that DOE anticipates that the largest number of casks would require no modification. DOE waste will likely require entirely new designs. Approximately 90 rail casks and 10 truck casks will be procured.
- Concern was expressed about the lack of dialogue between RW and utility stakeholders because the lawsuits, filed by utilities due to DOE's failure to begin accepting waste in 1998, have stifled the ability of DOE to speak the utilities regarding waste acceptance issues. RW acknowledged the problem and guidance has been sought from the Department of Justice on ways to engage utilities without confidential discussions being subsequently used in damage claims against the government.
- A question was posed about the ability to use heavy haul trucks if the rail line is not available in 2010. The option was evaluated in the Yucca Mountain Final EIS. Developing a parallel heavy haul truck capability was determined to be very expensive. The road infrastructure would require significant upgrades. However, heavy haul may be used to move rail casks from utilities to the nearest railhead or barge facility. Ned added that the SSEB and the CSG-ERC have expressed interest in evaluating the feasibility of using barges within the scope of their cooperative agreements with RW.
- Regarding RW's evaluation of the Association of American Railroads' (AAR) new standard for railcars used in trains transporting SNF and high-level waste (HLW), DOE was encouraged to share their evaluation of the pros and cons of using the AAR Standard and dedicated trains with stakeholders.
- One participant observed that the Private Fuel Storage, LLC (PFS) project in Utah was planning to use a rail car developed to comply with the AAR standard. DOE was encouraged to coordinate with PFS and take advantage of their lessons learned.
- Regarding the Fleet Management Facility (FMF), RW was encouraged to look at how private companies such as General Electric have developed similar facilities. It was noted that these types of facilities have been developed previously in other countries. Private companies would be interested in building and operating an FMF.
- A FRA representative raised the issue of shared use of the rail line. Mr. Larson responded that shared use would be considered. In fact, one of the questions posed in the Notice of Intent announcing the

rail alignment EIS scoping hearings is whether DOE should allow private entities to ship commercial commodities on its rail line. Clarification was requested about the relationship between the DOE and the Surface Transportation Board regarding lead-agency status in preparing the EIS.

- Some participants questioned the perception that the railroad to Yucca Mountain is so difficult to build, noting that railroads are being built in this country and in Europe. It was suggested that DOE work with other industries such as the coal mining industry.
- A representative of Nevada's Lincoln and Esmeralda Counties and the City of Caliente indicated that these communities are open for business. Nevada has a favorable tax climate. These governments are interested in working with vendors regarding the development of the rail line and support facilities. He also noted that rural Nevada communities are willing to work with DOE to help address concerns of local landowners and to make sure the rail spur is available in 2010.
- Regarding security of shipments, a representative of WIEB suggested that DOE consider procuring enough casks to have decoys similar to the MX missile program proposed in the 1970's. A representative of Edlow International noted that security is not a new issue. The industry currently meets stringent security standards today and has done so for over 30 years.
- A representative of National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) noted that at a recent House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee hearing, RW was encouraged to revisit using dual-purpose casks. Although RW's stance has been that dual-purpose casks are not covered in the Standard Contract, he encouraged RW to take advantage of what has already been paid for by the utilities. Another commenter encouraged DOE to consider modifications to the Standard Contracts regarding the waste acceptance process and the use of dual-purpose casks.
- One commenter commended DOE for its intent to maximize use of the private sector. Not reinventing the wheel, drawing on the extensive experience base of companies involved in shipping and benefiting from their long safety record are among the advantages.

For the complete presentation see, [Infrastructure TEC Final Larson.pdf](#).

AFTERNOON BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Security – Nancy Slater-Thompson

Overview:

The objectives of this session were to: 1) discuss the basic DOE approach to security planning, 2) ask the stakeholders what transport security-related issues they believed should be addressed, and 3) to request an expression of interest in forming a TEC Security Topic Group to provide input and feedback on issues related to transportation security.

The ONT's mission is to develop a safe, secure and efficient transportation system that is operated in a way that the public can rely on it without question. This mission will be accomplished through three means:

- Having an open and collaborative planning process with interested parties.
- Developing a safe and secure transport system and related infrastructure.
- Completing transportation system validation in time to begin operations in 2010.

