



**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
BUDGETS & CONTRACTS / HEALTH, SAFETY &  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE**

*April 11, 2018  
Richland, WA*

<b>Topics in this Meeting Summary</b>	
Budgets & Contracts Opening .....	2
Review of Current Contractors .....	2
Review of DOE Response to HAB Advice #294.....	4
Review of Committee Budget Priorities .....	5
Budgets & Contracts Committee Business .....	6
Regulatory Reform.....	7
Health, Safety & Environmental Protection Opening.....	8
Respiratory Equipment Hygiene.....	8
Health, Safety & Environmental Protection Committee Business.....	10
Regulatory Reform.....	10
Attachments .....	10
Attendees .....	11

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

## **Budgets & Contracts Opening**

Gary Karnofski, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) and Chair of the Budgets & Contracts Committee (BCC), welcomed committee members and introductions were made.

*There were no announcements made.*

## **Review of Current Contractors**

Gary Karnofski stated the purpose for the review of current contractors is for the BCC committee to align with the current procurement cycle and to continuously keep up with the procurements and contracts. As the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board), this is the only time the Board will be able to ensure the Board's priorities are factored into the Request For Proposals (RFPs). The BCC's goal is to learn about the historical procurement cycle and have a discussion as a committee.

Gary introduced the team of presenters for the review of current contractors. Tim Corbett, Contracting Officer with U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Richland Operations Office (RL) for the Mission Support Alliance (MSA) contract; Marcy Aplet-Zelen, Contracting Officer with RL for the HPMC Occupational Medical Services contract; Jenise Connerly, Lead Contracting Officer with RL for the Plateau and Remediation contract.

Key discussion points:

- 15 years ago, DOE started following a centralized procuring model similar to the Department of Defense (DOD). The efforts to get new contracts are performed out of a centralized office called the Environmental Management (EM) Consolidated Business Center (CBC) in Cincinnati, Ohio. CBC post the solicitations and solicitation notices for Hanford. Solicitations and general announcements can be found on the CBC website at <https://www.emcbc.doe.gov/>. CBC uses [Fedconnect](#) to post the solicitations for RL on FedBizOps. DOE regulations for certain types of actions require that DOE post notices in advance for those actions. This ensures that businesses have an opportunity to be ready before an action comes out.
- The current prime contracts can be found at [www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/primecontracts](http://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/primecontracts). A prime contract is a contract that is directly with DOE. Contracts between a prime contractor and another contractor are referred to as subcontracts. Only the major prime contracts are listed of the website. RL and DOE Office of River Protection (ORP) have their own contracting websites that are separate from each other.
- The conformed contract is the contract as it currently exists as modified, which includes all modifications to the contract. Contracts are modified for various different actions, such as adding funding to the contract. RL uses an alphabetical organization system. Section A of the award form will show the original contract date. Usually there is a transition period before the performance period begins. Section F lists the delivery schedules and period of performance. Every contract is different, but depending on the acquisition schedule, there are option periods to extend the contract. Contract extensions are optional, but not guaranteed.

***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.*

*Q: “Who makes the decision to extend contract? Is that done at the CBC or RL?”*

R: “Acquisition strategies are usually a joint effort. They can be done locally based on what the requirements are, then they are vetted through different approval processes.”

*Q: “The recent notice to extend the tank farm contract, did that option exist or did they have to go beyond the available options?”*

R: “There are two clauses in Section I of the larger service contracts that allows for the opportunity within the contract condition to extend contract for short periods of time. One of those clauses on the HPMC Occupational Medical Services contract in Section I.27 states that the contract can be extended for another six months, but no more than six months. There is another clause called continuity of services which is only for the purpose of continuity between the old and new contractors for up to 90 days to cover the transition period. What ORP has done with the tank farm contract is not in the contract, but is permitted within government contracting. When there is no benefit to competing, that the contractor can request and publicize to non-competitively extend the current contract for more time.”

*Q: “Would you have to go through CBC for that process?”*

R: “CBC procures the new acquisitions. This is one of the options within the federal regulations that allows for this kind of extension. The regulation that we follow is the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR). The FAR states that the contractor does not have to compete the contract in these certain situations without a full and open competition, but with restrictions. In reference to the tank farm contract, a notice was put out stating that an extension for one year was going to be issued due to transition conflicts.”

