

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
HEALTH, SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING**

*September 14, 2011
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary	
Welcome and Introductions	1
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB).....	2
Plutonium Finishing Plant.....	6
Hanford Site Biological Controls Program.....	11
Beryllium	13
Medical Site Contractor Draft Request for Proposal (RFP)	18
Committee Business.....	18
Attendees.....	19

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.

Welcome and Introductions

Keith Smith, Health Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) chair, reviewed the purpose of the meeting and led a round of introductions.

Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, introduced Jessica Ruehrwein, EnviroIssues, who will be taking over committee work while Cathy is away on maternity leave. Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues and Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) note taker, will be taking over for Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues and committee note taker, while Nicole is away on maternity leave.

The committee approved the May meeting summary.

Susan Leckband, Washington League of Women Voters and Board chair, noted that Glenn Podonsky, Chief Health, Safety and Security Officer for the Department of Energy (DOE), will be visiting the HSEP committee later in the day to discuss the Hanford Site in general, as well as how his office, DOE-Health, Safety, and Security (DOE-HSS) is relevant to Hanford workers.

Mr. Podonsky is in the Tri-Cities for a conference on integrated safety management (ISM).

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) (joint topic with the Tank Waste Committee)

Issue manager update

Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy and Tank Waste Committee (TWC) Chair, noted the importance of the topic to HSEP, the TWC, and the Board. He provided a history of the topic: in summer 2010, the DNSFB announced that they would be investigating allegations of safety issues at the Hanford Site because of concerns that had been filed. In October 2010, the DNSFB held a two-day hearing in the Tri-Cities, and HSS began their own investigation. Through the winter of 2010 and 2011, the DNSFB solicited testimony from many people and requested public comment; most of the comments and testimonies are available on the DNSFB website. The website also features technical information that provides an indication of what the HAB should be concerned about. In February 2011, the DNSFB issued a letter on questions of the large scale testing on site. In June 2011, they issued recommendations with a long list of items that are technical and of concern. DOE responded to the recommendations saying that they disagreed with some of the findings and are operating safely on site.

Dirk said Bechtel National, Inc (BNI) recently announced the formation of an independent expert panel, mostly comprised of former senior staff members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). This panel will be examining nuclear quality and safety criteria. Dirk said he is struck by a photo that demonstrates safety concerns. The photo is of test equipment with holes in the piping where erosion has occurred in the side of the metal. Dirk said there have been multiple statements about what happens when mixing solid wastes, and the contractor has said they are moving forward with full scale mixing tests, which is a sizeable project with a large budget. Dirk recommended that the Board should ask what the testing work is and what it should be. Dirk also asked what the Board's policy level concerns are with the Waste Treatment Plant's (WTP) safety. He said he has a concern with the black cells operating alone for 40 years. He said he thinks comments from the Board could focus on DOE and contractors providing joint information for the public that gives assurance WTP will be safe and on schedule.

Cathy said she would provide the DNFSB letter and DOE's response letter for committee members who want more background information.

Committee Discussion

- Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, said a public involvement process for the WTP will be crucial for sharing information and receiving feedback. She said the issues are complex and they deserve public awareness.

- Susan said a DOE presentation on the issues would be helpful in assisting the committees craft policy level advice, and she asked that DOE provide a presentation during October committee week. She said that with so much negativity surrounding WTP, the committees should ask DOE, on behalf of the public, if WTP will meet their expectations, not just as designed, but also for processing most of the tank waste. She said that the public is spending billions of dollars on WTP and they need to be provided with a comfort level.
- Keith noted that the design of WTP has changed extensively from the original design, and the public and the Board need to understand how the design changes are better or different. He said many of the design changes were in order to take most of the processing out of the black cells and into something where the equipment can be maintained. Susan said she receives many calls from the public, who think WTP will process 100 percent of the tank waste, and that belief needs to be clarified if it is not the case. She said she has seen an increased level of public interest in the WTP as compared to 15 years ago. Liz asked the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies if the public actually knows what WTP is. Erika Holmes, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), responded that people in the Tri-Cities are aware, but outside of the area, most people believe it is a sewage treatment plant. Liz noted that the public should be made aware of WTP and in the overall context of tank closure.
- Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge, said that there has only been one meeting (October 2010) where public comment was taken on the WTP; the meeting was hosted by the DNFSB, not DOE. Tom said Hanford Challenge's main interest is a safe and effective WTP. He said the issue of "safety culture" has been investigated many times and is currently being investigated by many different parties. He said that with so many quickly moving parts, he does not know how useful it will be for the Board to weigh in except with overall values. But the advice should acknowledge a good, strong safety culture and that DOE should take measures to get the WTP on track to where everyone is comfortable. Tom said the DNFSB noted in its June 9, 2011 letter of recommendations that if the safety culture at Hanford is broken enough, it will threaten the viability of the WTP. He said everyone agrees on the importance of safety culture, but reaching safety culture is another issue.
- Dick Smith, City of Kennewick, said that the major testing program for the mixer system is going to take a year or more, and it will be prudent for DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) to evaluate their back up plans should the system fail to function as advertised. He said the Board would like to hear the other viable possibilities as soon as possible.
- Susan recommended that the issue manager group assigned to how the Board moves forward safety issues at WTP examine the recommendations of the DNFSB to see where their issues coincide with the issues of the Board. She said the recommendations could be used as a framework to determine if Board advice should come forward. She also

recommended that the issue manager group examine a report due to Ecology in October 2011 about the viability and functionality of the WTP. She noted that this DOE report may not be available to the Board until January. Dan McDonald, Ecology, noted that the report is due under TPA milestone M-62-49. Carrie Meyer, DOE-ORP, said some of the information contained in the report would be addressed in an update to the Board in November.

