

March 8 2001

Dear Stakeholder

The Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement (RFCA) Stakeholder Focus Group will meet at the Broomfield Municipal Center at One DesCombes Drive on March 14 2001 from 3 30 to 6 30 p m

The agenda for the March 14 2001 meeting is enclosed (Attachment A) We will discuss the following topics

RSAL Schedule Review Update
Path Forward for the Focus Group
Establish Process for Reaching Closure on Issues

The meeting minutes for the February 28 2001 meeting are still in preparation at the time of this transmittal The meeting minutes will be submitted via email as soon as they are completed Paper copies will be brought to the March 14 RFCA Focus Group meeting Appendices to the meeting minutes are enclosed as some are not email friendly

Attachment B presents the latest RSAL Review Schedule

If you need additional information to prepare you for the Focus Group discussion on March 14 2001 please contact Christine Bennett of AlphaTRAC Inc at 303 428 5670 (cbennett@alphatrac.com) Christine will help to find the appropriate resource for you

You may call either Christine or me if you have any questions comments or suggestions concerning the RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group or the upcoming meeting

Sincerely

C Reed Hodgins CCM
Facilitator / Process Manager



ADMIN RECORD

SW A-004345

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION
REVIEW WAIVER PER
CLASSIFICATION OFFICE

1/12

RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting Agenda

When **March 14, 2001 3 30 - 6 30 p m**

Where **Broomfield Municipal Hall, Bal Swan and Zang's
Spur Rooms**

3 30 3 40 Introductions Agenda Review 2/28 Meeting Minutes Review

3 40 3 50 RSAL Schedule Review Update

3 50 5 00 Path Forward for the Focus Group

5 00 5 15 Break

5 15 6 15 Establish Process for Reaching Closure on Issues

6 15 6 30 Set Future Agendas and Review Meeting

6 30 Adjourn

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
February 28, 2001
Participants List**

NAME		ORGANIZATION / COMPANY
David	Abelson	RFCLOG
Christine	Bennett	AlphaTRAC Inc
Lane	Butler	Kaiser Hill Company LLC
Kimberly	Chleboun	RFCLOG
John	Ciolek	AlphaTRAC Inc
John	Corsi	Kaiser Hill Company LLC
Carol	Deck	Kaiser Hill Co LLC
Rick	DiSalvo	US DOE RFFO
Sam	Dixion	City of Westminster
Shirley	Garcia	City of Broomfield
Aaron	Grider	Jefferson County
Steve	Gunderson	CDPHE
Jerry	Henderson	RFCAB
Reed	Hodgin	AlphaTRAC Inc
Victor	Holm	RFCAB
Jeremy	Karpatkin	US DOE RFFO
Paul	Kilburn	JCNA
Joe	Legare	DOE
Jean	Lillich	
Ann	Lockhart	CDPHE
John	Marler	RFCLOG
Tom	Marshall	Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center
Robert	Mastro	DOE Comm
LeRoy	Moore	RMPJC
Sheila	Plunkett	Rocky Mtn Peace and Justice Center
Tim	Rehder	US EPA
Mark	Sattelberg	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Kathy	Schnoor	City of Broomfield
Joel	Selbin	
Dave	Shelton	Kaiser Hill Company LLC
Carl	Spreng	CDPHE
Ken	Starr	TCAT / RFSALOP
Noelle	Stenger	RFCAB
George	Vancil	City of Arvada

INTEGRATED SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM VERIFICATION (ISMSV) ENABLING PRINCIPLES AND CORE REQUIREMENTS

From the initial ISMSV it became evident it would be helpful in the design of future reviews to have a set of core requirements upon which the review could be based. The following core requirements were developed from the requirements of the DOE P 450 4, the requirements of the DEAR, and the fundamental attributes which support implementation of the Integrated Safety Management System.

A. The following core requirements should permit a full evaluation of an Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) at a site, a facility, an activity, or a process. Completion of the 13 enabling principles will verify successful implementation of ISMS.

1. Consistent and Responsive ISMS Description

The ISMS description should be consistent with DOE P 450 4, the DEAR, and the guidance as to the expectations for integrated safety management provided to the contractor by the Approval Authority.

2. Define the scope of Work

This requirement should be assessed at each organizational level (e.g., from the sitewide mission tasks to the processes at an individual facility to the individual operational or maintenance item within a facility). Only through clear definition of the work is it possible to manage the work safely. Some elements of this requirement, as discussed in DOE P 450 4, include the statement: "Missions are translated into work expectations are set, tasks are identified and prioritized, and resources are allocated."

