FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
HEALTH SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
January 10, 2013
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening[1]

Mike Korenko, Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection (HSEP) Committee Chair welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The November meeting summary was approved[2].

Update on the Employees Concern Program

HSEP Vice Chair Becky Holland, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB), introduced the topic of the Employees Concern Program (ECP). Becky noted that the committee is concerned that efforts to improve the program have not been maintained in the past. The committee asked Roger Gordon to speak about the improvements being made with the ECP and future plans for the program.

Agency Presentation

Roger Gordon, Director of Operations Oversight in the U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) provided a verbal presentation on the ECP and the ECP Improvement Plan. (Roger is currently detailed to the DOE-RL Deputy Manager to make improvements to ECP.) Roger noted that the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board DOE's Health Service System (HSS) reviewed the ECP, and issued reports recommending improvements to the ECP.

Roger discussed how users of the program are involved in the improvement process and noted that he has compiled a fifteen-person program development team (PDT) that meets every other week for a full day and completed a Six-Sigma process for program improvement. He said they will be recommending the

[1] Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

[2] Towards the end of the meeting Keith Smith, HAB member, identified a misstatement regarding Worker's Compensation in the November meeting summary that will be corrected in the final adopted version.

development of a sitewide employee concerns process based on the Hanford Site Safety Standards process. Roger noted that Mission Support Alliance (MSA) is providing support to the program improvement process by helping with facilitation. The PDT is currently focusing on the middle of the intake process, during which the concern is identified and the best way to route and resolve the concern is determined. Roger noted that he has been meeting with stakeholders, including interest groups, representatives from DOE Headquarters (DOE-HQ), DOE contractors, and DOE ECP Program Manager at HQ, Patricia Zarate.

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q: From an employee perspective, would an employee know what is different about the improved program? Have you met/involved any employees?

> *R: [DOE] From the worker's perspective, the biggest change will be knowing where to go with a concern. The ECP PDT is developing a process for filing a concern and how to resolve the concern respectfully. The PDT plans to develop a training and communications program to inform workers on how to file a concern. Worker trust will lag because work culture is difficult to change; trust will start to develop when people see results*
>
> *Yes. Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (HAMTC) and all of the other worker unions at Hanford were invited to participate in the program improvement process in order to share the workers' perspective.*

Q: Who is the Central Washington Building and Construction Trades Council (CWBCTC) representative?

> *R: [DOE] Bob Legard is the Beryllium Program point of contact for the Central Washington Building and Construction Trades Council.*

Q: What is the mission of the ECP?

> *R: [DOE] The mission is to offer employees an alternate avenue to resolve concerns. The program is designed so that an employee will first go to their management to work through employee concerns. If the concern cannot be dealt with at that level, the ECP is there to help resolve the issue in a respectful manner.*
>
> *Q: Improving ECP is a great opportunity to involve all potential users in the program. Many Hanford Site whistleblowers are not unionized, however. Have you socialized the program with all users of the program? It is great that you are reaching out to union workers. Where are you reaching out to the exempt workforce? How are you engaging them? Transparency, building trust, and increasing user involvement allows stakeholders to understand and contribute to the program. There is a gap if non-represented employees are not included in program development.*
>
> *R: [DOE] DOE has made announcements that the program is undergoing an improvement process, and DOE plans to continue to make announcements as procedures are developed. We will share the Plan with everyone. Also, we are developing a communications plan for ECP program managers, who will announce the availability of the Plan to their workers..*

Q: Would DOE consider including a non-union exempt user on the ECP improvement team?

R: [DOE] There are some exempt individuals already on the ECP PDT. The initial team is comprised of ECP experts and union representatives. Including exempt, non-union individuals on the team may make the team too large.

C: There are many non-union workers who do not use the ECP. Those who are unhappy with the program will continue to talk poorly about the program if they are unaware of the current improvement process. It might be beneficial to include a worker who is unhappy with and does not use the program on the ECP PDT.

Q: HSEP and the Board are concerned that workers were surprised that the concern they submitted to the DOE was turned over to the contractor for investigation without having been notified by DOE. Oftentimes the contractor's investigation comes back reporting no evidence for the employee's concern. Do employees have an opportunity to retract their concern if they do not want a contractor looking into it?

R: [DOE] The ECP PDT is looking into a process wherein there is an agreement between DOE and the employee that ensures they are informed along the way with the process and progress of their concern through the system. The ECP PDT wants to develop the process to enable employees to provide additional evidence that had not previously been considered. While there is a place for some concerns to be deferred back to the contractor, there are some concerns that should not be deferred back. The ECP PDT is looking to build in independent review on complaints referred back to DOE. DOE needs to recognize when employee wants DOE to investigate his/her concern. We are currently discussing how to achieve this.

