



Transportation External Coordination
Working Group

Work Plan

Version 6.0
Revised for July 1998 Meeting
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	2
II. Purpose of this Document	5
III. General Planning/Public Information and Communication	7
IV. Transportation Operations	10
V. Emergency Response	13
VI. Training and Technical Assistance	15
Appendix A. Table of TEC/WG Task Plans and Current Status	A-1

For more information about the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG), as well as the Department of Energy's other institutional programs, please contact: Judith Holm, NTP-Albuquerque, U.S. Department of Energy, Albuquerque Operations Office, P.O. Box 5400, Mail Stop FC5, Albuquerque, NM 87185-5400, phone (505) 845-4767 fax (505) 845-5508, or James Carlson, U.S. Department of Energy, RW-44, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, Washington DC 20585-0115, (202) 586-5321, fax (202) 586-9608. Editorial comments and/or corrections regarding this document should be directed to: Audrey Adamson, Urban Energy & Transportation Corporation, P.O. Box 341133, Bethesda, MD 20827-1133, (301) 564-5320, fax (301) 564-5321, aa_uetc@earthlink.net.

I. Introduction

In an effort to improve interactions between the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and external groups interested in the Department's transportation of hazardous (particularly radioactive) materials, DOE established the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC/WG). While the original focus of the group centered on emergency preparedness activities and related issues unique to separate programs within the Department, participants at the first meeting broadened the scope of discussion to bring consistency and improve coordination among the Department's transportation-related programs, including operations, general planning, emergency management, training, technical assistance, and public information and education.

TEC/WG participants include representatives from national, regional, tribal, state and local governmental and industry/professional groups. In an effort to minimize the potential for "capture" by parochial interests and to maximize the opportunity for broad-based decision making, no single state, local or tribal governmental entity or industry is itself a member; the membership is composed of organizations (a listing of TEC/WG members is found on Page 4). Members serve the group in three broad capacities: (1) to represent their constituent organizations; (2) to participate actively and consistently in TEC/WG activities; and (3) to communicate the findings and recommendations of the group back to their organizations for further input.

All DOE programs with significant ongoing or planned transportation programs participate in the group; these include the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, the Office of Environmental Management, the Office of Defense Programs, and the Office of Nuclear Energy. The Office of General Counsel also participates.

The TEC/WG meets on a semi-annual basis, with all meetings open to the public. At plenary and breakout sessions in these meetings, participants learn about current and future transportation plans, identify issues of concern to their constituents, suggest approaches the Department could take to address potential concerns, and track how DOE has incorporated their input into the planning process. Participants review and comment on documents that DOE has or is planning to produce, and also help the Department design and implement training programs for emergency responders along selected shipping routes. Beginning in 1996, subcommittees or "Topic Groups" composed of interested members were formed to examine specifically defined issues related to radioactive materials transportation. These groups enable a small number of participants to focus intensively on and discuss issues at a level of detail unattainable at the semi-annual meetings due to time and group size. The topic groups meet individually before TEC/WG meetings, and also participate in periodic conference calls, reporting back to the Department and the larger TEC/WG membership.

The TEC/WG approach has been endorsed by the Secretary of Energy, who has praised the group's committed efforts in working with interested parties and the public to develop a department-wide strategy on transportation issues. One key to the group's success has been its flexibility; the group has a formal charter and an issue resolution process, but TEC/WG is not considered an "advisory group" for purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee Act because final consensus is not being sought by DOE, and because the group consists of organizations and not members as individuals.

**TRANSPORTATION EXTERNAL COORDINATION WORKING GROUP
CURRENT MEMBERSHIP**

American Association of Port Authorities
American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials
American College of Emergency Physicians
AFL-CIO, Transportation Trades Department
American Nuclear Society
Association of American Railroads
Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc.
Cooperative Hazardous Materials Enforcement Development
Council of Energy Resource Tribes
Council of State Governments-Eastern Regional Conference
Council of State Governments Midwestern Office
Emergency Nurses Association
Energy Communities Alliance
FRA State Rail Safety Managers Program
Hazardous Materials Advisory Council
International Association of Fire Chiefs
International Association of Fire Fighters
International City/County Management Association
Intertribal Transportation Association
League of Women Voters Nuclear Waste Education Project
National Association of Chiefs of Police
National Association of Counties
National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians
National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
National Conference of State Legislatures
National Conference of State Transportation Specialists
National Congress of American Indians
National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management
National Emergency Management Association
National Governors' Association
National League of Cities
National Sheriffs' Association
National Tribal Environmental Council
Nuclear Energy Institute
Transportation Research Board of the National Research Council
Southern States Energy Board
Western Governors' Association
Western Interstate Energy Board