- Dirk spoke to the timing of commenting, and noted that comments could be provided one time, or over a period of time. He said the Board and the public should be involved in these issues for the long term. He said some of the issues associated with WTP include the cost and schedule, and the more technical issues like pulse jet mixers; TWC will receive an update and discuss pulse jet mixers in October. Dirk said the Board should be asking DOE about their priorities related to WTP and what will happen when those priorities are impacted by funding. He said he learned at the TWC meeting on September 13 that the court decision or consent decree for tank waste takes precedence over the TPA milestone when funding falls short; this creates a complexity for the schedule. Dirk noted the importance of timing and ripple effects to other projects.
- Liz said she would like to see advice come forward for the November Board meeting to acknowledge the complex interplay of technical issues, budget uncertainties, schedule concerns, and the desire for a transparent and accountable process to ensure there is a clear and technical process to treat tank waste. She said she is not as concerned with budget and schedule as she is with safety and technical issues, as safety and a technical process will be what ultimately ensure that WTP works. Susan reiterated that it is very important to understand that everyone involved wants WTP to work. She said the Board needs to make recommendations that will not delay WTP.
- Dirk asked if the Board and the public would want to weigh in on the different types of risk: technical risk versus programmatic risk. He provided an example of closing up cells with five-foot walls and trying to get back into those cells now versus later. Carrie responded that in regards to vessel welding, there is a manhole to allow access into the walled off tanks. She said the five tanks represent \$30 million in procurements, and it will cost \$1 million to remove the vessel heads. She said the vessels will not be installed until DOE is sure they will meet all of the safety requirements, but that if they do not proceed with the vessels at this point, they may be removed from the vendor queue, which could translate into a \$200 million impact. Dirk said that decisions made now will impact the vessels down the road, and he is concerned about the ripple effect. Carrie noted that there are two hold points in place for the vessels: one to make sure everything is considered before a decision is made and one before the vessels are installed. Tom said there was a holding point in place for capping the tanks, but DOE moved past it. He asked what is to stop them from using the same logic for the next hold point. Carrie said she agrees with Tom, and it is necessary to weigh all of the information available at the time. Dirk said the Board should emphasize that they want WTP to operate and be on schedule, but that they would like answers to their questions before decisions are made.

Carrie suggested that DOE provide TWC and HSEP with a one-system presentation in October on how the agencies are working in tandem with tank farms to meet WTP and tank farm safety requirements.

- Liz said it is important to note that the deadline for cleanup keeps moving and is being shifted onto future generations. She said the thought of who is inheriting tank waste and WTP completion needs to be kept in mind when making short term decisions based on funding.
- Keith said he has had many conversations with Board member BC Smith, Hanford Work Force, who is a construction representative. They have spoken about how safety culture for Hanford workers has greatly improved. Keith has heard technical complaints, like using the number of accidents to rate workers for re-hire, which is more of the workers' union view. He has also heard from a site foreman that Hanford is over safe. Keith noted that it is irritating to someone who wants to get their job done when it takes three days for approval to hang sheet rock. But this indicated that there is close scrutiny being paid to worker safety compared to when the Board first started talking about safety culture with the workers.
- Sam Dechter, Public-at-Large, noted DOE's response to the DNFSB recommendations, saying there is nothing in the response to indicate that DOE is doing anything new; all solutions for safety culture have been done before. Sam cited a 1993 event called Rock on a Rope that in post-analysis, pointed out a chain of safety concerns. At the time, the answer to the problem was to stop work immediately, independent of cost and schedule. Projects were not re-initiated until workers felt they were safe. Sam said it took six months for the site to run smoothly again. Sam also spoke to the difficulty of safety culture issues being solved by executives who never step foot on site. He said there have been many initiatives to better site safety, like behavior based safety and contract rearranging, but there is always the problem of schedule and cost taking priority, which causes managers to ignore safety. Sam said the point of safety culture is to have every worker go home at night in the same condition as when he arrived on site. Sam noted that members of the DNFSB are conservative and technically competent, so the agencies and the Board should take their concerns into account. Suzanne Heaston, BNI, commended Sam's observations and said that because of the recommendations, BNI has looked into first level supervisors and have sent over 400 people to first line supervisor training for safety. She said that when it gets down to it, safety is addressed through project management, which is why the supervisors should be trained in safety culture. She said safety and quality are never at the expense of cost and schedule, and BNI is working towards new and innovative ways to accomplish it.
- Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP, said it would behoove the committees to document a path forward, raise their questions to the agencies, and allow DOE to present back on the answers. She also noted that HSS is conducting an effectiveness review to determine if the corrective actions they recommended have made improvements to safety culture on

site. Liz said she will know there have been improvements on site when workers with dissenting opinions bring their concerns forward and are not punished for them.

