TEC Rail Topic Group, Planning Subgroup Conference Call
DRAFT

Wednesday, February 15, 2006
11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. EST

Group Co-Chairs: Lisa Janairo (CSG) and Ken Niles (State of Oregon)

Participants: Anne Clark (EMNRD), Pat Brady (BNSF), Randy Coppage (BAH), Bob Fronczak (AAR), Scott Palmer (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers), Kevin Blackwell (DOT), Marsha Keister (INEEL), Cort Richardson (CSG)

DOE Support contractors also participated on the call.

Action Items:

Responsible Party	*Action to be Taken*
Kevin Blackwell	Obtain a list of FRA-certified inspectors located in each state.
Randy Coppage	Verify the source of requirement that DOE seek NRC approval of shipping routes six months prior to start of shipments (SoS).
Ken Niles	Confirm the meaning of the term "purchaser."

Summary:

Rail Planning Timeline

The purpose of the conference call was to achieve consensus within the group on the latest edits to the revised Rail Planning Timeline document. The discussion focused on the following items:

At Least 24 Hours before SoS – Second bullet: The issue was raised as to whether equipment would be available to take appropriate corrective measures in the event of noncompliance with equipment safety standards. Participants indicated that the railroads might have the equipment. Marsha Keister suggested that even if they did, it probably would take more than 24 hours to fix such problems. She suggested that the specific time frame be removed from this bullet.

At Least 24 Hours before SoS – Sixth bullet: The issue was raised as to whether one week was a more realistic time frame. Ken Niles noted that in the case of truck shipments, inspections cannot occur more than 48 hours before departure (i.e., trucks cannot sit idle). Participants observed that railroad supplied power (i.e., a locomotive) was unlikely to be allowed to sit idle for that long, unless DOE owned or leased the equipment. Kevin Blackwell indicated that he would hesitate to put a

specific time frame on this requirement. To help define an appropriate time frame, he stated that he would obtain a list of FRA-certified inspectors located in each state and distribute it to the group.

At Least 24 Hours before SoS – Seventh bullet: Scott Palmer indicated that due to a lack of towers near many of the rail lines, cellular phones would not provide a reliable redundant communication system for train transport as indicated in the bullet. Bob Fronczak agreed, although he noted that satellite phones would suffice. Randy Coppage noted that there would be considerable development of cell phone infrastructure along the rail lines prior to shipments commencing. The group agreed to change the reference from "cell phones" to "satellite phones" in this bullet.

At Least 24 Hours before SoS – Eighth bullet: Participants generally agreed with this bullet; however, they questioned whether appropriately trained personnel would be on the trains to facilitate repairs to TRANSCOM should the need arise. Marsha Keister observed that in the case of the West Valley shipments, such personnel were indeed available. Ken Niles indicated that the wording and placement of this bullet would require coordination with the other Rail Transport Topic subgroups.

At Least 24 Hours before SoS – Ninth bullet: Bob Fronczak noted that since 9/11, there was no longer any meaningful public access to internet-based rail tracking systems. Participants agreed that the bullet should therefore be deleted.

At Least 15 Days before SoS – First bullet: Several participants asked for a clarification of the term "offeror." Ken Niles indicated that "offerer" was the same as "shipper" (i.e., either DOE or the source of the spent nuclear fuel). Participants agreed that the between the offeror and the railroad, the offeror should provide the anticipated timeline to the FRA, moreover, they agreed that DOE should provide the timeline to FRA, even if the shipment originated from a commercial facility.

At Least 15 Days before SoS – Third bullet: Participants had no comments on this bullet.

At Least 30 Days before SoS – Second bullet: Ken Niles asked how this requirement would account for states that wanted their own personnel to escort shipments through their jurisdiction? He also suggested that the training portion of this bullet be moved to the preceding section (i.e., 15 Days before SoS). Marsha Keister noted that this requirement may be somewhat unnecessary simply because personnel would most likely be verified as being trained prior to their even being eligible to escort a shipment. Ken suggested that the bullet be modified to make it explicitly applicable to DOE (i.e., "DOE will coordinate with . . . to ensure that DOE personnel riding the train have . . .).

At Least 30 Days before SoS – Third bullet: Participants suggested that similar changes be made to this bullet as to the preceding one, but with respect to

TRANSCOM training. Marsha Keister noted that the two bullets could be combined. Ken Niles disagreed because he thought the explicit maintenance requirement should be retained. Participants agreed to keep both bullets, subject to the edits discussed earlier.

At Least 90 Days before SoS – First and second bullets: Participants agreed that issues associated with these bullets had yet to be resolved.

At Least 90 Days before SoS – Fourth bullet: Participants suggested this may be a moot point if DOE presents a suite of potential routes, as long as the affected States do not get upset if their alternative gets used.

At Least 90 Days before SoS – Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh bullets: Participants noted that these requirements were all components of fairly general planning requirements that would likely be addressed within the contracts with the railroads that would be signed long before actual shipments began. Participants agreed that they should coordinate with the Security Topic Group with respect to these issues. They also suggested that the term "mitigation plan" be changed to "contingency plan" in the seventh bullet.

At Least 6 Months before SoS – Second bullet: Participants agreed that this bullet should be left as is, although they questioned whether this was a DOE or an NRC requirement. Randy Coppage agreed to verify the source of this requirement.

At Least 6 Months before SoS – Fourth bullet: Ken Niles agreed to confirm the meaning of the term "purchaser."

At Least 6 Months before SoS – Fifth bullet: Participants agreed to delete this bullet.

At Least 6 Months before SoS – Sixth bullet: Participants agreed to add FRA to this bullet (i.e., "DOE coordinates with railroads and FRA . . .).

At Least 6 Months before SoS – Seventh bullet: Participants agreed that this bullet should be left as is.

Three Years before SoS – First bullet: Participants noted that the referenced draft transportation plan probably would not have a lot of details upon which stakeholders could comment.

Prior to the first shipment (indeterminate timeframe): Participants agreed to the following:

- Delete the first bullet;
- Adjust the time frame for the second bullet to be six to eight months prior to SoS;

- Delete the third bullet;
- Refer the fourth bullet to the Security Topic Group;
- Combine the fifth and sixth bullets and establish a time frame of anywhere from the day of the shipment to three months prior to SoS; and
- Hold additional discussions with respect to the feasibility of FRA stationing Operating Practices personnel at dispatching centers once the number of shipments starts to increase.

The call was adjourned

Next Call: March ????