Associate Members:

Contractors Transportation Management Association
Training Resources and Data Exchange
Urban Energy & Transportation Corporation

II. Purpose of this Document

At the first TEC/WG meeting in New Orleans in April 1992, meeting participants developed a list of over 100 recommended objectives and activities for DOE transportation and emergency response programs to consider. The objectives were reviewed at the group's second meeting in San Francisco in September 1992, and the group agreed to track the status of the objectives and DOE's responses to them in a *TEC/WG Work Plan*, the first of which was produced in January 1994. The first version of the plan contained an extensive discussion of the issues under each of seven topic areas (general planning; safe, routine transport; inspection and enforcement; emergency management; training; technical assistance; and public information and communication). Task plans that resulted listed every recommendation that fell within the subject areas and also described the activities that DOE had undertaken to address each issue.

Since TEC/WG's inception in 1992, the group has grown significantly in both size and focus. While emergency management issues continue to occupy a large portion of the group's attention, other issues, such as transportation operations and public education, have grown in importance. At the same time, other issues deemed important in 1992 have since been resolved. While most TEC/WG meeting participants find the sessions to be useful and informative, others have voiced concern that the form and content of the meetings sometimes seemed repetitive.

The TEC/WG meeting convenors have tried and will continue to try to keep both the form and content of the sessions both timely and informative. Some efforts have included: simplification of the TEC/WG internal tracking process; minimizing repetition and reducing costs by suspending other, similar forums; and completion of a process-wide evaluation of the group's focus and objectives. The evaluation was based on interviews with a variety of participants in the group, which was undertaken in 1996, four years after the group's inception. The evaluation provided feedback to DOE and to TEC/WG participants about the value and achievements of the TEC/WG and information they could use to improve the effectiveness of the group. Findings and recommendations, which were provided in the evaluation report prepared for DOE by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory,¹ were discussed by members at subsequent TEC/WG meetings. A key change made as a result of the evaluation was the establishment of subcommittees or topic groups, to focus on issues deemed by members to be a priority.

As the first *Work Plan* itself stated, changes in program structure, developments in technology and other events might make format changes necessary. In order to keep the *Work Plan* as useful and timely as possible, the sections discussing the general areas of concern to the TEC/WG membership have been shortened and simplified. Each area (general planning/public information and communications; transportation operations; emergency response; and training and technical assistance) contains short issue statements, followed by a background discussion, progress to date, identification of potential future impacts on the particular issue, and a listing of resources to consult for further

¹ *Transportation External Coordination Working Group Evaluation*, PNNL-11300, Judith A. Bradbury and Kristi M. Branch, September 1996.

information, including specific task plans for individual objectives. The modifications made to this version of the *Work Plan* should help make the document useful for stimulating discussion as well as tracking past and current activities. A table of task plans and their current status is included as Appendix A.

This document will be updated semiannually to reflect comments and discussions at the TEC/WG sessions and to permit inclusion of new information. While every effort has been made to maintain objectivity and balance on the issues addressed herein, some resources or information may not be known to the document's editors. Your comments and suggestions on improving the document's usefulness and scope are encouraged; please submit any comments to the DOE TEC/WG Chairpersons, Ms. Judith Holm and Mr. James Carlson, at the addresses on the Table of Contents page or through the TEC/WG Homepage at www.uetc.org/tec.

III. GENERAL PLANNING/PUBLIC INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS

CURRENT ISSUES/ACTIONS:

- Develop recommendations for coordinating §180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act with state, tribal and local programs.
- Develop process for reviewing TEPP and §180(c) strategies.
- Discuss process for implementing WIPP Land Withdrawal Act (no activities recommended as of 6/98).
- Provide review and comment on transportation information products in development (e.g., Communications Topic Group).
- Clarify the TEC/WG's purpose and process through maintenance of TEC/WG Work Plan.

