

DOE TEC Routing Topic Group Conference Call
Thursday, October 4, 2007
3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m. EST

Conference Call/Meeting Notes

Welcome and Introductions

Chair: Alex Thrower, DOE-OLM

Topic Group Participants:

Melissa Bailey, CSG-NE
Jane Beetem, CSG-MW
Kevin Blackwell, DOT/FRA
Cloyce Brackett, SSEB
Barbara Byron, CA Energy Commission
Tony Dimond, BLET
Pat Edwards, CSG-NE
Dane Ellingson, NCSL
Ray English, DOE-NNPP
Dan Fisher, Public Utilities Commission
of Ohio

Ralph Hail, Norfolk Southern
Lisa Janairo, CSG-MW
Paul Johnson, ORNL
Candice Jordan, ECA
Marsha Keister, INL
Mel Massaro, DOT/FRA
Doug Osborn, SNL
Cort Richardson, CSG-NE
Tim Runyon, CSG/MW
Larry Stern, CVSA
Sarah Wochos, CSG/MW

Contractor Support:

Randy Copping, BAH
Michele Enders, SAIC
Lee Finewood, BAH
John Smegal, Legin

Summary:

The conference call began at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on Thursday, October 4 2007. The purpose of this call was to discuss the topic groups' approach, process and future direction via stakeholder input.

No comments on August 23, 2007 conference call/meeting notes. The August 23, 2007 conference call/meeting notes will be considered final.

Review of last call:

Alex Thrower reviewed the topic group's discussions on the last call. The current version of the Task Plan is what the topic group had decided to do during the DOE TEC Kansas City meeting. The task plan could be overtaken today based on the topic group's discussions and decisions on the topic group's path forward.

The only comment received in writing regarding the group's approach and path forward was from Kevin Blackwell. [Note: These comments were distributed at an earlier date.]

DOE Statements:

Alex Thrower stated that he had committed to providing very succinct and clear definitions regarding what DOE wants to do in the routing area generally and what DOE is asking the routing topic group to do.

These statements are as follows:

1. Cooperative development of a routing approach and process that is reasonable and defensible;
2. Cooperative, detailed input into route analysis, evaluation, and identification.

The ultimate goal of all the routing work is to come up with a planning-basis set of routes from origin sites that will support initial 180(c) grant allocation efforts, and long-lead time (i.e. - 5+ years before shipment) logistical analyses. The results will represent a starting point for negotiations between DOE and corridor jurisdictions, and for shipping arrangements between DOE and the railroads.

OCRWM will entertain any reasonable process approach for implementing this. "Reasonable" means there will be fair, objective analysis of potential routes that can be implemented by rail and highway carriers safely, and at a cost comparable to other hazardous materials. "Reasonable" and "planning-basis" does not mean every route from every site by any mode must be fully analyzed before any decisions can be taken.

Alex Thrower reiterated that he is willing to support any reasonable process that gets DOE routes that they can use.

Current and Future Legislation/Rulemaking

- **HR 1 Bill:**
 - May just involve studies
 - May impact what routing topic group is doing
 - No significant changes anticipated in the final rule
 - Ray English noted that the rules apply to how a carrier evaluates how it routes hazardous material shipments on it's system
 - Ray English and Kevin Blackwell noted that the new routing rules may make the work of the topic group irrelevant
 - Cort Richardson commented that the SNF shipments are not necessarily analogous to previous shipping campaigns, due to size and duration

Comments on What Stakeholder Input Should Include:

- Lisa Janairo said the stated purpose of the topic group in the task plan is to "provide stakeholder perspectives and input to OLM" in DOE's process for selecting routes. DOE should not expect stakeholders to determine the cost effectiveness of routes.
- Alex Thrower responded that he would like to have stakeholder input that can be implemented reasonably.
- Lisa Janairo commented that DOE needs to make some operational decisions since these decisions will impact the cost effectiveness of different routes

- Alex Thrower stated that he would rather have the difficult discussions now on route selection, and know the routes ultimately selected will work rather than just take stakeholders' perspectives and come up with routes that are not viable
- Cort Richardson recommended the topic group do more field work and look at real routes
- Alex Thrower conceded that there has been some indecision on the DOE side as to how to approach the selection of routes. He also noted that there has been frustration from many of the group's participants since the topic group does not appear to be making good progress
- Cort Richardson recommended a 2-3 day workshop be resurrected as a way for the topic group to select routes
- Tim Runyon commented that he was unsure if the topic group members are capable at looking at all the different variables that goes into selecting a national suite of routes. Tim recommends looking at a single route and a single plant
- Alex Thrower suggested that the topic group look at 6 or 8 sites as an exercise in modeling
- Lisa Janairo commented that what Alex is proposing for the topic group is not inconsistent with the task plan
- Pat Edwards agreed with Cort that a suite of routes could be created in a couple of days if key individuals from the railroads, utilities, etc. were involved

Perspective from Railroads:

- Ralph Hail stated that Norfolk Southern has service design centers. If the origin and destination are known, they can develop a best route scenario
- Railroads want to ship everything 100% incident free
- Norfolk Southern has marketing personnel that can give cost information on route selection
- Ralph Hail stated they have software programs that can be used to select routes
- Cort stated that the topic group needs to have the actual infrastructure in mind before routing principles can be decided
- Pat Edwards commented that in the Northeast they have been actually walking certain segments of Class I track to see what the needs are for the track

Decisions made on this call:

- Modify the task plan to incorporate the approach
- Conduct extensive analytical exercises (i.e., work on a standard problem with different approaches)
- Conduct workshops with railroads, etc.
- Solicit volunteers to lead subgroups on different approaches

Action Items:

1. Michele Enders will send an Excel file with topic group members' e-mail addresses to all topic group members [Note: Patrick Gorman pgorman@legin.com 202-488-3190 x115 will be taking over for Michele after she leaves.]
2. Alex will provide a modified task plan to incorporate the different approaches