

**U.S DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE)
TRANSPORTATION EXTERNAL COORDINATION (TEC)
WORKING GROUP MEETING**

March 5-6, 2007 Atlanta, GA

Rail Topic Group

Alex Thrower began the meeting and welcomed all topic group participants and support contractor staff. Mr. Thrower established that the following issues and sub-topic group matters required further consideration and in some cases next steps needed to be planned. These include:

Inspections Checklist

Mr. Thrower requested that members submit their feedback on the items inspected during point of origin and en route inspections in the form of a short listing. Next steps involve:

- Presenting the checklist to Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) state managers in a preliminary format;
- Discussions with DOT in regard to formatting the checklist; and
- Development of a complete reference list to be placed onto blue cards to be used during locomotive inspections.

A topic group member indicated that regional locomotive inspections are timed. Therefore, items can be missed and as a result, a checklist is necessary. It was also noted that the inspection done at the point of origin is comprehensive while the en route inspection checks for wear and tear. Dr. Ruth Weiner asked how long an inspector would spend on the inspection when casks are involved. A participant noted that routine inspections of freight cars take approximately 15 minutes to perform.

Tracking

A participant indicated that radiation monitoring is more than just a type of tracking system. Because of this, the participant felt that this subgroup lacked the appropriate expertise to fully deal with the issue of radiation monitoring. One commenter recommended the creation of a Radiation Monitoring subgroup.

A participant emphasized that cask tracking requires a power source. Furthermore, he indicated that solar panels could act as this source. Mr. Robert Fronczak, a topic group member, replied that there is no way to satisfy state needs of this magnitude. He added that even TRANSCOM does not provide individual packages. Another topic group member noted that in the event of a car monitor failure, the rest of the train could keep moving and the problem can be taken care after arrival of the shipment

Planning

The status of the rail planning timeline has not changed since the meeting in Green Bay. When changes are made, members will be asked for feedback.

Lessons Learned

Jane Beetem noted that a revised draft of the Lessons Learned document was created a week before the TEC Meeting. This version now includes an executive summary.

Wrap Up

Bob Halstead asked whether rail access issues in support of the EIS would be factored into the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Alex Thrower replied that nothing specific had been planned. Future topics for the Rail Topic Group would include:

- Increased focus on intermodal issues;
- The possibility of developing contracts with the railroads in order to solve routing issues;
- Suggestions to DOE;
- Training of the railroads on radiation monitoring and the creation of a short course; and
- Potential database containing all accidents.

Lastly, it was established that in the event of a subgroup change or elimination, a call will be held to discuss it.