BACKGROUND:

Each DOE transportation program has distinct roles and responsibilities that stem from different statutory and policy requirements, such as the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management's (OCRWM's) duties under §180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plan (WIPP) program's responsibilities as outlined in the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act. At the same time, many of their activities are interrelated and affect many of the same external entities; decisions made by one program can set precedents for the plans of others in the future. The TEC/WG was founded to help DOE interact with interested parties in a coordinated manner, and to help the different programs work together more effectively.

As a result of recommendations made by the group in this area, DOE has implemented several changes in its transportation planning practices. DOE has developed a standard glossary of terms so that different transportation programs will use consistent terminology. The TEC/WG developed a definition of technical assistance that was considered by OCRWM as they developed policies and procedures for implementing Section 180(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The TEC/WG definition will also inform the Office of Environmental Management's Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (including training). At the behest of TEC/WG, DOE has developed a Prospective Shipments Module as part of its tracking and commodity management programs. Unlike previous activities that provided only historical data, the Prospective Shipments Module (PSM) contains forecasts of shipments that are expected to occur within a 12-month time frame. This advance information has proven valuable both to TEC/WG members and DOE in their planning efforts. It is updated several times a year and distributed to TEC/WG members. Currently, the PSM is available on the World Wide Web; password registration through the Oak Ridge National Laboratory is necessary.

EFFECT OF TEC/WG INPUT ON PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:

- TEC/WG participants have reviewed and commented on several of DOE's transportation planning documents, including the *Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) Strategy Plan*, the TEPP program contribution to DOE Order 151.1 (Comprehensive Emergency Management System), and draft versions of the TEPP program's *Training Coordination Program Plan*, *Training Needs Assessment Report*, *Regulatory Requirements Report*, and *Job Analysis for "Responding to a Transportation Accident Involving DOE RAM"*. Other documents reviewed include the *Liaison and Communications Long Range Plan*, the *Transportation Institutional Policy*, the *Program Manager's Guide to Transportation Planning (Revision 2)*, and a Question and Answer Booklet on DOE's Transportation Programs. Extensive revisions have been made to the documents and their implementation as a result of the TEC/WG comments.
- TEC/WG members have recommended that DOE analyze transportation impacts in greater detail when conducting NEPA-mandated assessments such as environmental impact statements (EISs). As a result, DOE has incorporated its transportation plans into EISs by reference, and made other changes to more fully address transport concerns. Cooperatively developed transportation plans are now being produced for all major shipments of radioactive materials, such as foreign research reactor spent nuclear fuel being returned to the U.S. through naval facilities near Concord, CA, and Charleston, SC.
- The TEC/WG membership has also focused on the role that risk perception plays in planning and implementation of transportation programs, and has reviewed the recent work of Dr. Hank Jenkins-Smith of the University of New Mexico in surveying populations along DOE transport corridors before and after discrete shipping campaigns. TEC/WG members helped structure the form and content of the survey questions. A formal analysis of the data collected was released in a program report in the fall of 1996. This work has also been instrumental in assessing the impacts of spent fuel shipments from Concord, CA, to Idaho Falls, ID.
- As discussed in the previous section, Battelle/Pacific Northwest National Laboratory conducted an evaluation of the TEC/WG during 1996. Key changes made to the TEC/WG's organization and procedures as a result of the evaluation and subsequent discussions with members include: reformatting of the meetings to enhance member interaction; revisions to the *Resource Notebook* and TEC/WG meeting summaries; and the establishment of subcommittees or Topic Groups. The groups are responsible for scoping and developing their own schedule and workplan; each is composed of approximately 8-10 members, conducts conference calls/information exchanges between TEC/WG meetings, and reports back to the TEC/WG meetings.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS/SIGNIFICANT FUTURE EVENTS:

- While funding to support TEC/WG has been relatively stable in past years, current budget constraints will continue to put pressure on DOE upper management to cut costs wherever possible. DOE must be able to demonstrate that the TEC/WG process works and is a cost-effective method of involving interested parties in its transportation activities.
- The redeployment of transportation management functions from DOE Headquarters to the field will significantly affect how the EM program and the rest of the Department conducts its business. The National Transportation Program (NTP) is managed by a joint Headquarters, Albuquerque, and Idaho Operations Offices Team. The NTP is intended to provide the transportation infrastructure and technology to support accelerated cleanup of the EM complex, which is planned to occur through the year 2006.

RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTION ITEMS:

- Continue to use TEC/WG for review and comments on pre-decisional drafts of other DOE planning documents.
- Incorporate findings from surveys into TEC/WG planning process.
- Update and reformat TEC/WG planning tools, including the *Work Plan*, process charts and other internal products, to show how the process has changed as a result.
- Survey the process employed by similar working groups (both within outside DOE) so determine if other innovations in form and process might be applicable to TEC/WG.
- Ensure that DOE program personnel stay involved with TEC/WG on a continuing basis, in order to preserve continuity and the opportunity to bring emerging program developments to light.
- Continue to make available to TEC/WG membership “After Action Reports” relating to foreign research reactor planning sessions and shipments, as available.

RELATED RESOURCES:

- *Memorandum of Agreement between the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, and Defense Programs, Concerning the Transportation External Coordination Working Group’s Involvement with DOE Radioactive Materials Transportation Activities*, January 6, 1994.
- *U.S. DOE Liaison and Communications Long Range Plan*.
- *U.S. DOE Program Manager’s Guide to Transportation Planning*.
- *U.S. DOE Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) Strategy Plan*.
- *U.S. DOE Transportation External Coordination Working Group Charter*, July 16, 1993.
- *U.S. DOE Transportation Institutional Policy*.

Contact(s): **Judith A. Holm, NTP-Albuquerque, (505) 845-4767**
James Carlson, DOE-OCRWM, (202) 586-5321

IV. TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS

CURRENT ISSUES/ACTIONS:

- Track Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA) efforts in coordinating training and enroute inspections for radioactive material.
- Seek NRC acceptance of DOE policy concerning pre-notification of tribes related to spent fuel shipments.
- Study issues related to rail inspection and enforcement procedures and rail regulations.
- Study issues related to improvements in infrastructure that may be necessitated by transportation activities related to NWPA shipments.

BACKGROUND:

The basic framework for ensuring the safe transportation of hazardous (particularly radioactive) materials is provided by regulations promulgated by the Department of Transportation and (for radioactive materials shipments) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. DOE, like other large shippers of such materials, works with carriers of all shipping modes to ensure that shipments are accomplished safely, efficiently, and in full compliance with regulations and Departmental policy.

Transportation operations include the planning and execution of shipments of material; for particularly sizable or significant movements, DOE logistics staff will prepare formal written transportation plans that list the responsibilities of shipper and carrier, jurisdictions along the proposed route, shipment schedules, emergency contacts, communications/media strategies and any agreements made between DOE and other entities that may go beyond that required by regulation. Other operational considerations can include such elements as product characterization, packaging, and mode/route decisions. These elements influence decisions about carrier selection, freight rates and service negotiations.

TEC/WG participants, particularly representatives of state and tribal organizations, have emphasized their needs for current and specific information on DOE shipments in order to adequately plan for emergency response and other safety-related activities. DOE has worked to encourage coordination among various jurisdictions through which its shipments pass, to ensure uniformity and consistency in planning and potential response.

Several DOE programs have unique regulatory and institutional requirements that make complete uniformity among Departmental transportation programs not feasible. For instance, OCRWM and the WIPP program have special requirements imposed by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act, respectively. DOE is working to improve communications at all levels of government and to increase uniformity and consistency where appropriate.