*Q: “How do the companies negotiate with DOE to ensure that the companies being bought out are capable of meeting the same requirements that were critical to awarding the initial contract?”*

R: “The contracts for Plateau, Mission, and Tanks contain a requirement that the corporation must establish a separate corporate entity solely for the performance of the contract. In the case of the recent acquisition of CH2MHill Plateau & Remediation is wholly owned subsidiary of CH2MHill Constructors, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of CH2MHill Nuclear Business Group, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of CH2MHill. Jacobs Engineering bought out CH2MHill, but all of the other units still exists. It is not something that requires DOE permission. The only reason there was an issue with that acquisition, is because Jacobs Engineering was the owner of the entity of MSA. If it is a one for one transfer of ownership, there are certain clauses in the regulations. In terms of the actual management, we didn't see any change in the personnel.”

*Q: “What happens when there is a noncompliance with those terms? Is that an award fee or noncompliance of the contract?”*

R: “Usually that would be addressed within ORP. Contracting Officers are just the mouth piece of this process. The majority of this is the program itself. Contracting Officers are the interface and are the ones able to explain the clauses.”

*Q: “Is it in fact the only time we can comment on a procurement, during the Draft RFP?”*

R: “Occasionally we will post strategies in advance for commenting on RFPs. If you go to the CBC website and click the about tab, there is a link for Business Opportunities. We published an announcement for acquisition strategy about 10 years ago. I believe they posted an advance notice but I am not too familiar with this.”

*Q: “Are we wasting our time making comments on the Draft RFPs?”*

R: “I do not what the comments were, but I can tell you that the purpose for issues comments is really driven by the industry of that process, and not the HAB process. I will say, I have seen a time where HAB advice was taken into consideration in the past.”

### **Review of DOE Response to HAB Advice #294**

#### *Member Presentation*

Tom Galioto, Public at Large and Vice Chair of the BCC committee provided a presentation on DOE’s response to [HAB Advice #294](#). Tom noted that the purpose for review DOE’s response is to identify next steps for the BCC committee.

Key points from Tom’s presentation:

- The HAB issues Advice #294 on November 13, 2017 regarding the DOE Hanford Budget. The HAB received a [response from DOE](#) on January 22, 2018. The HAB also sent a [letter](#), including HAB Advice #294 to DOE Headquarters on March 12, 2018.
- In the [presentation](#), slides three through ten address the DOE response to each advice point. Tom noted that the responses indicate that DOE would not address further action on three of the advice points, has addressed three of the advice points, and does not agree with two of the advice points. Tom expressed in his opinion the advice had no impact to the budget.
- On March 29, 2018, the BCC committee received a webinar from DOE on the [Federal Budget Process](#), as requested by the BCC committee. DOE is primarily interested in receiving the HAB’s prioritization of planned activities. It was determined that DOE provides their budget input to DOE Headquarters in late May, so the HAB should provide advice on budget priorities early in the calendar year. Tom noted that DOE’s budget submittal meeting all legal and regulatory requirements, which leaves little to now room for additional recommendations from the HAB. The RL Budget Division is given a target budget by DOE Headquarters each year, which is how the local budget is established.

***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.*

C: “In the March 29, 2018 webinar, it was stated that DOE does not request more than the legal obligations.”

*Q: “On response to advice point eight, did DOE explain as to why they would not share the detailed information on the analytical building blocks?”*

R: “I don’t think that DOE can legally share the information. In regards to the budget, the public cannot see what the budget legal requirements are or what numbers are submitted to DOE Headquarters.”

C: “The HAB should not be discouraged from continuing to provide advice on the budgets.”

**Next Steps:** The BCC will move forward with bringing a budget priorities letter forward to the June HAB meeting.

**Review of Committee Budget Priorities**

The BCC committee requested each committee to review their Fiscal Year 2020 budget priorities. Tom Galioto stated that the list is very extensive and would like each committee to choose their top 10 priorities in order to determine if a letter or advice could be brought forward to the June HAB meeting.

BCC members reviewed the following list of budget priorities for each committee:

*River & Plateau (RAP) Committee Budget Priorities*

- Sludge off the River
- 324 Building Cleanup
- WESF & Cesium Capsules
- Completion of PFP Demo & Site Remediation (Including soil & slab characterization)
- Protect funding that keeps pump & treat running
- Apatite Barrier Completion
- Site Infrastructure
- 200 PW 1, 3, 6 Remediation

*Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Budget Priorities*

- Infrastructure (Issues, Maintenance)
- Safe Retrieval of Tank Waste

- Defining the Process of Closure of Single Shell Tanks (SST)
- Construction of DFLAW & Related Facilities
- Funding for New Tank Waste Storage Capacity (ref # 284)
- Funding for New Tank Design & Expediting the Permitting Process
- Continued Funding for Vapor Engineered Exposure Controls (Worker Safety)
- Continued Funding for Design & Construction for the VIT plant