The session was divided into two parts: 1) Introduction and lessons learned, and 2) An open discussion with the participants of their issues and concerns.

Introduction and Lessons Learned:

Ms. Nancy Slater-Thompson (RW) opened the lessons learned phase of the session by defining the four fundamental functional elements of a successful security planning process. She was assisted by Ken Sorenson from Sandia National Laboratories (SNL). The fundamental functional elements are:

- Information Security
- Personnel Security
- Operations - Processes
- Security Hardware/Technology

See presentation: [ONT Security Session Nancy Slater-Thompson.pdf](#).

Nancy defined Information Security as the fundamental building block of a successful security program, and with the participants' concurrence, noted that it would be the primary focus of the breakout session. During the presentation there was an active discussion about how information would be classified, the participants concern that too much information could be hidden behind the security wall, and that an actual need exists for information by the States, Tribes and local emergency responders. Emergency response participants stated that with appropriate training very little information is needed during normal operations. If there is an incident, however, they need to have a lot of information, quickly.

Nancy stated that to ensure a balanced approach to information security, the Department was drafting a Classification Guide, and she would be willing to share a draft with the TEC Transportation Security Topic Group. The Classification Guide is to be used to identify what information is to be protected, and the level of protection to be afforded that information. Participants recommended that the Classification Guide be kept simple and Nancy concurred.

One of the underpinnings of a successful approach to information security is the provision of information on a "need-to-know" basis. Stakeholders were asked to provide feedback on the types of information they need-to-know in order to successfully perform their responsibilities. To facilitate the dialogue on this and other security-related topics DOE presented its initial planning schedule for preparing the transportation related security documents.

- Draft a Security Concept of Operations - 9/04
- Develop an annotated Outline of a Security Plan - 10/04
- First draft of a Transportation Security Plan - 10/06
- A final Transportation Security Plan in 2007

It was noted that some of the information on which these documents will be based may not be shared openly. It could prove useful to those who might desire to pose a threat to the shipments. Samples of this type of information include the threat analysis methodology, the Transportation Design Basis Threat, and the evaluation of hardware and software needed for security communications (SECOM). The participants concurred with this division of information, but stated that they would like input to the public sections of the plans (those which they needed to perform their functions).

It was also noted that DOE is preparing the functional specifications for an escort car for rail shipments. That information is also not going to be made public.

Ralph Smith (CFO/WIPP) made a brief presentation on the security-related experiences with WIPP shipments and how the WIPP program modified its information sharing following 9/11 (See presentation: [TEC Information Security_Smith.pdf](#)). He said that WIPP was entirely open prior to 9/11 in that their function is to haul trash. Due to security issues raised by the 9/11 event, WIPP no longer provides the “road shows” at the request of states. Publication of shipping schedules to affected states and tribes is now provided via email to Governor-designated State and Tribal personnel. The schedules present an eight week rolling schedule, and a two-week advance notice. The schedules available to the public are published as semi-annual summaries.

Alex Thrower (EM) reported on security-related experiences with the FRR SNF Program. There have been 27 shipments under the current program that began in 1996, and DOE has developed a number of security measures, some required by regulations and internal Orders and others as a matter of policy. Examples include performing threat assessments, preparing and submitting security plans, protecting Safeguards Information, and using armed escorts. Additionally, the program is capable of using different modes and routes for its shipments.

Tom Hughes from the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency (PEMA), addressed policy and process changes his State made after “9/11.” Before 9/11, the DOE’s Prospective Shipment Module (PSM) rolling schedule of shipments was issued by the EM National Transportation Program and was shared among supporting state agencies. Since 9/11 shipment notification information is shared only with those agencies with a need-to-know, and is transmitted over secure communications systems. In addition, he stated that Pennsylvania passed a law requiring radioactive material shipments be escorted. Rail shipments must be processed through the Public Utility Commission, and PENNDOT is notified of highway shipments.

In addition, Pennsylvania is now interacting more closely with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the DHS on intelligence information analysis. Tom stated that the obtaining of security clearances is a big issue with Pennsylvania and other states. Within his state, 95 percent of the staff within the PA Emergency Operations Center (EOC) have military backgrounds and have held security clearances. These same individuals should be able to secure DOE and DHS clearances based on their U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) clearances. Since there is no reciprocity between Federal agencies issuing security clearances (DoD, DOE and DHS), this has become a problem, given their State emergency response responsibilities.