EFFECT OF TEC/WG INPUT ON PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:

- DOE has established an advance notification policy for informing states and tribes along shipping routes of spent nuclear fuel that is consistent with regulations established by the NRC and also complies with the spirit of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which governs civilian shipments under OCRWM auspices. In particular, the NRC regulations do not provide for formal notifications to tribes, although they mandate notification to state governors or their designees. For purposes of these shipments, DOE intends to provide the same notifications to tribes along routes as it does to states.
- DOE has drafted a guidance document for transportation operations in the event of bad weather and road conditions. The Department has examined the Western Governors' Association's (WGA's) WIPP Program Implementation Guide for applicability to other types of shipments, and has developed other guidance documents, such as the *Program Managers' Guide to Transportation Planning* and the *Prospective Shipments Module*, to better inform all parties about the roles and responsibilities each jurisdiction has. The Southern States Energy Board has developed a similar document for its region.
- DOE has also circulated portions of its *Transportation Operations Manual* to the TEC/WG for comment. The manual is intended to be used in conjunction with the *Program Managers' Guide to Transportation Planning*, which was also developed with TEC/WG input.
- TEC/WG also expressed interest in DOE's Motor Carrier Evaluation Program (MCEP), which is designed to evaluate a carrier's level of regulatory compliance and determine how aggressive the carrier is in areas of operational efficiency and safety that are not regulatory-driven. The MCEP was formally evaluated by a TEC/WG member organization, the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA), and its findings reported to the group and DOE.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS/SIGNIFICANT FUTURE EVENTS:

- DOE's internal Orders have been updated; the new Orders are DOE Order 460.1 and 460.2. The new Orders are intended to clarify the regulatory requirements while sustaining high levels of safety. Specific new requirements include the development of written transportation plans for significant shipments of radioactive material, and a new requirement that all sites must use the Prospective Shipments Module reporting system to help forecast future shipping campaigns.
- The hazardous materials transportation law may be reauthorized in the coming Congressional session. The U.S. Department of Transportation's Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), which is responsible for implementing the statute, has asked interested parties to submit their comments on the Act. Public meetings will be scheduled in order to solicit comments, and written comments are also being sought.
- DOE's Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management is considering whether to contract out its waste acceptance and transportation activities to private vendors. On November 24, 1997, DOE released a revised draft Request for Proposals that outlines the services for which it expects to contract.
TEC/WG participants have expressed a keen interest in how this potential arrangement will impact commitments already made to interested parties.

RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTION ITEMS:

- At the January 1996 TEC/WG meeting in San Antonio, DOE stated that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) had not yet rendered a legal opinion on the right of states and tribes to stop an enroute shipment of radioactive materials for radiological inspections. While the authority of states and tribes to do so for truck shipments is clear, the authority for rail shipments is not, and logistical problems can arise if trains are required to make stops in what might be remote locations. A new Topic Group dedicated to discussing rail issues has been formed; the topic group will report on its progress at each TEC/WG meeting.
- At the January 1996 meeting, DOE's Transportation Operations Team committed to provide an updated version of its guidance for transportation operations for bad weather and road conditions that incorporates comments received from TEC/WG members. A draft version was circulated at that meeting for review and comment. This issue was later covered in greater detail in the *Program Manager's Guide to Transportation Planning* and in the *Prospective Shipments Module*.
- In April 1998, the Routing Topic Group released a discussion paper on DOE routing of radioactive materials. The report outlines the current regulatory structure regarding routing, and also describes the perspectives of different state, local, and tribal officials on the issue of route selection. The report contains recommendations to DOE for future routing activities; it was transmitted to the Senior Executive Transportation Forum in June 1998.

RELATED RESOURCES:

- *DOE Orders 460.1, 460.2, "Departmental Materials Transportation and Packaging Management."*
- *U.S. Department of Energy, Acquisition of Waste Acceptance and Transportation Services for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, November 24, 1997 (Draft RFP No. DE-RP01-98RW00320).*
- *U.S. DOE Program Managers' Guide to Transportation Planning (Revision 2).*
- *U.S. DOE Prospective Shipments Module.*
- *U.S. DOE Transportation Operations Manual.*
- *Routing Issues Related to U.S. Department of Energy Radioactive Materials Transportation: Discussion and Recommendations.*

**Contact(s): Steve Hamp, NTP-Albuquerque, (505) 845-5640
Markus Popa, RW-44, (202) 586-5330**

V. EMERGENCY RESPONSE

CURRENT ISSUES/ACTIONS:

- Development of national transportation emergency planning documents (“TEPP Tools”) for use by State, Tribal, and local governments
- A pilot project to beta test planning documents
- Implementation of the National Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) through Operations Offices Regional TEPP Program

BACKGROUND:

The Office of Environmental Management (EM), as required by DOE Order 151.1, is establishing and maintaining a Department-wide Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP). Based upon DOE Order 151.1, TEPP addresses the Department’s roles and responsibilities in planning and preparedness to DOE hazardous materials transportation incidents, particularly involving radioactive materials. TEPP provides the framework for a DOE-wide program that integrates the existing DOE emergency response structure and provides for a comprehensive integrated approach to transportation emergency planning, preparedness, and support of local government response.

