

Highlights

CSWG Teleconference

Wednesday, January 18, 2012, 2:00 p.m. EST

Participants

Denny Armstrong, URS SMS/Aiken	Josh Price, URS SMS/Oak Ridge
Tom Bellinger, Y-12	Chuck Rives, Pantex
Courtney Haggard, URS SMS/Oak Ridge	Gregory Roddahl, Pantex
Jeff Hudson, URS SMS/Oak Ridge	Michael Stanley, B&W Conversion Services, Paducah
Jonathan Lowrie, URS SMS/Aiken	Melissa Thornton, URS SMS/Oak Ridge
Michael O'Keeffe, NNS	Tom Tuccinardi
Shana Peterson, Y-12	Kelly Ward, INL
Jim Powers, NA-41	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

None.

Old Business

- PAC-30 Screening.** The discussion of the PAC-30 Screening topic began with a side conversation regarding 40 CFR 68 screening thresholds (See New Business). This led to additional discussion regarding the differences between the PAC-30 screening approach and consequence-at-distance approach. Michele Wolfgram agreed to create a white paper that would serve as a documented comparison between the two approaches **(AI 12-01)**. Another identified item of interest was to determine what PAC-30 assumptions each site uses (e.g., event type, material type), if applicable, and prepare a comparison of these assumptions. Courtney Haggard agreed to prepare the scope for the Action Item which will not serve as a means to standardize the PAC-30 screening, but instead to facilitate discussions of options and lessons learned **(AI 12-02)**.
- Prescreening using inventory tracking systems.** Courtney Haggard briefly discussed the Draft comparison of "Site-Specific Prescreening" **(AI 11-01)**, which identifies prescreening methods and limitations of the individual site's prescreening process. Courtney Haggard requested for anyone who already submitted information to review the

Chemical Screening Working Group (CSWG)

"Site-Specific Prescreening" document. Sites that have not yet provided information should send input to Courtney by March 7 for inclusion in the March 21 CSWG meeting.

3. **Chemical waste constituent screening.** Courtney Haggard opened the topic by giving a recap of the discussion from the previous meeting and by discussing the use of PAC-30 screening approach for waste constituents which can be cumbersome with extensive lists of constituents. This topic maintains interest but will be tabled for future discussion given the number of current Action Items.
4. **Avoiding confusion with the Global Harmonization System (GHS).** Mike Stanley and Denny Armstrong offered insight into and discussion of the integration of the GHS. The information provided by the GHS is not supportive of screening of hazardous materials based on the current methodology. In addition, the anticipated implementation of the GHS is not near-term. Therefore, this topic is tabled for future discussion given the number of current Action Items. Future discussion should include, as applicable, a consideration for maintaining the information currently provided by the MSDS system which could be lost in implementation of the GHS. For information purposes, website addresses pertaining to GHS were provided by Mike Stanley and Michael O'Keefe. These will also be posted to the CSWG website for reference.
 - <http://www.osha.gov/dsg/hazcom/ghs.html>
 - http://www.unece.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/ghs_welcome_e.html

New Business

Screening Thresholds

- Mike O'Keefe raised a question regarding the use of 40 CFR 68 screening thresholds and EPA 550-B-99-009, *Risk Management Program Guidance*, for use as a possible screening criteria.
- Jim Powers provided a perspective on the historical use of these and other thresholds and the reasoning behind moving away from their use for Emergency Planning purposes. Not all materials are included in these lists, some of which are known to be considerable hazards. The CFR itself acknowledges that the list is not complete. Historically, questions arose regarding how to screen materials that are not on the list. Additionally, the EPA focus is on offsite consequences, but Emergency Management has to consider protective actions onsite as well.
- Chuck Rives stated that 29 CFR 1910.119, *Process Safety Management*, in combination with the 40 CFR 68 thresholds could potentially be more applicable from an EM perspective.
- Mike O'Keefe discussed the potential for examining the development of the thresholds for information purposes and to determine if there may be a path forward toward using similar thresholds in the future. He will report with more information at the next CSWG meeting.



Next HASC CSWG Meeting

The next HASC CSWG teleconference is scheduled for **Wednesday, March 21, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. EDT. Note the change in scheduled time from 2:00 EST to 1:00 EDT.**

The May 2012 HASC CSWG meeting will coincide with the 2012 EMI SIG Annual Meeting. The group decided on an informal meeting during a scheduled break in Seattle. More information will be provided.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m. EST. Courtney Haggard thanked everyone for their time and contributions.