3. Analyze hazards

This requirement should be assessed at each organizational level from the work defined in the sitewide mission tasks (as in an Environmental Impact Statement [EIS]) to the processes at an individual facility (in a Safety Analysis Report [SAR]) to the individual operational or maintenance item which is contemplated within a facility (as in a Process Hazard Analysis [PHA] or an Radiological Work Permit [RWP]). The hazards which are analyzed should include nuclear as well as chemical and common industrial hazards. The analysis should be balanced to the complexity of the work as well as the significance of the risk. As described in DOE P 450 4, hazards associated with the work are identified, analyzed, and categorized.

4. Develop Controls

Controls are developed which provide satisfactory mitigation for the hazards which have been analyzed. The controls may include programmatic, administrative, and engineering requirements. Those controls should be appropriate to the hazards which have been identified for work at all levels from the sitewide mission to the facility processes to the individual operation or maintenance action. As specified in DOE P 450 4, the controls include applicable standards and requirements which are identified and agreed upon. Controls to prevent/mitigate hazards are identified, and the safety envelope is established.

5. Implement Controls

The ISMS should provide for a method to implement the controls identified at every level of work and hazard. The methods should provide for assurance that the controls remain in effect so long as the hazard is present.

6. Operations Authorizations

The ISMS should provide for gaining authorization to conduct operations. Provisions should be included to grant operations authorizations for each level of effort at the site, facility, activity, or process. Such provisions or procedures may include an Operational Readiness Review approval to resume operations following a week-end shutdown, and authorization to start individual procedures or work items through

mechanisms such as work clearance permits, shift orders, or shift managers control. The ISMS should also provide for updating and configuration control for the operations authorization documentation such as Authorization Agreements, permits, SARs, etc.

7 Perform Work within Controls

Procedures and programs should be adequate to insure that work is performed within the controls which have been developed and implemented. Controls may include site or facility commitments such as conduct of operations and maintenance programs, worker safety programs, specified engineered safety systems, or specific controls in worker safety permits. The controls may be specified in site level programs or facility specific authorization bases documents. The ISMS should include provisions to insure that on going work continues to be performed within the specified and agreed upon controls.

8 Provide Feedback and Continuous Improvement

All aspects of the ISMS should be subject to continuous improvement through an assessment and a feedback process. At each level of work and at every stage in the work process, planning, the feedback and continuous improvement programs should be functioning. Feedback information on the adequacy of controls is gathered, opportunities for improving the definition and planning of work are identified and implemented, line and independent oversight is conducted, and if necessary, regulatory enforcement actions occur.

9 Line Management is Responsible for Safety and Clear Roles and responsibilities are established and maintained

At every level of control, line management must be responsible for safety. Clear and unambiguous roles and responsibilities should be defined and maintained at all organizational levels within the organization defined by the ISMS description. All aspects of work, identification, planning, and control must be executed under the control and responsibility of line management. Support organizations such as ES&H or personnel departments must have clearly defined roles and responsibilities which insure work is performed safely within the clearly defined principle that line management is responsible for safety.

10 Competence is Commensurate with Responsibility

Personnel shall possess the experience, knowledge, skills, and abilities that are necessary to discharge the responsibilities. All organizations and activities within the ISMS should be evaluated to insure that the competence is commensurate with the assigned responsibilities. Support and line personnel, workers as well as managers, should be included within the verification of this core requirement. The actual competence as well as the programs to define the expectations, provide the training, and evaluate that expectations are met, should be assessed. The process for the determination of the required competence should consider the roles and responsibilities of each position.

11 Balanced Priorities

Resources shall be effectively allocated to address safety, programmatic, and operational considerations. Protecting the public, the workers, and the environment shall be a priority whenever activities are planned and performed. Balancing priorities is particularly important when defining work, assessing hazards, identifying controls, and in designing feedback and continuous improvement programs. Once a decision is made that a work item is to be conducted, all the identified controls are necessary and thus the decision to do the work is a prioritization decision to apply the necessary resources as defined by the agreed upon controls.

12 Adequate Implementation and Integration Mechanisms

Implementation and integration mechanisms should be identified. Integration should be evident throughout all organizational functions at all organizational levels from the site to the individual activity (horizontal or vertical integration). ISMS specific programmatic requirements should include assessment, continuous improvement, and annual updates.

13 DOE Organization and Processes support ISM

The DOE Approval Authority should have a set of processes which interface efficiently and effectively with the contractor organization. DOE processes must include elements of the other core requirements as they apply to the responsibilities of DOE to translate missions into work, set expectations, and allocate resources as well as to approve, control, and authorize operations.

