

**DOE TEC Rail Topic Group Conference Call
Thursday, February 24, 2005, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m. EST**

Conference Call Minutes

Participants:

Co-Chairs: Jay Jones (RW), Alex Thrower (EM)

Members: Jane Beetem (MO Department of Natural Resources), **Kevin Blackwell** (FRA), **Dennis Brooks** (Texas Energy Conservation Office), **Patrick Edwards** (PA Public Utility Commission), **Ray English** (Office of Naval Reactors, DOE), **Paul Genoa** (Nuclear Energy Institute), **Eric Huang** (DOE), **Paul Johnson** (ORNL), **Doug Larson** (Western Interstate Energy Board [WIEB]), **Bill Mackie** (Western Governors' Association [WGA]), Roger Mulder (Texas Energy Conservation Office), **Ken Niles** (WIEB), **Jim Reed** (NCSL), **Lisa Sattler** (CSG-Midwest), **Conrad Smith** (CSG-East), **Sara Wochos** (CSG-Midwest)

Contractor Support: Ralph Best (BSC), **Ed Davis** (BSC), **Michele Enders** (SAIC), and **Ron Ross** (BSC)

Summary:

The conference call began at 11:00 a.m. Eastern time on Thursday, February 24, 2005. Jay Jones started the meeting by welcoming everyone and having the participants on the call introduce themselves. Jay asked if there were any comments or revisions to the meeting minutes from the January 27th conference call. There were no comments on the previous meeting minutes offered.

The next item on the agenda was to discuss the annotated outline for the summary report. Jay Jones asked if there were any comments on the annotated outline.

The following dialogue is in reference to the Transportation Route Decision Process Diagram included as Section 4 in the Annotated Outline.

Doug Larson: Doug commented that the diagram in Section 4 is one alternative for route selection but there needs to be a second alternative.

Jay Jones: DOE will evaluate alternate routes and State Regional Groups (SRGs) will be asked to provide feedback.

Doug Larson: In reference to DOE's decision on a transportation mode, Doug asked if DOE takes into consideration neighboring, nearby reactor routes that have already been prepared?

Jay Jones: Jay was not sure if TRAGIS is able to reflect the kind of detail that Doug is referring to.

Paul Johnson: It is necessary to define an origin consolidation point. The process is routes to reactors to consolidation points.

Ralph Best: The information presented in this diagram does not include mode or mode decisions. Ralph suggested that another box be added in the diagram and the paper that includes these decisions.

Jay Jones: Ralph will revise the diagram for the next conference call. [**Action item**]

Doug Larson: Doug asked if there needs to be some kind of feedback loop added to the diagram? This would be a loop that checks on the mode and determines if the mode would alter the risk and/or safety factors.

Ralph Best: Ralph answered Doug's question by saying that he did not think it was appropriate to add all the possible interactions and evaluations into this diagram/chart as it is already a very busy diagram/chart.

Doug Larson: Doug suggested that the additional interactions could be addressed in the paper as opposed to graphically representing them in the diagram/chart.

Jay Jones: Jay agreed that addressing the additional interactions and evaluations in the paper would be a good idea.

Kevin Blackwell: Kevin asked if Ralph and/or Jay were aware of the DOT RSPA 1998 Mode and Route Study. This was a comprehensive report.

Jay Jones: Jay was not aware of the report.

Ralph Best: Ralph stated that the RSPA mode study Kevin referred to was included in the list of references as part of the matrices that were done for the two historic factors papers (highway and rail) three months ago. The history of route selection was based on actual experience.

Kevin Blackwell: Kevin stated that as a point of reference RSPA is now known as the Pipeline Hazardous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA).

Jay Jones asked if there were any additional comments on the annotated outline/summary report. The following dialogue discusses Section 4.1 through Section 5 in greater detail.

Sarah Wochos: Sarah asked where does the utilities' input come into the paper?

Jay Jones: Jay responded that Operations has been working with the utilities.

Sarah Wochos: Sarah commented that the input from the utilities needs to be added at the beginning of the route criteria process.

Ralph Best: Ralph added that DOE is considered the shipper from the utility side.

Jay Jones: Jay agreed that the utilities need to be added in the process.

Ralph Best: Ralph stated that when a paper is written discussing the routing process, the utilities need to be addressed in regards to their local and regional community involvement and interests.

Ron Ross: Ron clarified that this paper is not determining rail and utilities capability.

Ralph Best: Ralph suggested that the topic group walk through the remainder of the annotated outline section by section.

