

**DOE TEC Rail Topic Group Conference Call
Thursday, January 26, 2006, 11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m. EST**

Conference Call Minutes

Participants:

Co-Chairs: Jay Jones (RW)

Members: Kevin Blackwell (DOT/FRA), Patrick Edwards (NE Task Force), Ray English (DOE), Scott Field (WIEB), Bob Halstead (Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects), Eric Huang (DOE), Lisa Janairo (CSG-MW), Paul Johnson (ORNL), Mel Massaro (DOT/FRA), Ken Niles (WIEB/STGWG), Ellen Ott (DOE General Counsel), Tammy Ottmer (WIEB), Cathy Reynolds (DOE General Counsel), Cort Richardson (CSG-ERC), Tim Runyon (CSG-MW), Ruth Weiner (Sandia National Laboratories), Chandler van Orman (NEI), Sarah Wochos (CSG-MW)

Contractor Support: Ralph Best (BSC), Randy Coppage (BAH), Michele Enders (SAIC), Julie Offner (BAH), and John Smegal (LEGIN)

Summary:

The conference call began at 11:00 a.m. eastern time on Thursday, January 26, 2006. Jay Jones started the meeting by reviewing the items to be discussed during the call. Jay announced the agenda items for this conference call would include updates from the subgroups, membership of the Rail Topic Group and subgroups, TEC agenda and Rail Topic Group meeting agenda. Jay also announced that he will be away for two weeks at the end of February. One additional item for discussion today is whether the topic group would like to have another conference call before the TEC meeting.

Items Discussed:

Subgroup Updates:

Jay announced that Legin will be providing note taking responsibilities for the subgroups if necessary. Contact John Smegal at 301-540-6820 ext. 15. Michele Enders will continue to be the notetaker for the entire Rail Topic Group.

1. Rail Planning Subgroup

Ken Niles reported that this subgroup has met at least three times by conference call over the past couple of months. The subgroup's end of product is a timeline that lays out the elements that need to occur by the different responsible organizations such as DOE, railroads, and utilities prior to a shipping campaign by rail. This timeline includes elements that must be done years in advance with a level of detail that shows elements that need to be done within one month, one week, one day and within hours. The subgroup went through a number of planning documents that they have access to including transportation plans of shipments that occurred in the east and Midwest. In addition the subgroup was able to get copies of the states' expectations that were developed for rail planning

WIPP shipments and for changing DOE's practice manual. All these documents were used to rough out a fairly extensive timeline. Participation from the subgroup has been very good with at least a dozen or so on each call. This has been a lengthy process as the subgroup has been discussing each of the elements that have been pulled out of these planning documents in terms of whether it is realistic, whether the timeline is correct, and who is the actual responsible party. The subgroup has another call scheduled for February 15. Overall the subgroup has been making good progress.

Lisa Janairo added that she has been trying to get planning timeline information of other DOE shipments that have taken place specifically West Valley and the Concord shipments and even truck shipments. It has been extremely difficult to get information from EM. She has also been trying to get someone from EM who actually works on one of these campaigns from the planning aspect at one of the sites to participate on the subgroup. The subgroup would like this person to at least participate on one or two conference calls if possible. Lisa asked Jay if there was anything he could do to help the subgroup obtain documents or get someone from EM to participate. Jay deferred to Eric Huang from EM.

Eric Huang was under the impression that Ella McNeil was in the process of getting back to Lisa in regards to her requests. Ruth Weiner suggested that Lisa call Roy McClain at Savannah River or Brady Lester at Oak Ridge. Mel Massaro added that John Chamberlain at West Valley has a good timeline document. Eric Huang also added that EM is getting ready to release in the next year the Perspective Shipment Module (PSM).

2. Inspections Subgroup

Tim Runyon reported that the Inspections subgroup had their first conference call on Tuesday January 24. The subgroup's workplan was distributed and reviewed during this call. Although not everyone was able to be on the call, the subgroup did make progress concerning the main objective of the subgroup. The subgroup was able to resurrect old TEC documents to make comparisons between highway and rail inspection criteria. In addition, comments are being submitted on the workplan and will be incorporated into the plan.

Tim asked Ray English if he would share some of the nuclear Navy's experience particularly rail car maintenance and inspection procedures. Kevin Blackwell reported that he spoke with Ray English about this matter and Ray agreed to share this information. Tim would like to have a good mix of representatives especially from industry. The subgroup has another call scheduled for February 23. Tim anticipates that the workplan will be finalized for the next call.