Ron Pope, DOE Consultant and past representative for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), gave meeting participants insight on the international transportation security perspective. The IAEA INFCIRC/225 (Rev. 4, Corrected) is a primary source of guidelines for countries to use in the physical protection of nuclear material. The IAEA and other international bodies are working to put forth additional guidance on security in the transport of all radioactive material. In addition, NRC provides guidance on physical protection for irradiated fuel in transport in 10 CFR 73.37, and the DOT has provided guidance on security plans and training (Federal Register, 25 March 2003, see also 49 CFR 172.704, 800-804) for all dangerous goods. These international and domestic documents include guidance on information security; all built around sound OPSEC principles that include:

- Performing country-specific threat analyses to establish an appropriate design basis threat.
- Providing physical protection in depth, following a graded approach.
- Avoiding the use of regular movement schedules.
- Requiring predetermination of trustworthiness of involved individuals.
- Limiting advance knowledge of transport information to those who have a need-to-know.

- Adequately protecting the confidentiality of information.

See presentation: [Transport Security Pope.pdf](#).

In discussion of State interests, the issue of the use of dedicated trains was expressed. DOE stated that the Department will engage stakeholders and Federal agencies (e.g. NRC, FRA, DHS, and DOT) in the discussion of the use of dedicated trains to facilitate secure transport. Questions to be considered could include:

- Are dedicated train shipments attractive to terrorists and are they prominent targets?
- What is the capability of an adversary to cause an accident involving a dedicated train, and is that different from other train service levels?
- What is the vulnerability of those shipments?
- What operational guidelines can be used to enhance security and are these linked to the dedicated train level of service?

Action Items: (for Fall 2004 TEC Meeting)

- Address how information security will impact public discussions as part of the Section 180(c) and routing discussions.
- Address consistency of DOE security program with 10 CFR 73.
- Form a TEC Security Topic Group.
- Post information security questions on TEC Website; ask for responses and additional questions.
- Identify if the DHS has established an initiative to develop a uniform method for obtaining and/or recognizing clearances between Federal agencies, and for expediting the issuing of clearances to State and Tribal personnel.

Section 180(c) – Corrine Macaluso

Overview:

Ms. Corinne Macaluso (RW/ONT) and Ms. Elizabeth Helvey, Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC, were the presenters for these sessions.

A summary of Section 180(c) and its history were presented. The current status of Section 180(c) activities was provided, including the key features of the 1998 Draft Policy. A New Schedule for Section 180(c) was then provided that provided dates from the present through 2008. See presentation: [180 C Presentation.pdf](#).

Discussion:

Corinne welcomed everyone to the Section 180(c) breakout and provided the overview.

Elizabeth then provided a review of where the Section 180(c) discussions left off in 1998, and the major changes that have occurred since 1998 that could inform or impact the 180(c) program. She explained that the intent of the breakout was to elicit opinions about potential goals for the Section 180(c) program as well as to begin discussion about what training increment remains for Section 180(c) to cover.

The consolidated grant was then discussed because it was the Department's last major effort to develop a grant program. While the effort was halted in 2002, the progress made in identifying issues can help inform the Section 180(c) discussion.

A review of DHS activities was then provided, including their consolidation of grants to state and local governments into the newly formed Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness, and Presidential Directives #5 and #8.

Summary of Issues:

- Goals for 180(c): Need to be simple, measurable competencies; adequate response at appropriate level.
- Formula vs. needs based: Take lessons learned from previous experience.
- DHS funding doesn't preclude 180(c) mandates.
- What constitutes safe routine transportation?
- Maintain regional groups' involvement: coordination, policy development and General Council to revisit definition of "State".
- Equipment as an allowable cost for 180(c): "Training" versus "response".
- Training: What training? Who trained? How delivered?
- Topic Group

Comments on Consolidated Grant:

- One Tribal representative noted that the grant was a sticking point with tribes. DOE had originally planned a percentage distribution for Tribes that weren't reasonable, and the Tribes had to push back.
- One State representative noted that there was a problem with the formula because the Northeast wanted it based on population and the Western states wanted it based on miles and number of shipments.
- Another state representative suggested that DOE not use the consolidated grant as a building block because it caused such heated discussions and disagreements.
- Several participants discussed whether Section 180(c) funding could go directly to States or to State Regional Groups. Some state representatives wanted direct grants to States, since less money flows down that way. One state representative suggested allowing states to opt out of receiving their funding through the regional groups.