C: In the past employees have been afraid to bring up concerns. Some are raising concerns as a form of layoff protection. Were the concerns always there? Potential layoffs make it more complicated (e.g., Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plan (WTP), employees are flooding the program with concerns).

R: [DOE] DOE is trying to develop a standardized set of employee concern metrics so that DOE can see where the concerns are coming from to help isolate the process or symptoms that need to be addressed.

Q: What is the percentage of concerns raised by non-union employees?

R: [DOE] Roger Gordon noted that he did not have the number offhand and will follow up with Tifany Nguyen (DOE-RL).

C: Employees are sometimes concerned about the definition of an employee concern. If an employee has a concern about their supervisor and the employee is afraid to bring the concern to their management program, they approach DOE with the concern. DOE will sometimes return the concern to the employee noting that it is an issue for the employee to bring to their management. The employee is then in trouble or in an awkward position with their management because they did not want their supervisor knowing about the issue. It would be helpful for DOE to describe what employee concerns are and what other avenues employees have to deal with concerns.

Q: Can you explain the difference between a whistleblower and an employee concern?

R: [Tom Carpenter responded at the invitation of Roger] A whistleblower is someone who has suffered retaliation. When an employee submits a concern through ECP, they are entitled to protection from actions taken against them due to that concern.

Q: Would DOE be open to having someone from HAB—either Tom Carpenter or Becky Holland—sit in on the bi-weekly ECP PDT meetings?

> *R: [DOE] This would need to be discussed with the committee. Roger Gordon noted that he would not be against people attending and listening. Roger will follow up with the Board via Tifany Nguyen.*

Q: Is it possible for an employee to remain anonymous while an investigation is being conducted by the contractor, and how can DOE ensure that the employee's name will not be revealed during the investigation process?

> *R: [DOE] If the employee wants the investigation to be handled confidentially, DOE communicates that the investigation can only be confidential up to a certain point. If the employee has been talking with their co-workers about the issue, the investigation cannot be confidential, and this is communicated to the employee in advance of the investigation.*

C: It would be helpful to have a flow chart to show what options are available for all ranks of employees.

> *R: [DOE] Roger Gordon agreed that a program flow chart would be helpful. Roger noted that ECP is an alternative route for employees to use to deal with their concerns, and it is not designed to be the primary means of dealing with employee concerns.*

C: The assumption should not be that people who come to the ECP have exhausted all of their options for resolving their concern. Rather, an employee may choose to use the ECP if they are not comfortable with other options, including dealing with the issue directly with management.

C: It might be helpful for ECP to coordinate with the Safety Culture program. With a healthy safety culture, there will likely be fewer employee concerns.

> *R: [DOE] Julie Goeckner (DOE-HQ) coordinates Safety Culture on a complex wide basis. Julie used to manage the ECP. It would be worth getting in touch with Julie to coordinate with the ECP PDT. It would be beneficial to integrate ECP with Safety Culture reform efforts.*

Q: How will DOE measure whether or not the proposed ECP changes are working, and what is the timeframe for those methods?

> *R: [DOE] A maintenance phase is built into the process to make sure the ECP improvements are properly implemented. After six months, HSS and DOE-EM will review program effectiveness. DOE plans to use a team approach to review progress. Programs are strong at first and tend to trend downward over time.*

Q: There is a focus on building trust in the ECP, and building trust will require relationships between employees and the agency. A new face in some key places might allow employees to build rapport and new relationships with management. Is DOE considering personnel changes for individuals who will be administering the changes to the ECP?

> *R: [DOE] Roger Gordon noted that he is not responsible for making personnel changes. Roger noted that the HSS report identified that employees oftentimes do not know who their direct manager is. DOE is building a communication plan and presenting draft policy to the ECP PDT for review.*

C: One way to increase program maintenance is to give the program to the employees.

> *R: [DOE] Making ECP a Site-wide process will help with program maintenance. The group managing the process will consist of representatives from each of the contractors and DOE. This group will not conduct the actual investigations, but rather will oversee the process.*

Committee members generally agreed that program maintenance is important, as past programs did not survive management and contractor changes.

The committee thanked Roger Gordon for attending the HSEP meeting. Becky Holland noted that next steps for the committee will be to wait for Roger's response to the questions posed during the discussion. Questions include: What is the percentage of concerns raised by non-represented employees, and would observers be invited to ECP PDT? Roger noted that he would be happy to attend future HSEP meetings to speak with the committee.

Instrument Calibration in High Humidity Conditions

Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge, introduced the topic of Instrument Calibration in High Humidity Conditions. Tom noted an incident when workers were recently removed from the Tank Farms while DOE looked into the effects of high-humidity conditions on instruments used on site. Tom noted that the instruments had been employed correctly, and the investigation was of the effect of the conditions on the data outputs and what manufacturer thresholds were for using the equipment in various levels of humidity.

