Transportation External Coordination (TEC) Working Group
DOE Transportation Protocols Topic Group
Conference Call, June 27, 2001, 3:00 Eastern Time

Conference Call Notes

The Transportation External Coordination (TEC) Working Group U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Transportation Protocols Topic Group held a conference call beginning at 3:00 p.m. Eastern time on June 27, 2001. The call was led by Carol Peabody, DOE-Environmental Management (EM) Office of Transportation. Other participants included: Corinne Macaluso, DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW); Alex Thrower, Science Applications International Corp.; Ken Niles, Oregon Office of Energy; Paul Seidler and Chris Binzer, Robison/Seidler, Inc.; Judith Holm, DOE National Transportation Program—Albuquerque; Phillip Paull, Council of State Governments—Eastern Regional Conference; and Ray English, DOE Pittsburgh Office of Naval Reactors.

Ms. Peabody began the conference call by updating participants on the status of the protocols development process. Based on input from the Office of Management and Administration (MA) and after extensive discussions on the best way to implement the protocols, it was decided that they would be renamed transportation "practices" and incorporated by reference into DOE Order 460.2, the primary transportation Order, which is currently being revised. Discussions between the National Nuclear Security Agency (NNSA) and other DOE programs over the scope, applicability and roles/responsibilities under DOE Order 460.2 have been occurring for some time, and implementation of the protocols will therefore be delayed until these issues are resolved. Ms. Peabody estimated that a revised draft Order will probably not be submitted until at least the end of July, with the protocols as part of that package. Given these delays, she said, there is essentially nothing new to report on the status of the protocols since the meeting in Portland in February 2001, and she therefore suggested the topic group forego a sit-down meeting in Cincinnati in July 2001. She reiterated DOE has committed to keeping the topic group members informed about substantive changes in the protocols resulting from the MA review, and the process for updating the protocols that will be used; these commitments are unchanged.

Mr. Paull asked how DOE was planning on handling the implementation and updating process. Ms. Peabody responded that when comments are received from the MA review, the requirements for implementation and updating the process will be more fully understood. She said she expected to be able to resolve these specific issues before the next TEC meeting. Clearly, implementation within the complex is going to be important; workshops will probably be held on how programs are to use the guidance.

Mr. Niles asked how long the group could expect the MA review process to take once they are formally submitted. Ms. Peabody replied they expect the review to take about three months, although that may be subject to change. The coordination process is extensive, she said, but reviewers are held to strict deadlines and nearly everyone in the

complex having interest in the protocols has reviewed and commented upon earlier versions. Ms. Peabody emphasized that the protocols are still drafts, however, and until the process is completed it is impossible to predict how it will all come out.

In closing, Ms. Peabody confirmed the group would forego a sit-down meeting in Cincinnati and would schedule a conference call after the MA review, in any case sometime before the next TEC meeting. She stated she would briefly update the entire TEC at the meeting on the status of the protocols and topic group members should feel free to make additional statements at that time if they wished.

The conference call adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m. Eastern time.