B ISMSV Core Requirements

1 Define the Scope of Work

A process has been established to clearly define facility missions. These missions have been translated into discrete tasks or processes that facility personnel understand and can adequately control. Specific tasks, operations, or work items are identified and prioritized.

2 Analyze the Hazards

The full spectrum of hazards associated with work or a task have been identified, analyzed, and categorized. Those personnel responsible for the analysis of environment, safety, and health impacts have been effectively integrated into the contractor's organization and work closely with those individuals who are responsible for the analysis of the processes.

3 Develop and Implement Hazard Controls

A process has been established that identifies appropriate safety requirements and readily adapts them to the diverse activities and hazards present within a facility. The set of requirements must be comprehensive and ensure adequate protection of the public, worker, and the environment.

The contractor has established adequate mechanisms for implementing the set of safety requirements agreed upon with DOE. These mechanisms ensure that consideration is given to the protection of the public, the worker, and the environment and that the appropriate controls merge together at the workplace to prevent or mitigate the hazards that have been identified.

4 Authorize and Perform Work within Controls

A process has been established for the effective planning of hazardous work. Personnel who are assigned responsibility for completing this work are instructed on the hazards and the engineered and administrative controls that will be used to control the hazards. Personnel performing the work are provided with a single set of instructions that effectively integrate the necessary controls. Appropriate mechanisms are in place to authorize the performance of the work, including a process that confirms the readiness to perform the work before it is started.

5 Feedback and Continuous Improvement

A process has been established to measure performance and identify opportunities for improvement. This includes identifying opportunities for improvement even in those cases where the current level of performance has been demonstrated to meet current expectations or safety goals. Recommended improvements are appropriately evaluated and are implemented when proven to be cost effective. Safety performance is measured by line management and is periodically validated by independent parties.

ROCKY FLATS CLEANUP AGREEMENT STAKEHOLDER FOCUS GROUP

Community Process Discussion

February 28 2001

DRAFT Revision 0

The community members of the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement (RFCA) Stakeholder Focus Group dedicated a portion of their February 28 2001 meeting to a discussion of the Focus Group process. Following is a facilitator's summary of that discussion.

FOCUS GROUP GOAL OBJECTIVES AND INTERESTS

The community members identified the following framework for the Focus Group which is shared in common:

Community Goal for the Focus Group To achieve the best possible cleanup of Rocky Flats

Community Objectives for the Focus Group

- Get complete information about cleanup related studies and decisions throughout the cleanup process
- Influence the agencies in their cleanup decisions
- Get clear understanding of agency decisions
 - Get clear understanding of the technical basis for decisions
 - Get clear understanding of the policy implications of decisions

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
Process Discussion Summary – February 28 2001**

- Know when a decision has been made – as soon as possible in the decision making process

Community Interests for the Focus Group

- Collaborate with agencies on cleanup analyses and decisions
- Understand the objectives for each discussion
- Get closure on each issue addressed
- Collaborate with agencies on setting Focus Group agendas

FOCUS GROUP PROCESS

The community members identified the following revisions which should be made to the Focus Group process

The agencies and community should work together to set the path forward for the Focus Group

The Focus Group should establish a steering committee to set the agenda for each meeting. The steering committee should include representatives from the RFCAB, the RFCLOG, and the agencies.

Agendas should be structured so that there is sufficient time for a full dialog on each issue addressed.

The agencies should provide background information on each issue to be discussed in the packet prior to the meeting.

There should be a round robin at the end of each meeting to get a key thought from each participant (a decision to pass will be honored).

**RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group
Process Discussion Summary – February 28 2001**

A holistic check in should be part of every meeting – where we are in the big picture and where we are going next

The March 14 2001 meeting should be dedicated to setting the path forward for the Focus Group and to establishing a process for reaching closure on each issue addressed by the group The path forward should be based on a current comprehensive outline of upcoming cleanup decisions and issues brought to the Focus Group by the agencies

FOCUS GROUP GROUND RULES

The facilitator will add the following ground rules to the Focus Group process based on the community discussion

Focus on the issue not the person Participants should demonstrate respect for each other as persons even when they disagree on issues Participants should not reprimand or criticize each other in person or in writing

No surprises! Controversial statements or issues should be shared with all of the participants prior to the Focus Group meeting Any potentially controversial written comments should be included in the packet prior to the Focus Group meeting

RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group

Issue

June 2001 will mark the first year anniversary of the RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group. While the group has discussed several Environmental Restoration (ER) subjects and their associated issues at length over the past 9 months, other important ER closure projects have yet to be introduced. These projects include decision documents currently in the early planning stages or in actual development, on going special studies and reports that bear directly on Site policy and future decisions and near term remedial actions. The RFCA Stakeholder Focus Group was intended as the primary forum for discussion of these projects and some subjects appeared on the original syllabus.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the discussions is to inform the focus group of the ER projects planned for Site closure. Objectives are as follows:

- Develop a clear understanding of the Site closure strategy
- Describe the ER projects and how they fit into the closure strategy and
- Obtain input from the focus group on the projects and strategy

Approach

The attached draft ER Stakeholder Participation Schedule describes relevant projects and the suggested frequency of discussion. The overall approach is to provide a project overview at the first meeting with later follow up discussions as the project progresses toward completion. Discussions will be technically focused with a presentation by technical staff followed by a question and answer period. Total discussion time will be approximately two hours. The question and answer period may generate issues that merit follow up discussion prior to the next scheduled meeting on the same project. These discussions will be accommodated to the extent that they do not delay scheduled dates for other topics. Some of the topics to be discussed will include decision documents, studies, reports and plans, and fieldwork. Some of the topics include 903 Pad Interim Measures/Interim Remedial Action, Present Landfill decision document, Original Landfill decision document, Solar Ponds Decision Document, Industrial Area Plume design, and the Buffer Zone Sampling and Analysis Plan. Also status information updates on the Land Configuration Design Basis, groundwater plumes, Annual Historical Release Report Update, Building 771 Under Building Contamination Characterization, and PU&D Yard plume treatability study.

Environmental Restoration Stakeholder Participation Schedule

Decision Documents	3/01	4/01	5/01	6/01	7/01	8/01	9/01	10/01	11/01	12/01	1/02	2/02	3/02	4/02	5/02
Soils Mgmt RSOP	F														
IASAP															
BZ SAP															
ER RSOP	F														
903 Pad															
Present Landfill															
Solar Ponds															
Original Landfill															
IROD/RIDD															
SW Control Config															
IA Plume Design															
Final ROD															
Studies Reports & Plans															
Water Balance															
Land Configuration															
GW Plume Report															
Annual Work Review															
Annual IA Strategy Update															
Annual HRR Update															
Field Work															
B771 UBCE															
PU&D Plume															
B123/B886 UBCE															

Continued updates and discussion on this schedule will be included on this schedule and will be included in the next HRR Update

Status Review/Focus Group Discussion
 Formal Public Comment
 Informal Public Information
 Approved and Implemented

Draft RSAL Public Process Proposed Schedule (3/7/01)
 (Changes from previous version are in bold)

Task	Initial Draft	Focus Group Mtg	2 Draft	Focus Group Mtg	Public Review & FG Comments	Final Draft
Task 1 (Regulatory Analysis)	10/27/00	11/18/00 & 11/19/00	1/19/01	2/14/01	3/8/01	3/22/01
Task 2 (Modeling)	11/20/00	12/13/00	3/23/01	3/28/01	4/11/01	5/30/01 (Note 3)
Task 3 (Permitting)	4/17/01	1/31/01	(Note 1)	4/25/01	5/09/01	5/30/01
Task 4 (News)	4/3/01	1/17/01	(Note 1)	4/11/01	4/25/01 (Note 2)	5/16/01
Task 5 (Consultation)	10/25/00	11/8/00	12/1/00	1/3/01		5/30/01 (with report)

Focus Group Meetings (Proposed)

10/25/00	11/8/00	11/29/00	12/13/00	1/3/01
Review of RSAL	Regulatory (Report)	Regulatory (Q&A) RFCA Review	Regulatory Modeling (Report)	Initial SAP News
1/17/01	1/31/01	2/14/01	2/28/01	3/14/01
Site News Workshop	Initial RSAL Workshop	Regulatory Update Workshop	ALARA	Task 1 Public Review & FG Comments Model Evaluation
3/28/01	4/11/01	4/25/01	5/9/01	5/23/01
Modeling Site Analysis	News Task 2 Public Review & FG Comments ALARA	Permitting (Report)	Permitting Task 4 FG Comments	Draft Report Task 3 Public Review & FG Comments

Formal Public Comment Period For RSAL Report

6/14/01	8/13/01	9/14/01
Public Comment	Public Comment	Final Report

Note: Schedule for public review of draft report to be completed by the end of the public comment period.

2. Focus group meeting with public review of draft Task 4

3. Final draft of Task 2 held for the modeling workshop (will be added with final draft report)

12/12