Agency Presentation

Rich Urie, Industrial Hygiene representative, DOE-ORP, provided a verbal presentation on instrument calibration in high humidity conditions. Rich noted that DOE-ORP and Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) acknowledge the legitimacy of the questions posed by HSEP. Rich noted that DOE plans to create written technical bases for each instrument. Rich noted that he does not see any impacts or situations in which the screening instruments failed to recognize an abnormal condition. It is commonplace to use the instruments being used at Hanford Site tank farms in the variety of conditions present. Rich noted that condensation in the instruments is the issue central to the concern with using the instruments in humid conditions. If condensation collects in the instruments, it can impede flow and corrode components.

Rich noted instrument manufacturers publish test parameters for each instrument based on standards that range from 0- 99% relative humidity (typically 0-95%). The humidity ranges apply to fire alarms, cell phones, and electronics. Rich noted that conditions under which these instruments are used on Site sometimes exceed those ranges. If a chemical bonding space is filled with water, the chemical will not collect. The methodology for the instruments used on Site builds-in a redundancy process. The process uses tubes that have two chambers, and lab analysts examine both chambers with the assumption that if the sample shows a certain amount of moisture collected, it is a lost sample; voided samples are not unusual. If the flow varied too much or there is a breakthrough in the sample, the sample will not be counted. Rich noted that there are a variety of handheld meters used for screening. The handheld meters are not meant to be high-precision instruments, but they are accurate.

Rich noted that personal monitoring is required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) supports OSHA methods. The monitoring uses direct screening, third-tier instruments in the form of a sampling pump and bag. Workers fill up the sample bag and send it back to the Industrial Hygiene (IH) laboratory for testing. Results are returned quickly, which allows decisions to be made in the field.

Rich noted that DOE is in the process of soliciting information from the instrument manufacturers to see if it is acceptable that their instruments are used in relative humidity levels beyond 95%. Instrument manufacturers have not agreed to submit written letters to DOE, but they have given verbal communication on how and in what conditions the instruments can be used dependably. Rich noted that he has called several other sites to see if technical bases have been produced, and so far there he has found none. Rich found in some cases there were technical adjustments made to programs.

Clint Wolfley, Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS), noted that a diverse team of industry experts, management, and Operations representatives conducted an investigation to determine what other contractors and other sites are doing about using instruments in high-humidity conditions. DOE is taking the time to validate the data received from the manufacturers. Clint noted that HSEP members are welcome to visit the laboratory if that would be of interest.

Committee Discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q: Is DOE monitoring humidity levels, and is there a humidity threshold used to determine if the equipment can go back out for use on site?

> *R: [DOE] Manufacturers provided guidance for instrument thresholds, and DOE has updated operational procedures accordingly. DOE is working to make sure that all questions are answered before work using the instruments in humid conditions recommences.*

Q: Is DOE applying a more conservative threshold for the instruments than the instrument manufacturers provide?

> *R: [DOE] DOE will follow best practices. Manufacturer guidance relates not to the quality of the data produced by the instruments, but rather on the functionality of the units themselves. DOE has not yet seen an instrument with a broken motor due to operation in humid conditions. The humidity applies to the instrument's circuit board operation. Humidity can cause the instrument's circuit board to short out or corrode. Intermittent exposure is less of an issue. Water vapor infiltration related to a particular sample did not affect the performance of the instruments. DOE accounts for the breakthrough volume by running a two-hour sample instead of an eight-hour sample.*

Q: Has DOE tested the instruments with the desiccate for a known chemical and, if so, how much loss was there?

> *R: [DOE] Desiccant tubes used for the ray system are compatible with the ray system. There are indicators of saturation. They have been tested for the photoionization detectors to allow the molecules through. This will absorb pneumonia, which allows a screening process for false-positive results. DOE cannot use desiccant tubes for the area rays that have ammonia sensors. The area rays cannot use a desiccant; they are placed in the weather containment systems.*

Q: Will sniffing the head space of a high-heat tank affect the system at all?

R: [DOE] The tolerance on the combustible gas indicator (CGI) containers goes up to 99% humidity, non-condensing. These containers use a bridge system with a hot wire, established with dual sensors to allow the system to compensate. Temperature and humidity interfere with the reading, and the test action levels are low. The action levels account for variation inherent in this work.

R: [WRPS] The desiccant tubes used at the Hanford Site tank farms are used throughout America. DOE now has the complete inventory of all of the instruments on-Site, and conducted testing to ensure functionality before distribution.

Q: Temperature destroys readings and is of far more concern than humidity. Pre-calibration and post-calibration taking place in the laboratory (rather than in the field) doesn't seem dependable. I recommend calibration at the use temperature, which can vary in the field. This should be considered in the technical basis document. Is DOE looking at management of temperature of the device?