TEPP is an element of the overall DOE Emergency Management System (EMS) and is coordinated by the Office of Environmental Management, through the Office of Transportation and Emergency Management (EM-76), with the Office of Emergency Management (NN-60), and all other appropriate DOE elements. TEPP includes aspects that make it unique and distinct from fixed facility EMS preparedness. The most obvious difference is the location of a transportation incident, which may occur outside of DOE’s jurisdiction.

EFFECT OF TEC/WG INPUT ON PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:

- EM-76 will provide planning documents, as they are developed, for review and comment by the Transportation External Coordinating Working Group (TEC/WG).
- TEC/WG members have reviewed and commented on several transportation emergency management documents including FEMA-REP-5, Revision 2 Draft, Transportation Emergency Preparedness draft chapter to DOE Order 151.1, and the TEPP training front end analysis documents distributed at the Albuquerque meeting.

POTENTIAL IMPACTS/SIGNIFICANT FUTURE EVENTS:

- Pre-shipment planning will integrate transportation managers, emergency managers, and public information officers beginning at an on-site facility level, based upon identified risks.
- Budgetary constraints may impact the implementation of a fully integrated, system-wide approach for transportation emergency response.

RELATED RESOURCES:

- U.S. Department of Energy Emergency Management Guides
- U.S. DOE Order 151.1, Comprehensive Emergency Management System
- Draft U.S. Department of Energy Program Manager's Guide to Transportation Planning (revised May 1998)

Contact(s): Kelly Kelkenberg, EM-76, (301) 903-1969

VI. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

CURRENT ISSUES/ACTIONS:

- Establish distance learning training modules for use by state, tribal, and local responders.
- Identification of opportunities for improvement of emergency response training (e.g., Medical Issues Training Topic Group).
- Implementation of the TEPP program to assist DOE programs and field offices in developing ongoing working relationships with state, tribal, and local officials.

BACKGROUND:

DOE has responsibilities, as stated in Federal laws, regulations, and agreements, to provide to State, Tribal, and local agencies:

1. Assistance in understanding the risks associated with DOE shipments, and
2. Training assistance for emergency responders who, in the course of their duties, may respond to incidents involving DOE radioactive materials shipments.

DOE seeks to address coordination of training issues with other Federal agencies through active participation in intergovernmental organizations such as the HMTUSA Interagency Coordination Group (ICG), the Federal Radiological Preparedness Coordinating Committee (FRPCC), and the National Response Team. The Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) serves as the point of contact for these activities.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT— TRANSPORTATION EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (TEPP)

The Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program will establish consistent emergency management policy among the various program elements within the Department. This policy incorporates DOE requirements, along with the requirements of other Federal regulations, in regard to transportation of hazardous materials, with a special emphasis on radioactive materials.

The TEPP training development is focused on developing training modules for responders commensurate with the risks associated with DOE radioactive materials transportation activities. TEPP will provide training materials that can be incorporated into existing emergency management training programs provided by state, tribal, and local governments. Implementation and distribution of the training materials will be accomplished through the Department's existing Regional Coordinating Offices (RCO).

Through implementation of TEPP, the types of assistance needed for DOE programs and field offices to develop working relationships with state, tribal, and local officials will be identified. Assistance may include provision of regional planning support, training materials and resources, exercise and drill guidance, and the identification of appropriate equipment resources for response to a radioactive materials incident to support DOE regional transportation programs.

