

**DOE TEC Rail Topic Group Conference Call  
Thursday, September 15, 2005, 11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. EST**

**Conference Call Minutes**

**Participants:**

**Co-Chairs: Jay Jones (RW), Alex Thrower (EM)**

**Members: Jane Beetem** (MO Department of Natural Resources), **Patrick Brady** (BNSF), **Sandi Covi** (Union Pacific), **Scott Field** (WIEB-CO), **Bob Fronczak** (AAR), **Eric Huang** (DOE Office of Transportation), **Paul Johnson** (ORNL), **Adam Levin** (Exelon Generation), **Bill Mackie** (Western Governors' Association), **Ken Niles** (WIEB), **Doug Osborn** (Sandia National Laboratories), **Ellen Ott** (DOE General Counsel), **Lisa Sattler** (CSG-Midwest), **Conrad Smith** (CSG-East), **Sarah Wochos** (CSG-MW)  
**Contractor Support: Randy Coppage** (BAH), **Michele Enders** (SAIC), **Lee Finewood** (BAH), and **Ron Ross** (BSC)

**Summary:**

The conference call began at 11:00 a.m. Eastern time on Thursday, September 15, 2005. Jay Jones started the meeting by welcoming everyone and having the participants on the call introduce themselves. Jay mentioned that Alex Thrower will be leading the Security Topic Group and may not be able to serve as co-chair for the Rail Topic Group. For this conference call, Jay will review where the RTG has been and where the RTG is going.

**Items Discussed:**

**Railroad Industry Meeting**

One item that will be discussed in more detail at TEC will be the railroad meeting Jay and others had on August 30<sup>th</sup>. Jay gave a review of the meeting that he and others attended on August 30<sup>th</sup> with DOE, FRA, AAR and four of the main line railroads. The purpose of the meeting was to explain to the railroads about the OCRWM program and to receive some validation from the railroads. Representatives from Union Pacific, Norfolk Southern, CSX and BNSF were present for the meeting as well as Judith Holm, Gary Lanthrum, and Alex Thrower from OCRWM. Paul Johnson also provided a brief overview of a transportation analysis looking at five representative nuclear utilities and proposed routes to Yucca Mountain. Feedback was received from the railroads as to what would or would not work. Jay anticipates that this will be one of several meetings that OCRWM will have the railroad industry. More detail about this meeting will be given at the TEC meeting and questions can be asked during that time.

**DOE TEC RTG Working Session Meeting**

Jay discussed what he anticipates the RTG working session meeting will entail.

- Background of what has been done during the last few conference calls
- Decision to defer the paper

- Development of the Task Plan
- Review activities and which ones the RTG would like to address

## **Task Plan**

Jay solicited comments from the members on the conference call as to what their general impressions were on the current draft of the Task Plan. At TEC, the RTG will look at the Task Plan in greater detail and look at each activity individually. Jay agreed with the suggestion by Lisa Sattler to have an RTG conference call every two months and have the subgroups convene monthly or however often is necessary to work on their particular task plan activity. The subgroups would report back to the larger RTG on their progress.

Jay opened the conference call for discussion. Scott Field commented that this draft Task Plan puts the RTG in the right direction. However, Scott was curious about the changes to the Task Plan, specifically the items that were left out of the Task Plan that were originally put in by Lisa Sattler. Jay was unsure about which activities were left out. The only activity purposely not in the Task Plan was Escorts. A decision was made to have the activity of Escorts be addressed by the Security Topic Group (STG). Scott mentioned that the activity of Escorts is not in the most recent version of STG Task Plan. Jay will talk with Alex about this issue of escorts.

Lisa asked what is the Security Transportation Force? Jay explained that this will be the term used for escorts as decided by the STG. Lisa also commented that Escorts is listed as a DOE security function but it also should say that escorts is a state security function. Jay will tweak the language.

In reference to #3 Tracking and Radiation Monitoring on the Task Plan, Lisa asked why is it that RTG can coordinate with the STG to address requirements and protocols by States and others to ensure protection of security-sensitive information but not coordinate with the STG to address the issue of escorts? Jay answered that he put that in to augment some of the activities that the RTG was looking at. Lisa countered that if it is possible to coordinate with the STG on one activity then it is possible to coordinate on the escort activity with the STG. Jay replied that he will need to talk with Alex about the STG's plans and relay that there is an interest from the RTG on these activities.