- Keith said he would like to see safety culture provided at the same level of effort for both union represented employees and non-union employees.
- Dan said that ISM is a big deal on site, but that in the hierarchy of program, project, activity, some issues get addressed and some do not. He said the Board and the agencies should ask if the ISM framework is still functional where it is being applied. The next question should be if the application of the infrastructure is functional. He said applying safety through ISM will only work if both the infrastructure and the application are functional. Dirk said he is not enamored with ISM because it is cumbersome, but noted that insurers ask how ISM works because Hanford has a lower accident rate than banks. Dirk said Hanford needs to be mindful of what can be accomplished in the context of what they have. Keith said that these issues are addressed in the presentation Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large and HSEP vice chair, is presenting at the ISM conference. The presentation will be shared with HSEP at a later time.
- Tom said that apart from safety behaviors on an everyday basis, there is also an issue of if someone sees something unsafe, will they report it. Tom referenced a 1998 review of safety, a 2000 hearing on tank waste remediation systems, and a subsequent congressional hearing on safety culture where they said they would review retaliation. Congress also said that the review cycle begins with understanding reform. Tom said DOE always seems to forget to follow through on reforms or address angry issues of retaliation. He said he agrees with Sam that there needs to be more innovative ways to apply safety culture, not just programs or trainings.

Cathy noted that Dirk, Rebecca Holland, Sam, Liz, and Susan will act as issue managers for the safety topic, and they will hold an issue manager meeting with DOE-ORP before receiving a one system presentation in October. The presentation will be a joint topic for HSEP and TWC.

Plutonium Finishing Plant

Issue manager introduction

Tom referenced a July 7, 2011 letter from DOE to CH2M Hill Remediation Company (CH2M) about a report and findings on the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP). He said the letter addresses a large number of findings, deficiencies, and a poor work scope for the PFP. Tom believes the letter demonstrates a programmatic ISM weakness with regards to PFP. For example, a group of workers used a circular saw to reduce the size of a contaminated glove box, which dramatically increased the radiation levels in the room; the workers also had poor respirator protection. Tom referenced additional examples of activities on site that exposed workers to radiation. He said that the numerous breakdowns involved junior staff members who may not have known what

they were doing. Tom said CH2M and DOE are tracking the issues, and the Board will want to track it as well.

Keith said he has been aware of safety issues at PFP and understands how important it is to have proper controls in place when dealing with plutonium contamination. He said plutonium in powder form takes very little movement to become airborne, so over caution is not unreasonable.

Agency perspective

Roger Gordon, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), introduced Brenda Panghorn, DOE-RL who wrote the report on safety issues at PFP. Roger noted that he is the Director for Operations Oversight at PFP. He has three facility representatives assigned to PFP that conduct daily oversight and work with the subject matter experts on this subject. Roger said many of the issues Tom mentioned were brought to light because the facility representatives started noticing a trend towards decreased radiological control work at the PFP. There was also an anonymous employee concern filed in January 2011 about radiological control work. DOE-RL then began to conduct surveillance at the PFP and came back with twelve findings, for which they requested a corrective action plan from the contractor involved; the plan was received last month. Roger noted that the contractor, Plateau CH2M Hill Remediation Company (CHPRC), began to implement corrective actions as soon as surveillance began, as they too were noticing a negative trend; PRC and DOE-RL will continue to partner on the issues moving forward. He said PRC has identified other areas for improvement and DOE-RL will oversee those improvements, in addition to the radiological control improvements. Roger said that part of the interim corrective actions allowed for additional managers to be brought on-site, and for a vacant manager position to be filled.

Roger spoke to the people, performance, and process for radiological control work, noting that the performance step is to set expectations for how to conduct radiological control work. He said the PFP area is one of the worst on the DOE complex for cleaning up plutonium, and DOE is aware of the hard work and complex issues associated with it. DOE has designed a new process for work control across the complex, which was implemented in June 2010. DOE has since seen improvements in this area. Roger said that at PFP, the contractor has also established more comprehensive work plans for conducting radiological control work, in addition to increased training for radiological control workers. Roger said the root cause for the report was that the PFP shift from operations to deactivation and decommissioning (D&D) could have been managed better. A contributing cause was that the workers used to work individually, and now the contractor has created a central group that has more say in ensuring radiological control work meets expectations. Roger noted that a proper conduct of operations is important to help improve the trend, as there could be a great process in place but it will not work if workers and managers don't follow procedures; PFP management has set expectations for following procedures that is now ongoing.

Roger said the path forward involves assessments conducted by CHPRC to measure improvements. He said they are seeing major improvements, but acknowledge they still have work to do. He said he expects PFP workers will need seven months to get used to the changes

and complete trainings. He said DOE will measure progress again in the spring after things have settled down.