Objectives of the TEPP include:

- Developing an implementation plan that is coordinated throughout the DOE-complex.
- Providing guidance material (“TEPP Tools”) for coordination of TEPP planning for emergency responders located along the DOE transportation corridors. This planning will promote horizontal and vertical integration for Federal, State, Tribal, and local planning and response to DOE accidents involving radioactive materials.
- Provide cost-efficient training materials that address response to a radioactive materials incident which may be incorporated into existing training programs for Federal State, Tribal, and local emergency responders.
- Make guidance and self help packages available to Federal, State, Tribal, and local emergency responders for the development of efficient and cost-effective transportation exercise and drill activities.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT (RW)

As a result of specific legislative and institutional directives, several programs within DOE offer training that is tailored specifically to their programs and are offered to State, Tribal, and local official. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) program, for example, has trained thousands of potential first responders along potential WIPP waste transportation corridors, The RW program is further required by Section 180 (c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act to provide technical and financial assistance to states for training public safety officials of appropriate units of local governments and to Indian Tribes through whose jurisdiction DOE plans to transport spent nuclear fuel (SNF) and high-level waste.

CURRENT ISSUES (Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program)

- Transition and integration of current training efforts and capabilities throughout the DOE complex.
- Identify training modules that lend themselves to a distance learning format.
- Develop standardized modular-based training material addressing response to a radioactive materials incident to supplement existing state, tribal, and local governments’ hazardous materials training programs.

EFFECT OF TEC/WG INPUT ON PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:

- TEPP has utilized TEC/WG input to help define program priorities, given budget constraints and limitations, on the development and updating of training courses. That group met in Las Vegas in early 1996, and a Topic Group was established to look at training in greater detail. Since the Charleston, SC, meeting the Training Topic Group has provided reviews of TEPP training documents that have helped define a national TEPP training program addressing response to radioactive materials incidents.
- TEC/WG members have reviewed and commented on the TEPP training front-end analysis documents distributed at the Albuquerque meeting (July 1997).
- At the July 1997 meeting in Albuquerque, NM, the TEC/WG Training Topic Group noted that medical training issues needed to be addressed and a topic group was established to address emergency medical care training.
- An awareness level training course on *Radioactive Materials Basics for First Responders* was provided to TEC/WG members for review and the comments received will be incorporated into the final product (January 1998).
- TEPP will provide training documents and materials, as they are developed, for review and comments by the TEC/WG.

POTENTIAL IMPACT/SIGNIFICANT FUTURE EVENTS:

- Continued budgetary constraints will require DOE and other entities to look for lower-cost training delivery mechanisms wherever possible.
- Potential changes to the hazardous materials transportation law (see discussion under Transportation Operations section) may impact resources available to State, Tribal, and local governments; funding of training through DOT's registration program may be reexamined.
- In May 1996, DOE published a Federal Register notice describing a proposed funding mechanism, allowable activities, timing and eligibility of grants, and defined key terms relating to how DOE plans to implement Section 180 (c) of the NWPA. A revised proposed policy and procedures are scheduled to be released for comments in the 1997 and the final version is scheduled for release in 1998.

RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTION ITEMS:

(Specific findings from subgroup meeting are available)

- DOE's training should focus on developing and fielding radiological training to supplement the existing hazardous materials training under the "all hazards" approach.
- DOE should seek professional group endorsement for its training programs.
- DOE should establish a hierarchy of criteria and tiered responses that govern how and what level it will respond to a transportation emergency.
- All training materials and related information should be pilot-tested by TEC/WG membership before release.
- TEC/WG members should continue to review and comment on revisions to DOE's 180 (c) proposed policy and procedures.

RELATED RESOURCES:

- *CFR 1910.120*
- *49 CFR 172.600 "Emergency Response Information."*
- *U.S. Department of Energy Emergency Management Guide.*
- *U.S. Department of Energy Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management; Safe Transportation and Emergency Response Training; Technical Assistance and Funding, Notice of Proposed Policy and Procedures (Federal Register, May 16, 1996).*
- *Department of Energy Program Managers' Guide to Transportation Planning (revised).*
- *U.S. Department of Energy Transport of Radioactive Materials Q&A About Incident Response, October 1992.*
- *Department of Energy Transportation 1996 North American Emergency Response Guidebook.*

Contact(s): Kelly Kelkenberg, EM-76, (301) 903-1969
Corinne Macaluso, RW-44, (202) 596-2837