DOE TEC Rail Topic Group Conference Call
Thursday, October 28, 2004, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m. EST

Conference Call Minutes

Participants:
Co-Chairs: Jay Jones (RW), Steven Hamp (EM)
Members: Kevin Blackwell (FRA), **Sandi Covi** (Union Pacific), **Mark Dalton** (North Carolina Highway Patrol) , **Patrick Edwards** (PA Public Utility Commission), **Ray English** (DOE Office of Naval Reactors), **Don Flater** (CSG-Midwest), **Bob Fronczak** (AAR), **Tim Holeman** (WIEB), **Paul Johnson** (ORNL), **Adam Levin** (Exelon), **Bill Mackie** (Western Governors' Association [WGA]), **Mel Massaro** (DOT/FRA), **Roger Mulder** (Texas Energy Conservation Office), **Ellen Ott** (Office of General Counsel, DOE), **Tammy Ottmer** (WIEB-CO), **Scott Ramsay** (WGA-Wyoming), **Lisa Sattler** (CSG-Midwest), **Peter Todd** (RI Emergency Mgt. Agency), **Ruth Weiner** (SNL), **Sara Wochos** (CSG-Midwest)
Contractor Support: Peter Bolton (BAH), **Michele Enders** (SAIC) and **Julie Offner** (BAH)

Summary:

The conference call began at 11:00 a.m. Eastern time on Thursday, October 28, 2004. Jay Jones started the meeting by welcoming everyone and having the participants on the call introduce themselves. Jay then turned over the meeting to Steven Hamp to discuss any additional comments on the *Rail Routing-Current Practices* paper. Steven Hamp began the discussion by first thanking all the members for their hard work on the paper. Steven reiterated that the paper has been posted on the DOE TEC web site and is to be used to promote further discussion and to be used as a reference in going forward with routing.

Kevin Blackwell: Asked how was the paper received at the last TEC meeting.
Steven Hamp: Replied that there was not a lot of discussion about the paper at the last TEC meeting.
Tim Holeman (Tim H): Raised the issue of spent nuclear fuel in general freight as a concern and wanted to know if the rail paper addressed this issue.
Steven Hamp (Steven H): The paper did not address operational issues at all. This would be a separate topic area.
Tim H.: Paper should go into that area and add a section addressing it.
Steven H: Agreed that it is important to address SNF in general freight but it needs to be addressed separately from the discussion paper.
Don Flater: Asked Tim Holeman, what are your concerns with SNF being transported as opposed to chlorine gas, etc?
Tim H: Replied that he is concerned about SNF sitting in rail yards and going in directions that emergency responders are not aware of. Also, the general public believes there is a higher risk for SNF if it is broken into in some way. For example, there was an

incident involving LLW that went from Colorado to Nebraska. The freight was unable to be tracked for a period of time.
Scott Ramsay (Scott R): Asked if the casks being built for trucks are the same as the casks for rail and was this addressed in the rail paper.
Kevin B: All packages either rail or highway are certified to the same type of criteria for packaging.
Tim H: Need to talk about general aspects of general freight versus dedicated trains
Steven H: Replied that Gary Lanthrum said that there has been no decision as of yet concerning dedicated trains
Kevin B: AAR's recommendation and dedicated train study is to be released soon. Currently, things are being done concerning security, RSPA is doing studies. All of these various pieces will have a bearing on the issues being raised today.
A member asked Kevin as to exactly when will the FRA study be released.
Kevin B: The study is supposed to go to DOT next week and should be on the fast track with OST.
Jay Jones: Reiterated that OCRWM has not made a decision on dedicated trains. Jay suggested that the topic group might need another paper to address the issue but maybe should wait until the report from the FRA.
Don Flater: Agrees it needs to be addressed but should use common sense not fear factors to address the issue.
Steven H: Commented that there were a multitude of things the topic group could have addressed. The effort of the topic group is to work on one issue at a time. Steven suggested that the topic group could have sub groups to tackle more than one issue at a time.
Jay Jones: Mentioned that the Route Decision Process Chart acknowledges the FRA study and can be factored in the decision making process.
Tim H: Asked if the rail paper is being distributed to TEC
Steven H: Replied that the paper is on the TEC website for all members to review.

In the interest of time, Jay Jones suggested that the meeting continue forward to the next item on the agenda. Jay asked the participants if there were any comments on the purpose, approach and products of the Draft Task Plan.

Bob Fronczak (Bob F): Asked if we are going to prioritize factors?
Ruth Weiner (Ruth W): Recommended whittling down the factors
Kevin B: Suggested dividing the factors by mode or have lesser importance factor
Ruth W: Some factors are more important in one mode and not another
Jay Jones: The main focus is rail.
Scott R: Need to reflect that the main focus is rail in the task plan. Task plan doesn't describe efficiently what we are doing
Ruth W: Ruth volunteered to provide comments for the purpose in the task plan to explain what the topic group is trying to achieve **. [Action item]**
Paul Johnson (Paul J): Commented that the topic group needs to consider heavy haul as well.

The next item on the agenda was a discussion of the Draft Task Plan Schedule and the baseline routing criteria.

One member remarked that this is a pretty aggressive schedule.