In regards to this subgroup having more industry participation, Kevin asked Jay the followup status of the meeting with the railroad representatives last August. Jay reported that a meeting summary was distributed to everyone. If there are

individuals the subgroup feels would be useful as participants from the railroads on this subgroup, Jay suggested calling them directly. Tim noted that there is no representation on this subgroup from the south or the northeast except for Cort Richardson. Jay suggested the subgroup send a list of questions to those individuals who are unable to participate on the conference calls. Lisa reiterated that it is important to have state representation. Pat Edwards volunteered to be on the Inspections subgroup. Jay suggested that he or Lisa send an e-mail to Chris Wells or Cloyce Brackett asking them for names of individuals who might be interested in participating on this subgroup and possibly other subgroups. Lisa stated that she has not been able to get a response from the south concerning their representation on the subgroups. Jay decided that he would call or e-mail Chris Wells directly.

3. Tracking and Radiation Monitoring Subgroup

Sarah Wochos reported that this subgroup has had one conference call and is scheduled to have another call in two weeks. The subgroup has been working on getting background information on the different technologies currently available. The subgroup is in the process of compiling some key questions to answer. In conjunction with the Security Topic Group, the first step is to get information from the states via a questionnaire that will go out in the next couple of months.

4. Legal Weight Truck (LWT) Subgroup

Bob Halstead reported that there has been some refocusing of the package plan activities in DOE known as Transport, Aging and Disposal concept. This makes avoiding legal weight truck shipments a higher priority than previously considered. However, more recently there have been difficulties with the Caliente Rail Corridor Proposal that casts more doubt as to if and when direct rail access to Yucca Mountain will occur. In addition, it has not been clear if planning activities are solely focused on Yucca Mountain. LWT casts have been shipped on rail in several foreign research reactor return shipments. There is also the NAS study that has given more attention to this area. Bob went on the Nevada field trip with the NAS Study Committee group and they were interested enough in LWT that they scheduled site visits to locations north and south of Las Vegas where intermodal transfer facilities may be located.

There has not been a conference call as of yet but one will be scheduled in the near future. Jay mentioned that other subgroups have created a work plan and suggested that Bob have this subgroup produce a similar document. Bob responded that the brief description Jay originally provided for this subgroup is probably sufficient as a scope of work. Bob suggested expanding the scope of this subgroup to include the entire range of intermodal operations that might be mostly associated with the rail scenario, and to include the relative number of shipments possible throughout the ten corridor states. Bob stated that it would be beneficial to have more state representation on this subgroup specifically if these individuals

had LWT experience. Jay reiterated that it would be helpful to have a written work plan or approach from this subgroup. Jay did not recommend that this subgroup look at intermodal operations as this is a rail topic group. Bob asked if anyone was looking at the intermodal operations. Jay stated that the Northeast and Southeast are looking at the barge issue. Ruth stated that there is a considerable bibliography from the EIS that looked at heavy haul, etc. Ruth also suggested that if anyone is looking for a particular document to e-mail her as much of the document information they may have and she can probably get the document through SNL's library.

TEC Meeting and Rail Topic Group Agenda

Jay reviewed the TEC meeting specifics such as time, place and agenda. The TEC meeting will March 14 and 15 in Washington DC. The agenda starts with a plenary session Tuesday morning and then the meeting continues with the consecutive individual topic group meetings for the remainder of the TEC meeting. The TEC meeting will conclude with a short plenary session on the integration of the topic group discussions. The Rail Topic Group will meet Wednesday morning from 8:15 until 11:30 am.

Jay would like to set aside time for Sarah Wochos to present the CSG-MW's route identification plan and report. Jay also suggested more detailed updates from the subgroups as part of the agenda for this meeting. Another suggestion is to have the subgroups meet amongst themselves for part of the meeting. The subgroup leads agreed that this separate time would be beneficial for them to meet.

Jay will draft an agenda and distribute to the membership at large for review and comment. Ruth suggested that a notice of the meeting be sent to the Congressional Offices in case they want to send a staffer to observe the meeting. Jay stated he would speak to the appropriate DOE individuals.

Miscellaneous

Jay mentioned that Kevin Crowley sent an e-mail saying the NAS study will be released on February 9. Ruth mentioned that the ACNW will be having a public meeting to discuss this study for those in the Washington DC area.

For the national routing perspective, Jay stated that there has been limited progress. Jay is in the process of having a discussion with the State Regional Groups. Bob asked about the status of the Regional Routing Report. Lisa responded that Bob should have received a copy. Bob confirmed that he did receive the report but was under the impression that the report was not public. Jay stated that once DOE receives the Midwest and Northeast routing recommendations, DOE will factor in these recommendations into the national routing approach. The south and the west have declined to provide DOE with routing recommendations.

The next Rail Topic Group at large call will be sometime in early March.