Ms. Ellen Ott (GC) commented that, in 1998, DOE did not interpret the term "State" in Section 180(c) to mean "regional groups". In response to a request, Corinne said that DOE would revisit that decision.

Comments on Department of Homeland Security:

- With DHS, Tribes have to go through States for funds, so there is not much Tribal access.
- Not all affected parties are happy with the DHS grant consolidation; Congress may intervene at some point.
- DHS is focusing on urban areas, while RW routes include many rural areas, so DHS grants may not help many jurisdictions on RW shipping routes. Also, the emergency management community objects to caps on personnel costs in DHS grants, and to the inclusion of the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) within DHS consolidation;
- Very little DHS money can be used for radiation detection equipment.
- The DHS focus on WMD threatens to undermine the infrastructure for high probability general hazards such as tornadoes and hurricanes. Congress will not let the general hazards emergency management infrastructure disappear.
- DOE is the lead agency for the radiological portion of WMD (preparedness), but the Department has not made much effort in that area.
- Does addressing these issues (terrorism, WMD) work against convincing the public that these shipments are safe?

- There has been little focus on issues such as contamination of soil in rural areas resulting from a terrorist event.
- A FEMA survey of fire departments found that 80% provide response to HAZMAT incidents, and 40% of fire departments responded to HAZMAT incidents with no training. Only 20 percent had all personnel trained to respond to HAZMAT incidents. This means that it would be a mistake to assume any pre-existing level of awareness – it doesn't exist. The increment for 180(c) is larger than one may assume.
- Don't assume that the ODP equipment programs get equipment to the right place. Needs assessments can capture the distribution of equipment.
- By the time grant money has been distributed among state agencies, the funding has been so diluted that it may not buy the local jurisdiction what it needs.
- The two Homeland Security Presidential Directives (#5 and #8) give DOE a seat at the table; DOE must fight for the State's needs.
- DHS grants go through the State-designated contact – whatever agency that may be, as it differs from state to state.

Comments on Goals for Section 180(c) and What it Should Accomplish:

- Train the people who need to be trained; provide and maintain the necessary equipment.
- Tribal consultations are necessary.
- Safe and uneventful transport.
- DOE should train to respond to Type-B cask incidents.
- Level of response appropriate to level of risk.
- Placard shipments with phone number and ID number in case of emergency. Another participant responded that this would bypass the established response procedures and create additional problems.
- Provide ongoing media training.
- Educating the public is difficult; public meetings can cause more problems than they solve.
- Public education touring with a truck and cask can be effective.
- Anticipate opposition and prepare responses to concerns that will be raised. Be prepared with information, whether you use it or not.
- Information and funding flowing to local governments creates a cadre of informed local opinion leaders.
- Newspaper and public outreach programs can inform the public without holding public meetings.
- 180(c) should address public information (media), and should also prepare local opinion leaders to respond.
- Exercises on radioactive shipments can be covered by the media.
- Can DOE revisit the underlying rationale for the base grant?
- Recipients of the training should have measurable competencies afterward.
- Responders should be able to appropriately respond to an incident – responders should know what to do and follow their emergency response plan.
- Recognize that volunteers have limited time available to train. Ella McNeill commented that if DHS approves TEPP, and if 180(c) funds can be used for that training, then that may help this problem.
- Three years is not sufficient to train all volunteers.
- Funding is not available to even copy TEPP training materials.
- There is a public relations aspect to 180(c). It helps if people know their responders are being trained.
- FEMA exercises are not approved by DHS because they are not applicable to DHS goals.
- Section 180(c) application and implementation needs to be simple.
- Maintain consistent funding throughout the year and have consistent multi-year funding.
- Identify the link between Section 180(c), route selection, and the queue — effective delivery of Section 180(c) assistance is tied to route selection.

