Rail Issues Panel Transportation Coordination Group Meeting

Presentation to the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board Arlington, VA

Robert J. Rooney June 14, 1995

Rail Issues Panel

Association of American Railroads (AAR)

R. E. Fronczak

Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)

E. W. Pritchard

K. R. Blackwell

 American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), Standing Committee on Rail Transportation O. F. Sonefeld

CRWMS M&O Contractor

L. Green

Mineral County, Nevada

V. E. Poe

Panel Moderator

R. J. Rooney

- Bob Rooney—Moderator
 - Improved railroad infrastructure since economic deregulation in 1980
 - Future abandonments and line sales will affect intermodal mix
- Larry Green—M&O
 - Summarized rail transportability of Large MPC Study Report
 - Minimal restrictions on 6-axle rail car capacity of 394,500 lbs. GWR
 - Continued monitoring necessary

- Vernon Poe—Mineral County, Nevada
 - Concern about 125-ton MPC on rail infrastructure and recoverability
 - Concern about train dynamics of 125-ton MPC
 - Prefers 75-ton MPC single design
 - Recommends examination of dedicated train option

- Bob Fronczak—AAR
 - AAR policy is to seek risk management plan before transportation system design
 - Railroad operating goal of timetable-authorized speed without passing restrictions
 - Recommends use of dedicated trains
 - AAR's current crash-worthiness research plan

- Ed Pritchard—FRA
 - FRA's role in SNF transport
 - FRA's role in accident investigations
 - Inspection plan (NIP)
 - Inspection disciplines
 - Track, signal and train control, operating practices, motive power and equipment, hazardous materials
 - HMTUSA-mandated reports
 - Dedicated trains, mode and route

- Kevin Blackwell—FRA
 - Current procedures for SNF shipments
 - CRWMS would strain FRA's inspection resources
 - FRA's current state participation

- Otto Sonefeld—AASHTO
 - State DOT rail planning function
 - Growth of short line and regional railroads
 - Interchanges between railroads must be planned carefully
 - Capacity constraints on rail lines
 - Rail cars are becoming increasingly specialized
 - Commercial considerations and logistics management firms

Civilian Radioactive Waste Management System

06/12/95

Comments Among Panelists

- Bob Fronczak—AAR
 - DOE needs to factor railroad company plans into DOE planning (e.g., abandonments)
 - Railroad concerns about MPC recovery time in a derailment
 - Not convinced that sole reliance on 75-ton MPC is necessary
 - Relationship between train speed and risk needs more study

Comments Among Panelists

- Kevin Blackwell—FRA
 - FRA has begun dialogue with railroads on emergency response planning
- Otto Sonefeld—AASHTO
 - When notified of SNF shipments, Governors will turn to State Secretary of Transportation for review of route

Questions and comments from Audience to Panel

- R. Halstead—State of Nevada
 - Little discussion of routing and avoidance of urban areas
- W. Craig—State of Utah
 - Definition of FRA's enhanced inspection program for SNF?
- D. Salisbury—Community Awareness Project
 - Concern about routing in rural areas and the notification process

Questions and Comments from Audience to Panel

- A. Johnson—Eureka County, Nevada
 - Are long rail spurs subject to safety regulation similar to mainlines?
- B. McBride—League of Women Voters
 - Questions on shipment notification process and cause of difference between highway and railroad hazardous materials routing regulations

Questions and comments from Audience to Panel

- R. Halstead—State of Nevada
 - Without a rail line to a storage site, is the 125-ton MPC a problem for heavy haul?
 - Recommend 75-MPC system
 - Report appears over-optimistic on site to mainline track structure