R: [DOE] This issue was raised in instrument training, and technicians are skilled using the technology. DOE is formalizing this process.

Q: Does DOE calibrate the instruments, or are they sent out to a lab to be calibrated?

R: [DOE] The instruments are both calibrated by DOE and sent out to the lab to be check-calibrated.

Q: What kind of feedback does DOE receive about instruments that were out of calibration and require adjustment?

R: [WRPS] It is rare that instruments are kept longer than ten years. If the lab notices something is out of calibration when the instruments are sent out for annual calibration, the lab writes DOE a notice of discrepancy. Erosion of electronic components is uncommon and occurs over a period of ten to twenty years. The instruments at the Hanford Site tank farms are in the field between one and four hours on a given day, three to four times per week. The manufacturer reported to DOE that at this level of use, it will take even longer for the instruments to corrode.

Q: Technicians are being trained to be aware of high-humidity conditions and operate instruments accordingly. This sounds like a good response to enhance training. Is DOE concerned about the past data that has been collected during high-humidity conditions?

R: [DOE] Rich Urie noted that he has been directed to conduct extensive surveillance based on past data collected in high-humidity conditions. Data has been collected based on NIOSH methodologies. DOE will review the data to determine if there are any indications that the data was inaccurate. Thus far there has been no indication that past readings were inaccurate.

Q: Can dust storms cause problems and alter data?

R: [DOE] Yes, dust storms can alter data, but as soon as there is evidence that flow is altered, filters are changed out.

Q: [Ecology] Use of these instruments is not new a new phenomenon. Given that work conditions (temperature and humidity) have remained the same and the equipment is the same over the years, what caused the stop-work? What brought attention to this issue?

R: [WRPS] DOE is conducting a root cause analysis (RCA) to determine how this issue came to light.

Q: Will there be an independent review of DOE's written technical bases for each instrument by anyone from outside of DOE-ORP and WRPS?

R: [DOE] There is no plan for outside independent approval, but DOE is open to suggestions.

The committee agreed that this was a topic on which HSEP would like to receive an update, specifically with regard to what caused the stop-work when the information is available. Tom Carpenter suggested that it would be helpful for NIOSH to formally review the technical bases to validate DOE's process and findings and receive an independent review to help improve the program in the future. Tom will follow up on this item with Rich Urie.

Note: At the end of the committee meeting, Becky Holland proposed that the committee develop potential advice that NIOSH conduct an independent review of the Industrial Hygiene program for the tank operations contractor. Mike Korenko noted that there is a cost to conduct reviews. The committee did not reach consensus on bringing the advice to the Board, but did agree to discuss it further on the HSEP Committee call on Tuesday, January 15. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, noted that she would distribute the proposed advice to the working committee list.

Voluntary Use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)

Tom Carpenter provided the issue manager introduction. Tom noted that a number of years ago, worker complaint investigations took place for which there was media coverage, and reports were issued within a month of each other. The conclusion of the reports was that Hanford was not taking care of its workers. A number of people lost their jobs over a two-year period as a result of these issues. The issues were contentious and led to the formation of a technical basis for vapor control and protection program led by contractor CH2M HILL.

Tom noted that the Hanford Concerns Council put together an expert panel including a reputable toxicologist, worker hygienist, and worker chemist to review the technical basis. The panel rejected the draft and proposed changes that CH2M HILL adopted. The IH program has been expanded, instrument quality has improved, and awareness has increased. With the revised technical basis reports, workers can ask for a personal protective equipment (PPE) upgrade and the Safety Department can decline the request if there are trade-offs due to conditions that would make the requested upgraded equipment unsafe to use.

Agency Presentation

Rich Urie provided a presentation on voluntary use of PPE. Rich noted that the program was enacted October 2012, and there has been a lot of HAMTC involvement and support. As an example of a situation in which a request to upgrade PPE might be denied, Rich noted that if employees are doing electrical work with while wearing a harness on their back and there is no driver for a respirator from an IH perspective, WRPS is obligated to say no to the upgrade request.

Clint Wolfley noted that the Site-wide respiratory protection program is modeled after WRPS's previous respiratory program. WRPS looks at each case individually based on the scope of work, and a safety analysis is conducted to determine if an upgrade will impact other aspects of the work or others' safety.

Public Comment

John Swain, City of Richland resident, attended the meeting to provide public comment. John noted that he used to be an employee working at the tank farms. John noted that he used to believe everything was safe until he was exposed in 2003. John said the company reported that there was nothing out there to cause the exposure. John said he is permanently disabled as a result and noted that at the time of retrieval it is unknown if there is anything coming out of the tanks that can cause damage. John said that he knows people recently who have gotten exposure, in spite of DOE maintaining that there is nothing out there that will hurt them. John asked the timeframe for getting permission from Radiological Control (RADCON) and IH if someone requests it. DOE responded that there *is no designated timeframe, but DOE responds to the requests as soon as possible while needing to fully understand the scope of the work.* Laura Hanses thanked Mr. Swain for attending and contributing in the meeting.