Conrad Smith: In reference to Section 4.2 Route Analysis Tools, Conrad commented that RADTRAN needed work concerning accident rates by states. Conrad asked if DOE is moving forward with the FRA in getting better accident rates?

Jay Jones: Since Ruth Weiner was not able to be on the conference call, Jay commented that there are numerous pieces of information that individuals want to see added to RADTRAN. Ruth Weiner went to an FRA meeting in Florida to retrieve information that will aid in updating the model for RADTRAN.

Paul Johnson: Paul commented that he and Ruth are also talking with Tom Bouve from the FRA.

Ralph Best: Ralph stated that RADTRAN does not need to be updated to improve its capability to estimate transportation risks but rather, to do the analysis suggested by

Conrad Smith, there would need to be more fidelity in regards to the data used to estimate risks within states.

Conrad Smith: Conrad agreed that the problem is with the data and not the model itself.

Ralph Best: Ralph stated that the data used for the Yucca Mountain EIS was collected from the FRA. The data was compiled by Argonne (state data). This data was insufficient to use for accident rates at the level of detail of rail segments or specific rail lines. The fact that key information, such as commodity shipping data for a specific railroad is proprietary limits the ability to develop accident rates having more fidelity than state-level rates estimated by Argonne researchers.

Kevin Blackwell: Kevin commented that for 2002, train accidents were reported by railroad and then by state. This information gives an accident rate and a percentage of count by state.

Doug Larson: Doug asked wouldn't the Topic Group want accident rates by segments?

Jay Jones: Jay agreed that the Topic Group needs to address the accident rate issue however, the funding and resources are limited for model revisions.

Conrad Smith: Conrad commented that the model needs to be good for everyone. Having an accident rate that is the same throughout the state as opposed to having an accident rate for each segment would not be acceptable by a Federal Judge.

Jay Jones: Jay stated that the Topic Group will take this issue into consideration and incorporate it into the paper.

Ralph Best redirected the Topic Group to focus on how the annotated outline was put together. Ralph proceeded to discuss each section of the outline beginning with Section 1 Introduction and Summary.

Ralph Best: In drafting the Introduction and Summary. Ralph stated that he tried to cast the scope of the paper, what it should include, what it will not include. The paper will identify the stakeholders and other parties involved in routing. Ultimately, the paper will discuss route identification and the implementation of Section 180(c).

Ralph continued with Section 2 History of Route Selection stating that this section will discuss the 1977 analysis by Rasmussen on risk, DOT's own work in setting up routing criteria (HM 164), as well as how routes were selected for several campaigns.

Jay Jones: Jay stated that Ralph will write the first two sections of the paper.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa agreed that Ralph should write the first two sections. However, she suggested that foreign experience in route selection be added in section 2.

Ralph Best: Ralph stated that Section 3 Routing Issues for Shipping Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste should be written by the Topic Group. This section should address issues concerning dimension, complexity of the routing criteria, and the challenge of determining routing criteria and ultimately routes.

Alex Thrower: Alex commented that Section 3 is an ideal place to discuss the states' dissatisfaction with routing decisions.

Jay Jones: Jay will rely on the SRGs to provide input for Section 3 of the paper.

Ralph Best: Ralph continued reviewing the outline. Section 4, Process for Selecting Regional Suites of Routes needs to address alternative processes. Ralph also suggested that Sections 4.1 and 4.2 discuss basic routing information which could be written by Paul Johnson and Ruth Weiner.

Jay Jones: Jay agreed with Ralph on Section 4. Jay also added that this section should discuss strengths and weaknesses of the transportation model and include participants' feedback.

Ralph Best: Ralph stated that the meat of the paper is Section 4.3, Determination of Routing Criteria. This section essentially asks what do we now do with all this information. Routing criteria will not be the same for every region. This section will discuss what is important to each region and why. For Section 4.4, Identifying Regional Routes, Ruth Weiner's Decision Model will come into play here. This section will discuss the process as opposed to a discussion of results. For Section 5, this section will discuss the essential characteristics of routes, how routes connect and what characteristics are desirable.

Jay Jones: Jay mentioned that he talked with Bob Fronczak and Kevin Blackwell about rail associations becoming involved in the routing decision process. Jay asked for volunteers among the SRGs that would like to help write sections of the paper. The sections drafts would be due by the next DOE TEC meeting in April. **[Action Item]**

Conrad Smith: Conrad commented that he thought it was difficult to distinguish from Sections 4.3, 4.4 and 5-selection criteria versus desirable characteristics.