Committee Discussion

- Keith asked about the breakdown of ISM, noting that Roger mentioned work planning, but did not see where there was room for open feedback. Roger said the assessment of the surveillance targeted five functions of ISM (how they planned, identified hazards, etc.). He said the assessment's focus was more on work planning and conduct in the issues identified. They looked at everything pertaining to radiological control and work control in general. Brenda said the surveillance involved facility engineers and radiological control experts, but did not evaluate the entire process and its weaknesses.
- Keith noted that the issues at PFP with radiological controls also happened at the tank farm sites. He asked why the lesson from tank farms was not learned across the site. JD Dowell, DOE-RL, said that lessons learned have not been shared at a high level, and tank farms and PFP are two different situations. JD mentioned that the young staff at PFP, as well as issues with documentation, contributed to the radiological control problems. He said everyone involved has to be sensitive because the work at PFP is the most sensitive of the DOE-Environmental Management complex.
- Tom asked if the corrective action plan due within 30 days of the report was filed in time. Brenda confirmed it was and it is currently under review. JD noted that an interim corrective action plan is in place until the final is ready. Brenda reiterated that the contractor implemented corrective actions while DOE conducted their assessment. Tom asked if a root cause analysis was conducted. Brenda responded that the contractor conducted that analysis. Roger said a causal analysis, as well as a look at the extended conditions at PFP will all be done in addition to the new corrective action plan, independent of cost and schedule.
- Keith said he regularly attends CHPRC council meetings, where senior managers have said that they will not support production over safety. Keith said this message may not be filtering down to the field. Tom said he has spoken to workers who do not believe the senior managers feel that way. JD said there is a meeting once a month where contractors rate their own ISM success, and then DOE rates them. He said there used to be a big difference in the ratings, but now they agencies and contractors are more in sync as the contractors learn to be more self-critical. JD said he has more sensitive projects that are driven by schedule, but the stop work process is working well on site. He also noted that the layoff process has not been conducive to truthful incident reporting on site. Tom said the threat of layoffs seems to compress people's concerns rather than draw them out. JD said they address any concerns brought forward, but he is concerned about the safety message not successfully trickling down to the field. JD referenced the DOE Employees Concern Program as a program that allowed employees to voice their concerns privately.
- Tom asked how and when DOE heard about the problems at PFP. Brenda said the facility representatives asked her to put it on her calendar for this year, and the report took place

as early as she was able to schedule the process audit. Roger said the facility representatives are in the field every day, and they have a good pulse on what is going on performance wise. The subject matter expert is brought in when the representatives notice a programmatic problem.

- Tom referenced the letter from DOE that mentioned many deficiencies that extended beyond the PFP. Brenda said they examined programs and procedures, processes, and training programs. Tom said he had heard there were also concerns in the K Basin area. Brenda said they examined the K Basin, but not in the same assessment as the PFP. She said they went to different areas to look for similar issues with the corrective dosimetry, and have examined each contractor under the separate operational awareness process.
- Tom asked if DOE had considered standing down work at PFP in light of the issues. JD said they did, and Brenda clarified that DOE prevented the stand down due to the immediate corrective action response from the contractor. She said the contractors worked overtime and over the weekend immediately after surveillance began to review their procedures. Tom Bratvold, CHPRC, said there are many ways to stand down work, and at PFP they implemented a task by task work process and did not release any work until an independent team had reviewed the work packages and made sure the proper controls were in place. JD noted that the contractor also implemented a senior supervisory watch after the workers did a non-documented disassembly of a glove box. He said the biggest problem was that workers were using the same relaxed procedures that work in other areas on site, but were not adequate for the complex work at PFP. He said they have seen a remarkable turnaround at PFP in the last six months.
- Tom Carpenter said he showed the report and DOE's letter to members of the DNFSB and DOE-HSS, and no one had heard of it. Brenda said she provided the DNFSB with a copy of both the report and the letter as soon as they were published. Roger said DOE-EM is well aware of the report and has reviewed it.
- Tom Carpenter said he was unaware of the four plutonium exposures in March until when he read the report recently. He asked what DOE's mechanism is for notifying the public and stakeholders on something of such high importance. Roger said it is not DOE's intent to hide information, and they will work to be more transparent. He noted that Keith meets with Ray Corey, DOE-RL, on a monthly basis to discuss safety issues on site. Keith said he did learn about the issues in a meeting with Ray, but not the specifics that the report addresses.
- Laura said that even as a worker on site, she did not hear about the exposures. She asked if there was a post-job reporting of the incidents. She also asked how issues like those in the report continue without raising a red flag. Roger said that each independent incident was recorded and reviewed before and after the job. He said DOE did not start talking to the contractor about the issues until the trend became apparent. He said they try to give the contractors time to correct themselves before interfering.