Committee Discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q: When an employee's request to upgrade PPE cannot be accommodated, what does DOE do to accommodate the worker's concern?

> *R: [DOE] DOE assigns them to other work that is available. If it is deemed unsafe to put on respiratory protection, DOE will look to see what other work is needed where there is no requirement for respiratory protection involved and where that worker is comfortable.*

Q: How many occurrences are there where the employee's request for a PPE upgrade cannot be accommodated?

> *R: [DOE] There is no mechanism to track that with at this time. There are requests every week. DOE is looking into a mechanism to track that.*

Q: The Hanford Site Respiratory Protection Program (HSRPP) is supposed to help reduce the number of respiratory combinations to have a standardized respirator. Is that part of the program at this point?

> *R: [WRPS] There are many types of respirators on site at this time. DOE is looking into consolidating the respirators.*

C: The Central Washington Building Trades Council (CWBTC) has concerns that work has to stop every time an employee says they want a PPE upgrade. This is a caution from the building trade perspective.

C: From a worker's experience, if respiratory protection is not marked on the job hazard analysis (JHA) sheet, the worker has to speak with the Safety Department (Safety) in order to request a PPE upgrade. A self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) cannot be worn when working on scaffolding because it is not safe. If the ventilation system goes down and workers are out on the tank farm, work stops. The voluntary use portion of the program has improved. It is still a major inconvenience to wait for a Safety representative to check the box on the JHA sheet so that a worker can wear a respirator on the job. It would be great to streamline the ability to get the box checked to approve requested PPE upgrades.

C: It is a trust issue when individuals make a request to get greater protection on the job. The questions are whether or not the testing device can monitor the conditions accurately in the field and if the background information can be trusted. For a lot of chemicals, workers may be able to tell. This time of year, the potential to exposure is higher because of temperature issues. I suggest working on the trust. Having an option for PPE upgrade on the JHA would go a long way to increase trust. I understand why this would impact the project from the construction trades perspective.

C: A procedure like this should indicate management intent and desire as well as authorization. Section 15.6 Voluntary Use of the PPE policies say that PPE "may" be provided to an employee. The language used is important. In Appendix C of this document, it says that employees are "encouraged" to use a respirator even when exposures are below exposure limit to provide increased comfort for workers. DOE should review the procedures thoroughly to clarify what management is saying to the workforce about upgrading PPE when workers feel they have the need.

C: The only protection against vapors is SCBA. People have gotten long-term, permanent disability, and there are reasons to be concerned about it from the perspective of many workers. It is hard to be the one person in the group that says they would like to upgrade PPE, and everyone has to sit and wait for permission for them to get the upgrade. People think that worker does not want to work, or suspects motives. In 2003, these were public cases, and at that point the contractors and government said that workers should not feel pressure for wanting to protect their health and safety. This standard is shrinking. It is easy to have the whole system orient towards "no", and then people feel unsafe and unprotected.

C: There is more unknown than known information about chemical vapors based on how difficult they are to detect and what their synergistic effects are. There are more chemicals than anyone even knows of. There is no recognition of the unknowns. Our human inability to control that situation means downplaying the concern and impacts of the workers who are affected.

> *R: [DOE] Rich Urie noted that he understands the committee members' frustration. DOE does not know what the exposure limits will be in ten years, and not all of the interactions are known. Rich noted that he called NIOSH to request modeling, but they declined. Rich said that is why DOE has the voluntary respirator program, and that specifics and ideas for solutions help a lot.*

C: At no time can a contractor refuse respiratory required protection. If a worker were to request an upgrade, does that require the entire project to back up because the worker now has restricted vision and work could take more time? The National Research Council (NRC) would say forget the mask, the worker is going to get shorter time exposure and the body will flush the exposure. Is DOE looking at the As Low as Reasonably Achievable (ALARA), timeframe for exposure, and the whole procedure? Who is making the analysis of the potential effects to the project of requesting an upgrade to PPE?

> *R: [DOE] That is part of the safety analysis. Is there an impact to the co-workers. DOE looks at the overall effect, and if it is okay if the job is postponed.*
>
> *R: [WRPS] WRPS tries to enforce a workplace that treats people with dignity and respect. Discrimination is not tolerated. When the company does find out about discrimination, the company tries to figure out what happened. WRPS's reaction to PPE upgrade requests is that it needs to be respectful. People with concerns should not feel threatened.*

Tom Carpenter noted that this was a great discussion, and thanked WRPS and DOE for presenting. Tom would like the committee to continue to track this issue. The committee agreed that they would like the

following information when it is available: number of requests of incidences when request for PPE could not be accommodated.