*Public Involvement & Communications (PIC) Committee Budget Priorities*

- Regional Public Meetings (Regional Dialogue Meeting)
- Fully fund the HAB including HAB Regional Board Meetings
- Multi-media capability on deck to record and publish meetings online
- Fully fund public participation grants
- Investing in the next generation
- Regional budget meetings
- Fully fund both member and alternate to attend all committee meetings/Board meetings
- Policy research analyst (Ecology)

*Health, Safety & Environmental Protection (HSEP) Committee Budget Priorities*

- Infrastructure support functions (health and safety, traffic)
- Fully fund WESF

**Next Steps:** The BCC will move forward with bringing a budget priorities letter forward to the June HAB meeting. BCC will have a committee call to review the budget priorities ahead of the June HAB meeting. The committee call will be Tuesday, May 8, 2018 from 10:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

**Budgets & Contracts Committee Business**

*Committee Leadership Nomination*

Gary Karnofski was nominated for Chair of the BCC committee. Tom Galioto was nominated for Vice Chair of the BCC committee. Gary stated that he will end his term on the Board in June and will not be able to continue as BCC Chair. Tom agreed to serve as Vice Chair, while Gary will serve as Acting BCC Chair until the end of his term in June.

### *Other Items of Discussion*

#### **Roles and Responsibilities of the BCC:**

Gary Karnofski introduced the topic of BCC Role and Responsibilities and how to move forward with the information gathered to date.

Tom Galioto suggested a timeline of milestones can be integrated with the HAB workplan and committee review of the Tri-Party Agreement and Consent Decree.

Melinda Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) suggested the Lifecycle Cost report will be out in January 2019.

#### **Leadership Workshop:**

- Remove Performance Metrics
- Add HAB budget for review and comment
- Review of legal requirements 89-1 consent decrees and revision of consent decrees.

#### **Regulatory Reform**

Gary Karnofski introduced the topic of Regulatory Reform. Susan Leckband, Board Chair requested the committee to discuss the charge from Environmental Management regarding regulatory reform.

The regulatory reform outline provided by Susan Leckband is focused on the NEPA, EPA Superfund Task Force Report, and the regulatory integration.

Gary noted that the input should be on an individual basis and not on a committee level. BCC committee members did not have enough information to provide any useful feedback on regulatory reform.

## **Health, Safety & Environmental Protection Opening**

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trade Council (HAMTC) and Chair of the Health, Safety, & Environmental Protection (HSEP) committee, welcomed committee members and introductions were made.

*There were no announcements made.*

## **Respiratory Equipment Hygiene**

### *Agency Presentation*

Rebecca introduced the topic of Respiratory Equipment Hygiene and Ricky Bang, Safety Analysis for U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (ORP).

Key points from Ricky's presentation:

- There are three main requirement areas that drive how Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) manages the Respiratory Protection Program. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Certification provide guidance on how to maintenance, care for the respiratory equipment.
- The Hanford Site-Wide Respiratory Protection Program consists of representatives from all Hanford contractors provide site wide procedures that WRPS is required to follow. The site wide program also manages the storage, issuance, use, maintenance, care, inspection, and recordkeeping requirements, as well as ensuring the Respiratory Equipment (RPE) is cleaned and sanitized by an approved manufacturer. The manufacturer is 3M Scott.
- All personnel using the RPE receive training that meet OSHA and American National Standards Institute (ANSI) requirements including selection, inspection, assembly, use, and participation in realistic hands-on scenarios that mimic situations in the field. The Volpentest Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) Federal Training Center provides training for the RPE. The workers are required to complete the training before the RPE is issued.
- There are eight RPE issue stations. The worker's Hanford badge is scanned and the RPE is inspected by the worker before issuance. The workers are to return the RPE to one of the eight issue stations. Inspections are completed upon return of the RPE. Unitech cleans the mask with an approved process and manufacturer recommended cleaning solution. Unitech is contracted by RL. WRPS cleans the rack and regulator at the issue station. The cleaning solution sits on rack and regulator for 10 minutes. After three rinse cycles the equipment is put into a dryer. Inspections are done after the cleanings are completed, with a wipe down of mask and straps to ensure no residual material is left behind. The cylinders are leak tested through an automated system. Leak testing is done to ensure no air leaks in or out.
- 40 masks and regulators have been evaluated each month for chemical and bacterial contamination. The samples taken have come back negative.

