

.....
CBDPP I&M Committee Meeting Minutes

April 21, 2011

2430 Stevens / CR 297
.....

ATTENDEES:

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Michele Solano | Darrell Riffe |
| Mike Stoner | Randy Phenneger |
| Kirk Domina | Tonya Bean |
| Emily Millikin | Larry Sherman |
| Chuck Wildman | Leo Wickstrand |
| Bob Legard | Thomas Morris |
| John Calcagni | Joseph Samuels |
| Lisa Hart | John Herber |
| Silvette Boyajian | Mario Moreno |
| Colby Smith | Thomas Staker |
| | Terry Kreitz |

*Mark Fisher delegated his vote to Chuck Wildman

*Scott Seydel delegated his vote to Tonya Bean

INTRODUCTIONS:

- Terry Krietz – DOE/HQ/EM
- Thomas Staher – DOE/HQ/EM, HSS Team Lead

SAFETY TOPIC:

- Parking lot safety.
 - Do a 360 check of your car when you get out to it to make sure everything is ok to drive (tires, mirrors, etc.)
 - Pay attention when backing out, as pedestrians aren't always paying attention when walking across the parking lot
 - As a pedestrian, don't be distracted in the parking lot, pay attention.

CARRYOVER TOPICS FROM LAST MEETING:

- **Training for Handling Beryllium Material**
 - The last paragraph of the response was revised during the meeting, however, there were remaining concerns about two sections of the response:
 1. The phrase "non-qualified workers" is confusing. Qualified workers have been defined but "regular workers" has not.
 2. The Committee decided that the word "recommended" was not strong enough language so therefore replaced it with the word "determination".
 - A concern about the word "decontamination" (last sentence of the second to last paragraph). What does that mean? Does it mean the waste has been

sampled? Or that the sealed container was just wiped down? The answer to that question raised the following concerns:

1. Does the 'decontamination' process follow a standard process for all containers coming out of a BCA? Or is a negative exposure process required? If a negative exposure determination has been made, then periodic validations of that determination should be made to ensure that the decontamination process is still working correctly.
 2. Should it be addressed via process verification or via release criteria?
 3. Does the CAP cover establishing release criteria?
 4. Have to consider not just sealed drums, but respirators as well. How are those handled outside a BCA?
 5. If this Committee is worried about a sealed drum once it's outside a BCA, then the concern is that the decontamination process may not be adequate. If so, the Committee needs to strengthen the program at an earlier stage than when the waste gets outside the BCA.
 6. Routine sampling must be done to ensure that the double bagging is working.
 7. The response to the question doesn't cover if waste is put into a container, and that container is sealed inside the BCA. Can we get waste out of a BCA before it's cleared? What is that process?
 8. Does HAMMER cover double bagging in training?
- Larry Sherman will re-work the response for the next Committee meeting and also contact the person who asked the question and give status.
- **Review flowchart that outlines how changes get made to DOE-0342**
 - An updated version of the flowchart was handed out; which includes feedback from Tim Bussman.
 - There have been two 60% Be CAP Product Presentations, and it is the expectation of Ray Corey that all VPs attend product presentations. This is so that when it comes time for the product to be reviewed by contractors, the VPs are aware of the product, as well as any questions that came up during the 60% presentation, and can take that back to their respective company presidents and legal teams.
 - The flowchart tries to address every possible path that could be taken, including dead ends, or times when a change is rejected and either returned back to the product team or a determination is made that portions (or all) of the product is not needed. Although the possibility of such dead ends may be few and far between it is still taken into account on the flow chart.
 - Program vs. Procedure
 - It was discussed that not everything that comes out of the consensus process should/would be put into DOE-0342, as it is a program document. Some things will be more amenable to become a Site Wide Procedure.

- Having DOE-0342 be a high level policy/program document that directs the use of procedures that fall underneath it is the way that other Site Wide Programs are documented. This would allow the CBDPP to be consistent with other site wide programs.
 - During implementation of these products, it is quite possible that some “tweaks” will be required as field implementation progresses. It is easier to revise a procedure than the whole CBDPP.
 - We have requested that the Be CAP Product teams identify what changes must be incorporated to the CBDPP and additionally, identify what processes should be hand-offs to procedures referenced by DOE-0342. The expectation will be that the Product teams provide redline-strikeout edits to DOE-0342, as well as develop the draft implementing procedures, if that is deemed the better mechanism for establishing the process implementation.
 - This Program versus Procedure process is now depicted in the flowchart (see Process #2).
- The flowchart Process #2 depicts DOE’s direction to the Hanford Onsite Contractors regarding implementation (handing off to Process #4). Process #4 defines the mechanisms by which contractors develop baseline changes and negotiate costs and schedules for implementation of the products. For most contractors, the costs are those that are incremental to existing contract direction.
 - Since not all contractors use BCRs to get contractual changes, Emily Millikin will provide proposed language to be added to the flowchart.
 - All Committee members are to provide any suggestions or changes they would like to see to the flowchart.
 - It was clarified that by making these changes to the contracts, those changes will stay well into the future, and be requirements for new contracts or transitions.
- Configuration Control for DOE-0342
 - There is still an issue for how to manage the document between revisions to the document and release/implementation into the field.
 - Shared drive was discussed last week, but not voted on. There was a quorum today, and a formal vote was taken. All Committee members agreed, and there was no dissent.
 - For any resolution forms that will be replaced by new resolution forms coming from the product teams, there will need to be a written notification for the record to show why the original resolution form is not being implemented. This is to ensure historical data, and create a history for all CBDPP change documentation.
 - Rolling version of the CBDPP kept in the shared drive:

- ❖ Be CAP Product teams need to not only provide redline strikeouts of the sections they are changing, but also leave comments on other sections of the CBDPP that will be affected by their changes.
- ❖ It was suggested that at the 60%, Be CAP Product Teams can provide comments to the rolling document stating which sections they are working on, and then provide the details of those changes at the 90%.
- ❖ Access to the shared drive must be controlled:
 - Read/Write access will only be given to Shawna Flood and Michele Solano. Any changes to the document, in the form of redline/strikeout or notations (e.g., placeholders or informational comments to other Product teams) will be entered into the document by Shawna or Michele.
 - Read Access – suggested groups to have read access were Be CAP Product Team Leads, Voting Members of the CBDPP Committee, Pete Garcia, DOE-RL and Mario Moreno, DOE-ORP.
 - While only Shawna and Michele will be able to make changes to the share-drive version, Team Leads will be able to download the existing version of the document to incorporate their redline/strikeout revisions.
 - Only Be CAP Product Team leads should be sending comments and redline strikeouts to Shawna/Michele
 - A watermark stating “DRAFT Copy – Not for Field Use” or similar wording will be incorporated into the document. Team Leads are asked to retain that watermark drafting their revisions.
- ❖ If two product teams are making revisions to the same section of the CBDPP at the same time, Shawna/Michele will bring that to the team leads’ attention and ask them to work together to provide a redline strikeout version of that section that incorporates both teams’ changes.
- ❖ Draft procedures will also be stored in the shared drive.
- ❖ All draft procedures and the rolling version of the CBDPP will be saved in the shared drive as a PDF file.

NEW BUSINESS:

- **Communication to Workforce**
 - The last communication distributed to the workforce took six weeks to get out; from the time it was submitted.
 - A status update should be sent out to the workforce. Should that come from CBDPP Committee or the Be CAP Development Team?

- It was reported that Julie Goeckner plans on developing the product description for Communications on Tuesday, April 26, 2011.
 - The outstanding concern is that it will take weeks for that product description to get created, the team to meet, and a product developed. In the mean time, the workers need to be updated.
 - It was suggested that the Be CAP Development team be the one to put out the message. This will also be discussed at the April 26th meeting.
 - It was further suggested that communications can go out via more ways than just a Site-Wide message:
 - Posting to the website
 - Email
 - Company Newsletters
 - Project Newsletters
 - PZAC/EZAC meetings
- **New Programs Implementation**
 - There are misinterpretations of the DOE directed interim actions for beryllium. The interim actions don't say what you do if you exceed the control limit. It was assumed that the CBDPP would be followed, but instead, people are treating it like a trigger level and are just re-sampling.
 - ❖ IBOT will be meeting with Pete Garcia, RL, to discuss more directional language for this.
 - Delays are being incurred as IBOT and the Labs are slammed. It was stated that some contractors, from a project point, prior to down-posting, are sending everything through the IBOT which is causing a delay in results. Further delays are happening due to the Labs backlog.
 - Lessons learned need to be posted on the website, so that they are accessible. May need to create an "Interpretations" page to the website.
 - Only a few of the Committee members had read the Lessons Learned that came out of Livermore having to do with a beryllium component in a sensor. A copy of the lessons learned was read to the group. The point was that of the eight instruments sampled, after decontamination, follow up samples were done and they showed that two of the instruments were still contaminated after the initial decontamination.
 - The specific instruments that were tested at Livermore are not used at Hanford.
 - ❖ Darrell Riffe will follow up and send the names of those instruments to the radiological controllers to confirm that they are not being used at Hanford.
 - It was proposed to add Lessons Learned to the CBDPP Committee agenda as a standing item. The Committee agreed.

- **Be CAP Update**

- It was reiterated that the voting members are encouraged to attend the product presentations if they can. Some of the members who have attended the presentations have found it very informative.
- Be CAP Product Updates:
 - The IH/IHT Training can't move forward like they thought they would be able to after the 60% presentations, as the team leads are not ready to release their products to the IH/IHT Training development team for incorporation into the training.
 - ❖ HAMMER will be working with the Product Teams at some point between the 60 and 90% presentations. Product Team leads must work with HAMMER to determine the best point at which training analyses and development are integrated in the various products. The Beryllium Worker Training will obviously have to have changes, as will the IH/IHT and PPSM training. This will have to be coordinated with the various Product teams and HAMMER. The Committee recognizes that there will be some staging due to prerequisite training (i.e., Beryllium Worker Training is a prerequisite to IH/IHT training and PPSM training. As such, it is important that HAMMER be integrated into the Product Teams at the appropriate point.
 - ❖ HAMMER is aware of what is coming down the pike as Lisa Hart is the HAMMER Representative on the CAP team.
 - ❖ HAMMER will be the one to decide what the method of training should be (GAP, modification of existing training, etc.)