New Medical Contractor

Margery Swint, HAB, provided an introduction to the topic New Medical Contractor. Margery provided a brief history since 1943, noting that when Hanford Site was in production, there were between 13,000 and 18,000 workers on site. The first contractor, Dupont, had their own safety staff and physicians. GE took over about a year after Dupont, and the same Dupont doctors remained on site until 1975. The Hanford Environmental Health Foundation (HEHF) formed by doctors from Dupont in 1965 - 2002. The fire department provided transportation. Workers—clerks, janitors, and workers—received yearly comprehensive physicals. The Industrial Hygiene department handled water quality on Site for the wells. AdvanceMed came on 2002 with nine doctors, eighteen nurses, and four twenty-four hour medical stations. Their services were more limited.

Margery noted that under HEHF the program was very comprehensive, including drug testing, psychologists, physiologists, autopsy, and whole body programs at several major nuclear sites. After about 1990 when the Hanford Site was out of production and into cleanup, DOE decided that because the agency received few bids for this contract, they would split the contract into separate pieces. Psychologists, epidemiologists, physiologists, all of the health studies, and an emergency decontamination facility were cut from the program. DOE also reduced the number of physicals provided. Hanford Site is now on its third medical contract while the work has changed.

Agency Presentation

Darius Slade, DOE-RL, provided a presentation (Attachment 2) on Hanford's New Occupational Medicine Contract (HPMC). Darius noted that he is the only health systems specialist with DOE. DOE takes a health systems orientation towards the delivery of occupational health. He is DOE's Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for the contract delivery and performance that represents the technical side of the contract delivery. Darius noted that he read the HAB advice # 241 and DOE's response relating to HAB interest in the process of procuring a new contract.

Darius noted that HPM Corporation (HPMC) is the new contractor (October 1, 2012). HPMC is a certified small business, and there is emphasis for government to promote contracting to small businesses. Darius indicated that HPMC was the sub-contractor under the previous contractor and that the scope of work is the same as was in the previous contract. The structure and type of contract are different, however. The previous contract was cost reimbursable. This contract is fixed price, which means the contractor picks up the risk of delivering the services for that price. Darius noted that the new contract is a six-year term contract. The first two years is the base, and then there are four, one-year options. DOE has a stakeholder survey in the performance section of the contract to collect input from ORP and other prime contractors about the performance of the contractor.

In order to familiarize Darius with committee members, committee members and attendees introduced themselves following his presentation.

Committee Discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q: How is DOE covered for inflation effects for items under a fixed price contract?

R: [DOE] DOE has an escalation cost built into the contract for inflation. Market volatility is built into the contract. As part of the fixed price, it is in the contract that whoever the contractor is will do outreach in the community.

Dr. L.B. Sandy Rock, HPMC OMS, noted that he has conducted local outreach and gone to medical meetings to inform people about medical services. Most of the time was been spent on the beryllium issue.

Q: There are workers on site that are on medications to treat depression and other psychological issues, and who have started on those medications within the last five years. There are instances where people on these medications are denied disability, have been cleared for work, and yet are clearly not fit for duty. Does the medical contract/DOE look at fitness for duty and medications, and where the line is drawn? What services under behavioral health, workers compensation, and occupational health are available to workers?

R: [DOE] Occupational health and workers compensation deal with injuries or illness related to the work. If the injury or illness is not a work-related illness, then it is addressed within an individual's primary care. One can pursue a claim or make a claim or deal with the issue through primary care.

Q: Are there any fitness for duty concerns when people are on certain psychiatric medications?

R: [DOE] The employer makes that decision, not the occupational health providers. It is up to the manager to support and encourage that worker to seek assistance. If they are unable to perform that work, then it is impacting the performance of the organization. The employer considers what they can do to help that individual be more productive.

C: Mark Reavis, (CWBCTC), noted that the building and construction trades are concerned with the process of hiring and the physicals required. The trades are not happy with the EJTA process. They cannot pass workers, because the workers are required to seek additional medical attention before work can be pursued (e.g., heart murmur). For a high percentage of these potential medical issues, doctors cannot confirm any diagnoses.

Q: There is an inconsistency between the medical contractor and the medical physicians in the community. There are questions related to the individual tests required by the medical contractor, the ethics of those tests, and the test results as compared with what one would find in the community. For some of the issues identified, a worker cannot simply go downtown and get checked. The delay could cost a worker their job. Is there some way that someone who goes through this process could get reimbursed?

R: [DOE] Darius agreed to sit down with Mark Reavis and discuss his concerns.

Q: Is it clear what the return to service screening for beryllium tells the contractor? What is the communication like between the medical provider and the organization, and what options are available if there are still concerns after that employee has been cleared to go back to work?

