

**DOE TEC Rail Topic Group Conference Call
Thursday, April 20, 2006, 11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. EDT**

Conference Call Minutes

Participants:

Chair: Jay Jones (RW)

Members: Jane Beetem (CSG/MW), Kevin Blackwell (DOT/FRA), Anne deLain Clark (WGA/NM), Scott Field (WIEB), Bob Fry (NCSL), Eric Huang (DOE EM), Paul Johnson (ORNL), Marsha Keister (INL), Angela Kordyak (DOE General Counsel), Bill Mackie (WGA), Michael Mulhare (NE Task Force), Tammy Ottmer (WIEB), Sarah Wochos (CSG/MW)

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

Summary:

The conference call began at 11:00 a.m. eastern time on Thursday, April 20, 2006. Jay announced the agenda items for this conference call would include updates from the each of the four subgroups, discuss putting the Legal Weight Truck Shipments subgroup on hold, summarize OCRWM strategic planning meeting concerning routing, and review upcoming meetings over the next few months.

Items Discussed:

Subgroup Updates:

1. Inspections Subgroup

Sarah Wochos reported that the subgroup had a conference call on April 6. The subgroup is in the process of answering some basic planning questions regarding inspections. There are two groups within the subgroup that are reviewing motor power and hazardous materials to determine what is needed in terms of questions for inspections. This will enable the subgroup to produce a straw man regulation for in-route and point of origin inspections for rail. The subgroup's next call will be May 18. Additional information will be available for the next Rail Topic Group call. In regards to the straw man information, Kevin Blackwell added that the state of Ohio has mechanical and hazardous material certified state inspectors. Carlisle Smith is going to have the inspectors from Ohio create an outline or chart of what the inspectors look for when conducting a compliance inspection.

Jay added that he has reviewed the draft of the meeting minutes from the TEC Rail Topic Group session and provided comments. Jay asked John Smegal what the timeframe will be for when the TEC meeting minutes will be available on the TEC website. John replied that he needed to clarify with Corinne Macaluso as to the exact timing for the TEC meeting minutes to be posted on the web site. Jay stated that the Rail Topic Group members will see the TEC meeting minutes in the next couple of weeks either as a draft or e-mail from Michele.

2. Tracking and Radiation Monitoring Subgroup

Sarah Wochos reported that this subgroup had a conference call shortly after the TEC meeting in March. The subgroup will be having a Web X demonstration next week from MHF Logistical Solutions on their smart card technology. Larry Stern from CVSA may also join the demonstration. Sarah has also setup another demonstration in May for the subgroup to preview a different technology. Jay asked if these demonstrations were web based and accessible for all locations. Sarah replied that the demonstrations were web based.

The subgroup has piloted the tracking questionnaire. The subgroup has been surveying the states via a pilot program with the Security Topic Group survey that the regional groups are currently completing. The subgroup is expecting to receive responses back this week. Once the responses are received, the subgroup will determine if there are any adjustments to be made to the questions. The final step will be to finish surveying the remaining states. Jay asked if there was going to be one major questionnaire that will include all the areas such as inspections, tracking, security, etc. Sarah replied there will be one questionnaire that will include all of these areas. The tracking portion of the questionnaire was separated from the security portion since they may be answered by different groups of people in the states. The entire questionnaire will be sent out next month and responses from all the states will be received the following month. Jay asked if the questionnaire will be sent from the state regional groups. Sarah confirmed that the questionnaire will be sent from the state regional groups.

The subgroup continued the discussion from TEC as to whether the remote radiation monitoring should be included only in this subgroup. It was decided by the subgroup members that remote radiation monitoring should be opened up to other participation or could be another subgroup entirely. Sarah stated that remote radiation monitoring crosses over into other areas. The subgroup also discussed as to whether there should be an intermodal subgroup.

Jay clarified that this subgroup is not addressing remote radiation monitoring at this time.

3. Lessons Learned Subgroup

Jane Beetem reported she is working with her intern to create a draft. In the next two weeks, Jane hopes to have a draft to send out to everyone in the topic group to review.

