

**DOE TEC Rail Topic Group Conference Call
Thursday, March 9, 2006, 11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. EST**

Conference Call Minutes

Participants:

Chair: Jay Jones (RW)

Members: Jane Beetem (CSG/MW), Kevin Blackwell (DOT/FRA), Pat Brady (BNSF), Bill Burgel (HDR Engineering), Anne deLain Clark (WGA/NM), Sandy Covi (UP), Patrick Edwards (NE Task Force), Ray English (DOE), Scott Field (WIEB), Bob Fronczak (AAR), Lisa Janairo (CSG/MW), Dan Johnson (WIEB/WGA), Paul Johnson (ORNL), Angela Kordyak (DOE General Counsel), Adam Levin (Exelon), Bill Mackie (WGA), Mel Massaro (DOT/FRA), Michael Mulhare (NE Task Force), Doug Osborn (SNL), Ellen Ott (DOE General Counsel), Scott Palmer (BLET), Cort Richardson (CSG/ERC), Tim Runyon (CSG/MW), Sarah Wochos (CSG/MW)
Contractor Support: Randy Coppage (BAH), Michele Enders (SAIC), and John Smegal (Legin)

Summary:

The conference call began at 11:00 a.m. eastern time on Thursday, March 9, 2006. Jay Jones started the meeting by apologizing for the short notice of the e-mail received by some of the members. Jay announced the agenda items for this conference call would include discussing any changes to the January 26 conference call meeting minutes, updates from the each of the four subgroups, discussing the Legal Weight Truck Shipments subgroup, confirm membership of the Rail Topic Group and subgroups, and discuss the TEC agenda and Rail Topic Group meeting agenda.

Items Discussed:

Subgroup Updates:

1. Tracking and Radiation Monitoring Subgroup

Sarah Wochos reported that this subgroup has held three conference calls over the past couple of months. There will be another conference call scheduled for the end of March. The subgroup has been discussing the different technologies as well as what the needs are and what is needed to get the job done. The subgroup has drafted a list of questions that will be part of the Security Topic Group's questionnaire to the states. The subgroup has received offers from various vendors that would like to demonstrate their tracking technologies for the subgroup. At the Waste Management Conference, Sarah met with some businesses that the subgroup may be contacting in order to set up these demonstrations in the future.

2. Inspections Subgroup

Tim Runyon reported that the subgroup had their second conference call. The subgroup is in the process of reviewing documents. There have been some lively discussions on the types of inspections that are done, how the inspections are done by FRA, and how some of the railroads handle inspections and their training for inspections. From Tim's perspective, the discussions thus far have been educational and will probably evolve into more detailed discussions as the subgroup continues. In Tim's opinion the CVSA comparison is more philosophical in nature. Overall, Tim feels this subgroup will be educational, interesting and perhaps somewhat contentious.

Jay commented that each of the subgroups will give more detail about their activities during the Rail Topic Group session of TEC meeting next week.

Tim also added that the subgroup is looking forward to receiving input from the railroads, AAR and FRA. This is going to be a longer process than expected. Tim stated that this subgroup does not have a representative from SSEB or the southern states. Jay stated that he spoke with Chris Wells. Sarah also stated that she did not have any representation from the southern states on the tracking subgroup as well.

3. Rail Planning Subgroup

Lisa Janairo reported that this subgroup has had five conference calls with the last conference call being on February 28. The subgroup has finished their first pass through the subgroup's draft timeline. On March 10 Lisa will send out the draft timeline to the Rail Topic Group at large for an initial review at the TEC meeting. Lisa will send Michele the draft timeline so it can be copied for the topic group at TEC. Kevin offered his office's copying services for TEC if needed. Lisa confirmed the names on the current membership list were accurate for the Rail Planning Subgroup.

4. Lessons Learned Subgroup

Jane Beetem reported that she had hoped to have a draft report to circulate at the TEC meeting but other tasks took priority. Jane requested from the regional groups (besides the Midwest) any lessons learned compiled from previous shipments or thoughts on maybe how shipments could have been handled differently. The only information the subgroup currently has is from the Midwest. Jane will be compiling a more expanded bibliography of lessons learned which will include a summary of the most important points of the lessons learned and weblinks if applicable. This will hopefully give the reader a sense of what the lessons learned were without having to read the entire document. Lisa asked Jane if there were any members on this subgroup besides Jane. Jane responded that

there are additional members. Cort stated that it will be easier for the subgroup to convene once there is a draft bibliography.