- Laura noted that one of the immediate corrective actions taken at PFP was to implement more technical staff for support. She said that DOE should take that lesson learned to examine staffing under the budget constraints and make sure not to sacrifice safety professionals. She said the programs need to have safety professionals in the beginning, not only after accidents. Brenda said the contractors will now have direct authority to implement safety professionals as needed to meet the level of risk.
- Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (HAMTC), asked about the classifications of risk at the PFP and if senior supervisors are on site when work is going on. Tom Bratvold said most of the activities at PFP are high level risk and the senior supervisors are engaged. He said the staffing increases at PFP have enabled engineers and radiological control supervisors to be present during activities. He said PFP was understaffed for a time and that contributed to the issues. Rebecca asked if senior supervisors are required to be in the field under work packages and if the supervisors have the ability to write themselves out of the work packages. Tom Bratvold said that the supervisors are already integrated, but they want to make it part of a work package. Rebecca referenced issues with other senior supervisors who write themselves out of work packages because a shift might be undesirable. She said it is a central theme at Hanford to have junior workers complete activities because they do not ask too many questions. Keith suggested that every work crew should have at least one senior worker who knows about the work and will raise issues. Roger said DOE has addressed this issue with the contractor, and CHPRC wants experienced people working with younger workers.
- Rebecca asked if stop work at PFP is formal or simply a pause. Roger said a stop work pause is implemented whenever workers are unsure of steps or resources. JD said he believes the stops are formal, and that he has seen more formal stop works at DOE-RL in the past two months than he saw in four months working for DOE-ORP. Rebecca said she knows supervisors who prefer only pauses as formal stops involve paperwork. Roger said stops can range from ten minutes to an hour or more, whether they are formal or just pauses. He said a lot of issues can be resolved quickly.
- Sam said work control has been revised 18 times in 18 years, and that there should be a good work control system in place by now. He said DOE does not seem to learn from the revisions. Sam said that ISM is blamed over and over, and even though DOE and contractors claim a victory after revisions. Sam said that lessons learned are not being transmitted across site because the lessons learned programs is under each individual contractor, and the contractors do not share with each other. He said that controls are put into place to make Hanford safer, but the controls are then forgotten about and are relaxed too soon. Sam said he thinks the supervisory watches ought to be institutional controls; they should be in place all the time rather than just after an accident. He said corrective actions are put in place constantly, but no one is trying to fix the institution. JD said that when an incident occurs anywhere on site, the issue is brought before all levels of management site wide, for both DOE and contractors. He said single assessments or audits will not be shared unless their effect is so significant that it stops work; a stop

work would be shared. JD said that sharing all lessons learned all the time would be information overload. JD said that elements of assessments and audits can be put into site wide programs, but the elements will need to be to scale. JD said that they know and have learned the importance of training, but cannot institute a six-month training for all new employees like some agencies are able to do. JD said that in his opinion, DOE does the best they can to keep the corporate memory alive and to learn from their mistakes. JD said DOE will watch PFP until it is done, because it is high-level risk. JD said the committee's opinions about safety radiological control resourcing is helpful, because they need to focus on the transition of resources.

- Laura noted JD's reference to corporate memory and asked who will be the gatekeeper to make sure things are done right. She specifically asked who will help the contractors understand their staffing needs under future budget hits. JD said there are teams of people keeping memories alive by telling stories to new employees. He said that when an incident is bad enough, it is a motivator to not do it again. JD said there are other controls in place to keep the memory, like ICs and lessons learned, but those systems are not visited often enough, and it is the strength in team and sharing that sustains the corporate memory.
- Liz said she would be interested in providing advice to DOE regarding the relationship between layoffs and worker safety, as safety is an effect that was not anticipated. JD noted that the layoffs begin as early as the end of the week, and advice may not be timely.
- The committee agreed to continue to track the issue as a priority for Fiscal Year 2012. Tom Carpenter said he has a request in for more information on the issues, and he will share it with the committee as soon as possible.

Hanford Site Biological Controls Program

DOE update

Liz Bowers, DOE-RL, provided an overview of the program update and noted that DOE-RL is also continuing to update employees on biological controls with announcements, safety briefings, handouts, and more as they have done in previous years. She said outreach focuses on snakes, mosquitoes, and other critters. Liz introduced Juan Rodriquez, Manager of the Biological Control Program under the Mission Support Alliance (MSA).

Juan provided a presentation on current actions being taken on site for biological safety. During his presentation, Juan emphasized:

- West Nile Virus Prevention:
 - Weekly Safety Start messages are distributed for what workers should expect on site.

- Proactive pest control has been implemented at sites identified to have had previous mosquito problems. These sites are treated with mosquito larvicide and barrier applications. There are three insecticides being used currently: Altosid 30, 120 day briquettes and Tempo SC.
- The Biological Controls Programs communicates and coordinates testing with Benton County Mosquito Control District. Hanford does not own the proper testing equipment so Benton County has offered theirs. Testing requires 100 samples of one variety of mosquito. DOE has not collected 100 samples of the mosquito with the West Nile Virus, but they continue to try.
- The Biological Controls Program works with facility safety officers to coordinate pesticide applications as barriers in shrubs, lawn, etc.
- The current locations where the West Nile Virus is present include:
 - 609A Fire Station (drain).
 - 222-S Labs (storm drains).
 - Trench 31 and 34.
 - Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Campus.
- Locations being observed and treated with preventative measures include:
 - WTP evaporators.
 - Purge Water holding tanks.
 - 200E Water Fill Station.

Committee Discussion

- Keith noted the marshy areas surrounding the waste tanks where capping has been implemented. Juan said those tanks are observed constantly, and that the water drains quickly. Juan said that if the water were to take more than a week to drain, they would begin treatment.
- Laura commended the program's work on site and asked if workers are more aware of biological concerns. Juan said that workers are definitely more aware, especially around the site facilities.
- Keith said that when DOE first presented on this program, they had not paid for larvae site licensing. He said he knows the licensing has since been supported, and he asked if it has been an effective way to control mosquitoes at Hanford. Juan said that since larvicide treatment began, there have been fewer complaints about mosquitoes on site. He said DOE has received one complaint this year, compared to six last year.
- Harold asked what the staff members who work on West Nile prevention work on during the rest of the year. Juan said they work on bird and pest control, mostly. They make sure nuisance birds are not present at the facilities, as well as insects.

Keith thanked Juan for his hard work and asked for another presentation in spring 2012.