R: [DOE] Within the constraints of mental health issues and the Health Information Privacy Act (HIPA, 1999) there is some narrow and clearly defined information that can be shared about the issues and medical diagnoses of that individual. From the contractor's perspective, the issue is if the worker can perform the work. A person may be physically able to perform the work, but they

may not feel capable of performing the work. Darius noted that he would to look into the return to duty screening to determine if management looks at the Employee Job Task Analysis (EJTA) when making their return-to-duty determination. The process involves collaboration with the occupational medical health provider and the worker's compensation provider. There is uniqueness in terms of work at Hanford Site and the providers in the community. In terms of the context of the work on site, it may not be clear.

Q: Historically, the occupational health medical (OccMed) physician acted as workers' primary physician who sent people to a specialist if additional care was needed. If that is not the way it is now, then DOE needs to communicate that to the workers. It is valuable for workers to be familiar with the physicians and for the physicians to be familiar with the work conducted on site. Is the patient supposed to decide if their issue is occupationally related?

R: [DOE] There has been an ongoing effort to communicate what OccMed relates to and where primary care physicians come into play; more outreach can always be useful.

Q: Why was the 200-West Area first-aid station closed?

R: [DOE] DOE completed an analysis on the number of visits between 2010 and 2012 and the amount of money spent on station operations. Results showed that there were 147 visits over 52 weeks. Of those 147 encounters, only 46 were occupational medical health-related. In budget terms, DOE spent $3,900 per visit for minor medical issues (e.g. blood pressure checks). The station did not provide enough services given the cost expended to maintain the clinic.

C: The new contractor is impressive. At a recent physical, a follow-up consultation was included once results were available. DOE is commended for the health promotion services and health coaching.

R: [DOE] The driver behind that is an epidemiology study indicating an obesity issue among workers on site. Obesity levels on site are higher than state wide obesity levels, and obesity has implications for other medical and physical issues.

For next steps, DOE will follow up with the committee on current staffing under OccMed, and with Mark Reavis on his specific concerns. No additional steps were determined to be necessary at this time.

Framing February Topics *(joint topics with TWC and RAP)*

The committee framed the topic Effects of Radiation on Critical Concrete Structures. This will be joint topic with TWC and RAP. Mike Korenko showed the committee graphs of gamma dose rate and distance in ordinary concrete density (Attachment 3). Mike explained that the first graph shows the curve of when radiation hits concrete. Every three inches, gamma dose decreases. The density of the concrete is an important factor. The gamma dose at the surface is very high, so the data needs to be verified. Mike noted that the last graph shows combined curves, where concrete loses 80% of its strength at the surface.

Issue managers provided a list of questions to Vanessa Turner, DOE-RL, to obtain more information and continue issue manager discussion. Issue managers Mike Korenko, Dirk Dunning, and Rob Davis will take the draft questions proposed at the TWC and HSEP meetings, refine them, and provide the committee with an updated set of framing questions to establish the scope of the discussion. The committee agreed that this would be a good topic for issues managers to bring to the February meeting in order to potentially get an update from DOE in March. Vanessa noted that the process of receiving clearance for the documents the issue managers have requested will take several weeks. Some of the

documents are large and will require time to review. The committee agreed that this topic is timely for March.

The committee framed the topic Preliminary Documented Safety Analysis (PDSA) for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP). This will be a joint topic with TWC. Rich Bloom and Dirk Dunning are the issue managers. The committee agreed on the following framing questions: Is there a PDSA? If so, is it available for review? Is the preliminary safety basis being maintained given the design changes and unresolved technical issues? What is the schedule for initiating the final safety basis determination for system start up? How is DOE challenging its assumptions and views (e.g. using external folks) in the development of the DSA? Does the WTP affect the safety basis already determined for public areas (e.g. 240 Area, B-Reactor, LIGO, Gable Mt.)? Sharon Braswell (MSA) noted that Vic Callahan had announced during the November HSEP Committee meeting that he would be more than happy to come back and speak with HSEP about the PDSA for the WTP.

The committee briefly discussed the topic Flammable Gas Buildup in Double-Shell Tanks. Becky Holland and Dirk Dunning are the issue managers for this topic. The committee tabled this item in the holding bin, given that work is currently underway to address this issue, and more information will be available at a later date.

The committee framed the topic Cross-Site Transfer Systems. The purpose of this topic is to discuss potential issues associated with the near surface transfer of waste to the WTP. Framing questions include: What is the overall plan/design for the transfer line? What are the safety and functional issues to be dealt with? What is the accident scenario as it pertains to erosion and corrosion? What is the schedule for line construction? When is transfer expected to start? Mike Korenko and Vince Panesko were identified as the issue managers for this topic.