- The Site-Wide Respiratory Protection Program assessment was conducted in 2017. WRPS performs an assessment annually and is currently in progress. Another assessment is conducted every three years by third-party vendor, which will be conducted in May 2018.
- WRPS owns 600 Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) racks, 3000 3M Scott face masks, and 600 3M Scott SCBA cylinder bottles. In FY2018, 250 new racks and 150 SCBA cylinder bottles were purchased. The new equipment will go through a validation and inspection process before the equipment can be used on the field.
- There were 47 issues reported between January 2018 and March 2018. 10 of the 47 issues reported were for facial rashes from the face masks. 26 of the 47 issues reported were for odors from the SCBA cylinder bottles. 11 of the 47 issues reported were for debris in the masks and regulators. There were eight stop-works initiated related to the face masks and SCBAs. All RPE issues reported are being tracked by WRPS and are being investigated to ensure all issues are being taken care of.

HSEP committee members had an opportunity to try on the rack and regulator, which weighs about 30-35 pounds. Two different types of face masks were passed around for members to view.

***Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):***

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.*

*Q: "How often does OSHA and NIOSH check in on the program?"*

*R: "It's part of an assessment process."*

*Q: "Are there workers that participate in the site wide program?"*

*R: "Yes, there are workers in the program."*

*Q: "Is the equipment issued daily?"*

*R: "Yes, they are issued daily."*

*Q: "Were the people with rashes, the same people in both 2017 and 2018?"*

*R: "I am not sure. I would have to go back and check the data."*

*Q: "The rashes are considerable. Does the cleaner being used, contain iodine? If someone is allergic to shellfish and iodine, this can be a considerable factor to the cause of the rashes."*

*R: "We check for iodine and ammonia. To date there has been no iodine or ammonia found."*

*Q: "Is it correct that 90 SCBA racks and regulators were pulled from service for repeat issues?"*

*R: "If the regulator is sent to the Hanford Fire Department more than a few times, it will be taken out of service."*

**Next steps:** HSEP committee would like to see the full 2017 list of reported incidents. HSEP will follow up on the annual WRPS and ORP assessment data to determine if a draft letter is needed. There will be a tour of the HAMMER Facility on Wednesday, May 9, 2018 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

### **Health, Safety & Environmental Protection Committee Business**

#### *Committee Leadership Nomination*

Rebecca Holland was nominated for Chair of the HSEP committee. Richard Bloom was nominated for Vice Chair of the HSEP committee. Both nominees agreed to serve another term as leadership for the HSEP committee. The leadership selections were approved by consensus.

#### *3-Month Work Plan*

The committee would like a presentation on Beryllium at the next HSEP committee meeting.

HSEP will tour of the HAMMER Facility on Wednesday, May 9, 2018 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

#### *Other Items of Discussion*

Leadership Workshop:

- Remove Performance Metrics
- Add Simplified Waste Primer
- Add DSA to DFLAW (combined with TWC)

### **Regulatory Reform**

Rebecca Holland introduced the topic of Regulatory Reform. Susan Leckband, Board Chair requested the committee to discuss the charge from Environmental Management regarding regulatory reform.

The regulatory reform is based on the NEPA, EPA Superfund Task Force Report, and the regulatory integration.

HSEP committee members did not have enough information to provide any useful feedback on regulatory reform.

Shelley Cimon, Board Vice Chair stated that she will be sharing the HAB's Board Values as contribution for the request.

### **Attachments**

**Attachment 1:** BCC Review of DOE Response to HAB Advice #294

**Attachment 2:** Tank Farms Respiratory Equipment Management Program

**Attendees**

**Board Members and Alternates:**

Dan Solitz, Alternate	Tom Galioto, Member	Gary Karnofski, Member
Dave Rowland, Alternate	Rebecca Holland, Member	Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Gerry Pollet, Member	Richard Bloom, Member	Jan Cantrell, Member
Paige Knight, Member	Margery Swint, Member	

**Others:**

Kyle Rankin, DOE-RL	Mark Heeter, DOE-RL	Dana Gribble, MSA
Melinda Brown, Ecology	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC	Jenise Connerly, DOE-RL
Tim Corbett, DOE-RL	Marcy Aplet-Zelen, DOE-RL	James Lynch, DOE-ORP
Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Ken Way, WRPS	Tonya Bean, CHPRC
Lindsay Strasser, ProSidian	Melissa Orona, ProSidian	Echo Dahl, Northwind supporting DOE-ORP