Beryllium

Issue manager update

Keith welcomed Pete Garcia, DOE-RL, who is intimately familiar with the beryllium program. He also welcomed Glenn Podonsky, DOE-HSS, who commissioned the first beryllium program.

Glenn thanked the committee for allowing himself and the DOE-HSS Deputy Chief of Operations, Bill Eckroade, to attend the HSEP meeting. He said they are there to hear the presentation and answer any questions the committee may have.

DOE update

Pete said he last briefed HSEP in March, and a lot has happened since then. Pete provided an update on the Hanford Site Chronic Beryllium Disease Prevention Program (CBDPP) and the associated Corrective Action Plan (CAP).

Pete provided an update on the activities of the CBDPP:

- The CBDPP worked with the Beryllium Awareness Group (BAG), HAMTC, and site contractors to re-baseline the CAP to incorporate a new closure process (submitted to DOE-EM for approval on August 18, 2011). Pete noted that a team from DOE-EM reviewed the CAP baseline earlier in the year, and they are supportive of the CAP process.
- The CBDPP is holding regular team meetings to develop new higher-level products in accordance with the re-baseline of the CAP. All products are developed on a consensus basis. They are also developing new Be Work Permit (BWP) products with all site contractors.
- The CBDPP is working to develop processes (e.g. contracts, trainings) for the implementation of the new CAP products. Pete said they hope to have the high-priority products implemented simultaneously by the end of the year.

Pete reviewed a graphic of the consensus process for the CBDPP, noting that product development teams are formed to work on each product, and the products are reviewed by the full group at 60 percent complete and 90 percent complete, and are then sent into completion. Changes and suggestions from the full group are accepted at the 60 and 90 percent completed stages.

Pete noted that 36 percent of the original corrective actions are complete, with 32 percent active, and 32 percent to be completed in the future. Most of the 36 percent actions completed are trainings. The categories for the corrective actions are related to findings, worker safety, and administrative enhancements.

Pete reviewed the upcoming events for the CBDPP in regards to product presentations. He said that six products have gone through 60 percent presentations, two through 90 percent presentations, and two products are currently going through CBDPP revision and approval and are in development for contractor trainings. Those two products are the Beryllium Work Permit and Assessment Process for Buildings.

Pete reviewed recent highlights and accomplishments for the CBDPP, including, but not limited to:

- Required Beryllium Worker training for all persons in charge, planners, managers, and supervisors involved with beryllium work.
- Conducted all employee and former worker meetings to provide beryllium-related information (approximately 8,000 employees).
- Directed each contractor to provide personnel involved in work planning with how and where to find current and updated beryllium status information.

Pete noted the emerging issues, concerns, and needs of the CBDPP:

- Definitize contract modification and fund scope of implementation associated with new process and early phase one products.
- DOE-EM approval of Supplemental CBDPP CAP.

Pete said the CBDPP is working well as a group, and they recently took a break in product development to better define the roles and responsibilities for team leaders, members, agencies, etc. Pete said he remembered a question that Mike Korenko asked during the previous presentation about why DOE-RL is not providing notice on free medical screenings. He has asked Gail Splett, DOE-RL, to provide that answer.

Gail said DOE has been struggling to help the former workers medical screening program be successful at Hanford. She said the program is managed by DO-HQ, not a contractor. She said she has been working on how to provide free screening information to former workers; she recently completed a letter of direction to each contractor to have them identify their former workers, which could be tens of thousands. The returned information from contractors will then be provided to DOE-HQ, who will contact the former workers with screening information. Gail said she wants to make sure former workers know what their rights are and that they have the opportunity to talk to someone. Gail said she is concerned about the potential large number (300,000) of former workers and where it would be successful to hold a meeting for them, as most former workers no longer live in the Tri-Cities. The current plan for a public meeting involves four minutes of presentation for presenters and an open house format for meeting participants to speak with health representatives.

Committee Discussion

- Mike said he is happy to see the execution on the two pieces of advice from the Board, but of the advice pieces not addressed, reaching out to former workers is one. Mike acknowledged the difficulty of finding former workers. He said that there is still a large amount of people who do not know about free screenings for former workers, and he noted that more than former workers may have been exposed, including students. Mike suggested that due to the cost of locating former workers and anyone else potentially exposed, DOE should try to locate people based on any kind of exposure, including asbestos. Gail said she has only been aware of the former employee program for the past three years. She said DOE needs to do a better job of disseminating information. She said the goal of the public meetings will be to have former workers identify the areas where they worked and be connected with someone who knows their issues. If they have symptoms or a disease proven to be related to Hanford, the worker will be directed to the compensation program. Gail said former workers will be identified by the zip code where they are currently living, so public meetings can be conducted where there is a high concentration of former workers. Mike said he thinks it is appropriate for the former worker programs to be managed by DOE-HQ, as it is important to find and treat former workers across the DOE-EM complex, not just Hanford. Gail said she is excited about the program and the opportunity to demonstrate that Hanford really cares about worker health.
- Keith asked if there have been any breakthroughs in working with local physicians to treat beryllium-related diseases. Pete said there is an item in the Community Relations Plan to develop a medical outreach program. The program will bring local physicians in and educate them about beryllium.
- Laura asked what the long-term vision is for site-wide implementation. She also asked how much leeway contractors will have to interpret and implement the products internally. Pete said some of the products lend themselves well to the contractor's procedures, and those products will be implemented by the contractors. He said that if the products do not lend well to procedures, then the CBDPP will implement an oversight program to make sure workers across the site are seeing the products used in the same manner; all entities involved in the CBDPP will provide oversight, and facility representatives will receive more training to oversee the new products. Pete said they are trying to eliminate internal interpretation.
- Susan said she is getting the impression that once the action items for the CAP are in place, the program will become a part of the disease prevention program. She asked if there will be a standardization on the DOE-EM complex where beryllium has been an issue. Pete said he has heard some ideas about standardizing the Hanford beryllium program as an example for other sites. He said DOE has made great effort to make the CBDPP a best-in-class program. Susan said it would make sense to implement this program nationwide, as workers move from site to site, carrying their exposure with them. Bill Eckroade said DOE-HSS has been directing other sites to follow Hanford's example. He said that simply from a lessons learned perspective and desire to be the best, the other sites will be asking questions about the program. He said DOE is in the process