- Regional organizations are important to States' awareness; make sure regional groups are adequately funded (Strategic Plan identified work with regional groups).
- Let regional groups manage Section 180(c) grants.

Comments on Allowable Costs:

- Recommend Section 180(c) should fund opportunities for interface (inter-region and inter-state interactions).
- Recommend sending MERRTT Training directly through the State Fire Academies — need funding to implement this change.
- Reimbursement for overtime would allow more people to be trained because another fire fighter can cover the shift while one is in training.

Comments on Safe, Routine Transportation:

- What are appropriate costs associated with rail inspection? Would RW shipments require 50% of inspections, and could 180(c) funds pay for inspector training?
- Tribes can't participate in rail inspection program.
- Can 180(c) pay for development of extra-regulatory procedures and criteria?
- Can 180(c) funding be used to train State personnel (rail inspectors)? Is it allowable under 180(c)? This needs clarification.

Are there local activities for safe, routine transportation?

- Yes, train public information officers who can respond to inquiries about shipments.
- Training radiation workers for working in a rail environment is necessary.
- How does training Public Information Officers (PIOs) contribute to safe routine transportation? Should you single out PIO training from training for other local officials?
- Regarding allowable activities, strict definitions cause problems. You need allowances for differences in State requirements (for instrumentation, etc...)
- DHS activities don't relieve DOE of its responsibilities under 180(c).
- What about providing PIOs and incident commanders with a template for responding to media inquiries during and incident?

Comments on Initial planning grant:

- Needs to be State-by-State decision; original grant was based on what was okay for seven Western States.
- RW's impact on an individual State will affect planning grant needs (for example, Illinois will be greatly impacted by RW shipments). At the same time, greater experience with shipments in states such as Illinois should make needs assessment easier.
- A State representative commented that the formula for consolidated grants was a bad formula, but does that mean that all formulas are bad?
- Can calculations be done that address both road mileage and population?
- The consolidated grant formula wasn't bad; it balanced various regional factors.
- Consolidated grants didn't follow a process — there was no agreement on how to weigh the factors. DOE should follow a defined process to develop a formula and not focus on the outcome.
- Massachusetts has an annual limit (2.5%) on budget increase. Some States have these restraints on unfunded mandates.

General Comments

- One commenter asked what had happened with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Notice of Intent regarding Tribal notification of SNF shipments. Ms. Macaluso responded that, while DOE has

notified NRC that RW intends to notify Tribes of shipments, she had not heard the status of NRC's rulemaking.

- Another commenter noted that the success of the WIPP program should be used as a model by RW.
- 180(c) funding can help pay for copies of TEPP training manuals.
- The training (MERRTT) is already developed; law provides for funding; the real problem is ensuring the availability of equipment.
- A State representative asked how the Department plans to fund equipment purchases through Section 180(c). What can be purchased? Ms. Macaluso responded that DOE's Office of General Council has determined that the only equipment purchases Section 180(c) could fund would be equipment for training.
- A State representative commented that DOE shouldn't equate owning equipment with being trained to use the equipment.
- A state representative asked whether there would be a topic group regarding Section 180(c) issues. Corinne responded that there would be a topic group and that their activities will feed into plans for the September meeting.
- One commenter asked if Section 180(c) would apply to shipments to an interim storage facility. It was noted that it only applied to a Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) facility. The commenter then noted that once PFS shipments begin, DOE could end up using those same routes.

Rail Topic Group and OCRWM Routing Approach - Leads: *Steven Hamp and Judith Holm*

Rail Topic Group Update – *Steven Hamp*

Summary:

Mr. Steven Hamp (NTPA) reviewed the topic group charter and noted that the main purpose of the topic group is to identify and discuss important issues to members in a smaller group setting. Steven also stated that the topic group was first formed in 1997, temporarily sunsetted in 1999, and then reformed in 2002 during the January TEC meeting.

Over the years, the Rail Topic Group efforts have been to develop and prepare issue papers on particular topics of interest. Past efforts are available on the TEC Website and include: Transportation Inspections Summary Matrix, and the 2002 Summary of the Rail Topic Group Transportation Safety WIPP-Program Implementation Guide (PIG) Rail Comparison. The latter report is a comparison of the rail safety programs to the WIPP highway safety implementation guide.

