

Rail Topic Group Meeting Minutes Monday, November 3rd 2:00-3:00 p.m. (EST)

Participants included:

- Markus Popa, DOE (OCRWM)
- Bill Sherman, NE HLRW Task Force
- Robert Holden, NCAI
- Mike Butler, UETC
- Bob Fronczak, AAR
- Kevin Blackwell, FRA

Mike Butler (UETC) greeted participants and informed the group of previous notification by Robert Light (Mescalero Apache Tribe), Robert Centracco (FRA), and Mike Calhoun (FRA) that they would be unable to join the call.

Mr. Butler began the call with a brief update on the status of Matrix 1, now entitled "Summary of Rail and Highway Regulations and their Applicability to States, Tribes, Shippers, and Carriers." He informed the group that he had completed an initial draft of the matrix, but that he was making substantial revisions to it and therefore he had not distributed it to the entire group for comment. He apologized for not having a draft for distribution prior to the call. He briefly described the set-up of the matrix, and informed the group that he anticipated distributing a version for their review by the end of the first week of November.

The group then went on to discuss the first draft of Matrix 2, now titled "Comparison of Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance Recommended National Procedures and Out-Of-Service Criteria for the Enhanced Safety Inspection of Commercial Highway Vehicles Transporting Transuranics, Spent Nuclear Fuel, and High Level Waste to Rail Inspection Standards." This draft had been prepared by a subset of the Rail Group and submitted by Bob Fronczak (AAR).

The major comment pertaining to Matrix 2 was offered by Bill Sherman (NEHLRW Task Force). Mr. Sherman felt that the matrix might be more powerful for its intended audience if it were somehow to highlight sections where the Enhanced CVSA standards differed substantively from regular inspection criteria.

Kevin Blackwell (FRA) and Mr. Fronczak replied that had been done in the initial CVSA document, but that given the time already required in preparing the matrix, they had decided to format the matrix differently, and not include a line-by-line summary of the CVSA document. Mr. Sherman reiterated the need to differentiate the particular items and aspects of the enhanced standards, primarily to make comparison to rail inspection easier for the matrix user. He stressed that the user would be looking for a way to determine whether or not the inspection criteria and standards are comparable i.e., are there extra-regulatory measures in place for rail shipping?

Mr. Blackwell returned to the initial idea supporting the creation of this matrix that what is already in place for rail might be comparable to the standards endorsed by CVSA. He cited the increased frequency of inspection required by FRA as an example. Mr. Fronczak mentioned the AAR rules and recommended practices as further evidence.

Mr. Sherman suggested perhaps including a 1-2 page "topsheet" detailing what is contained in the enhanced version of the CVSA standards and how the comparable item is covered for rail transport. The group generally agreed that Mr. Sherman's point was well-taken, but that a significant amount of work was already put into the matrix itself and given the nature and orientation of the project it should not get too extensive. Mr. Butler noted that the matrix itself was the action item from the TEC/WG; given this, comments from the wider membership after review of the matrices would be the best way to determine whether additional information should be added or points clarified. Mr. Sherman asked that his comment be recorded and then tabled, to the agreement of the group.

Mr. Butler then moved on to the issue of the Rail Plenary session in the January 1998 TEC/WG Meeting. He informed the group that representatives had been secured from Union Pacific, Burlington Northern Santa Fe, and Conrail, and that he was negotiating with a representative from CSX Transportation. Mr. Blackwell offered a suggestion as to another point of contact with CSX should the current one be insufficient. Mr. Sherman offered an idea for the group's possible consideration after the January 1998 meeting. He suggested that state representatives might have an interest in the TEC/WG comparing the issues covered by the WGA developed Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Program Implementation Guide (WIPP-PIG) with rail issues. He said that the WIPP-PIG had become something of a standard planning tool for highway shipments, and offered that perhaps the TEC/WG should either consider its applicability to rail shipments, or produce a similar item focusing exclusively on rail transport. Mr. Blackwell and others concurred that this might be a good idea, but that it would be difficult for FRA and other actors to devote a significant amount of time to activities designed for use by DOE. Several participants asked where they could obtain this document; Markus Popa (DOE-RW44) told them that it was available on the World Wide Web and probably from WGA as well.

[For all interested parties the website address for this document is www.westgov.org/wipp/documents/pigtxt.txt]

Mr. Sherman suggested tabling the idea for discussion again after the January meeting. Mr. Blackwell informed Mr. Popa that the answer to the OCRWM letter on regulatory applicability to states and Tribes should be available by the end of November or early December.

The participants agreed to schedule the next meeting for Friday, December 5th from 2:00-3:00 p.m. An agenda will be supplied to all Group members no later than one week prior to this date.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:55 p.m.