

Highlights
CSWG Teleconference
Wednesday, November 16, 2011, 2:00 p.m. EST

Participants

Denny Armstrong, URS SMS/Aiken
Tom Bellinger, Y-12
Jayne-Anne Bond, ATL International
Bud Bucci, Fluor Hanford
Dave Freshwater, NA-41
Judy Fulton, SLAC
Courtney Haggard, URS SMS/Oak Ridge
Thad Kedzierski, LLNL

Jonathan Lowrie, URS SMS/Aiken
Kelly Parker, AlphaTRAC
Shana Peterson, Y-12
Jim Powers, NA-41
Josh Price, URS SMS/Oak Ridge
Tom Tuccinardi
Kelly Ward, INL
Michele Wolfgram, ORNL

Roll Call

Courtney Haggard conducted a roll call, acknowledged that 16 working group members were present, and called the teleconference to order.

Administrative Matters

Nominations were taken, and Courtney Haggard was elected as CSWG Chair.

Old Business

No old business

New Business

New business items of interest were discussed, and four topics were identified as priorities based on the interest of the group. Details of discussion on these items are included below:

1. **PAC-30 Screening.** The PAC-30 Screening approach was discussed as an item of interest. Bud Bucci discussed the Frequently Asked Question (FAQ), "Screening Thresholds and Consequence-at-Distance" and requested information from the working group on the application of PAC-30 screening. The referenced FAQ can be found on the EMI SIG website (<http://orise.orau.gov/emi/doe-o151/faq/FAQ-ScreeningThresholdsandConsequence-at-Distance.pdf>). Denny Armstrong provided a historical perspective on the reasoning behind the FAQ, including ultra-conservative results obtained from using a "parking lot" approach to determining the consequences at a distance. Michele Wolfgram offered information regarding the differences between the Consequence-at-Distance approach versus PAC-30 Screening and referenced verbiage in DOE Order 151.1C which allows for quantitative analysis to be included in the Hazards Survey if it indicates that all events would be classified as less than an Alert. This topic remains open for continued discussion.

2. **Prescreening using inventory tracking systems.** Judy Fulton expressed interest in the topic and posed a question regarding what other sites use for their screening. The discussion indicated that several sites including Hanford, Sandia, and Savannah River Site may be using some form of this approach. Denny Armstrong discussed the use of quantity-based prescreening and how aggregate amounts may not be appropriately identified by the process. Michele Wolfram offered a similar experience at ORNL. Judy Fulton expressed concern regarding aggregates from smaller containers that are later grouped into a larger container. The group identified the need for additional involvement from the sites to discuss prescreening methods and to self-identify any limitations of the prescreening process. Courtney Haggard will send an email to the CSWG requesting this information and will compile this for future discussion.
3. **Chemical waste constituent screening.** Bud Bucci expressed interest in this topic and requested information regarding a quantitative approach towards screening chemical waste constituents. Michele Wolfram discussed an interpretation of the Laboratory Scale Quantities criteria which concluded that the quantity criteria may be applicable to smaller waste containers that are easily and safely manipulated by one person, but not for larger containers of waste material. Jim Powers referred the group to the FAQ, "Screening Chemical Mixtures." The referenced FAQ can be found on the EMI SIG website (<http://orise.orau.gov/emi/doe-o151/faq/FAQ-ScreeningChemicalMixtures.pdf>). This topic remains open for continued discussion.
4. **Avoiding confusion with the Global Harmonization System (GHS).** Judy Fulton discussed complexities regarding the implementation of the GHS and identified the need to avoid confusion and maintain NFPA ratings, as necessary, for screening purposes. The group discussed looking into the feasibility of creating a crosswalk between the GHS and NFPA ratings. Michele Wolfram offered to provide Rocky Petrocchi's presentation regarding different rating systems to the group for comparison. Dave Freshwater provided the basis behind the use of NFPA ratings for screening purposes, and cautioned that the GHS is not that straightforward and cannot be directly aligned with the NFPA rating scale. The discussion concluded with the idea that we should become familiar with the GHS and develop means for avoiding confusion with the near-term implementation of GHS. This topic remains open for continued discussion.

Next HASC CSWG Meeting

The next HASC CSWG teleconference is scheduled for January 18, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. EST.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m. EST. Courtney Haggard thanked everyone for their time and contributions.