Keith Smith, HAB, noted an emerging issue of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) contamination event that occurred in early January 2012. The committee agreed that this would be a timely topic for March.

Susan H. completed the February Meeting Topics Table on-screen during this discussion, and will email it to the committee and agency liaisons.

Committee Business

Mike Korenko reviewed the HSEP 3-Month Work Plan (Attachment 3) and agreed that February might be a good time to have a fully joint meeting with TWC. The committee agreed to complete an update to the 3-month work plan on their January 15 committee call. Susan will send out the latest version with today's edits in advance of the call.

Susan Hayman reminded the committee that it noted in October that it did not intend to meet every month. Which topics are HAB priorities and time sensitive? The committee may wish to consider this when developing the 3-month work plan.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 2: Hanford's New Occupational Medicine Contract Presentation
Attachment 3: Gamma Dose Rate and Distance in Ordinary Concrete Density Handout
Attachment 4: 3-Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Richard Bloom	Rebecca Holland	Vince Panesko
Tom Carpenter	John Howieson (phone)	Mark Reavis
Lynn Davison	Mike Korenko	Ed Revell
Sam Dechter	Pam Larsen	Keith Smith
Dirk Dunning (phone)	Bob Legard (phone)	Margery Swint
Steve Hudson	Liz Mattson	Jean Vanni
Laura Hanses		

Others

Al Farabee, DOE-RL	Nancy Uziemblo, Ecology	L.B. Sandy Rock, HPMC OMS
Roger Gordon, DOE-RL		Sharon Braswell, MSA
Tifany Nguyen, DOE-RL		Barbara Wise, MSA
Darius Slade, DOE-RL		Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
Vanessa Turner, DOE-RL		John Britton, WRPS
Rich Urie, DOE-ORP		Rich Higgins, WRPS
		Roby Robinson, WRPS
		Clint Wolfley, WRPS
		John Swain, Richland resident
		Abby Chazanow, EnviroIssues
		Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues

DSA - Comments

- Very complex process – very thorough – sometimes things still get "missed."
- Would recommend DOE really pay attention to: chemical hazards, definition of onsite/offside hazards.
- "Process Safety Analysis" – Different from DSA.
- Use this topic to tie back to other discussions in HSEP.

Page 1

Safety Culture Advice Response

- Follow up on Advice Point 4 response: Are DOE's assessments identified in the response actually addressing the design issues?
    - DOE will follow up with committee on this. (Savannah River as an Example)
- Follow up on Point 6 – How is DOE doing with this (specific actions), and what are the outcomes?
- Advice point 8 – HAB: "Welcomes input, protective, inspires trust"
    - Want to know how DOE is addressing specifically.
    - Use "independent review" to address this point.
- Generally:
    - Keeping contractors focused and performing on safety.
    - Don't let incentives outweigh safety performance.
    - Advise 13 – Piggybacks on independent assessment for design.
    - ORP needs to own ECP (But similar with RL)
    - Small business issue – how they are supporting safety culture issues? (more on this at next meeting)

Page 2

Site-wide Survey Comments

- Generally, ask how many "managers"/people a person "reports" to
    - → DOE tried to address this in definitions.
- Next steps:
    - Reports: How did contractors use safety information to identify cont. IMP actions (Jan. 15 – self-assessments to DOE)
    - After March – Briefing on above point.

Page 3

ECP Program Advice Response

- Advice pt. 3: Need more demonstration of action here.
- Advice pt. 2: Disappointed no intent for separate ORP program.
    - Hard not to hear a direct ORP contract.
- Advice pt. 1: Anxious to meet with Roger Gordon.
- Think ORP should know if there is an issue (e.g. contractor) – weakness in process to always resolve at lowest level.
- Use signage so that workers know who/how to contact ECP.
- Next steps:

- Have Roger Gordon come to HSEP
- Request to invite Mark R. and Becky H. to meet with DOE Team.

Page 4

CAS

- Next steps:
  - Open opportunity for HSEP members to sit in on EZAC/PZAC meetings (let Mike know)

Page 5

CAS Comments

- Would be useful to share lessons learned between contractors and between RL/ORP
- Next Steps:
  - Follow up with ORP – How are they tracking meetings? Comparable? (IM follow up)

Page 6

Follow Up

- Continue Advice #258 response discussion – from advice pt. 9 – 13 (include small business issue)
- More on "Process Hazard/ Safety Analysis" (IM = Richard)
- Meet with new ECP program manager, Roger Gordon.
- How do issues get to ECP when they are committee issues?
- Have Roger send Becky information on DOE Team that is meeting r.e. ECP. (Stan)
  - Mark expressed interest in serving on team
- Steve P. – Follow up with Laura regarding worker meetings r.e. survey results communications.
- Add Becky and John as HSEP IMs for TL & WM EIS

Page 7