Ralph Best: Ralph explained that an example of selection criteria would be radiological risk. A desirable characteristic might be constraints or boundaries on a route that is identified. An example would be that, as applicable, routes in one region need to connect to routes in adjacent regions.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa suggested that Section 5 be folded into Section 4.4.

Jay Jones: Jay asked the Topic Group, How can we best spend our time in Phoenix?

Doug Larson: Doug stated that his group will volunteer from the West to provide alternatives for Section 4.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa stated that the MidWest Regional Group is strictly participating as observers in this Topic Group. This regional group feels their routing identification process is correct.

Jay Jones: Jay stated that DOE will clarify the routing criteria section with input from the SRGs and then have the entire Topic Group review the process.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa suggested that Ralph continue on developing the first two sections of the paper.

Alex Thrower: Alex stated that this paper will not serve as a resolution of every issue. The fact that DOE and the SRGs are working on this complicated issue is good.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa commented that the purpose of the paper is fairly definitive. The purpose may need to be revised.

Conrad Smith: Conrad suggested the following course of action for the SRGs:

Western group will write they want

MidWest group will write what they are doing

Northeast group will write what they think is important

Southern Group will write what they think is important

After all five groups have completed their part, compare them and see what matches or doesn't match.

Alex Thrower: Alex stated that each group will write their own perspective and submit to the entire Topic Group.

Jay Jones: Jay agreed with Alex. Each group will have 1 to 2 pages written before the next conference call. **[Action Item]**. FRA and DOT will participate as needed.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa suggested that the paper's purpose change or clarify what the groups are doing.

Jay Jones: Jay stated that he and Ralph will revise the purpose of the paper offline.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa suggested that the purpose could describe alternative approaches to route criteria.

Ken Niles: Ken asked why is the Topic Group writing this paper?

Ralph Best: Ralph answered that this is the Topic Group's working paper. This is a paper vehicle for the identification of routing criteria for use in identifying regional suites of routes. This paper can be revised and updated as necessary.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa asked to whom and what do the SRGs submit?

Jay Jones: Jay answered that the SRGs are to submit their criteria or alternative approach to Jay, Alex, Ralph and Michele by the next conference call. This will be a 1 to 2 page document. **[Action Item]**

The next item on the agenda was the Action Item and Closeout from the January 27th conference call.

Kevin Blackwell: Kevin gave a brief update on the Short Lines Association. Kevin reported that there is not much enthusiasm or eagerness to become involved with the Topic Group. Kevin also gave an update on the Dedicated Train Study. FRA is in the process of addressing the comments and will send it back to the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST) the week of March 1. OMB has already looked at the study. The next step after OST is for the study to go directly to Congress.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa asked how will the Topic Group be able to get copies of the study?

Kevin Blackwell: Kevin stated that there are two parts to the study. The first part of the study includes the findings and a general synopsis. This will be available on the FRA web site. The second part of the study is the technical study. This will not be available on the FRA web site.

Michele Enders: Michele gave a brief status of reference availability and hyperlinking capability from the T-REX database. Almost all the references will be available for hyperlinking with the exception of three references. These three references are AAR 2002 and two INEL documents.

The next item on the agenda was to discuss the upcoming DOE TEC meeting in April.

Jay Jones gave a brief update of the schedule of the next DOE TEC meeting. The first day will have the Tribal Topic group in the morning. The second day will have the Rail Topic Group in the morning. The second day (Tuesday) in the afternoon will have the Decision Analysis.

Lisa Sattler: Lisa asked if there was a draft agenda for the Topic Group meeting in Phoenix?

Jay Jones: Jay answered that a draft agenda will be available by the next conference call on March 24th. **[Action Item]**

Lisa Sattler: Lisa announced that the Midwest group will be having their own routing group meeting on March 24 and will not be available for the March 24th conference call.

Jay Jones: Jay announced that there is a tentative call planned for March 15th at 3 pm EST for the SRGs and DOE.

Alex Thrower: Alex gave some general information about the EM training workshop that will be following the DOE TEC meeting in Phoenix. The EM workshop will be a 2 ½ day workshop focusing mainly on EM waste shipments. The agenda for this workshop should be available in the next couple of days.

The next conference call is scheduled for Thursday, March 24, 2005 at 11 am EST.

Action Items Summary:

1. Ralph Best to revise the diagram/chart.
2. SRGs to submit a 1 to 2 page document on their perspective of routing criteria and route identification.
3. Jay Jones to provide a draft agenda for the Rail Topic Group meeting in Phoenix.