of updating the beryllium rule, and they have gone out for public comment to get input. Keith noted that the Board provided comment on the beryllium rule.

- Julie Goeckel, DOE-RL, said verification and validation has been built into the process at the implementation state, as well as the site-wide effectiveness review. She said employees are a part of the process. The CBDPP will be going out in teams to get feedback on whether the products and procedures are really working. Mark Fisher, BAG, said there will always be a CBDPP team in place to review the products and processes and make sure the programs continue through final cleanup.
- Mike Korenko spoke to ISM and the integration of programs into ISM. Mike said it will be important to look at all risks together simultaneously rather than just beryllium. Mark said that is why all site-wide processes are working hard to work through the ISM process; they all use the same type of hazard identification. Mike said he believes that any safety program is only successful if it has a good work control process. He said the success of the beryllium program will come through coordinating work control processes between contractors. Keith noted that site-wide systems need to be consistent so that workers who move between contractors have the same experience with ISM.
- Tom Carpenter commended the CBDPP and said he would like to see the same approach be implemented for safety culture. He asked if there is a program available for individual workers who have trouble within the former worker program, like an ombudsman program. Pete said there is a beryllium health advocate under MSA that crosses company lines to help employees. The health advocate is working to identify process issues for improvement to make the system clearer to workers. Pete said there is also an affected workers handbook that is underdevelopment which all contractors will use. Pete said they are experiencing issues related to accessibility to data and how health services receives information quickly from affected workers and notifying their bosses. Tom Carpenter suggested implementing an ombudsman program for workers who find themselves in a place in the system that is not working. Mark said one of the problems workers are facing is fear of being laid off if they are tested positive for beryllium sensitivity. Mike said that being beryllium sensitive could also limit the amount of work available to a worker on site. DOE has pledged to find other work for beryllium sensitized workers, but some still see the risk. Mike Stoner, HAMTC safety representative, said every affected worker will have the new handbook, and the handbook will have the names of CBDPP people workers can contact if they are not being treated right. He said the beryllium rule will fail if continued work is ensured for each affected worker. DOE has an obligation to protect workers' employment, and if they get sick, they will be taken care of.
- Liz Mattson reiterated what Tom Carpenter said about implementing consensus programs for other issues on site, and noted that she would like to see the programs implemented more proactively, rather than in response to a problem.
- Keith noted his appreciation for DOE's focus on beryllium issues, and DOE-HQ's involvement in the process which can lend solutions to other sites. He noted that the

illnesses caused by beryllium have so far exceeded diseases from radiation and more cases emerge every year. .

- Glenn Podonsky thanked the committee for allowing Bill and himself to sit in on the meeting. He said DOE-HSS was created five years ago to focus on worker health and safety because the focus had to be sustained through each administration, not be based on political appointments. Glenn said former Assistant Secretary Inés Triay contact him 21 months ago and asked him to look at beryllium issues at Hanford, which turned into an inspection. Glenn credited the inspection to the Board and their hard work. He said they started working with the locals like the Board and BAG so the public would trust the programs. Glenn said he is really worried about safety culture, and he noted that safety culture means different things to different people. He said DOE needs to do a better job at listening and taking action, which is difficult due to administration changes every four years. Glenn noted that his position of looking out for worker health and safety is secure. He also said that ISM has survived all of the administration changes because it makes sense to everyone. . Glenn believes that safety culture is when workers can raise issues and not fear for their jobs, and their families know they will come home safely. He said DOE cannot lose sight of the fact that people need to feed their families and be safe, and that their employees and the government are responsible for keeping them safe. Glenn said all site managers believe safety culture is important, but that they and their contractors have to do a better job of demonstrating it. He said safety has to be paramount to the mission, and that workers need to feel they can stop work whenever they are uncomfortable. Glenn said DOE-HSS will follow up and finish addressing safety issues at WTP. He said DOE-HSS has a standing order that former worker programs cannot be downsized due to budget issues, because nothing is more important than taking care of former workers demonstrating to current workers that DOE will take care of them, too. Glenn said public meetings have been problematic because people do not want to come forward, but DOE and the Department of Labor will continue to provide opportunities for people to be screened and get appropriate care if necessary. Glenn said he has taken \$10 million out of his budget for security and put it towards safety. Glenn finished by saying that DOE-HSS is very engaged and will continue to look at Hanford as an example to other sites.
- Susan thanked Glenn for participating in the committee meeting and for speaking about putting the humanity back into health and safety programs. She said workers are not just numbers, they are lives. She said it is important for DOE to step up and ensure any injury can either be prevented or taken care of, because cleanup will go on for decades.
- Liz said she appreciated what Glenn said about personalizing the process. Liz said she knows Glenn personally contacted people who commented on the DNFSB report to thank them, and she appreciates how well he listens, cares, brought in contributing players, all to find the big picture. She said the result is a process that has integrity and has people vouching for it rather than going against it. . Liz said there will always be problems on site, but the real indicators of culture are how people respond to it. Glenn said his response to the DNFSB comments is what should be expected from DOE-HSS, because