5. Legal Weight Truck Shipments Subgroup

Jay stated that he has had several conversations and e-mails with Bob Halstead about whether to continue this subgroup. Jay feels that this subgroup can be addressed through the other subgroups. In the future, this subgroup may be resurrected. Scott Field stated that based on his conversations with Bob, Scott does not think Bob agrees with disbanding this subgroup. Scott stated that he feels there are issues that this subgroup needs to discuss. Scott suggested that this discussion should take place next week at TEC with Bob in attendance. Lisa asked what the issues are that Bob wants to discuss with this subgroup. Cort responded that there were several issues to address. One issue is the legal weight truck casks on rail. Another issue is the intermodal issue. Kevin also responded that he was unsure what this subgroup would be discussing since there seems to be very little concern about the LWT casks on rail. Scott stated that there are a lot of questions about how rail will interact with other modes of transportation.

Cort suggested that if subgroups have issues that cannot be addressed in their subgroup then there should be a process for submitting those issues to the Rail Topic Group at large to resolve.

Jay will put Legal Weight Truck Shipments subgroup on the Rail Topic Group agenda and the topic group will discuss its future at the TEC meeting.

6. TRAGIS

Jay stated this subgroup will be on the agenda even though they are on hold. Kevin asked if Paul Johnson and Sarah Wochos are the only members on this subgroup. Kevin stated that he offered an FRA representative to serve on this subgroup. Jay stated that Kevin was correct and there are other members on this subgroup. Lisa stated that the subgroup is waiting for the update of TRAGIS to be completed. Cort asked if the topic group could receive a report on the TRAGIS update and its status. Paul responded that he could give a status report at the TEC meeting. Paul stated that he is incorporating changes into the TRAGIS model for FRA to be able to intersect points along rail lines and adding additional GIS capabilities to GIS side of TRAGIS. In addition, Paul is doing a major update of the rail network and highway 12. Everyone can still use TRAGIS while these updates are being done.

Subgroup Membership:

Jay reviewed each of the subgroups' member lists by reading aloud the member names. Sarah Wochos confirmed the names were accurate for the Tracking and Radiation

Monitoring Subgroup. Tim Runyon confirmed the names were accurate for the Inspections subgroup. Bob Fronczak stated that there was no railroad representative on the tracking subgroup. Sarah replied that there is FRA representation. Kevin requested an update of the subgroup participants list.

Jay reminded all the subgroup leads that if they are using a powerpoint presentation for their update, all electronic presentations need to be sent to Michele Enders before the TEC meeting.

Rail Topic Group Agenda

Jay reviewed the Rail Topic Group meeting agenda. Jay asked the subgroup leads if they preferred to give their updates before or after the subgroups break into their groups. Lisa commented that the Planning subgroup would like to get feedback from the topic group at large on their planning timeline. Tim stated that he would like to have the entire topic group meet in case there are individuals who want to join one of the subgroups. Cort suggested that a discussion time be added on the agenda for the subgroups to have with the entire Rail Topic Group. Jay stated he would add a discussion time to the agenda. The final consensus from the group is to have more discussion time with the entire topic group versus the subgroup breakout.

Lisa asked if DOE RW would have a response to the SRGs questions on the Proposed Path Forward for the National Route Selection Process. Jay was unsure if management would have specific responses ready in time for TEC.

Miscellaneous

Jay asked John Smegal if the TEC website will be up in time for TEC. John confirmed that the TEC website would be ready. Lisa asked if the website update could be given during the plenary session. Jay will delete this item from the Rail Topic Group agenda.

Jay stated that he would like to have a volunteer to give the topic group summary on the second day. Lisa suggested that each subgroup draft some bullets for the volunteer to talk about it for the summary.

On Thursday, the CSG/MW will be meeting with DOE to review their routing paper. Lisa stated that the purpose of the meeting is to have DOE respond to CSG/MW's response to DOE's questions. For anyone who wants a copy of the report, they can contact Lisa directly.