4. Legal Weight Truck Shipments Subgroup

Jay stated that this subgroup will be placed on hold for the time being. Jay recommended that the topic group keep the current subgroups, and not create or start new subgroups until some of the current subgroups finish their work. Scott

Field replied that suspending the LWT subgroup was acceptable to the Western states, as long as an Intermodal subgroup was formed to consider the issues raised by the LWT subgroup. Scott stated that while the states of his region feel strongly that intermodal issues need to be addressed, it would be better to wait until some of the existing subgroups stand down so that topic group members can focus their attention on this subject.

During the TEC meeting, Kevin Blackwell stated that he thought it had been decided this subgroup was going to be disbanded and then the new subgroup would be an intermodal subgroup at a later time. Jay confirmed this decision and reiterated that there would not be a separate Legal Weight Truck subgroup.

The following excerpt is Bob Halstead's response via e-mail to Jay Jones regarding the disbanding of the Legal Weight Truck Shipments Subgroup.

"... eliminating the subgroup is an efficient and face-saving way of getting on to the larger issue of intermodal transportation.

Nevada is not interested in making it a big deal, whether the TEC Rail Topic Group has this LWT on rail subgroup, or not. But it will be a big deal for DOE, for Nevada, and for the work of the Rail Topic Group, if DOE continues to propose LWT on rail as a contingency plan for early shipments to Yucca Mountain while a rail spur is under construction, or if LWT on rail should be proposed as a substitute for construction of a rail spur, or if LWT on rail is proposed as a supplement to mostly rail to accommodate reactors without direct rail access. Use of LWT casks on railcars would be a cross-cutting issue for waste acceptance and campaign scheduling, institutional interactions, transportation safety, and shipment security

As Nevada and other state representatives have said on a number of occasions, there cannot be a mostly rail scenario without massive intermodal transportation efforts, and the best way to handle LWT on rail is as a subtopic of a topic group on intermodal transportation. We believe you should establish such a topic group sooner, rather than later, and have it co-chaired by a Western state rep and an Eastern or Midwestern state rep."

5. TRAGIS

Sarah reported that the subgroup had its first call recently to work on the tasks and plan. One of the first tasks for this subgroup is to look at the different assumptions in TRAGIS and explain them in layman terms. Kevin asked if there was an FRA representative on the subgroup call. Paul Johnson replied that Tom Bouve decided not to be on the call but will be on future calls.

Miscellaneous

Jay gave an overview of an internal institutional planning session. At this meeting a considerable amount of time was spent talking about routing and critical paths during this meeting. The discussion focused on the route identification process. Jay stated that based on Sarah's update of the TRAGIS subgroup, it sounds like the TRAGIS subgroup is starting this process. Jay suggested letting the TRAGIS subgroup continue with their discussions and then expanding the subgroup into a larger group. The larger group would be the vehicle to start the national routing approach. The current timeline would be to have the routes identified three to five years before shipments start to the repository. Over time, this may evolve into a separate route identification/criteria subgroup. Sarah stated the information from the TRAGIS subgroup would feed into the route identification process but not necessarily route criteria. Jay stated that he will put on paper the proposed timeline and other pertinent information that was discussed during this internal meeting for the topic group. Sarah agreed that this would be extremely helpful for the SRGs.

Jay mentioned that he was unsure about the status of a users group for RADTRAN and TRAGIS. However, having a users group for these two tools would be beneficial in developing table top exercises for identifying routes.

Meetings

Energy Communities Alliance Meeting-Las Vegas, Nevada, April 20, 2006

Judith Holm is attending this meeting. Mayor Kevin Phillips is the lead for this group.

Southern States Energy Board- Rockville, Maryland, Week of April 24, 2006

A tour of the operation center will be given. Paul Johnson will be giving a training session on TRAGIS at this meeting.

WIEB/WGA combined meeting- Salt Lake City, Nevada, May 2 and May 3, 2006

Council of State Governments-Eastern Regional Conference-Atlantic City, New Jersey mid May, 2006. Judith Holm and/or Jay Jones will be attending this meeting

US Transport Council and Central Nevada Community Protection Working Group Meeting- May 23, 2006, Pahrump, Nevada. Gary Lanthrum will be attending this meeting.

WGA Security Sub Committee- Carlsbad, New Mexico, end of May 2006.

State Regional Group meeting-Cedar Rapids, Iowa, June 2006. Jay Jones will be attending this meeting.