Steven discussed the topic group's timeline and accomplishments since being reactivated in 2002. The January 2002 meeting identified some of the rail issues that were brought up by the larger breakout session. Some of these issues included: security, rail shipment, and lessons learned from DOE rail shipping. The next communication for the topic group was a conference call in June 2002 that narrowed the topic group membership to a smaller and more manageable group. This smaller group, in turn, was tasked with developing a "Strawman Report" that summarized current practices for routing rail shipments and also looked at potential rail routing using as a basis the highway routing regulations. In June 2003, the report was refined and writing assignments were made. A preliminary draft was sent out to everyone in the topic group in November 2003. Seventy-five comments were made on the first draft. All of these comments were compiled into a comment matrix and changes were made to the report. As it stands now, the paper is in very good shape. Steven anticipated one more conference call with group members to ensure all concerns were addressed. At that point, a final paper would be prepared. In preparing the issue paper, the Topic Group's focus has been to:

- Improve understanding of the current rail routing system.

- Identify concerns with current practices on rail route selection.
- Understand the operational differences between rail and highway transportation that contribute to difference in routing approaches.
- Identify the issues associated with a regulatory basis for rail routing.

See presentations: [Rail Topic Group Update Hamp.pdf](#) and [Criteria Selection Hamp Weiner.pdf](#)

Comments:

- One participant suggested that there needs to be more face-to-face interaction of the topic group members or, at the very least, more communication via conference calls. It is easy to lose momentum between meetings. Steven responded by suggesting that a conference call be set up shortly after the TEC meeting to facilitate the path forward to completing the final draft of the issue paper.
- A participant noted that the paper does not address the issue of dedicated trains, large-scale shipments and route designation. Steven responded by stating that the paper is meant to be an information document not a decision document. The paper is not meant to recommend courses of action but rather to focus on the issues and generate input.
- Another comment was made as to whether the experience and backgrounds of the rail topic group members have been drawn upon in developing this paper. Steven confirmed that the rail industry has been involved as evident by the current make-up of the topic group members that includes industry, State and Tribal representatives.

Action Items:

- Conference Call in May to work on preparing the final draft.
- Prepare final issue paper and distribute to TEC membership.
- Present summary at next TEC meeting in September 2004.

OCRWM (RW) Routing Approach – *Judith Holm*

Summary:

Ms. Judith Holm (NTPA) presented RW's approach to routing during the second half of this session. Judith presented a draft transportation route decision process that involves running the Transportation Routing Analysis Geographic Information System (TRAGIS), developing routing criteria, identifying a possible route or suite of routes, utilizing RADTRAN for safety analysis, and relying on stakeholder feedback throughout this process. Judith emphasized that this is an iterative process to get to the candidate routes and suite of routes and that there are a lot of unknowns at this time. This is a big campaign and, as such, there are concerns of security. In addition, shippers need to consider multiple routes. At this time, this approach is very broad and DOE is looking to State Regional Groups for assistance in a routing approach that will involve many shipments.

Judith pointed out that the rail industry has its own standards and operating practices. Therefore, close coordination is needed to assist in determining what criteria are important to different groups. RW will work with State and Tribal government officials and industry over the next 18 months to develop routing criteria applicable to a development of a suite of routes. Operational campaign plans are the last step in the process and would need to be in place prior to shipping.

See presentation: [RW Routing Decision Process Holm.pdf](#)

Comments:

- Several participants noted that RW needs to look at the types/classes of track, traffic congestion and response capabilities. Interchange points are also a concern especially if DOE is not willing to do “corn field interchanges” or use dedicated trains.
- Comments were made concerning the volume of shipments and how this campaign will be the largest undertaking in many decades for the rail industry as well as DOE. Some participants voiced their concern over having a suite of routes (i.e., there cannot be a suite of routes because of security issues).
- One participant noted that the whole routing process encompassed more than logistics. A suite of routes may be perceived negatively as this could be interpreted as an equity change (i.e., spreading the danger, risk, etc.). Judith responded to these comments by saying that this would not be an easy or straightforward process and DOE must maintain flexibility within this process.