Scott Field commented that while there are some aspects of the escort issue that only the STG can address, there are other relatively mundane aspects such as the logistics of state escort personnel getting on the train. These aspects may not be addressed or approached by the STG from the same angle as the RTG. Jay agreed with Scott that some of the issues are more operational in nature and are not security or rail specific.

## **Inspections**

Jay mentioned that language was added to the activity of Inspections in the Task Plan based on feedback from the railroad industry. The railroads expressed some concern as to

how the RTG was going to approach inspections. Language was added that OCRWM would work with the railroads.

Alex Thrower joined the RTG conference call at this point. Jay asked Alex about the escort issue and how it is going to be addressed by the STG.

Alex replied that the STG workplan has a short outline that Alex will be revising and sending out to the STG as part of the agenda for the STG working session as TEC. Escort is one of the issues in the outline that STG will be addressing. Scott reiterated that it needs to be clear as to which topic group will be discussing the issue of escorts, state security personnel logistics, etc. Alex suggested that the issue of escorts be moved over to the STG first. If after a period of time, the RTG feels acceptable progress has not made, then escorts could be moved back to the RTG or dealt with in some other way to be determined. Lisa and Scott both agreed to this decision.

Jay reviewed the agenda for the RTG working group session. Jay asked the conference call participants if there were any more comments on the Task Plan.

Lisa commented that the start date should be September 2004. Jay had put September 2005 to indicate that this was a new Task Plan. Lisa suggested that the words “that merits public confidence” be added to the purpose statement as this is part of the Transportation Strategic Plan. Jay agreed and will revise the Task Plan. Under the Approach, Lisa suggested that the words “the entire topic group” be changed to something like “a consensus or majority.” Jay agreed and will revise the Task Plan. Under 180 (c), Lisa suggested that DOE technical assistance should not be limited to just technologies or technical assistance. The word financial should be added for assistance and the word technologies should be deleted. Jay asked if these changes would be redundant with what is being addressed in the 180(c) Topic Group. Lisa and Scott did not think it would be redundant. OCRWM is currently saying that 180 (c) cannot be used to pay for inspections.

Scott Field also asked about a sentence that was originally under #4 Rail Planning Process, Protocols and Guidance in the Task Plan. The sentence included what planning responsibilities are retained by DOE and what can be delegated to the railroads. Scott was curious as to why the sentence was not in the current Task Plan. Ralph Best explained that he may have dropped the sentence since the planning part of this process is primarily a DOE function and Ralph felt that delegating to railroads at this point was not appropriate. #4B in the Task Plan which states “the roles and participation of States, Tribes, railroads, utilities, and other stakeholders in DOE planning of rail shipment campaigns,” does cover the previous sentence that was dropped from the Task Plan.

Lisa also suggested that language be added that provided more of a timeline as to when DOE will have information available concerning the rail planning process. Bob Fronczak suggested using the word “process” in the Task Plan.

Lisa mentioned that #4d in the Task Plan is confusing and would like to know the purpose of #4d in the task plan. Ralph responded that the purpose is really to look at the physical distribution sites DOE will be shipping from and how that may vary from year to year. These variations may impact the overall planning process and the states' resources.

Jay stated that the Topic Group will address each of these issues in more detail at the TEC Rail Topic Group working session.

Lisa had another question concerning #6 in the Task Plan concerning the TRAGIS rail routing model exercise. Lisa thought Alex mentioned that there was to be a cross check between the TRAGIS output and what the railroads routing practices would be. This aspect of the exercise is not included in the current description of #6. Alex stated that this was to be a validation exercise for the TRAGIS code which may result in showing the limitations of TRAGIS. Jay stated that the intent is to have input from the railroads for the TRAGIS exercise even though it is not expressly stated in #6 in the Task Plan. Lisa requested that #6 be revised to include verbage that states that there will be railroad input for the TRAGIS exercise.

Jay stated that some of the issues listed in the Task Plan will be worked on in conjunction with the DOE Practices Manual update.

Scott asked about the products that the Rail Topic Group will be producing. Specifically, Scott wanted to know when the products will be put back in the Task Plan. Scott mentioned that Lisa originally had products listed in her version of the Task Plan. Jay replied that he wanted to wait and have a discussion with the entire Topic Group before going ahead and listing products.

Jay will have Michele send out the agenda for the working group session on Thursday, September 22.

The call concluded at 12:00 pm.