he works for them. He called the people who commented because he really wanted to understand what was going on; he wanted to reach out, and he believes that is what the government should do.

Medical Site Contractor Draft Request for Proposal (RFP)

Issue manager update

Mike said the issue managers wanted to provide advice on the medical contractor draft RFP, but due to the timing of the short comment period, ended up providing individual comments. Mike said the comment is a gap analysis in terms of former advice, and it should be easy to follow and implement. Mike addressed some concerns about the draft RFP being handled by DOE-HQ, but noted that it is common for DOE-HQ to not want the site to get too close to the issue.

Committee discussion

- Keith said he thinks it is a bad precedent to not allow the Board an opportunity to provide advice, and he is curious to see what the end product will be. Mike said he thought that in the past the HAB has been able to provide comment after the official public comment period, but he could not find anything to support his claims. Susan said that has been true before on documents, not procurements. Keith said local DOE offices makes that decision. Susan clarified that the local DOE offices can make adjustments to their deadlines, but not to issues coming from DOE-HQ. Susan said that sometimes the timing is just off, and it is adequate for Board members to comment as independent people; it is encouraged. She said comments or advice might have more power coming from the Board, but that with individual comments, DOE-HQ is required to respond to them individually.
- Mike said the only surprise in the RFP was that the contract went towards a fixed-price mode. He said he understands that DOE and the Department of Defense use a fixed-price as much as they can, but for the money they are allocating in this contract, the fixed-price is a problem and is small for paying current staff. He said that a downsize in a fixed-price, multi-year contract could be dangerous, and DOE needs to be more careful about per head contracts.
- Mike noted that the comments did address testing leadership for caring, which was partially addressed in the RFP, but the comments elevated it.

Committee Business

Cathy asked if the committee would like to bring forward Liz's idea for advice on the relationship between reducing the workforce and worker safety. Lynn Davison, Non-Union/Non-Management Employees, said he thought the topic should be couched for another time, as the layoffs are already occurring. He said the awareness of distraction during reorganization is also

an issue. Susan said the committee should request an update from DOE after the layoff transition has occurred; DOE should present on problems they have seen and take part in a dialogue with the committee. Liz said she does not want to see a huge accident on site because there is too much stress and distraction. The committee agreed to address the issue at a later committee meeting.

The committee will schedule a committee call for Tuesday, September 20 at 1:30pm PDT to work on next month's meeting topics table and to discuss the committee's 6-month work plan and Board HSEP priorities.

Cathy noted that an issue manager group will meet with DOE-ORP before the next committee meeting to discuss and frame WTP worker safety topic.

Mike provided copies of the presentation he made at the ISM conference. Mike said he was able to share this presentation with Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, and Scott Samuelson, DOE-ORP, before the conference. Mike said the ISM conference was attended by over 1,500 people. He said the points of the presentation are to follow the process and apply appropriate behaviors. He said ISM can be broken into three levels. He referenced a graphic of how ISM may be confusing to many people, but since DOE produced it, they are able to cross the duty of explaining ISM off their list. He said breaking down the graphic to the three levels would go a long way towards simplification. Mike said the issue managers will be watching for breakdowns in ISM and will then determine whether or not further advice is needed. The committee will hear a full presentation at the next committee meeting.

Handouts

Update on the Hanford Site Chronic Beryllium Disease Prevention Program (DOE)
DOE-RL Biological Control Program Update for HSEP

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Tom Carpenter	Laura Hanses	Susan Leckband
Lynn Davison	Harold Heacock	Liz Mattson
Sam Dechter	Rebecca Holland	Keith Smith
Dirk Dunning	Mike Korenko	Dick Smith (phone)

Others

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Erika Holmes, Ecology (phone)	Suzanne Heaston, BNI
--------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------

Elizabeth Bowers, DOE-RL	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Bill Eckroade, DOE-HSS
JD Dowell, DOE-RL	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Glenn Podonsky, DOE-HSS
Roger Gordon, DOE-RL	Michele Gerber, URS	Angela Adley, Public
Brenda Panghorn, DOE-RL	Barb Wise, MSA	Shannon Cram, Public
Gail Splett, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, MSA	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
Carrie Meyer, DOE	Juan Rodriguez, MSA	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Julie Goeclm, DOE	Tom Bratvold, CHPRC	Jessica Ruehrwein, EnviroIssues
Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Sonja Johnson, CHPRC	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues
Mark Fisher, BAG	Lee Milleken, CHPRC	Mike Stoner, HAMTC