Decision Analysis Tool – *Ruth Weiner*

Summary:

Ms. Ruth Weiner (SNL) provided a demonstration on the application of decision analysis to routing. (The presentation was co-authored by Steven Hamp). Decision Analysis is a method for evaluating alternatives by their measurable characteristics and independently by the importance of each characteristic to the selection. As applied to routing, the process essentially allows the decision maker to look at various criteria independent of routes and give more important criteria a higher weight. In using this for determining routes, one can see the effect that certain criteria have in determining a decision. This tool lets one see the importance of criteria to different groups. One of the keys to using this process is to select parameters that are different between routes. One of the benefits of using the process is that this particular tool provides documentation for the selections made by the decision maker.

Comments:

- One participant stated that the decision analysis tool might be difficult for railroads to use since there is reason to believe that route options will be limited due to security issues.
- One participant asked who would make the criteria decisions and weight the criteria within DOE. Judith responded by saying that DOE would rely on stakeholder feedback, build as much flexibility into this process as possible, and use Topic or Regional Groups if appropriate.
- A suggestion was made by one participant that Ruth look at the DOT Modal Route Study completed in 1998 to assist in identifying criteria for rail routing. Steven acknowledged that this particular reference has been used in previous DOE routing analyses.
- Another suggestion was made to Ruth that it would have been helpful if SNL could walk through the data and talk about the strengths and weaknesses of the data. A short discussion followed identifying that data associated with different parameters used in the demonstration were not always equivalent in their rigor.

See write-up: [RADTRAN 5 Exec Summary.pdf](#)

RECEPTION

During the reception, Paul Johnson and Paul Singley, both from Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) provided a demo on the application of the Transportation Routing Analysis Geographic Information System (TRAGIS) to spent fuel routing analysis. See presentation and posters: [TRAGIS Layout.pdf](#) and [TRAGIS Posters.pdf](#)

Ruth Weiner (SNL) also provided a demo of the RADTRAN software package that provides a means of estimating the risks posed by transporting radioactive materials along different routes.

DAY 3: April 23, 2004

Judith Holm began the last day's meeting by introducing Lisa Sattler and having her present an update on the Midwestern Office of the Council of State Governments. [Due to travel delays, Ms. Sattler had been unable to present during the designated time on the previous day]. Following this presentation, Judith proceeded with the scheduled plenary summary session. Each breakout group had one or two representatives give an overview of their previous day's discussions and presentations which can be found at: [Friday's Presentation.pdf](#).

After the session overviews were completed, Gary Lanthrum thanked everyone for coming to the meeting further stating the importance of being able to meet face and to face and discuss issues important to all parties involved in this process. Discussion then led to the date and location of the next TEC meeting. It is tentatively scheduled for mid-late September 2004 in the Midwest. Mr. Lanthrum introduced Theodore Garrish, Deputy Director, RW Office of Strategy and Program Development. Mr. Garrish briefly addressed the audience stating that he was very pleased with the attendance and the variety of the groups represented at the meeting. Mr. Lanthrum adjourned the meeting.

During the break, ballots were distributed to the participants and they were asked to rank future topics for TEC. The topics for ranking were: Lessons Learned/Communications; Training; Routing/Rail; Transportation Infrastructure Acquisition; Security and 180(c). A total of 65 ballots were collected. The results are:

1. 180(c)
2. Routing/Rail
3. Security
4. Lessons Learned/Communications
5. Transportation Infrastructure Acquisition

Summary of Evaluations

The April 2004 TEC meeting was rated excellent or good by 82% of participants who returned an evaluation form.

Of the plenary sessions, Program Updates for RW and EM received the highest rating followed closely by the Regional Group Updates on Transportation Activities. For the breakout sessions, the Security and 180(c) received the highest rating of "Very Useful".

The majority of attendees rated 180(c), Security, and Rail Routing as topics that should continue to be addressed. Other areas of interest mentioned with less frequency included Communications, Training, and the coordination between Federal agencies.

As in the past, funding was also noted as an issue to be addressed. Comments were also made concerning the viewpoint that more emphasis should be given to Tribal involvement in these areas.

Overall, participants expressed that TEC is an excellent opportunity for them to interact and discuss issues of importance to them with individuals from other agencies, as well as Federal officials and industry representatives. The breakout sessions were very useful in that they allowed individuals to focus on topics of interest to them.