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Rail Issues Panel

- Association of American Railroads (AAR)  R. E. Fronczak
- Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)    E. W. Pritchard
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), Standing Committee on Rail Transportation  K. R. Blackwell
- CRWMS M&O Contractor                    O. F. Sonefeld
- Mineral County, Nevada                  L. Green
- Panel Moderator                        V. E. Poe
- R. J. Rooney
Introductory Comments

• 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
Introductory Comments

- 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

Civilian Radioactive Waste Management System
Introductory Comments

• 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
Introductory Comments

- 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
Introductory Comments

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

- 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
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