Tim H: Asked who does the final criteria go to?
Jay Jones: The schedule was based on internal milestone dates. By September 2005, should have final route selection criteria to help identify suite of routes.
Tim H: How are the criteria applied to TRAGIS?
Steven H: Judith presented a route decision process chart during the TEC meeting in Minneapolis. By looking at that chart, one can get a better feel for this activity and how it fits in the overall process. This may help to address your questions.
Jay Jones: Commented that Gary Lanthrum's presentation also included a chart that helps define how the criteria fits in this overall process. Jay will send Tim H. Gary's chart
[Action Item] After reviewing Gary's presentation – I did not find the chart with the overall process, but did find one in another presentation that Judith Holm gave earlier this year. The minutes are correct as written, but the chart will be provided from a separate meeting.
Lisa S: Remarked that the topic group is going to take almost a year to propose routing criteria [September 2005] but have a suite of routes recommended by January 2006 that gives only three months to make sure criteria fits the routes
Jay Jones: There are four State Regional Groups (SRGs) and OCRWM is working with them to identify routes in their region as a parallel effort.
Lisa S: Commented that the 180(c) schedule requires that preliminary routes be selected in order for states to apply for grants in March 2006.
Kevin B: Concerning the preferred suite of routes, are railroads being queried as to what they see as being preferred routes?
Jay Jones: Railroads are one of DOE's (OCRWM's) stakeholder organizations
Steven H: While it is not clear from the route decision process chart, railroads need to be included.
Kevin B: Disconnection points may be less problematic
Ruth W: Aren't the railroads stakeholders?
Scott R: Commented that to get the topic group kick started developing criteria, it would be helpful for the topic group to know what the railroads determine as criteria. Scott mentioned querying carriers on important points up front.
Bob F: Can coordinate from his members what criteria is important but a lot depends on initiating carriers, need to know destination points, etc.
Tim H: Agrees it get fuzzy. Tim asked Steve Hamp if the rail routing paper captured what Bob Fronczak just commented on concerning the information needed before proposing routes.
Steven H: Replied that the paper did address the issue but not on a specific level.
Jay Jones: asked the group, should we propose routes or identify a suite of routes as outlined in RW's decision process chart? (I can't remember exactly what I said, but I think this is more accurate of what I meant to say)
Scott R: Also asked, should we ask carriers about criteria and then what routes meet the criteria that we're proposing?

Bob F: to Sandi Covi: Could Union Pacific propose routes?
Sandi Covi: Yes, but it would change in the final analysis.
Steven H: Suggested that at a stage where the topic group has a set of criteria then the topic group can bring in set of routes and see how they work.
Scott R: Remarked that the topic group should go the experts. The railroads know about criteria. The topic group shouldn't have to try to guess the criteria.
Kevin B: Volunteered to be the point of contact for any potential regional and/or short line involvement.
Steven H: Can we get status of short line? It was agreed that by the next conference call Kevin B would be able to provide this information **[Action Item]**
Paul J: Will give Kevin B origin points/locations
Kevin B: Remarked that there are over 500 short lines but not all will be involved. Probably less than 50 may be applicable.
Peter Todd: Would we need to know the dynamics of commercial freight versus dedicated trains?
Bob F: The train dynamic issue is not route specific but terrain specific.
Ruth W: Is there going to be highway transfer or trucks? If so then the task plan, etc needs to include intermodal transfer.
Tim H: Feels the schedule should go beyond September 2005
Jay Jones: The only comments received on the factors for selecting criteria were from Lisa Sattler. These comments represent five states in the Midwest. Jay will resend the Task Plan before the next conference call **[Action Item]**
Steven H: Suggested that the factors need to be clearly identified as to which are regulatory driven and which are not.
Ruth W: Also need to separate highway from railroads
Bob F: "Consultation with Carriers" needs to be added as a factor
Ruth W: should there be intermodal transfer as a factor? This is a risk factor all by itself.
Steven H: Intermodal transfer is an operational issue
Tim H: Counted that there were 24 X's for FRR and 28 X's for DOE on the factors matrix. How we work this into TRAGIS?
Steven H: Replied that the regulatory driven factors are already accounted for in TRAGIS
Kevin B: commented that the topic group should be careful about using the regulatory process with routing. The FRA study is only about dedicated trains and is not a routing study. It is a comparative study of safety risks of shipping SNF in general freight versus dedicated trains.
Ruth W: Noted that some criteria is not independent of others. For example, "time in transit" feeds into "minimize risk" factor. Suggested that she draft a list of factors for Jay and Steven. **[Action item]**
Kevin B: Is the topic group going to weight these factors?
Jay Jones: Weighting factors will be handled by the Decision Analysis Tool next year.
Steven H: Remarked that the factors matrix is too long. Need to focus on independent factors . Matrix should be shorter and more focused. The actual number of factors is smaller.
Tim H: Can we tier the factors matrix somehow? Maybe start to prioritize.

Steven H: This factor matrix is strictly background information. When the topic group actually creates their own list, then we will prioritize.

The conference call was concluded by establishing the next conference call date and time to be December 16, 2004 at 11 a.m. ET. The same call in number and access code would be used for the next conference call.

All additional comments pertaining to the Draft Task Plan, Schedule and Factors Matrix are to be sent via e-mail to Steven Hamp. Jay Jones, Michele Enders, and Julie Offner.

Action Items Summary:

1. Ruth Weiner will provide comments on the purpose in The Draft Task Plan.
2. Jay Jones will send Tim Holeman the chart from Gary Lanthrum's presentation at the Minneapolis TEC meeting in September 2004.
3. Kevin Blackwell to be the point of contact and a provide a status of the short lines by the next conference call
4. Jay Jones will resend the Revised Draft Task Plan to all topic group members before the next conference call.
5. Ruth Weiner will draft a revised list of factors for the matrix and provide to topic group chairs for incorporation into the next version.